



**The Portland Committee on Community Engaged Policing (PCCEP)  
November 16, 2021, Full Board Meeting Transcript**

**Livestream: <https://youtu.be/706zcuftaF8>**

Lakayana:

November PCCEP meeting Portland Committee on Community-Engaged Policing, doing it slightly earlier this month because of Thanksgiving next Thursday, my name's Lakayana I'm the co-chair of PCCEP. We're going to go around and do a round of introductions. And then I'm going to turn it over to Ann to say a piece and then open up with our first agenda item. We're switching around our department of justice settlement agreement update because the wonderful Jared [Hager 00:11:10] is about to hop on a flight. So we want to make sure that he's able to give that before he has to turn his plane on airplane mode. I will have Celeste, if you can introduce yourself, please.

Celeste Carey:

Yes. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Celeste Carey. I'm a member of PCCEP and the acting chair of the racial equity subcommittee. For a living, I'm interim co-manager of KBOO radio.

Lakayana:

Thank you. Celeste, let's go with Amy next.

Amy Anderson:

Good evening, everyone. Amy Anderson, here. I am the chair of the behavioral health subcommittee for PCCEP and I work in the community as a forensic assertive community treatment, peer wellness specialist. That's what I do in the community so... Thank you.

Lakayana:

Thank you. Byron.

Byron:

Thank you, Lakayana. Good evening everybody. My name is Byron [Vaughn 00:12:24] PCCEP member and also on the behavioral health subcommittee.

Lakayana:

Thank you, Byron. Tia.

Tia:



Hello, my name is Tia [Paulafox 00:12:37]. My pronouns are she/her and I'm a retired school counselor from Eugene, Oregon. Kind of new to Portland involved at Rahab's Sisters, working with unhoused women and on the behavioral health sub subcommittee here with PCCEP. Thank you.

Lakayana:

Thank you so much. Ann.

Ann Campbell:

Hi everyone. Ann Campbell. I use she/her pronouns. I am the chairperson of the settlement and policy subcommittee and I'm also a member, I'm a secretary of PCCEP and on the steering committee.

Lakayana:

Thank you. Turn it over to you in just half a second. Just want to welcome all of our community members, leadership from law enforcement, including chief [Flavel 00:13:29], members of the media that are here. The team Open Signal that's always producing this and then also our interpreters that are doing hard work as well. So I'm going to turn it back over to Ann to take over the last part of the introductions and start us off with our settlement agreement update.

Ann Campbell:

Thank you, Lakayana. I just wanted to take a few moments to acknowledge the wonderful work that Lakayana has provided to our community here. Working with PCCEP volunteering. This is his last meeting and he is our longest survey member at this time, I believe. I've had the opportunity to work with him and he is such a wealth of information and has enormous passion in the community and around this work and he will be so missed. So thank you for your service Lakayana. And now we're going to have some time for both the city and department of justice and any other, if Amici's here or others that want to kind of give their viewpoint on the mediation. We did do a kind of full look at where the DOJ settlement is currently at the settlement and policy subcommittee meeting last week. But we wanted to just give overall update on it today. And we're going to start with Jared and we will have a little bit of time for questions at the end. So go ahead, Jared, Jared or Jonas.

Jared:

Thanks, Ann. I appreciate the opportunity. My name's Jared Hager. I use he/him pronouns and I represent the United States in litigation regarding police reform with the city of Portland. We serve as monitors of the agreement and appreciate the opportunity to give you a little updated. You mentioned we went through sort of the proposed resolution that came out of the mediation at the settlement agreement and policy subcommittee. I don't know if the video's up for that yet, but if it is, I encourage folks to look at it. Heidi Brown did a great overview of what those provisions mean. Paragraphs 188 to 195. But what I wanted to focus on today is, a point that was made at the court hearing where judge Simon essentially ordered the parties to go back and try to bridge gaps between what the Amici [Abin 00:16:22] Ministerial Alliance and mental health Alliance would like to see in the proposed addendum section 11 and what the parties had come to a tentative agreement on.

Jared:



And we're looking for dates to schedule that and we'll report back. We're happy to do more mediation and try to bridge those gaps. We are worried a little bit about unintended consequences of reopening a negotiation that was a pretty drawn out process. And there's a lot of competing interest at play here. And it is difficult to find a solution that everybody likes and accepts, but we'll try it again and hopefully avoid those unintended consequences. What I really wanted to focus my remarks on tonight is about the body-worn camera remedies which is spelled out in paragraph 194 of our proposed resolution that we're still mediating. We issued a letter to the city at the city's request so that they could understand what the department of justice is going to look for in a body-worn camera policy. And as a little bit of background, the settlement agreement gives the United States the authority to review and approve policies that are relevant to the settlement agreement.

Jared:

And the terms of paragraph 194 would also allow the United States to seek enforcement immediately. If the body-worn camera remedy, that's negotiated and bargaining doesn't, in our estimation, resolve the issues laid out in our notice of non-compliance that we sent around in April of this year. It's a long process that we've been in. I think we're getting close to the end. In any event the letter laid out the basics of the who, the what, the where, the when and the why and the how of a body-worn camera policy, but the most important principle, from our perspective is that any body-worn camera policy really should be informed by public input. And so we hope that this committee has a role in collecting that input. I know you've already done that in the past, as it gets a little more crystallized, I think there's a place to solicit comment on the proposals of what we've laid out in the letter is really a floor of a body worn camera policy, not the ceiling of it.

Jared:

And so to the extent, some folks want a more restrictive policy. We're interested in hearing that. I know the compliance officer is also going to be soliciting a community input, and I believe the mental health alliance is going to host a forum to take that community input. And I'm happy. I think everyone has received that letter. I sent it to the PCCEP staff and Ann as her role of the chair of the settlement and policy subcommittee. I'm happy to take any questions that you might have, or the community might have and happy to take those questions at a later date, perhaps at the December settlement and policy subcommittee, but really we want to everyone to understand where we're at and why we're there in terms of a body-worn camera program that when implemented really would be effective to resolve our compliance concerns that we saw in 2020. And that's where we're coming from as the plaintiff in this litigation.

Ann Campbell:

Jonas, did you want to add anything?

Jonas:

So thank you for the opportunity, but I'm going to pick up the kids now. I think the letter speaks for itself and I'm happy to speak to any questions on the letter that Jared can't address or would like me to address as well. So I'm going to leave it with that, Jared very well stated. Thank you.

Ann Campbell:



Thank you. Heidi, would you like to comment?

Heidi:

Thanks Ann. Hi everybody, I'm Heidi Brown. I'm a chief deputy at the city attorney's office and have been working on the DOJ settlement agreement for a while now. So thank you for having me here. If I can be indulged for one second, I would love to introduce two new attorneys in our office, [Vamsi Reddy 00:20:53], and Sarah [Ames 00:20:55]. Vamsi and Sarah just joined our office and we'll be working on the DOJ settlement agreement and we're really excited to have them here. So I just wanted to take that moment to introduce them to you. You will see them around regularly going forward. So thank you. And as for the settlement agreement, the remedies, we did go over them in at length last week and you are more than welcome to watch that. But if folks have questions about the remedies about what they say, I'm more than happy to answer those at this larger meeting as well. And Ann or anybody on the PCCEP, if you think it'd be helpful for me to give a summary of those, I'm happy to do that again as well.

Ann Campbell:

I think a brief summary, I did want to ask PCCEP staff, is it all right if we posted the letter in the chat, can we share that with the community of the letter that came out from the DOJ this past yesterday rather? Is that a possibility or Jared would that be all right if we did that?

Jared:

Yeah. The letter is a public letter. It wasn't meant to be private. We shared it with a broad group of people. I believe it's been published in the press. So there's no concern of confidentiality from our perspective. And it's our thoughts. So go ahead.

