CITIZEN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

City of Portland / City Auditor

Community Oversight of Portland Police Bureau
Independent Police Review (IPR)

Citizen Review Committee (CRC)

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 (meetings are typically held the first Wednesday of each month)
Time: 5:30 pm * *Please Note: agenda times are approximate*
Location: Virtual Meeting

Present: Candace Avalos, Sylvan Fraser, Taylor Snell, Yume Delegato, Amanda Greenvoss, Kyra Pappas, Jessica Katz, Gregg Griffin, Julie Falk, Ross Caldwell, Irene Konev, Captain Bates, Commander Hurley, Lt. Gjovik, Fallon Niedrist, Maya Rinta, CRC Appellant, Debbie Aiona, Dan Handelman, Jonas Geissler, Barbara Christianson, Carol Cushman

AGENDA

5:30 pm—5:35 pm Introductions and Welcome by CRC Chair Candace Avalos

5:35 pm - 5:40 pm About Tonight's Meeting

- Chair Avalos: Welcomed everyone and welcomed new CRC members.
- CRC recorder duties on rotation. Rotation schedule was shared with meeting participants, and issues will be stored in a Parking Lot. The CRC parking lot sheet was shared virtually in the meeting.
- Ms. Greenvoss is first to be the CRC recorder, list is in alphabetical order.

5:40 pm - 5:45 pm Approval of Minutes

- **Minutes:** March Minutes and April minutes to approve. If a CRC member is not at a meeting, they cannot approve minutes. Five new members cannot vote for the minutes. Minutes were moved to be approved by Ms. Falk and seconded by Ms. Pappas.
- Vote called:
- Chair Avalos: Aye
- Ms. Falk: Aye
- Mr. Mozyrsky Aye

- Mr. Delegato Abstain
- Mx. Fraser: Aye
- Mr. Snell: Aye
- Ms. Katz Abstain
- Ms. Pappas Abstain
- Ms. Greenvoss Abstain

Minutes approved

April Minutes:

Mr. Snell moved to approve April minutes, seconded by Mr. Mozyrsky

- Vote called:
- Ms. Falk Aye
- Mr. Mozyrsky Aye
- Mx. Fraser Aye
- Mr. Snell Aye
- Chair Avalos Aye
- Remainer of CRC Abstained

Minutes approved

May Minutes:

Mr. Delegato moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Ms. Greenvoss

- Vote:
- Chair Avalos Aye
- Ms. Falk Aye
- Ms. Mozyrsky Abstain
- Mr. Griffin Aye
- Mr. Delegato Aye
- Ms. Greenvoss Aye
- Mx. Fraser Aye
- Mr. Snell Aye

- Ms. Pappas Aye
- Ms. Katz Aye

Minutes approved

5:45 pm - 5:50 pm Director's Report (IPR Director Ross Caldwell)

https://www.portlandoregon.gov/ipr/article/784174

- Director Caldwell: Director's report was shared, outreach.
- Update on the DOJ compliance agreement.
- New City Ordinance passed today to exempt training for CRC members to serve on PRB – for now ride-along and Citizen Academy not required to serve on PRB cases until folks can work in person; postponed PRB cases for a week or two. Once safe to work in person, training requirement will come back. Will look at in-service training for CRC.
- Case load numbers, making progress on backlog of protests. Many cases have gone to Internal Affairs (IA).
- Chair Avalos reminded Mr. Griffin that he is the recorder for this meeting. Asked the audience to put their introductions into the chat.

5:50 pm - 5:55 pm Chair's Report (CRC Chair Candace Avalos)

- Chair Avalos: Have folks met with their CRC buddy yet, and remined folks to do so.
- Will discuss CRC retreat later.
- Met with the Mayor, discussed the Crowd Control Report, went over the report process and outreach to hear from community report input.
- Mayor talked about OIR report working on assessment of PPB – bias why culture resistance exists.
- Council members will be picking members for new oversight, and Council has given three years of support to IPR bonuses, to retain people at IPR.
- Mayor reminded Chair Avalos and Auditor is not required to keep IPR.
- Met with IPR and CRC, PRB cases schedule, need off office hours for PRB cases, Ms. Pomerantz will create a sign-up sheet for PRB rotation.
- City Attorney will work at future restaffing for attorneys in future CRC meetings.

- PRB file accessibility will remain virtual.

