Present at the meeting were Civilian Review Board members Bridal Pearson (Chair, Northern District), Blair Thompson, Secretary (Northeastern District), Fred Jackson (Northwestern District), Mel Currie (Southwestern District) and Leslie Parker Blyther (Central District).

Also present were:

- Jill P. Carter, Director of the Office of Civil Rights
- Sharita Thomas, Deputy Director
- Jesmond Riggins, CRB Supervisor
- Evangula Brown, CRB Investigator
- Shaun Clark, CRB Investigator
- Samantha Jeffrey, CRB Investigator
- Amy Cruice, ACLU
- Deputy Eric Cox, Sheriff’s Office
- Chief Rodney Hill, Office of Professional Responsibility
- Sgt. Theresa Scott, Office of Professional Responsibility
- Sgt. Tiffany Willis, Office of Professional Responsibility
- Lisa Robinson, President of the Vanguard Justice Society
- Edward Wilson, Vanguard Justice Society
- Danaena White, Baltimore School Police
- Shantay Guy, Community Mediation
- Michelle Herring, Community Mediation

Many members of the public were also present, including noted activists from Baltimore Bloc, Tawanda Jones, correspondents from the Real News Network, and community members.

I. **Welcome**

Director Carter welcomed everyone to the meeting, and asked that everyone around the table introduce themselves, which they did.

II. **Board Chair and Secretary Elections**

Director Carter asked for nominations or volunteers for the position of Board Chair, and Bridal Pearson volunteered. Blair Thompson seconded the nomination, and he was unanimously voted in as Board Chair by all other members. Bridal Pearson nominated Blair Thompson as the Secretary, which she accepted, and was voted in as Secretary unanimously by the other Board members.
III. Discussion and Vote on Board Meeting Dates and Times
There was a brief discussion on whether Board members would like to continue to hold meetings on the third Thursday of each month at 6pm. Leslie Parker Blyther stated that she believed that the Board should meet more frequently than once a month until the backlog had been resolved. Bridal Pearson seconded, and Board members agreed to discuss dates later in the meeting.

IV. Approval of the Minutes
Mel Currie confirmed that the approval of minutes was a pro forma action to be taken at this particular meeting. A motion to accept the February 17, 2017 public session minutes was made by Bridal Pearson, seconded by Mel Currie, and all were in favor. The public session minutes were approved as submitted.

V. New Complaints
Amy Cruice asked whether it would be possible to provide information on individual complaints, such as allegations and a brief synopsis for the public. Board members agreed that this would be a good idea. It was noted that complaint CRB2017-0030 was found on an audio file that many Board members had difficulty with hearing, and so they decided to default to a vote for CRB. Amy Cruice clarified that this CRB vote would be for a full investigation. Leslie Parker Blyther questioned whether it would be possible for Board members to vote to have a complaint sent to mediation, and Director Carter explained that both parties have to be in agreement for mediation to take place, and Supervisor Riggins stated that mediation eligibility is determined during the intake process before complaints are forwarded to the Board. If mediation is completed, then the complaint is closed under mediation and not forwarded to the Board for review. Leslie Parker Blyther noted that many of the complaints were difficult to read, and Director Carter noted that staff had received that feedback and would be working on a solution. New complaints were reviewed by the Board, who voted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaint Number</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-0030</td>
<td>CRB Simultaneous Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0032</td>
<td>CRB Simultaneous Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0037</td>
<td>CRB Simultaneous Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0039</td>
<td>CRB Simultaneous Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0041</td>
<td>IAD Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0043</td>
<td>CRB Simultaneous Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0045</td>
<td>CRB Simultaneous Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0048</td>
<td>CRB Simultaneous Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0050</td>
<td>IAD Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0053</td>
<td>CRB Simultaneous Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0058</td>
<td>IAD Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0059</td>
<td>IAD Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0064</td>
<td>IAD Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017-0069  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0073  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0075  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0077  IAD Only  
2017-0078  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0081  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0083  IAD Only  
2017-0084  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0085  IAD Only  
2017-0089  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0092  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0097  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0103  IAD Only  
2017-0109  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0110  IAD Only  
2017-0112  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0114  IAD Only  
2017-0119  IAD Only  
2017-0121  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0123  IAD Only  
2017-0124  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  
2017-0125  IAD Only  
2017-0126  CRB Simultaneous Investigation  