Ann Campbell:

Okay and thank you. And I also wanted to say for those of you who were not at the court hearing that there were two issues that the judge asked the parties to go back and mediate. When was on body-worn cameras and the, from an observer, it seemed like maybe focusing in on some policy issues relative to that. And then the other one was related to crowd control, actually the protests of 2020 and the accountability. Would it be Lieutenant and above accountable, or would it be supervisor and above accountable for the actions of the officers during the protests? Please help me if those were not the two issues that were brought up.

Jared:

Yeah, I think you got the issues generally right, Ann. One concerns paragraph 192, and that would require IPR to open an investigation of certain lieutenants and above who had a hand in the crowd control problems, for lack of a better word. The Amici are concerned that they want that to be a required investigation of all sergeants and perhaps all officers who may have done something wrong in 2020. And that's the gist I think there, and as far as the body-worn camera paragraph 194, I think the dispute was really over the Amici wanting the policy preferences that the United States put in our letter that we sent on Monday, they would like that in the agreement. So actually in paragraph 194 and I can't speak for them why, but I can speak for us on why we think that's really... There's no difference in our



estimation, whether you have those provisions within the agreement or outside of the agreement, ultimately the United States has to review and approve a policy.

Jared:

And if we don't review and approve a policy, there's a line to court. That line to court and enforcement can be longer or shorter depending on where we start from. But ultimately without a policy, without paragraph 194, being a term of the agreement and a policy for body-worn cameras, there's really no enforcement. So you can have it in the agreement or outside of the agreement, but that doesn't make the policy come to fruition. And so that's really what I'm trying to understand from the Amici and we'll meet with them to better understand their concerns, happy to hear those concerns from the public. I do want to say about paragraph 192, the language that requires IPR to open the investigation of certain lieutenants and above, it doesn't foreclose or negate accountability for other people who might be determined or found who have violated policy, their settlement agreement already requires those other, every officer to be held accountable when they violate policies, just whether or not we require IPR to go investigate certain groups of people without having a complaint of misconduct, normally only look at complaints of misconduct.

Jared:

And so, do we require them to look at all hundred plus sergeants or do we require them to look at a certain amount of lieutenants? Either way, if they find evidence that a Sergeant or an officer or anyone else committed misconduct, they really would have to investigate and hold those folks accountable. So, from our perspective, maybe we need to better understand from the Amici what their concern is, but I don't know that I share the concern and it might be that I just don't understand it, yet.

Ann Campbell:

Thank you for that. I also heard from the mental health alliance that they had a similar concern. So I'm sure that that will, but you'll talk about that in your mediation that is yet to be determined. Does anyone have any questions that you'd like to ask? If you can raise your hand? Okay. What I'm going to do is-

Lakayana:

Got one from cop watch. I think its Dan.

Ann Campbell:

Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I didn't say that. Go ahead, Dan.

Dan:

Oh, hi. Yeah, this is Dan [Handleman 00:27:02]. I use he/him pronouns, I'm with Portland cop watch and I posted in the chat that we've been talking about forums. The compliance officer is picked out as doing forums on body cameras. It was just mentioned here. Maybe PCCEP will host a forum on it that maybe the mental health alliance will host a forum. But the city promised in the year 2016, which is five years ago now, when they signed the last police association contract, that there was going to be a stakeholder group put together.



Dan:

I believe the ACLU was going to be on that and I was going to be on it. And a couple other community members were going to be on that to help develop that policy. And it's listed as being binding city policy when it was passed by the city council back then. So I haven't heard anybody talking about that, except for me, I know that deputy chief Davis was aware of that because he and I used to make jokes about when we were going to get together. So I'm not sure if that's still going to happen. I hope the city attorney can address why, if that's binding city policy, nobody's talking about a stakeholder group. Thank you.

Ann Campbell:

Jared. Would you like to answer that or?

Jared:

I can't answer for the city. I will say that public input from whatever sources I think can be valuable, including if they're city led whether directly or through the compliance officer who they pay the salary for, but ultimately that's a question of local ordinance and that would be for Heidi to answer.

Heidi:

And if I can then, Dan, I'm happy to look at that, but I will say that, of course the paragraph on the body-worn cameras does include input from the community. That was an essential part of it. And that would have happened through the compliance officer to, I think the intent was to make that accessible for everybody, but I am happy to look into the portions of the agreement related to that in 2016 and get back to you personally.

Ann Campbell:

Okay. Thank you. Are there any other questions? Okay, I'll turn it back over to Lakayana then. Thank you all. Thank you for being here tonight, Jared and Heidi and everyone else. Thank you.

Lakayana:

Thank you, Ann, great work on that. So we're going to go back into our regularly scheduled program and do our subcommittee updates and reports. And then also hear from our PCCEP staff, Portland police bureau on their updates and the mayor's office as well, starting with our PCCEP subcommittees. Can we get Ann? Oh, nevermind. Can we get our racial equity subcommittee update? I believe that's from Celeste.

Celeste Carey:

Yes. Marlon Marion and I have been putting together an effort to do a re-review of stops data, working with the racial equity subcommittee to compile some questions, to put some fresh eyes to the data and to see what kind of questions or concerns could be brought to the data group, the data collection group and analysis group for either adding categories of information for the analysis, or being able to drill down and get more information like what shifts, some of the incidents or the stops happen in what neighborhoods and a few other of categories of data.



Celeste Carey:

To that end Marlin put together a meeting with assistant chief [Leisure 00:31:05]. And then we also met with Lauren Brown from data services to talk about what could be done and we're setting up yet another meeting so that we can start looking at the data, what kind of call types, looking at ways we can shape the information for future used and we will be moving forward gradually with that effort. Sitting out, we've sent out invitations through the PCCEP staff to any past participants and any new participants. And it's a slow rebuild to get ourselves some critical mass, but that's where we are for right now.

Lakayana:

Thank you so much. I'm going to turn over to Gloria for the youth subcommittee. You're on mute.

PART 1 OF 6 ENDS [00:32:04]

Lakayana:

You're you're on mute.

Gloria Canson:

All right. How about now?

Lakayana:

Yes, ma'am all right.

Gloria Canson:

We have some works in the plan. We have reached out to several high schools to get youth from all the culture groups that we can think of, including the houseless community. And on the 6th of December, for those of you who can participate with us, please do we're going to be doing a work session where we talk about the kinds of fears that our young people are facing, especially now in light of what is going on in the high schools, the fights that seem to break out over race or gender.

Gloria Canson:

And we're also looking at, there was an article in the paper, not too long ago, about how police have been using the force against children. And we want these groups to kind of speak out and let us know what their concerns are. And if they think that they want to be involved in the planning, and I need to also reach out to you Lakayana, because you put out a beautiful flyer or someone put it out for you. And we need to know, Tia had a question about if we published a flyer and handed it out to the different high schools and different groups of young people, could we get more buy-in to what we're trying to do? So if you could get to me later and let me know who put the flyer out for you. Good.

Lakayana:

Yup. I'll do that.



Gloria Canson:

Thank you.

Lakayana:

It probably wasn't me. I'll say that. I don't think I make very beautiful flyers, so.

Gloria Canson:

Oh-oh. All right.

Lakayana:

Thank you for the update.

Gloria Canson:

Yes. Remember December 6th, if you can make it, please do, we will be planning our speak up for the youth.

Lakayana:

There was a question about the time. What time is it and where?

Gloria Canson:

Oh, I think we said six o'clock. Yeah, I think it's on the calendar for six.

Lakayana:

Okay.

Gloria Canson:

And if it's not, I'll let people know.

Lakayana:

Perfect. We'll plan on it. Thank you.

Gloria Canson:

Thank you.

Lakayana:

Next we're going to go to Barb. Who's going to give our update for the behavioral health subcommittee.

Barb:

Hi folks. My name is Barb, she, her pronouns. I'm the Amy Anderson's sort of assistant and peer here. At our most recent meeting, we invited Portland street response to come and they came and talked about there's six, the first six months of their pilot. And then also their first responders specifically about calls





that they've been on and interactions they've had, and barriers, and what have you. And then this coming month, we are planning to really have a discussion and see if we have any recommendations around the wellness program, because the training advisory council, also has a committee working on that. So, we do little things, they do big things. And our next meeting is December 7th, I'm pretty sure the first Tuesday in December, from six to 7:30. Thank you.