Appeal Case File Review/ Appeal Hearing 2020-C-0043/ 2021-X-0001

Chat box was closed, CRC moved into the appeal process.

- First step File Review, making sure the case had the information needed to review, discussed the completeness of the file. Appeal will be the second phase of the process. Many allegations. Appeal summary was posted into the chat box.
- Asked if every member of the CRC has read the case.
- Asked for IPR to give an overview of their role in the case.
- Director Caldwell gave an overview of the case. Not able to contact appellant and attorney at the beginninr, case was closed, later reopened and investigation was completed. Received the CRC appeal in November of 2020.
- Mr. Delegato had a question, this was discussed, without direct access to DA files, could not determine the information.
- Questions of IPR?
- Ms. Falk: Multiple threads of the appeal with another person?
- Mr. Caldwell, that was handled in a different case. Another person was arrested and IPR investigated it, but it is separate case.
- Mx. Fraser, similar question, was there a separate interview?
- Mr. Caldwell, sometimes this happens, interview them at once to save time.
- Mx. Fraser, emails from IPR investigators videos were not relied. Referenced videos, found confusing.
- Mr. Caldwell, there were a lot of videos reviewed so need to find out which video being talked about, had to go through the City Attorney's Office to get videos.
- Mx. Fraser, videos that were eventually gotten by IPR, are they the same as videos CRC get?
- Mr. Caldwell, would need to know which videos are being asked for.
- Mr. Delegato, some correspondence at PPB if there was footage of the arrest.
- Mr. Caldwell, IPR often ask media to get video, sometimes can't get the videos. Very difficult. Looking for ideas on how to do this better.
- Ms. Rinta, there was reference to a video, she put in a records request, but did not get it.
- Mr. Caldwell, that is the same video in the file.

- Mx. Fraser, is there any way to get the video?
- Mr. Caldwell, if seeking more information, CRC would need to stop and find the video and wait to hear this case later.
- Ms. Greenvoss, the file ending in 06 is the right one?
- Mr. Caldwell asked if Ms. Rinta has the same video?
- Mx. Fraser felt like the file is complete. Allegation question, unfounded.
- Mr. Caldwell, a typo in the summary allegation 6 should be unfounded in the summary.
- Mx. Fraser, allegation 7, justify a finding of not sustained, but listed as unfounded, pg. 14. Justifies a non-sustained, but later listed as unfounded instead of not sustained.
- Mr. Caldwell, that is what we are here to find out, if the case is complete.
- Mx. Fraser, in one of those places is it an error?
- Lt. Gjovik, it appears there is a mistake, but it is inconsequential. Not findings of record.
- Mr. Caldwell, everything Lt. Gjovik said is accurate.
- Chair Avalos asked IA to give their report on this case.
- Lt. Gjovik, this was an IPR case, IA just facilitate the interviews and reviewed the report; had very little to do with this case.
- Mr. Snell, the media video, was that IPR editing?
- Mr. Caldwell, tried to subpoena video, but could not get the video, don't have teeth with subpoena power, don't have the rest of the video.

Public Comment:

Mr. Handelman: Interviews of appellant and officers, but not witnesses. How unfounded was attached allegations in use of force. Obtaining videos, very dangerous to give unpublished video to government. Don't pass judgment on media not sharing video with IPR. Attorney did not have access to the file, but a CRC Appeal Process Advisor (APA) would have had case file access.

- Mr. Caldwell, an APA was offered to this appellant, but they only have an attorney. In answer to Dan's question, witnesses not found, cannot be interviewed.
  Mx. Fraser, was there a witness?
- Mr. Caldwell, IPR askes, but if no witnesses are presented, they can't be interviewed.
- Ms. Rinta, I have videos, but I cannot cross reference them, is there a moment to have that happen here? If computer screen could be shared, that would be good.