VI. Completed Investigations
Amy Cruice suggested that a key be included with the agenda that explained the acronyms to members of the public, as well as that information be included in the agenda that explains what information is substantiated by investigators and what the investigators recommendation was for the case. Supervisor Riggins noted that he felt it may not be appropriate to include the investigator’s decision since the final decision is made by the Board. Ms. Cruice stated that she felt it would be important for the public to know how often the Board’s finding agrees with the investigator’s recommendation. Lisa Robinson stated that she would be interested in statistical information on how many cases are voted for CRB versus IAD, to which Director Carter replied that a semi-annual report would be issued containing that information. Mel Currie wanted to note for the public that if a case is voted for IAD only investigation, the Board may still request further investigation of that case. Chair Pearson noted that he felt it was extremely important to give the public as much information as possible. A member of the public (Kim Trueheart) noted that it would be important to include district information as well, and noted that there was public distrust in IAD, which was the cause of concern for the Board’s votes for IAD only, and so wondered if Board members could discuss their reasoning. Board members noted that they were not prepared to discuss their reasoning, but they would be in future meetings. Chair Pearson urged the Board to move on to the newer cases, and Leslie Parker Blyther noted that the Board was catching up and that the cases were
very extensive. Director Carter assured the Board that in future meetings, the caseload would be smaller, and Supervisor Riggins elaborated on the fact that the Board was recovering from a backlog that they will be working through this year, and cases would be spread out as much as possible to accommodate this backlog. Blair Thompson felt that many of the cases would require extensive discussion, and therefore wondered if it might be possible to table some for the next meeting. Supervisor Riggins clarified that Excessive Force allegations did not have the same one year time limitation as other cases, and therefore were not up against the same deadline. Leslie Parker Blyther agreed with the need for in depth discussion, and that some cases should be delayed until the following week. Mel Currie noted that the Board was inundated with data, and much of it was very repetitive and contained little substantive information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRB#</th>
<th>IAD#</th>
<th>Board’s Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD028-14</td>
<td>14-0209</td>
<td>Sustained EF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chair Pearson noted that Sustained the case because of the independent eyewitnesses. Mel Currie noted that the IAD case contained testimony from officers who were not present, and did not provide helpful information. He further noted that he was moved by the fact that the incident was so egregious that an independent witness stopped her car in the middle of traffic to get out and take photos of the scene in order to file a complaint. He stated that the fact that she did not know these people made the case even stronger. He further noted that the officers interviewed were being vague about what was considered an “appropriate” use of force. Blair Thompson noted that the victims were walking away and the officer followed them, unnecessarily escalating the situation. Fred Jackson noted that he also sustained the case because of the eyewitness testimony and the fact that most of the officer testimony was from officers that had not witnessed the incident. There was some discussion about making a disciplinary recommendation, however Board members did not feel prepared to make a disciplinary recommendation and so chose to table the discussion for the next meeting. Fred Jackson noted that he felt it would be difficult to make an accurate disciplinary recommendation without being privy to the officers’ prior records and knowing whether offenses had been committed for the first time or were recurring incidents. Chief Hill clarified that these decisions would be recommendations, with the final decision made by the Commissioner, and that the actual process for instituting discipline could be long and involve a trial board. Bridal Pearson noted that he wanted Board members to make sound decisions that would strengthen the credence of the Board.

| PD045-15 | 15-0231 | Not Sustained EF |

Mel Currie noted that the Civilian Review Board was unable to get firsthand information from the victim, and there was no willingness on their part to speak to the CRB investigator. Blair Thompson asked what the meaning of the term “BOLO” was. Chief Hill answered that it stood for “Be on the lookout”, and could sometimes involve an actual wanted poster. Blair Thompson further stated that she was unclear about whether the warrant was active. Chief Hill answered that the officer had called
the hot desk, and was not informed that the warrant had been quashed. Blair Thompson noted that the warrant was quashed on April 7th and the complainant was arrested on April 21st, and expressed concern that the system was not updated within that long gap. Lisa Robinson noted that it could be because the warrant list is updated on a monthly basis. Amy Cruice stated that in cases like this, it would be helpful to know the reasoning behind the recommendation of Not Sustained.