Lakayana:

Thank you. And I'm going to turn it over to Anne to give the settlement and policy subcommittee update, and then also the steering committee as well if you could please.

Anne:

Hello again, I kind of went over, and Jared and Janice and others talk talked about the settlement. And we spent the whole meeting talking about the court date, the settlement with the DOJ in the city and where it was. We talked about what was going to be the next steps. And next month we are hoping to, once again, talk about the DOJ settlement and maybe focus a little bit on the recent letter from the DOJ, that I believe kind of further focuses in on some of the body-worn camera issue. We also are hoping to actually will be planning a listening session or town hall. So the community can weigh in as well on the body worn camera policy or how it's going to be rolled out through Portland.

Anne:

So that's the settlement and policy subcommittee. In the steering committee we talked about, on the steering committee, there's Lakayana and myself and Taji Chesimet. And we talked about our next steps because Taji is going to stand a little bit longer with PCCEP, but Lakayana is no longer going to be with PCCEP. And we talked about what was our next steps for PCCEP leadership. And we do have a proposal we're going to talk about later in the meeting, I'm going to bring that up to kind of create maybe a little more inclusive leadership structure for PCCEP. So I think, did I miss anything Lakayana?

Lakayana:

No, that covered the main pieces of it. Yeah. Okay. So I'm going to turn it now over to PCCEP staff, Theo and Claudia to give updates on their end.

Theo:

Thanks, Lakayana. I appreciate it. We just want to first start out by thanking Lakayana for all of your time and dedication to this piece of effort. You've been there since the very beginning. It's better with you, it's better because of you and really appreciate all of your work. I can't name the number of recommendations that you've been a part of or been the sole creator of, but it's a lot. So my sincere gratitude to you my friend. PCCEP staff have been working on recruitment quite a bit.

Theo:

We really want to get applications in, so we can try to honor the legacy of folks like Lakayana and have some other good members step on and do other good work for the community. And alluded to some of the work, so the bylaw stuff, we've been working on the language around that, we've been working on



the quarterly report. And we've been trying to nail down the contract for a strategic plan. Other than that, that's all we got and you'll be hearing from me a little bit later. So thanks very much.

Lakayana:

Thanks Theo. I'm going to turn it over to PPB. I'm not sure who's going to give that update. I know Mary Claire is on and Chief Val is on. So whoever wants to take that update, go ahead. Looks like it's going to be chief. Good to see you. Thank you for being here.

Chief Val:

Yeah. Thanks Lakayana. Good to see you. And to definitely echo what Theo said, thank you for all your time, effort and energy into PCCEP. You've been added a longtime and this work is not easy. So definitely kudos to you and I thank you. I'll give a quick update on a fit, our focus intervention team. We have currently 46 applicants. So 46 officers who have put in for the 12 officer spots, for the focus intervention team, which is a marked improvement from the almost nil interest we had the first go around. So it's created a good problem for us. We have several days of interviews to do. I think we're going to do five days. We've done three days already, we've got two more to go. So I'm really hopeful that we'll have a really great pool to pick from, to fill out this team.

Chief Val:

We're still trending really well as far as getting folks selected, there'll be a 360 part after the selections where we look at people's backgrounds, talk to their peers and supervisors, to finalize the selections. But I just wanted to give a positive good update on that. I think the DOJ mediation piece has been covered pretty well. And I know Sam's here from the mayor's office to talk about bump budget stuff too. So I think that's all I've got from the PPB side. And it's good to be here with all of you.

Lakayana:

There's one question to chat. What, if anything, will PPB do differently to get additional applicants?

Chief Val:

Yeah. There's a few things that we're looking at, we're hopeful to get a bonus approved, and we're looking at ways where we can bolster our recruitment staff. We typically had for the last two years or so, a recruitment manager and two recruiters, two officers recruiting. And when we took the budget cut last in 2020 or 2021. So last year, we ended up having to get rid of our recruitment manager and the two recruiters sending them back to the street. So we want to bolster our recruitment efforts there.

Chief Val:

And I think just looking at ways where we can bring in just a diverse applicant pool as well, we're hopeful to maybe reengage our cadet program, keep some of those folks in involved in the process till they can get to hiring age. One of the things we did previously when I was in personnel is we went out to New York to John Jay College to recruit there because it was a larger and more diverse pool. So maybe doing something of that nature too, looking at places where we could possibly tap into a really diverse, larger pool could be good as well.



Lakayana:

Thank you, Chief.

Chief Val:

Sure.

Lakayana:

All right. We're going to turn it over to Sam Adams in the mayor's office.

Sam Adams:

Hi everybody. And I'd like to add my thanks to Lakayana. Thanks for your service, not only here, but I know you'll continue. I hope and I think I know you'll continue to be involved in always trying to make Portland better for all Portlanders. So thank you. So the many of you probably know that there was an unanticipated adjustment to the city's budget, additional business tax revenue came in. And so the city council has been working over the past month and a half on using these dollars, investing these dollars. These are one time dollars. They're not tagged as ongoing.

Sam Adams:

So the investments have focused on limited term positions or one time invest that hopefully have long-term benefit. In terms of the top three priorities, the bulk of the resources has gone into alleviating the plight of houseless and those impacted by houseless camps. This was done in a joint budgeting process at the invitation, the [inaudible 00:44:35] county chair, Deborah Cafore, \$38,000,000 goes to a variety of new investments, that are intended to help the conditions of folks that are in tent encampments around the city, to who provide them with more services.

Sam Adams:

There's also significant amount of resources to procure more shelter facilities with an emphasis on buying or leasing hotels. This also moves forward the houselessness part of this budget, it also moves forward the, say for rest villages on the public safety side, as the chief mentioned briefly, this budget includes resources to hire retired police officers and pays the difference between the city's pension that's being phased out to those, the differences when they come back, they come back and they're on the per system.

Sam Adams:

So this allocation pays for that differential. We also, the mayor set out, it's not a council Paul, but as the police commissioner, based on input from the chief, looking to try to have minimum staffing levels at all times, in the districts, in the police precincts, rather, he set out a personal goal of hiring 300 police staffers in the next three years.

Sam Adams:

This will be subject to scrubbing. Also in this budget is staffing analysis that will be done by the community safety division, led by the community safety division. So not by the police bureau, will scrub



the mayor's goal. The mayor's specific three year goal was for 200 armed police officers and 100 unarmed police, public safety specialists. And I'm especially excited about the expansion of the public safety unarmed specialist, where they have been deployed in more community facing situations.

Sam Adams:

They've been received with a lot of positive feedback. So we're doing a deep dive into how the public safety specialist work has gone so far. We'll be bringing it back to the city council and then look to make expansion. Again, public safety specialists are unarmed. This budget does, I think as most of you know, include resources for, to move forward on the procurement of body worn cameras.

Sam Adams:

It does not include money to make body worn cameras operational, but the mayor wanted to show good faith in moving forward with calls by the DOJ. And the community and others too. And he has a longtime supporter of body worn cameras that this shows the seriousness. This is, in terms of the operations and protocols that are subject to negotiations with Department of Justice and with the Portland Police Association labor contract. There's a lot of other components to this, but I'll just stop there. And I'm happy answer any questions on any other issues that you would like.

Lakayana:

Thanks for all those updates. I got one question so far from Anne. Go ahead.

Anne:

Thank you, Sam. I was wondering, I haven't read or heard any talk about onetime funds for training. I know that you brought in the able training, which I think is fabulous. I went to a training for community members and the focus is to change culture. And I'm really interested in that. And I've heard from the community that we want to train, so we don't harm our community members. So is there any onetime fees or monies of the 62,000,000 that will go towards training?