- Mr. Caldwell, cannot have any new evidence come in at this point, must be very careful in CRC appeals.
- Chair Avalos did not allow the screen share, statement is okay, but materials cannot be shared.
- Ms. Rinta just want to cross reference at this point.
- Ms. Niedrist, the opportunity for that was when IPR was investigating this case, explained the CRC process.
- Ms. Rinta, if case is sent back to IPR for further investigation would that not bring in new information?
- Ms. Niedrist, CRC needs to make specific recommendations that require new information, missing or requires further investigation.
- Mr. Delegato, if all these documents were submitted to IPR, then all these documents should be in the file?
- Mr. Caldwell, yes, but if you want to take time to verify, we can come back to this case later.
- Chair Avalos, the point of the investigation process is that it should have all been sorted, but if CRC wants to triple check, we can postpone this case.
- Mr. Caldwell, if CRC want to review the case more closely, it can postpone this case.
- Ms. Niedrist, Ms. Rinta, did all the videos you have get sent to IPR?
- Chair Avalos, Ms. Rinta, you sent everting you have, but can't confirm?
- Ms. Rinta, yes
- Mr. Caldwell, this is one of the flaws of the IPR system.
- Ms. Rinta went over the videos in question and everyone looked through their files, to verify videos and tweets and all information so that everyone has the same information. This helped satisfy the questions CRC had and the file review.
- Motion to move that the investigation file is complete, and CRC move forward with the appeal was moved by Ms. Greenvoss and seconded by Mr. Delegato.

Vote on completeness of the file:

Chair Avalos Aye

Ms. Falk Aye

Ms. Mozyrsky Aye

Mr. Griffin Aye

Mr. Delegato Aye

Ms. Greenvoss Aye

Mx. Fraser Aye

Mr. Snell Aye

Ms. Pappas Aye

Ms. Katz Aye

Vote passed.

Appeal

- Chair Avalos went over the process of the appeal and explained the next steps. She asked IPR to add anything at this point.
- Mr. Caldwell had nothing further to add.
- Appellant made a statement through her attorney Ms. Rinta, who thanked the CRC for their work. Ms. Rinta went through the major pieces of the findings of the case, and how her client was arrested for during the protest. She went over the details of the incident going through each allegation.
- Appellant was offered time to speak, but appellant declined.
- Officer statement was offered but officer was not present.
- Internal Affairs was offered to make a statement, but declined
- Command staff explanation was offered, and Commander Hurley spoke.
- Commander Hurley went over the history of the case in detail for each allegation.
- IPR was offered to comment and Director Caldwell talked about IPR constraints.
- Mr. Snell disclosed that he went to law school together with Ms. Rinta, but that was not going to be conflict of interest. He also said he had concerns about allegations 1 through 3.
- Other CRC members expressed concerns, went over questions and after a robust discussion moved onto the next phase of the appeal.

Public Comment:

Ms. Reyna: Gave an overview of her time as PPB sergeant, use of force in policy in protests and how policy impacted this appellant; that use of force against the appellant is unreasonable. Individuals singled out in protests was not reasonable, and addressed "contempt of cop." Officers should not have used force. Gave an overview of how officers lied in use of force reports during her career. Officers used force on appellant.

Mr. Handelman: Failing the attitude test, police felt justifiable to arrest her, bias of the police. Proud Boys got an escort and this appellant got arrested, letting the right-wing protesters go but arrested appelant. Decisions about this case were made in 2020, and Commander Hurley said publicly that people should vote out the DA. PPB created the problem of traffic blocked and then blamed the appellant. Officers made bad decisions, and officers should have debriefings added.

Mr. Mort: Should not be bringing in new evidence into the community, but someone wearing Black Lives Matter got targeted. These events were political to the police. Was in the protest, anyone who comes to the protest is seen by the PPB as political event. Police have discretion and should not be given full reign, arrested a lot of women. Applaud the CRC for going through this appleal carefully.

- Appellant Statement or rebuttal: This has been traumatic; daughter saw this on TV and was traumatized. Been at the hospital, had injuries, doctor said appellant has versa from this injury, a pocket of air and it will get worse, using Biofreeze every day, and feels like appellant was specifically targeted.
- Internal Affairs Rebuttal: Did not have rebuttal referred to IPR.
- Director Caldwell, reiterated what was said before, this was a struggle, CRC struggled too, reviewed the evidence carefully and made findings.
- Ms. Niedrist explained the next steps and the role of the CRC, supported by the evidence or not supported by the evidence.
- Chair Avalos, clarified the next steps, need to go through and negate if first?
- Ms. Niedrist, yes, first whether fining is supported by the evidence or not supported by the evidence, needs to be distinct and only then move onto the next step.
- Chair Avalos, this is new to CRC, go through each one.
- Ms. Falk Can CRC ask for a debrief?
- Ms. Niedrist, a recommendation of a debrief can be added.
- Director Caldwell, Chief's Office could disagree and send CRC something which could lead to a conference hearing.

- Chair Avalos let's go through each one and then make a recommendation afterwards.