PD029-16/PD034-16 16-0135/16-0128 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting Bridal Pearson noted that the case was recommended for administrative closure, and Director Carter clarified that the Board had the power to override the administrative closure and vote for a finding. Mel Currie stated that he had only noted that the case had aged off. Bridal Pearson noted that he felt it was important that the Board focus on those cases that were not expired, and consider the administrative closure recommendations at a later date. Some member of the public voiced concern that it was not fair to the complainants in those expired cases. Mel Currie assured that the cases would be discussed, but at a later date. Lisa Robinson noted that there is a one year statute of limitation for officer discipline in all cases except excessive force. Members of the public noted some concerns about their trust in Internal Affairs investigations, and suggested that a standardized checklist or rubric be used to determine whether an independent CRB investigation should be authorized, and that this rubric should be made available to the public. Bridal Pearson noted that the Board was open to suggestions, and reiterated that the expired cases and cases recommended for administrative closure would be tabled until the next meeting.

PD031-16 16-0130 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD032-16 16-0144 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD036-16 16-0157 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD038-16 16-0160 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD039-16 16-0171 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD041-16 16-0172 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD046-16 16-0206 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD048-16 16-0232 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD050-16 22K13 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD051-16  16-0169  Further Investigation Requested EF H
Blair Thompson voiced her concern that she believed that the complainant may have been incarcerated during the contact attempts, and therefore unable to respond to the investigator’s letters and calls. The investigator noted that it is standard procedure to do an inmate locator search to ensure that the complainant is not incarcerated or in some other form verify that the person is not in police custody. Supervisor Riggins also noted that it was standard for investigators to conduct interviews at the correctional facility for complainants that were incarcerated and explained the policy on contact attempts, as well as the fact that some complainants will not cooperate. Mel Currie said that he was hesitant because he did not have a sense on the demands that were being made on investigators and whether they were reasonable. Supervisor Riggins noted that investigators currently had a heavy workload due to a large influx of cases from the previous Board which sent the majority of complaints to investigations, and noted that decisions had to be made in order to move forward, as well as the importance of balancing the public interest with the legal constraints of the Board. Bridal Pearson asked for further investigation to determine whether the complainant was currently incarcerated in order to make a final contact attempt. Amy Cruice noted that while inmate locator could find an inmate in local and state facilities, it does not extend to federal. The investigator confirmed that the complainant was not incarcerated at the time of the contacts. Board members voted for further investigation to make an additional contact attempt.

PD053-16  16-0230  Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD060-16  16-0255  Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD062-16  16-0288  Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD063-16  16-0270  Sustained EF
Mel Currie noted that the complainant was diagnosed with a concussion, and expressed that he felt extremely concerned that a dirt bike violation ended in stitches and a trip to the hospital. Leslie Parker Blyther noted that the officer admitted to striking the complainant. It was further noted that the allegation of false arrest was expired. Amy Cruice asked whether cases with incidents that rose to the level of criminal action were forwarded to the State’s Attorney. Supervisor Riggins noted that in the past cases had been referred, however the Consent Decree laid out a specific process for forwarding these cases. Director Carter also noted that staff had met with the State’s Attorney’s office, and that there was concern that information in the complaints could be used against the complainants in a criminal case.