Sam Adams:

Yeah, there's about \$800,000 that's been set aside for expanding the training that's done by DPSST, the required state training, for them to expand and start offering training here in the Portland area. There's been interest from other jurisdictions in region. It's been a real bottleneck, Portland being able to hire officers. And then we only have 10 slots in the DPSST every training cohort. So we hope to expand that. As part of the specific to your question. The first step on the path that you sort of spoke about, which we feel is very important also at the request of DOJ is to hire a civilian director of training and to get that person on board. And then to work with stakeholders, both external and internal to come up with a training program. But that, that be done by a civilian and. The development of training coordinated by a civilian. So that's step one. And that, that money is in this bump budget.

Anne:

Thank you.

Sam Adams:



You bet. Thank you very much.

Lakayana:

Yup. Thank you, Sam. Any other questions?

Gloria Canson:

Lakayana.

Lakayana:

Yes ma'am.

Gloria Canson:

I have a question.

Lakayana:

Yeah. Go Ahead.

Gloria Canson:

First of all, I would like to say Mr. Adams, thank you so much. My name is Gloria Canson.

Sam Adams:

Hi.

Gloria Canson:

She, her. Hello. Thank you for getting back to me regarding the rehire letter.

Sam Adams:

Yeah.

Gloria Canson:

And I was wondering, did you read the article? And I think it was Fridays paper, Portland Needs Policies for Body Cameras Before Buying. The writer of that article, I think it was trial lawyer in Clackamas by the name of Amanda J. Marshall. She brought out a lot of points about who should wear the cameras. Is there a clear policy for them? Will recordings be used in court? She had so many questions to go on down the list, but the one that really hit home to me, she says that there is no police oversight board. Is that true?

Sam Adams:

No. And there's an existing one and there'll be a strengthened one that was passed under the leadership of Jo Ann Hardesty will be set up soon, but it was passed at the vote, at the ballot box. So it depends on what she means, but no there's oversight.



Gloria Canson:

Well, her direct quote was, "When no progress has been made implementing the voter approved police accountability board."

Sam Adams:

Oh. So progress is moving forward. Implementation is moving forward, both in terms of the budgeting and the staffing of that. So it is moving forward. I don't have the latest update, I'm sorry. But I can get back to you with an update.

Gloria Canson:

Thank you.

Sam Adams:

You bet. And Ms. Cason, I'm going to put in the... So Ms. Canson asked what kind of select action criteria in an email to me would be used to judge, whether someone recently retired should be rehired into the police force and the retiree hire we're looking at because it's the fastest way we can get police officers back on. So I just put in the chat, and this is working with, again, Commissioner Hardesty office. These are the sort of, some of the baseline selection criteria. We know that this is of concern to some. And so that's why we embrace this selection criteria.

Gloria Canson:

Thank you.

Sam Adams:

You bet.

Lakayana:

Mr. Barnett, you're up.

Mr. Barnett:

Okay. I just unmuted. Thank you, Mr. Lakayana. And I'll preface my question with by thanking you for all the hard work and complexity that you've dealt with over the time of this PCCEP operation. It's been admirable and set models for future participants and leaders. So I want to thank you for that. I want to address my question to Mr. Sam Adams. Thank you, Mr. Adams for being here. It's always reassuring to get a formal recognition right from our local government. And so I appreciate yours there. My question, since you're referencing budgetary matters, is that given, as my under and correct me, if I'm not, the funding that comes for this bump out of the extra, however much it is 62,000,000 or whatever it is, is that it's a one time thing.

Mr. Barnett:

And so it can't, it can't be expected to be continued in terms of what gives funded now, for instance, I'm referencing it specifically the training package that has been addressed. And if the developments in that



area that are going to be going on and paid for out of this particular source of funding, what happens when that funding is no longer available, vis-a-vis these improvements and hopefully reforms, and training?

Sam Adams:

Yeah. So the \$800,000, you're absolutely right, Mr. Barnett about that's onetime funding for training. And the next budget cycle, it's the mayor's intent to ask for it again, but using ongoing revenues. But we didn't have ongoing revenues, we're in this midyear budget adjustment, but you're right. Kenai the DOJ, civilian training agents or civilian training director, the same thing. And I think that for the DOJ recommendation on a civilian training director, there's unanimous council court for that being funded on an ongoing basis. But because this is a budget adjustment, you'll see those on the request, the mayor's proposed budget during the next year's annual request, but we'll have to fight for it again. You're right. Thanks for your question.

Lakayana:

All right. Looks like the last question we have is from Zeenab, go ahead.

Zeenab Fowlk:

Thank you, Lakayana. And again, I also thank everyone, appreciation to your participation and your leadership. And I think that my question for Sam Adams.

Sam Adams:

Hi.

Zeenab Fowlk:

So I have a lot of questions. I think you answered some of the questions based on others, but one of the questions that I have is about the mental health of those who are returning as well those also existing on the police force. What kind of funding did you allocate or was the budget allocated for that? And like the Mr. Barnett who shared, how will you plan to, I guess, continue to help and support this type of funding moving forward, the mayor or the city be able to do that?

Sam Adams:

So your question is about the mental health of those officers serving and other officers potentially returning. And what does this budget do to address that issue? I just, it was a little hard for me to hear you. Was that your question?

Zeenab Fowlk:

Yes. Is it hard to hear? Sorry about that.

Sam Adams:

No, I'm getting old.



Zeenab Fowlk:

That was my question. Yes.

Sam Adams:

Okay, great. So-

Zeenab Fowlk:

[crosstalk 00:58:13].

Sam Adams:

... the bureau right now is, and the chief can speak to this, looking at the issue of mental health, mental health assessments, mental health benefits for existing police officers. And also those that in terms of benefits that might be returning that work is underway and there is already under the current health insurance there are mental health benefits. But as implied in your question, we are looking at how we can bolster that. And so that work is underway. This particular, because it is onetime it does have training, but it does doesn't have anything on mental health. But I would expect in the next regular budget process that there would be additional resources as a result of the work that the Bureau's doing now to assess how they can continuously improve their efforts at keeping their officers mentally healthy.

Zeenab Fowlk:

So how do we piece up make recommendation for that? Because I feel like if we're talking about the actual settlement agreement and where it comes from, it comes from those who not taking care of their mental health. Okay, when violence is happening, when people are angry, most of the things that are happening, just comes from that. And so if we're not addressing that in the dollars that are existing and this hasn't been addressed and you're talking about bringing people back on the course. And in addition to that, [inaudible 01:00:02] have learned that training is not often humanly. So even based on DOJ's information, how is it that the funds... Why wasn't the funds a part of... Why weren't any funds [inaudible 01:00:19]. I'm just going to [inaudible 01:00:21] out that way. And why wasn't this planned about?

Sam Adams:

Yeah. So the, an assessment is underway. Benefits are available now, but an assessment is underway on how those can be improved. That's one thing, and this is onetime money that we have to spend before the end of the year. And so we're focused training. I guess I should explain, also the training component in the future is intended to also bolster mental health training as is part of the overall training. And so we do look forward as soon as possible to hire that civilian director training that I believe and I think the mayor would agree would have significant experience and expertise as part of training police officers, and continuously training police officers, that part of that just now, as a matter, of course, includes mental health wellbeing of our office and applicants.

Chief Val:





And if I could I'll add to what Sam was saying, the wellness piece is really important to us. I mean, 21st century policing, one of the six pillars is officer wellness. This particular time is really for adjustments to the budget. And like Sam said, it's really onetime money that we're looking at, but for next year's annual wellness is going to be something that I think is really important for us to really look at and try to get some resources to really support officers as best we can.

Lakayana:

Thank you both for filling those questions and to everyone else who's been chiming in on some of these. we are going to turn to the next piece of our agenda, which is a vote on a proposal for a strategic plan. This is a PCCEP vote. Let me copy and drop this link into the chat. So for those of you who want to take a look at it for some background context to this PCCEP has been looking for a while to have a strategic planner come in and help craft a three year plan for PCCEP. I've been one of the strong proponents of this because I think the lack of a plan prevents PCCEP from really honing in on key areas and having metrics to measure our own success. And when we look at other similar organizations and the organizations that we're even supposed to be engaging with, all of those have strategic plans.