Allegation # 1 Officer A made an unjustified and improper arrest of the Appellant during a protest in downtown Portland [Conduct - Exonerated]

CRC Motion: Affirm finding

- **Moved by Mr. Mozyrsky.**
- **Seconded by Mx. Fraser.**

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky Yes

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss No

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell No

Ms. Pappas No

Ms. Katz No

Passed 6-4-0

Allegation #1: Officer A made an unjustified and improper arrest of the Appellant during a protest in downtown Portland [Conduct - Exonerated]

CRC Motion: Add Debrief to affirm exonerated finding.

Moved to Ms. Falk.

Seconded by Chair Avalos.

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky Yes

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss Yes

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell Yes

Ms. Pappas Yes

Ms. Katz Yes

Passed 10-0-0

Allegation #2: Officer B made an unjustified and improper arrest of the Appellant during a protest in downtown Portland [Conduct - Exonerated*]*
CRC Motion: Affirm exonerated but add debrief.
Moved by Mr. Delegato.
Seconded by Mr. Mozyrsky.

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky Yes

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss No

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell No

Ms. Pappas No

Ms. Katz No

Passed 6-4-0

Allegation #3 Officer C made an unjustified and improper arrest of the Appellant during a protest in downtown Portland [Conduct - Exonerated]

CRC Motion: Affirm exonerated but add debrief

Moved by Mr. Delegato.

Seconded by Ms. Falk.

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky Yes

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss No

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell No

Ms. Pappas No

Ms. Katz No

Passed 6-4-0

Allegation #4: Officer A used inappropriate force during the custody of the Appellant. [Force - Unfounded]
CRC Motion: Challenge finding
Moved by Mx. Fraser.
Seconded by Ms. Greenvoss.

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky Yes

Mr. Griffin No

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss Yes

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell Yes

Ms. Pappas Yes

Ms. Katz Yes

Passed 9-1-0

Allegation #4: Officer A used inappropriate force during the custody of the Appellant. [Force - Unfounded]

CRC Motion: New finding is Not Sustained with Debrief

Moved by Mx. Fraser.

Seconded by Ms. Greenvoss.

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky Yes

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss Yes

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell No

Ms. Pappas Yes

Ms. Katz Yes

Passed 9-1-0

Allegation #5: Officer B used inappropriate force during the custody of the Appellant. [Force - Unfounded]
CRC Motion: Challenge finding
Moved by Mr. Delegato.
Seconded by Mx. Fraser.

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky Yes

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss Yes

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell Yes

Ms. Pappas Yes

Ms. Katz Yes

Passes 10-0-0

Allegation #5: Officer B used inappropriate force during the custody of the Appellant. [Force - Unfounded]
CRC Motion: New finding is Not Sustained with Debrief
Moved by Ms. Greenvoss.
Seconded by Mr. Delegato.

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky Yes

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss Yes

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell No

Ms. Pappas Yes

Ms. Katz Yes

Passes 9-1-0

Allegation #6: Officer C used inappropriate force during the custody of the Appellant. [Force - Unfounded]
CRC Motion: Challenge finding
Moved by Ms. Pappas.
Seconded by Mr. Delegato.

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky Yes

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss Yes

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell Yes

Ms. Pappas Yes

Ms. Katz Yes

Passes 10-0-0

Allegation #6: Officer C used inappropriate force during the custody of the Appellant. [Force - Unfounded]
CRC Motion: New finding is Not Sustained with Debrief.
Moved by Mx. Fraser
Seconded by Ms. Falk.

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky Yes

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss Yes

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell No

Ms. Pappas Yes

Ms. Katz Yes

Passed 9-1-0

Allegation #7: Officer B wrote an inaccurate report in relation to the arrest of the Appellant. [Procedure - Unfounded]
CRC Motion: Challenge finding.
Moved by Mx. Fraser.
Seconded by Ms. Greenvoss.

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky No

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss Yes

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell Yes

Ms. Pappas Yes

Ms. Katz Yes

Passed 9-1-0

Allegation #7: Officer B wrote an inaccurate report in relation to the arrest of the Appellant. [Procedure - Unfounded]
CRC Motion: Change finding to sustained.
Moved by Mx. Fraser.
Seconded by Mr. Snell.