PD071-16  16-0236  Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD074-16  15-0777  Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
Director Carter noted that in this case, the law prior to July 1st stated that excessive force complaints had to be made within 90 days of the action giving rise to the
complaint. She stated that she had discussed the issue with Chief Hill in terms of resolution for statutorily barred cases, and noted that because of the review of the legal consultant, they were bound to stick to the original law. Supervisor Riggins noted that complainants now have up to a year to make a complaint after an incident of excessive force. Leslie Parker Blyther noted that she would like for there to be direct contact with the complainant from staff so that they would not feel ignored. Mel Currie noted being frustrated with these limitations. Director Carter noted that she had asked if there was a way to find resolution for these cases since the legislative direction was that eventually this limit would be expanded, and that Chief Hill noted that it was not possible per the law department. Amy Cruice noted that they may be time barred, but that may not preclude the Board from reviewing them based on Baltimore City Police Department vs. Andrews in 1999. Chief Hill cited that that case was challenged by Rush vs. Maryland State Police, a case in which the MSP had initiated an investigation in spite of the fact that the complainant was uncooperative, and Sustained the cases. He stated that the court of appeals had set forth language that said the cases “may not” be reviewed instead of “shall not”, which is prohibitive. He noted that the Law Department had stated that Internal Affairs did not need to abide by the 90 day time bar, however that did not extend to the Civilian Review Board, as it became a personnel issue at that point. He also noted that IAD was in agreement with the change to the statute. Bridal Pearson noted that he felt the case should be tabled until the next meeting, and other Board members agreed. Director Carter stated that staff had believed that the case was technically outside the Board’s jurisdiction, and that they were not informed that there was another option. Hill noted that in this case, the officer had resigned. Amy Cruice noted that she felt it was still important for the Board to review the case.

PD082-16  16-0033  Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD106-16  16-0161  Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting

Supervisor Riggins noted that this was an IAD only case which the Board had reviewed and compiled a list of questions for further investigation. These questions were assigned to an investigator for analysis. Mel Currie noted that he thought the waiver of rights was a central piece to the complaint and wanted to know when it was signed. Blair Thompson noted that the complainant was not free to leave, and expressed concern about the waiver of rights under these circumstances. Leslie Parker Blyther asked whether it was common for African American males that were detained to be asked to become informants and locate weapons. Chief Hill noted that it was common practices to use informants and that officers were always looking for information on weapons. Leslie Parker Blyther questioned whether the complainant was made to feel like he would be jailed if he did not find a gun. Chief Hill stated that he would have to look at the specifics of the case. Members of the public affirmed that this was common practice. Mel Currie stated that he would like a clearer write up of the case. Supervisor Riggins noted that according to the statute, further investigation would have to be requested from IAD, and that the Board would have to present their questions to them, and IAD would have to respond within a certain
timeframe, but to request further investigation from the CRB investigator would be
going in circles. Leslie Parker Blyther questioned whether, as the Board evolves, it
would be possible to express concerns about a case although they may be restricted in
their ability to act. Director Carter and Supervisor Riggins both noted that it was
possible to write a letter to the Commissioner, which had been the practice of the
Board in the past, however the Commissioner was not obligated to act or respond.
Amy Cruice expressed the importance of having the Board’s concerns on the public
record. Mel Currie wondered if the correspondence could be made public, and
Supervisor Riggins noted that it could and the Board could discuss this. Amy Cruice
noted that it would also be helpful for Board members to review past correspondence
that the Board had sent.