Lakayana:

So we've got a proposal. I dropped the link in here for everyone to look at. Several months back, there was some question about the strategic plan and the process and making sure that it was done right, or it was even something that PCCEP wanted to pursue. And so we decided to put it on the agenda as an item to vote on. As I mentioned, it's a three year plan. In here, the pieces of it that are important are just the scope up of work. So it would include a project management design and execution of strategic planning process that meets the criteria outline in this description. So it would involve all of our PCCEP members. I think it would also involve community input and input from some of the other organizations that interface with us.

PART 2 OF 6 ENDS [01:04:04]

Lacchiana:

Input and input from some of the other organizations that interface with us develop a three year strategic plan that an estimated hours and all the information for the project, the qualifications of the consulting staff. So once this passes, we will be looking for... We'll be doing a request for proposal, for a facilitator to run this strategic planning process for us. So that's the background context. I feel like this has been brought up several times, but I want to before we move to community input give PCCEP members a chance to wait in on this. And if there's anything from staff that they would like to add, we could also include that in this time as well. So PCCEP questions, or staff input? Yes, sir. Go ahead, Theo.

Theo:

Yeah, I just wanted to say that from a staff perspective we're very in favor of this. We think it's a great idea. We've allocated funds in the PCCEP budget to do this. And it's a good way of tracking work, and trying to go in the next direction. We've had all the indications from the mayor's office, as well as the city attorney's office that PCCEP will be codified in this bill to help last settlement agreement. So we want this to really shape the next direction of PCCEP. So we think it's a great idea.



Lacchiana:

Awesome. Thank you for that. I got a... Whoops. Guess that was all on mute. I was going to say, just thank you for that Theo. And then we've got a question from Anne, and then Celest, and then Tia.

Anne:

Thank you. I just had a question, because this is the first time we're looking at this piece. I'm in support of this under the goals and target audience under stage one review of PCCEP's history. Conversations with the current leadership and staff and overall assessment. I'd like that to include current PCCEP members, not just current staff. So I would like to add that, so that everyone is involved in the conversations as regarding the pre-planning

Lacchiana:

You said in stage one?

Anne:

Yes. Stage one pre-planning.

Lacchiana:

Okay. I'm wondering if current leadership means current PCCEP members. Theo, could you clarify that?

Theo:

I'd initially met current steering committee members, but I'll amend that language. I'm taking notes as you all talk. So I'll amend this language. This is just a draft.

Lacchiana:

Okay. I'll just note that down as we get ready for the final vote, but I agree with that. Celest?

Celest:

Yes. I have two questions please. In stage two, could you expand on who the executive... Oh, nevermind. Dyslexia rules. For some reason I thought it said executive committee. Okay. That's good. That's been answered. My second question however, is about funding. So when we had a chance to speak with Sam Adams at a prior meeting, we talked about various funding being ongoing a one time. How are we funding this? And for a three year effort, will the funding be guaranteed to extend through the duration of the effort to make sure that it doesn't die on the vine?

Lacchiana:

That's a staff question.

Theo:

All right Celest, this is funded through the PCCEP budget and we've allocated this money. So this has nothing to do with the increase in funding from the city hall.



Celest:

Excellent. Okay. So it's totally independent and it's totally concrete and confirmed?

Theo:

Yep.

Celest:

Okay. Thank you.

Lacchiana:

Great question so far, let's go to Tia. You're on mute too.

Tia:

I had questions about the consulting. Where are the consultants from? And then how will they work with us to create, or plan the strategic plan? And will it be as a whole committee, subcommittees, or individually? And is it on Zoom?

Lacchiana:

So the consultants haven't been chosen. Once we vote and pass this plan, then a request for proposal would go out and interested consultants would submit a proposal, and then we would look through them. And a small group that was interested in reviewing those applications would choose them. I believe the other question was who would be involved in it? It would be the committee as a whole. And as Anne pointed out, we want to make sure that even in the pre-planning stages that the entire committee is included.

Tia:

Okay.

Lacchiana:

Yep. Yeah. Any other questions?

Amy:

Yeah, [Lacchiana 01:09:38], I have one. At the very last section of the letter, it talks about reviewing follow up sessions with the office of equity and human rights staff to gauge the progress of implementation. Should we have anything there about producing like a document summary, or a report of findings instead of just follow up sessions? Can we have something concrete, like a document?

Lacchiana:

I'm open to that. I'm wondering if other folks have thoughts on it? I think that's a good idea. I think something should be written up with whatever assessment they're doing.

Amy:



Yeah.

Lacchiana:

Okay.

Phil:

Yeah. I think that's great Amy. I think we can put that along with whatever other deliverables they end up coming up with in the strategic plan section on the website. Or what will be a strategic plan section on the website.

Amy:

Right. Thank you.

Phil:

Uh-huh (affirmative).

Amy:

Oh, and my other thought was on your previous subject. If we all are going to meet as a single group. This stuff would be great work product sessions. So as we talked about combining together as a larger group of chairs for the steering committee. This stuff is the work we'd be doing as we'd all be working together with all of our input on these different areas. So I think it's going to be a good thing if we... Nobody will be left out in other words. Everybody gets to participate.

Lacchiana:

Yeah. And I think that'll be the hallmark of a good facilitator is to make sure that that happens beyond the efforts that we're doing it. They're making sure that they're observing and getting everybody in, but I 100% agree. And I added that in there.

Amy:

Thank you.

Lacchiana:

Yep. We got Zaynab. Go ahead.

Zaynab:

I have two questions. One. Has the city looked for someone internally who could possibly serve in this capacity? That's one question. And the second question was related to the settlement agreement in itself. This is a three year plan, but does PCCEP plan to go on further after the settlement agreement? For instance, there is improvement and there's compliance and everything is approved will PCCEP go on past that. And is that what strategic planning's for, to go further than I guess what was intended by the settlement agreement?



Lacchiana:

Yes, that is the plan. So I'm not exactly sure where we are in the process, but we submitted that other document around codification of PCCEP. So that's in the works somewhere. I'd love to get an update on that. If someone on the call has that, but the strategic plan should include that. That's the one challenge with the strategic plan, especially mapping out three years it's really hard, right. Especially when we are in the middle of... Well, it's hard to say when the settlement agreement will be wrapped up. But I think the strategic plan should at best try to incorporate that eventuality. I missed the first part of your question. I forgot it.

Zaynab:

Does the city look internally to see if someone could facilitate this with [inaudible 01:13:26]?

Lacchiana:

That's that's a staff question. Staff have that and then also if we could get... If staff, or city mayor's office has any update on the status of the codification process would be great too.

Theo:

We haven't looked internally. This is Theo. We haven't looked internally for somebody who would facilitate that, but we're certainly open to doing that. I don't know what that would look like. But if you all are interested, then I think it's a conversation worth having, and I think Heidi's probably the best person to ask about codification.

Heidi:

Yeah. Hi everybody. And I don't have a lot of details because Anika [inaudible 01:14:07], one of my colleagues has been working on this specifically. But I do know that last I talked to her, the plan was to work on the ordinance documents and start looking at what... Get those documents ready so that the PCCEP plan that would extend it beyond the settlement agreement would go to council.

Lacchiana:

Thank you. Just reading a comment from the chat from Judith there. She's saying that there aren't really professional development staff available internally to do things like strategic planning. But I think it's a conversation worth having once we've passed it to see what that looks like, but I think Theo's got another thought on it.

Theo:

Yeah. I was also going to say that we would ensure that any contract is from somebody who's Portland based. So we're not going elsewhere. I know that that was a question that didn't get addressed. But it's important to work with somebody that's Portland based. That's going to involve all the stakeholders. So that includes folks like the city attorney, the Amici, folks involved directly in the settlement agreement so that we can push that work forward and also look to go beyond it when that time comes. But they will be Portland based.