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk No

Mr. Mozyrsky No

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato No

Ms. Greenvoss Yes

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell Yes

Ms. Pappas Yes

Ms. Katz Yes

Passed 7-3-0

Allegation #8: Officer B made the decision to arrest the Appellant on the basis of race. [Disparate Treatment - Not Sustained]
CRC Motion: Challenge finding.
Moved by Mx. Fraser.
Seconded by none – motion dies.

Chair Avalos

Ms. Falk

Mr. Mozyrsky

Mr. Griffin

Mr. Delegato

Ms. Greenvoss

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser

Mr. Snell

Ms. Pappas

Ms. Katz

Passed 0-0-0

Allegation #8: Officer B made the decision to arrest the Appellant on the basis of race. [Disparate Treatment - Not Sustained]
CRC Motion: Affirm finding but add a debrief
Moved by Mr. Mozyrsky
Seconded by Mr. Delegato

Chair Avalos Yes

Ms. Falk Yes

Mr. Mozyrsky Yes

Mr. Griffin Yes

Mr. Delegato Yes

Ms. Greenvoss Yes

Ms. Pomerantz 0

Mx. Fraser Yes

Mr. Snell Yes

Ms. Pappas Yes

Ms. Katz Yes

Passed 10-0-0

- Chair Avalos thanked the appellant and her attorney, and acknowledged the anger and frustration felt. Will work with IPR to move through the process and keep the appellant appraised on the process.
- Skip the rest of the agenda items and go directly to public comment. Comment will be timed at two minutes.

Public Comment:

Dan Handelman, produces a show and have last City Council appeal on Flyingfocus.org and will be aired tonight at 11 pm. City Attorney has made this assertion on separate vote before for CRC, has been done by the CRC before and check with your own attorney in the future. Appreciate the work of the CRC.

Jasmin from KBOO Radio, stay to the end, appreciate the work of the CRC. Thanked the CRC for the work they do.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 pm

7:50 pm—8:00 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. Policy and 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 points for ongoing communications with IPR, the City, the Bureau, community members and/or act as the face of CRC.

Chair: Vadim Mozyrsky / Members: and Julie Falk, David Lin, Shaina Pomerantz
IPR staff: Irene Konev, Senior Community Outreach Coordinator

Next workgroup meeting tomorrow. A conference call is scheduled for May 17th with Commissioner Hardesty's Office.

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: Vadim Mozyrsky and Jihane Nami

No updates.

3. Crowd Control Workgroup & Use of Force 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: Candace Avalos /Members: Andy Chiller, Sylvan Fraser, Taylor Snell, Yume Delegato, Sarah Malik, Amanda Boman, Barak Goodman, Val Barlow, and Alec Condon

Chair Avalos: Crowd control workgroup put together a report and it is close to being done. Recommendations were approved at last meeting. The report will be sent for CRC to review the report. The whole CRC will vote on it at the next full CRC meeting. It will be an up or down vote. If anyone has questions about the report, send the questions in advance of the next meeting.

6:45 pm—7:00 pm Public comment and wrap-up comments by CRC members

Public comment:

- **Mr. Handelman:** Appreciate the conversation about how this group will function moving forward. Director's report skipped over which cases are going to be investigated by IPR. The case lists don't say what kind of cases these are – broad category. Deadly use of force cases are not explained.
- Nine CRC alternates recommend plug them into the workgroups.
- IPR staff cc'd are for decisions of CRC. Google Drive should be open to the public.
- PRB, would like to hear from Ms. Greenvoss and how CRC experience is different from PRB experience.

- Audit workgroup were looking at dismissals, but this was never published. Looked at cases and information was never published.
- Appeal that went to City Council and that was not talked about today. Police commissioner voted to sustain a finding, for the first time in over 20 years of IPR/CRC existing.
- May Copwatch issue will be coming out soon.

Chair Avalos celebrated that the Police commissioner voted to sustain the finding!
Ms. Pomerantz commended Ms. Avalos for having a health episode but still went forward with the City Council presentation. Representation matters. Things are shifting, and the CRC has a great Chairperson. All CRC members put in a lot of work into this case and it went well. Proud of the work of the CRC!

- **Ms. Aiona:** Recurring Audit reviews the work of IPR, for example, this workgroup looked at closed cases to see what the case was about; and if dismissing that case was the right thing to do. An IPR staff member was assigned to this workgroup to pull certain cases for review to make sure things are done the way they should be done.

Chair Avalos thanked everyone, and the meeting was adjourned.

7:45 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 email 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.*