PD124-16 16J-0015 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
Chief Hill clarified that the victim was not shot 56 times, only that 56 rounds were
fired, and responded to questions about the meaning of the term “in policy”,
specifically that it was equivalent to “not sustained” and that the officer’s actions fell
within policy. Chief Hill went on to explain that the SIRT team, which deliberates on
whether actions were within policy, was formed 2 years ago and was considered one
of the best practices by the consent decree. Members of the public noted that these
were the 5th and 6th people that the officer in question had killed, and became upset
that the case would be tabled. Chair Pearson asked that comments be held until the
end, and noted that he felt that there should be further investigation since people had
been killed. Director Carter explained that the Board could request further
investigation, but specific questions would need to be formulated by the Board. Leslie
Parker Blyther asked whether there was a specific policy that dictated after firing a
certain number of rounds, whether an officer had to stop and reassess. Chief Hill
noted that this information would be within the officers’ training, not laid out in a
policy, but that there was no specific number of rounds described in the policy. Bridal
Pearson and Mel Currie agreed that more time would be needed to formulate proper
questions. Fred Jackson expressed concern that this was not the officer’s first
shooting and that he should have been taken off of the streets at some point. He stated
that this name should never come across the CRB’s desk again. Mel Currie noted that
the Board should create their own database for repeat offenders since they would not
be privy to officers’ personnel records. Board members agreed to table the case for
the next meeting. Supervisor Riggins reiterated the policy that Board members would
formulate their questions and present them to Internal Affairs, at which point Internal
Affairs would need to respond within a certain amount of time.

PD133-16 16-0282 Continuance until 7/7/17 Meeting
PD171-16 16-0683 Not Sustained
Mel Currie noted that he could not sustain the case because he did not feel any of the
officer’s action explicitly fit the allegations, although the law could be written in an
unfortunate way. Blair Thompson noted that while she felt the case was unfortunate
and frustrating, she did not believe there was a policy violation. Bridal Pearson noted
that there was a difference between a policy violation and an unfortunate incident. Fred Jackson felt that the complainant was simply angry that his car had been towed.

Bridal Pearson noted that IAD had attempted a number of times to contact the complainant but was not able to get any information. Mel Currie noted that he did not feel that the language was explicitly abusive. Blair Thompson stated that she felt that when officers were in uniform, they should not talk in an inappropriate way, since it could make certain groups of people feel unprotected, and questioned whether officers received training in appropriate language. Chief Hill noted that some things were training and some were common sense. Bridal Pearson was concerned that IAD was not able to contact complainants or identify officers. Leslie Parker Blyther felt that a finding of Not Sustained might be inappropriate for this case. Supervisor Riggins that the Board could vote for no finding based on the lack of information. Fred Jackson noted that even if they sustained the case, it was not clear who they would be sustaining it against since the officers were not identified. Director Carter noted that the Board was able to create new policies and procedures for these situations. Ultimately, the Board decided to table the discussion for the next meeting.

VII. **Director’s Report**

Director Carter began the report by stating that the Board was in a position to build their processes and make their own rules, and stressed the importance of looking at each case to determine how to shape policies and procedures.

Director Carter also noted that the Mayor had appointed the members of the Community Oversight Task Force, and that the Board would be able to review the report that staff had prepared for the COTF.

At that point Director Carter invited members of the public to comment.

VIII. **Public Comment**

Kim Trueheart noted that there are cases reviewed which need to be revisited and the recommendation is that the patterns and practices need to change. While some steps may have been taken, those steps do not constitute enough action on the part of the BCPD or BCPD leadership and stated that the public was counting on the Board to be their advocates and represent their interests.

Towanda Jones expressed her thanks for the CRB and questioned Chief Rodney Hill as to whether a complaint by her uncle George Peoples, on behalf of the West family, was filed with IAD and CRB. Chief Hill responded to the affirmative that the case was investigated. Towanda Jones clarified that she meant to ask whether a CRB claim was filed. Chief Hill stated that he had not received this complaint. Ms. Jones stated that Chief Hill was supposed to be walking her uncle through the process and that he was supposed to be acting as liaison through the filing process. She went on to state
that she and her family have now been protesting for 205 weeks in the case of Tyrone West and that her brother was beaten to death by BCPD officers. She continued on to say that her family’s attempts to seek justice have been met with evasion and inaction. She stated that officers Chapman and Ruiz almost killed Abdul Salaam some 17 days before she states they killed Tyrone West. She says that 24 hours later they assaulted Darrell Harris who survived only due to the presence of their supervisor. She stated no action was ever taken against the officers, however they were promoted. She stated that the police commissioner has engaged the same evasion and inaction in these instances. She asked the CRB to take the claims seriously. She stated the autopsy results falsely showed her brother’s cause of death as dehydration and cardiac arrest and that those results conflict with the results of a previous autopsy. She stated that the assault occurred over 30 minutes, and requested that the CRB conduct an investigation.