Lacchiana:



Thank you Theo. Any other PCCEP member questions before I open it up to community comment? Just before I open up to community comment, the two changes that we were asking before we vote on this was, number one, to include PCCEP members in stage one of the pre-planning process. And to stage three, add a deliverable of a report to go along with the update from the office of equity and human rights. Community member comment on PCCEP's strategic plan proposal.

Lacchiana:

Going once, going twice. Okay. So we are going to go to a vote. So I'll just call off folks names. And if you can just vote yes or no to approve that PCCEP go forward to strategic planning process, which would then trigger us to do the RFP, the request for a proposal for this process. So going down our list, I'll start with Anne.

Anne:

Yes.

Lacchiana:

Celest?

Celest:

Yes.

Lacchiana:

Amy?

Amy:

Yes.

Lacchiana:

Byron?

Byron:

Yes.

Lacchiana:

Tia?

Tia:

Yes.

Lacchiana:

Zaynab?



Zaynab:

There's a yes, but I'm still looking for the codification. And so I think it depends on the codification and one that's done.

Lacchiana:

Okay. I vote yes. Is there anybody else on this call for PCCEP that we may have missed?

Anne:

Gloria.

Lacchiana:

Oh, Gloria. Sorry about that.

Gloria:

Yes.

Lacchiana:

Okay. So that's one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight yes votes. No nos, no abstentions. So that measure passes. Thank you all for doing that. I think it's really going to help PCCEP moving forward.

Celest:

Thank you very much Lacchiano for your guiding hand. I just appreciate it.

Lacchiana:

Yes. Ma'am.

Celest:

And also not to leave out anybody else involved.

Lacchiana:

Yeah, no. There's been a lot of discussion over the last several months and making sure it's done right. And as Anne has noted, there's still questions. So there's still work to be done on this. We are headed to another vote and I'm going to turn it over to Anne to talk about this. This is another exciting piece. It's re-looking at our steering committee structure. So I'll leave it to her to get into the details about that.

Anne:

Yes. Thank you, Lacchiana. We have talked about that. This change that we're proposing, I believe in the last month or maybe two. In order to be more inclusive in PCCEP on our steering committee, it's been suggested that instead of voting. So let me just describe what we have currently in our PCCEP plan. Under membership and term, we have actually four positions.



Anne:

We have an alternate co-chair, and two co-chairs, and a secretary position. Those people meet in the steering committee and set... Among other things, they set the agenda of the full board meeting. So moving forward, what we suggest is that instead of voting, we have the chairs of all of the subcommittees be on the steering committee and together they would share the leadership. And how it's been described to me is for instance, the members would talk about the upcoming full board meeting, and they would share the facilitation of different topics at the meeting. And it would be discussed how that would work in the steering committee.

Anne:

Let's see. And the idea is to vote on this and once we have voted on this, then we would change our PCCEP plan. We would amend it to include the new verbiage about steering committee, chairpersons would be also an automatic member of the steering committee. Lacchiana did I leave anything out?

Lacchiana:

No. I would guess what I would just add is that we... Just from doing this for several years, we're just looking at how we close certain gaps, right? If you look at this meeting right now, there's two people that are facilitating, which are basically filling the two co-chair roles. And I think there's room for more people to have a role in facilitating.

Lacchiana:

And one of our blind spots current within PCCEP is that the steering committee is not as connected as it needs to be to the subcommittees. And what their needs are, what are they working on and things of that nature. And so by having the chairs of these committees be the members of the steering committee, then it automatically closes that in and makes sure that there's representation from each of those committees on the steering committee.

Lacchiana:

The one challenge is that it kind of taxes them a little bit, because they're now supposed to come do a second meeting, but it's only one more. And I think one other way you could get around that is by sending a representative. But I think it helps get it to be a more inclusive group. You're hearing from more voices at the regular body meetings just strengthens our leadership as a whole. So I'm in favor of it. I wonder if Theo might want to just add something before we open up the questions because I know he's also had a hand in helping us think through this as well.

Anne:

Go ahead Theo.

Theo:

Thanks Anne. Thanks Lacchiana. As Anne correctly stated it would take a bylaw revision. PCCEP staff has created a document that I'd like to share, if that's okay with you all. Just on proposed language, it can be changed at any time. It doesn't need to be taken, or voted on. But I wanted to share this. Can you all see that?





Theo:

Can I still see it? I'm moving stuff over. So the current language is just as follows. It has a breakdown of the officers. It's sections seven of the bylaws, and it discusses in A,B,C, and D. So we kept that same process. So just the draft. I'll read through it with you all.

Theo:

The steering committee will be comprised of the chairs of each PCCEP subcommittee. If the PCCEP adds a subcommittee, the members of that subcommittee will elect the chair. Will begin to serve on the steering committee immediately.

Theo:

B. PCCEP subcommittees will elect new chairs annually in January. I made that just because there was the beginning of the year. So it was initially done in November to coincide with other elections that you're probably all familiar with. But I made it January just so there's time in the beginning. If this is adopted to elect chairs, if that's something that subcommittees each one would do. But I'll continue to read. Each subcommittee may elect up to two co-chairs. That should say one. One of whom may be a non PCCEP member. The co-chair elected who is a PCCEP member will be the only one eligible to be a steering committee member.

Theo:

C. An elected steering committee member may vacate the position for any reason. That member will continue to participate as a full PCCEP member, but the subcommittee will need to elect the new chair. PCCEP subcommittees may fill a vacant position by a special election. So that's the same process as opposed to being in the general committee. It's just for subcommittees.

Theo:

D. Finally, it's just the breakdown of what happens basically with officers right now, and that language hasn't really been changed except for their co-chairs have been replaced with steering committee members. So it says, steering committee members will be responsible for conducting PCCEP meetings. Steering committee members remain voting members of the PCCEP. Steering committee members may request that the mayor's office provided culturally responsive facilitator to facilitate PCCEP meetings. Steering committee members will encourage full and safe participation by everyone, assist in the process of building consensus and ensure all participants abide by PCCEP's operating procedures.

Theo:

The steering committee members, office liaison, and project manager will serve as liaison between PCCEP members and the city. In consultation with the facilitator if there is one and project manager, steering committee. Steering committee members will develop meeting agendas, maintain some committees, and ensure an efficient advisory process.

Theo:

And that's all. So I'll stop sharing that. I'm happy to take questions. So that's just meant to be guiding. It's not been voted on, obviously that was just piece of stuff.



Anne:

Okay. I think is... Yeah. So that's the first time we've seen that document. I'm wondering if we can vote on this process if we decide and then revisit that document at a later meeting. Lacchiana do you have any feeling on that?

Lacchiana:

Say that last part again.

Anne:

The document that was just shared, that's the first time we've seen that. So I'm wondering if we can have our vote on this process after we take questions and comments, and then review that document later, because I think there's some areas that maybe we want to explore a little bit.

Lacchiana:

Yeah. I would agree with that. Yep. I guess the only question would be just, what do we do with our current leadership? Right now, Elliot stepped down, Taji's still here. So our steering committees will be after tonight down to two members. So I'm wondering if-

Anne:

Yeah, no, I'm suggesting we vote on this-

Lacchiana:

Yeah.

Anne:

And this the wording.

Lacchiana:

Yeah. I get that. I guess I'm just saying I guess maybe it's slightly a separate question of just, yes, I'm in favor of [crosstalk 01:27:10].

Amy:

Lacchiana. If I might, I think if you just think about your original intention and we go through with it, I think there are enough wonderful facilitators right now that are chairs of subcommittees that could potentially share this responsibility of hosting our main meetings. I don't see an issue with it.

Amy:

I think if we put it out there and just ask folks, would they feel comfortable hosting a meeting, then we could take turns. I think it's cooperation, collaboration. And then together will be the example of what good working people look like on a committee of this nature. I think your ideas are fabulous. Because both the community and the PCCEP members get to contribute if they come to a steering committee meeting. So everyone gets to have a say. And we all get to think together like a think tank.



