

POLICE-CIVILIAN INTERNAL AFFAIRS REVIEW COMMISSION
City of Saint Paul
Human Rights and Equal Economic Department

DATE: October 4, 2017

TIME: 6:00 PM

LOCATION: Saint Paul City Hall, 15 Kellogg Blvd W., Saint Paul, MN 55102, Suite 220

MINUTES

Commissioners: Chair Bryan Langford, Commissioner Daria Caldwell, Commissioner Kristen Clark, Commissioner Sasha Cotton, Commissioner Eric Forstrom, Commissioner Kaohly Her, Commissioner Rachel Sullivan-Nightengale, Commissioner Susan Trupiano, Commissioner Constance Tuck

HREEO Staff: HREEO Deputy Director Jeffry Martin, PCIARC Coordinator Libby Kantner

IAU Staff: Commander Troy Greene

I. Call to Order

II. Approved Agenda

Motion made by Commissioner Langford
2nd by Commissioner Sullivan- Nightengale
Approved

III. Approve September Minutes

Motion made by Commissioner Tuck
2nd by Commissioner Forstrom
Approved

IV. Chair's Report

- A. Welcome guests
- B. Thank staff for their work preparing for this meeting
- C. Dispositions Sheet: Clarified on the disposition sheet that the action of "termination" is in fact an option for the Commission to recommend

VI. Old Business: None

VII. New Business

A. Election of Chair

- a. Nominations
 - i. Commissioner Trupiano nominated herself
 - ii. Commissioner Tuck nominated herself
 - iii. Commissioner Langford nominated himself
 - iv. Nominations closed
 - b. Speeches
 - i. Commissioner Langford
 - ii. Commissioner Tuck withdrew her name from consideration
 - iii. Commissioner Trupiano
 - c. Paper Balloting
 - d. Commissioner Langford elected to Chair
- B. Election of Vice Chair
- a. Nominations
 - i. Commissioner Tuck nominated herself
 - ii. Nominations closed
 - b. Speeches
 - i. Commissioner Tuck
 - c. Motion to elect Commissioner Tuck by acclamation
 - i. Motion made by Chair Langford
 - ii. Seconded by Commissioner Cotton
 - iii. Commissioner Tuck elected to Vice Chair by acclamation
- C. Adopt Bylaws and Special Rules of Order
- a. There was a proposal that any time limits on complainant statements be included in the meeting notice mailed to complainants
 - i. Discussion
 - 1. Concern was raised that there may be circumstances where more or less time is needed
 - 2. It was recommended that the language could state “no more than ten (10) minutes”
 - 3. A suggestion was made to leave the time limit ambiguous, because each case is unique
 - 4. Concerns were raised with leaving it ambiguous, citing the possibility of extensive testimony
 - 5. The issue was raised that without a maximum time, the Commission could run into issues of appearing biased
 - 6. It was agreed that a maximum time limit would make sense
 - 7. The Commission was reminded that this process is new and that the appropriate amount of time for testimony is unknown. The practice of time limiting to ten (10) minutes could be tested and if it proved too long or too short, the rules could be revised
 - ii. A motion was made that requested an amendment to Article 8, Section 3 be drafted that sets the complainant testimony time limit at ten (10) minutes
 - 1. Motion made by Vice Chair Tuck

2. 2nd by Commissioner Trupiano
 3. Approved
 - b. There was a proposal that since detailed meeting notes are no longer being shared with the Chief of Police, that change should be written in Article 3
 - i. Discussion
 1. The new process around meeting notes was clarified
 2. The point was raised that since the old process was never documented in the Bylaws there would be no reason to state the change and stating it may confuse future Commissions
 - ii. No motion made
 - c. Adoption of Bylaws and Special Rules of Order laid over to November meeting

VIII. Adjourn to Closed Door Session

IX. Case Review

X. Adjourn (9:18)