A member of the public wanted to know the role of Chief Hill in the meeting. He stated that the public did not trust Chief Hill, and expressed his concern that any claim he files will be taken seriously and forwarded to the right people or handled by the appropriate parties and that some action will be taken on his claim. He continued on to express concern that the officers are repeat pattern offenders and that their history is unknown to the Board. He went on to question the LEOBR and whether it would allow CRB members to know the service history / personal conduct records of the officers.

Mel Currie expressed that he felt that going forward the CRB should be keeping their own records of officer personal conduct and service history.

The same member of the public went on to say that officer Wiczulis had shot 6 people, Kimani Johnson and Matthew Wood, and again wanted to know why Rodney Hill was present at the meeting.

He was informed by Director Carter that Chief Hill was present as a non voting member based on the controlling statute.

Kelly Holsey expressed concern about the continued involvement of Internal Affairs and the limitations of the statute. She stated that the public needed an impartial, unbiased, investigative process and that the presence of Internal Affairs undermines the community faith in that process. She stated that when she filed an IAD complaint 2 years prior, she was not able to get any information or updates until she posed as a student. She stated that she has no confidence in the IAD process and that while the CRB may be bound to only offer suggestions, she reiterates that the presence of Rodney Hill and others undermines even that duty. She stated that the community at large is frustrated with the inaction and continued incidents of the involved officers. She stated that the claims made by citizens were true and reiterated that the overall process needs equality and freedom from bias. She went on to suggest that meetings be held without an Internal Affairs representative present.
Another member of the public moved to face Chief Hill, and requested that he look at the people who are addressing him, and stated that he was showing disrespect by failing to do so. Multiple citizens agreed.

A member of the public expressed that his mistrust of certain officers in IAD stemmed from having witnessed them at the scene of a police involved shooting, specifically officers Tashana, Gerry Rodriguez, Garnell Greene, and Commissioner Davis. He stated that he witnessed all the officers in a circle laughing at the scene of the shooting, and expressed his deep concern with whether or not such incidents were taken seriously. He stated that he is continually met with evasion whenever he attempts to speak with IAD/BPD concerning these issues.

Director Carter thanked the citizens for their testimony and passion. She stated to the board that they may discuss individually any cases they heard tonight and advised Ms. Jones that the CRB has been looking into the case with her brother Tyrone West. Director Carter stated that many statutory changes are being proposed, but public input and support was needed.

Another member of the public informed the Board that they will be themselves under scrutiny by the citizens going forward and expressed the need for them to have sound arguments behind their decisions.

Another member of the public had questions about information that is available to the public. He wanted to know the extent to which the board’s recommendations for discipline are adhered to and whether or not the outcomes will be available to the public. He also wanted to know the criteria behind why a complaint may be voted IAD only.

Director Carter replied that Board members had received complaints over time and in advance of the meeting, and that they had already come to the meeting with their decisions made but without noting their reasoning. She stated that going forward the practice will be to come to the meeting with their reasoning noted for votes on new complaints.

A member of the public requested a case by case breakdown in the future along with accompanying rationale, and information about whether the CRB’s recommendations were adhered to.

Director Carter stated that she initially had concerns about the validity of the CRB because there is no requirement that the board’s recommendations be enacted. She stated that internally the Board has discussed making their outcomes public and that she would propose making the board’s recommendations either mandate or weighted in the decision accompanied by rationale from Internal Affairs as to why the recommendations were or were not adhered to. She stated that she is pushing for
statutory changes—namely in the procedure of having their outcomes made public, and the mandate that their recommendations adhered to. Director Carter noted that progress had been made in processes, and that two cases were overturned in favor of CRB’s recommendation, as well as noting that the public would be informed of the outcome of cases. She reiterated that the process was new, and would take some time to work out with the new Board.