Anne:

Thank you Amy. Yeah, that's the idea is that together they would decide amongst the members.

Amy:

Yes.

Anne:

Sharing in the facilitation of the full board meetings. Zaynab?

Zaynab:

There's a lot of conversation happening. So I agree with you Anne. I agree with everyone who just spoke about... Because where are we now? We don't have a plan for a plan B. I don't believe so. Because if that was the case, then we would've already had elections by now. So let's just... Like you said, I feel like it should be... Theo, is there a reason why you didn't share this ahead of time? I'm just going to ask this question and you know why. So that we actually make a vote on this. Thank you.

Theo:

Yeah. It wasn't done ahead of time. I was still working on it because I was trying to figure out how to word it and it was never intended to be voted on at this meeting. It was just supposed to be something that could potentially happen. Because the terms end. The terms expire for officers no matter what. So if folks decide to vote on the steering committee being the subcommittee chairs, that's great. So I just wanted to paint a picture of what something could look like, but this was never intended to be the plan. It's supposed to be developed by the new steering committee.

Zaynab:

Well the new steering committee is what you're looking to form based on the new structure. And so the only pieces that I would ask about is the co-chairs. I do believe that there should be two voted on for each of the different steering committees. So that if there's ever alternate needs to have to be there, they're available. That's the only thing I would ask of that particular new policy, or new initiative that we're looking to do. But for now can't we just do what we have been doing, which is, I don't know who said, who shared before about people just stepping up to volunteer to facilitate. I think everyone here on the committee has the ability to do that.

Anne:

Thank you for that. Well this idea came forward because every November in our bylaws we do elections. Some members had talked about this previously in terms of allowing more members to be involved and the operation of PCCEP, the steering committee and at the meetings. And once again, the idea would be that the steering committee made up of the chairs of the subcommittees would together decide who was going... What parts of the meeting they were going to share. So it would be a shared meeting. For instance, this evening I led some parts of our meeting and Lacchiana led some parts. So that's the idea behind that. Lacchiana, did you want to add anything?

Lacchiana:



Yeah. I guess that we're trying to decide on tonight. So what Theo presented is just a draft of what the language could look like, but we're just voting, or would be voting on this idea of having a structure change. The point that I had bring up was just a thought. I was just thinking out loud of where does that leave our current steering committee, which is down to two members.

Lacchiana:

A couple of the other pieces that were taken into consideration with this change was where PCCEP is at right now. Our committee is extremely young with everyone who's on it is, is really new to the group. Right. And so all it, there was that challenge.

Lacchiana:

And then there's just the other piece of a representational steering committee. And that's one thing we haven't talked about that does also need to be taken into consideration is making sure that those leadership positions are representational of both PCCEP and of our committee as a whole. And so I think that that's another thing to take into consideration is not just like, we just going to have a vote, whoever wins wins, but we do need to make sure that those things are in there too.

Lacchiana:

So I'm not suggesting that we have to take care of that now. I think the process is getting a little complicated, but the main thing that we're looking at now is changing the structure from what it currently is of having two co-chairs, a secretary, and an alternate co-chair. Which the alternate co-chair position was added way back when in the beginning when we had three really qualified individuals running for chair, and we didn't want to lose any of them. So we created the alternate positions, which wasn't truly utilized in a lot of instances. It was because I was at just recently and then Elliot resigned. So all that is to say, those are some of the considerations we need to think about, but I'm going to turn it back over to Anne to take it from here.

Anne:

Thanks Lacchiana. Celest did you have a question?

Celest:

I did, and it may be a little preemptive, but what I was concerned with was what was our functioning style going to be? Are we going to be a separate working committee of our own? Or, are we going to handle things as an overview, a meta view? The reason I'm asking is I'm concerned that as the chairs of the subcommittees, I don't want us to have work that might cause us to be divergent from our subcommittees, or that may lead us down two different paths simultaneously. And so I do like the idea of subcommittee chairs serving because it does provide more opportunities for facilitation and representation. I appreciate all the points Lacchiana that you brought up and Anne you presented, but I'm just curious as to what our functionality is going to be.

Anne:

Do you mean functionality in terms of running meetings, or [crosstalk 01:35:02]?



Celest:

Are we going to be like a work group that takes on specific task that may be separate from our subcommittees? Are we going to be a work group? I guess I should say.

Anne:

Well, it's a subcommittee. So it's another subcommittee meeting, and the issues that are brought up are what are we going to present at the full board meeting?

Celest:

Okay.

Anne:

The idea of having the chairs of the subcommittees then, a more robust view can be presented to the community. Issues that are brought up, will have more people involved in that discussion.

Celest:

Okay.

Lacchiana:

The role of the steering committee wouldn't change. It would just be how the leadership people are elected. But the steering committee's function is to be the governance body of the committee as a whole. But as I mentioned, one of.

PART 3 OF 6 ENDS [01:36:04]

Lakiana:

The governance body of the committee as a whole, but as I was mentioning, one of the pieces that we're kind of running into is that we don't really... We focus a lot on the outward piece of our world. Like what recommendations are we bringing for? But we need to take more of an internal too and make sure that our internal could committees are functioning right, what are they working on? What supports do they need? Right? And so by having a representation at that, they would do that and kind of help bring some together. So I think that that's one of loopholes that it would close.

Celest:

Yeah, I can see that. And actually, it seems like this particular structure would work better with the strategic planning as well. So thank you. Appreciate that.

Ann Campbell:

Zeenab.

Zeenab:



Thank you. I'm really trying to figure out what the vote is, and then on top of that, I do believe that there is some... Tia's question goes to it, it is extra work. And so let's not tip toe around that because the steering committee that I've seen, there are always been extra additional work, especially when it comes to these different meetings that have recent behalf of PCCEP to get additional work accomplished. Isn't that correct Lakiana and Ann? Because I know that that's some of things I've noticed from I joined. So let's be clear [inaudible 01:37:34] subcommittees so that understand what this could probably mean. And I do believe that once we decide on whatever way the structure is going to look like, that we have to continue to review this process. And I think Lakiana, I think Ann, if you can hear why you are looking... I think we understand there's the structure, but there is a reason why you're thinking about moving in this direction and it's based on your own experience. So I think it's really important that you share that too. Thank you.

Ann Campbell:

Do you want to go first Lakiana?

Lakiana:

Just as to the why, I would just say, I think that if we look at this meeting, right, it's being facilitated by just two people and I think the agenda should be shared by more individuals. And the only other piece that I would say is to just get, I think, piece that needs to focus a lot more on the internal piece of our stuff. And to your point, Zeenab, it is another responsibility. And I think that's one thing to take into consideration because as I was saying earlier, you're not only now going to be a chair of your subcommittee, but she would also be the chair of the one that's doing overall, so I think that's one piece that could be a double duty, but at the same time, almost all of our previous steering committee members were on subcommittees themselves.

Lakiana:

I don't think we've ever had one where people weren't on it. So I think those that choose to be in that role just will have to know that there will be a little added weight to it. I like Theo's suggestion of possibly having two so that you could have someone, or you could also need someone to go in your place, but that's also kind of challenging because those people who are at the steering committee are the ones facilitating the meeting. So there's never going to be a full, perfect one, but those are the two main things. And the conundrum that we were also running into at this point too, was just that the committee was so young and new. I think, PCCEP, it's in the middle of a process of change right now. And I think that there has to be really intentional steps of what we do next and make sure that the leadership is strong enough to continue on the work that we've been doing.

Ann Campbell:

And I think what I will add is, this idea was kind of put forth by, I believe Lakiana, you and Taji. I'm not sure exactly where it came from, but I like the inclusive part of it, inviting more people to be involved in leadership. And it is another meeting, but like myself I'm already a chair of that settlement and policy subcommittee. And in respect to what Lakiana said, we have a young group of people. I think that with Lakiana leaving and also with Elliot leaving, they are lots of experience and have been here a long time, and we also do have some really terrific members here that we just want to bring into leadership, and



we are all also looking for new members. So I just wanted to add that last piece. Did that answer your question? Zeenab did that answer your question?

