

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 4, 2021

In Attendance

Council Chairman Chip Henderson called the in-person and electronic-conducted (virtual) committee meeting to order at 4:26 p.m. A quorum was present, including Council Vice-Chairman Ken Smith and Council members Jenny Hill, Darrin Ledford, Isiah Hester, Carol Berz, Raquetta Dotley, Anthony Byrd and Demetrus Coonrod. Other panelists present were Phil Noblett, City Attorney, and Keren Campbell, Council Support Specialist.

Approval of Minutes

On motion of Councilman Byrd and seconded by Vice-Chairman Smith, the minutes of the last meeting (April 13, 2021) meeting were approved as published.

PARC Quarterly Report

Chairman Henderson opened the floor to Kay Baker, Chair of the Police Advisory and Review Committee (PARC), who gave the PARC quarterly report covering the months of January – March 2021. Her report included the case statistics and the committee's concerns, policy recommendations, and/or requests. (See the attached report.) Discussion ensued with Ms. Baker and Chief Roddy.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Councilman Henderson adjourned the meeting at 4:57 p.m.

Attachment:
PARC Quarterly Report

CHATTANOOGA POLICE ADVISORY AND REVIEW COMMITTEE
QUARTERLY REPORT

PERIOD COVERED: JANUARY, FEBRUARY, and MARCH 2021

REPORT PROVIDED TO COUNCIL: APRIL 8, 2021

REPORT REVIEWED AT PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING: MAY 4, 2021

I. CASE STATISTICS:

- a. PARC reviewed 36 cases involving 42 officers.
- b. Breakdown – Citizen v. Internally Generated Complaints
 - i. 26 Citizen Generated Complaints
 - 1. In 9 of the cases generated by a citizen complaint, COC found at least one violation of policy by one officer.
 - 2. In 10 of the cases generated by a citizen complaint, PARC found at least one violation of policy by one officer.
 - ii. 10 Internally Generated Complaints
 - 1. In 8 of the cases generated internally, COC found at least one violation of policy by one officer.
 - 2. In 6 of the cases generated internally, PARC found at least one violation of policy by one officer.
- c. CPD Chain of Command found 22 violations of policy among the 36 cases
- d. PARC found 19 violations of policy among the 36 cases.
- e. Chief Results: For all cases considered by PARC since October 2020, the Chief has issued results in 36 of the 73 total cases heard. The Chief’s decision differed from the PARC decision in 4 of those 36 results (Note: in 4 other cases the officer resigned prior to a result being made by the Chief and those cases were administratively closed).
- f. Chart of Violation Categories (this section covers October 2020 – March 2021):

OCT - NOV - DEC 2020

CATEGORY OF VIOLATION	# OF COMPLAINTS	VIOLATIONS FOUND BY COC	VIOLATIONS FOUND BY PARC
Conduct Unbecoming	4	4	4
Criminal Offense	4	0	0
Digital Recording Rules	2	1	1
Discourtesy	6	4	4
Improper Procedure	4	1	1
Insubordination - Level 1 or 2	1	1	1
Misrepresentation	2	1	1
Public Ridicule/Dept Criticism	1	1	1
Pursuit Policy	4	3	3
Unsatisfactory Conduct	2	2	2
Unsatisfactory Performance	5	3	3

Untruthfulness	4	2	2
UOF Policy	2	1	2
Vehicle Use Violation	3	0	0

JAN - FEB - MAR 2021

CATEGORY OF VIOLATION	# OF COMPLAINTS	VIOLATIONS FOUND BY COC	VIOLATIONS FOUND BY PARC
Conduct Unbecoming	2	1	0
Criminal Offense (Misd)	1	0	0
Criminal Offense (Felony)	1	1	0
Digital Recording Rules	1	1	2
Discourtesy	6	3	2
Discrimination	1	0	0
False Arrest	2	0	0
False Report	2	2	2
Firearms Discharge Level I	1	1	1
Harassment	3	0	0
Improper Investigation	3	0	0
Improper Procedure	7	4	3
Knowledge of Laws/Rules	1	0	1
Misrepresentation	1	0	0
Public Stmts or Appearances	1	1	1
Pursuit Policy	2	2	2
Unsatisfactory Performance	3	2	2
Untruthfulness	2	0	0
UOF Gun	1	0	0
UOF Physical	2	1	1
UOF Taser	3	1	0
UOF Report Violation	1	1	1
UOF Left Taser at Home	1	0	0
Vehicle Use Violation	2	1	1

II. CONCERNS/POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS/REQUESTS:

- a. Is there a system in place where final results from the Chief of Police can be provided to PARC within a certain period of time from when PARC submits their recommendation (i.e., 60 days)?
- b. PARC heard another case where the officer did not have a car camera system in his vehicle due to his regular assignment being exempt from requiring a car camera system. We feel that all officers should have a car camera system, especially when

those officers are working in assignments that would normally have/require a car camera system.