Another member expressed concern that the method of publication the board uses, mainly posting to its web sources, are inaccessible to most residents who may not have access to Internet.

Another member replied that Baltimore Bloc is one resource that often widely publishes information regarding CRB through a variety of resources and methods to reach community members.

Another member of the public recommended that board recommendations come with clear language identifying the decision as based on “no prior history” given the board’s inability to access to see officer service history records. She continued to state that all members need to be aware of potential implicit biases they possess.

Bridal Pearson thanked the public for comments and informed them that Board members have had similar discussions and concerns among themselves. He asked the public to continue giving suggestions and holding members accountable.

Mel Currie stated that all the members are passionate and motivated to perform their duties and are dedicated to improving the processes and outcomes.

A member of the public inquired about the number of vacant seats on the board. Director Carter informed the public that there are 4 vacant spots in the Southern, Eastern, Northeastern, and Western districts, and that although recommendations have been sent to the mayor, nominations have been made and they have not yet been confirmed.

Director Carter asked the Board to decide on the next meeting date.

A member of the public asked where she could find definitions of harassment and excessive force, and Director Carter responded that the information is in the statute and may also be found on their website and social media, and stated that questions and suggestions or recommendations could be emailed to civilrights@baltimorecity.gov and noted the individual board members may also be contacted directly, although a single channel might make communication easier. Other Board members agreed.

Director Carter requested suggestions again on the frequency of board meetings.
Bridal Pearson asked if the board is caught up on cases, and Director Carter explained that they were not and that the combination of a defunct board and a previous backlog of cases is responsible for the heavy work load.

Supervisor Riggins stated that the cases are only increasing and will continue to increase as cases are tabled. He expressed that time is of the essence in reviewing cases before their expiration.

Fred Jackson stated that he is spending on average 4 to 6 hours per day on cases and that he is taking all matters very seriously and being very diligent in looking into the claims.

IX. New Business

Board members agreed on next meeting date July 7th, at 5PM in order to avoid conflict with the Independent Monitor Town Hall. They stated they will discuss internally the cases prior to the meeting.

Director Carter informed all present that this is not the normative process and that typically meetings are not held weekly but monthly and that the goal is to return to a monthly schedule.

Leslie Parker Blyther requested a larger meeting space.

Director Carter explained that a larger meeting space is being explored, and that they would be open to suggestions from the public.

Supervisor Riggins noted that the Board was required by the statute to have 4 meetings within the community.

A member of the public asked if there is a party which the citizens can speak to regarding having the CRB recommendations enforced.

Director Carter states that the Community Oversight Task Force would be the best resource for making those recommendations, including but not limited to legislative changes.

Supervisor Riggins stated that the taskforce was recently created and there is an 11 month period in which they will issue a report, followed by a period of public comment and then the public issuing of the report online. He expressed that he believes the CRB should take the report of that Task Force into consideration and that this is only the beginning of the process.

Director Carter states the city still needs to select a monitor for the implementation of the consent decree and that public comment is being accepted on the choices for that
position. She stated that the monitor would have a critical role, and therefore the public should be involved in the selection process.

Supervisor Riggins stated that most people were not aware of the functions of the CRB, and that community support was necessary in changing the law.

A member of the public stated that she took offense to the implication that community members did not understand the functions of the CRB, and that if staff wanted community support, they should make a greater effort to be transparent and educate the community.

Director Carter noted that there would be much more community involvement now that the Board was up and running, and Chair Pearson stated that the Board had been discussing how they could improve.

A member of the public noted that even when citizens followed all the rules, the investigators could still make mistakes, and this situation needed to be corrected.

Shantay Guy from Community Mediation wanted to let members of the public know that the Town Hall on the Independent Monitor would be taking place on July 6th at 6pm at Coppin State University, and went on to suggest that for those civilians who did not have access to the internet, that staff and Board members partner with community organizations to disseminate information in their district.

Another member of the public stated that they supported police representation at the meeting and noted that they needed to be present and participate in open dialogue.

X. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Pearson declared the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jill Muth