Zeenab:

I think you answered my question. I just people to be able to share that. Thank you.

Ann Campbell:

Thanks. Amy, did you have any additional comment?

Amy:

Yes. I think I also heard Lakiana and Theo talk earlier that since we're all working for under the settlement agreement, that each of our subcommittees may run into a particular situation that actually impacts everyone, and maybe a bigger discussion as to what recommendations would be best would be best served if we could bring that information to a larger group. And that could come from the behavioral health group, it could come from the racial equity group, it could come from the policy or the youth. I think everyone was feeling like everyone was running great meetings individually, but it was so hard to try to keep up with what was really important to everyone. There wasn't time, and so we wanted to create time to be able to hear and learn and build upon our common recommendations for what we want within the settlement agreement. So that was also my takeaway, was that it would build capacity for us to have bigger conversations if it were like a single issue that impacted everyone. Does that make sense to everyone?

Zeenab:

Yes.

Dan:

Yes.

Ann Campbell:

Okay. Yes. Mr. Barnett, did you have a comment?

Mr. Barnett:

Yes, I did. And thank you for recognizing me. I'm very impressed by just the idea of this what's being proposed, and actually I have a small contribution to make and support of what you're doing. First off, I've really endorsed the perspectives and the reasons for them of several of the people who have spoken, Ms. Anne and Lakiana, and Ms. Celest, and... What's her name? Miss Amy or I'm sorry. Anyway, here's my contribution to all that. I've been involved with a number of different community based organizations, and one of the organizations, which is fairly large that I belong to ran into and continues, although I think more recently they... A problem, a conundrum that they found perplexing, and here's what happens. Many times subcommittees can operate as if their silos or ivory towers separate and they would come up with things unintentionally that would either be a duplication of what somebody else is working on or in conflict with it.



Mr. Barnett:

One of the problems I see solved by you're moving in the direction you are by having these subcommittee chairs meet together in the context of the steering committee is a lot of that stuff could be resolved at that level and provide, oh, well, wait a minute, we're working on this. Oh, well we're working on that. Oh, well we understand each other, or we don't, and we just need to be clear about it, whatever. And that would prevent some kinds of confusions and controversies at the board level, at the overall... When the PCCEP Committee as a whole met, you would pre either resolve or at least be about the overall direction. So there's so many good things about what you're proposing. I really particularly also want to think that you may have avoided some unintended conflict by the comments that Ms. Celest Garry made to clarify roles, accountability, what would be the authority, how far would things go, and that kind of thing. So I think altogether, it sounds good to me.

Ann Campbell:

Sounds good.

Lakiana:

Can I just add on that, that we have Mr. Barnett ran into those issues in the past, where some committees have felt left out or left behind and things of that nature. So I appreciate that endorsement because that's some of the work that we're trying to avoid.

Ann Campbell:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Burnett. Is it Dan, do you have your hand up?

Dan:

Yes, I do. Thank you. This is Dan Handelman again with Portland Copwatch. And I don't know if anybody's made a formal proposal yet, but one of the things that jumped out at me from the staff proposal that I know you're not voting on tonight is this concept that there might be co-chairs of subcommittees where one of them might not be a member of the PCCEP. In addition to the fact that PCCEP members are especially trained and selected by city council, which is why I think only PCCEP members should be on the steering committee, so I think that should be added to any motion, okay, just to be clear. I'm still concerned about the notion that came up a few months ago, that they were considering making a police officer a co-chair of the racial equity subcommittee.

Dan:

I think, at the end of that conversation, I made it really clear I agree that it's okay to have the police there at the table contributing to the agenda, but I really don't think in a community led organization like this, that the police should have a vote or be a chair person because I think that causes problems, and we saw that happen with the COEB, your predecessors. So my short comment is, whenever you make the motion, if you're voting on this, I hope that only PCCEP members get to be on the steering committee. Thank you.

Ann Campbell:





Thank you, Dan. I know you've brought that up before, and I personally agree with you. What we're going to be voting on and tonight is the structure, and in terms of the writeup that Theo provided, we're going to review that and kind of look at that and make some additions and changes to that. So tonight, is there any other comments that people would like to make? Just looking to see if I see any hands.

Lakiana:

No, but just to Dan's point, it's impossible for a police officer to be on this steering committee because they can't be on PCCEP and even in Theo's right up there, it would require you be a PCCEP member so there's a safeguard on that.

Ann Campbell:

Thank you. Thanks for that clarification. Okay. So I think now we will go to a vote. So what we are voting on is changing our steering committee structure to be... The membership of the steering committee will be the chairs of the subcommittees and they will then determine the agendas and how the meetings will be run. They will share the running of the facilitation of the full board meetings. Did I leave anything off Lakiana? I also wanted to add that we have agreed to review the information that Theo... I'm just looking at what he said. That Theo presented tonight. We're going to review that for specifics because we do have to change our bylaws, but we are going to review that and have another vote on that at meeting. So right now I want to just call people's names on the vote of the change, being no other questions. Celest?

Celest:

Yay.

Ann Campbell:

Thank you, Byron?

Byron:

Yes

Ann Campbell:

Thank you, Tia?

Tia:

Yes.

Ann Campbell:

Oops. Thank you. Gloria?

Gloria:

Yes.



Ann Campbell:

Thanks Gloria. Zeenab?

Zeenab:

Yes.

Ann Campbell:

Thank you, Amy?

Amy:

Yes.

Ann Campbell:

Thanks Amy. Lakiana.

Lakiana:

Yeah.

Ann Campbell:

And me, yes. So we have eight members that passed, but all the PCCEP members tonight. And as I said, that will be effective the end of this month. Thank you everyone, and thanks for your work on this. And we will move forward, Gloria, Amy, Celest. Tia, I don't understand your question.

Tia:

Those are the chairs for the committees. I just wanted to know if they were the new steering committee. And then there's a settlement agreement committee, but who's on that now?

Ann Campbell:

Oh, that's me. So yes, that is correct. Yes. That's a good clarification. So the steering committee will now be made up of Gloria, Canson, Amy, Anderson, Celest. And I'm sorry Celest, I don't cover name. I apologize.

Celest:

No worries there.

Ann Campbell:

And myself, Ann Campbell. Zeenab, do you have an additional question?

Zeenab:



Yeah, I was going to ask about when you said, when is this going to take place? Is one question. And I was on the agreement policy. I'm not interested in being co-chair that's not what I'm asking, but I was on this committee, so I would like to be on that committee and-

Ann Campbell:

Great. Yes. Great.

Zeenab:

That is still clear. Okay. But yeah, I just want to know in regards to when is this going to be communicated to all of us that we know what's happening? That's all I care about, is knowing who's on the steering committee now, what's kind of work it's being done, how will the information be reported to the members? So we're all understanding what's happening within this PCCEP. That's all I care about. Thank you.

Ann Campbell:

Great questions, and first yay Zeenab, you're going to be back with the Settlement and Policy Subcommittee. That will be terrific. You and I will be working on that subcommittee and yes, we will send something out to all the members.

Amy:

And also the meeting's going to stay the same. So it'd be the second Tuesday of every month. It's going to be the same meeting time, right? We're not changing that. Right?

Ann Campbell:

That's a good question, thank you for bringing that up. I'm actually going to ask that we have the meeting at 5:30, start at 5:30 or 6.00. I have actually started a new job, I work in Vancouver now, so I would really appreciate it if we could actually have our steering committee meeting at 6:00 PM.

Amy:

Well maybe since all the folks are in the room at this moment, have everyone just put in chat their availability to start it that time. I don't have a problem with it. It would make it easier for me too. So that's fine. I'm glad you mentioned that now so we can have a chance to think about it, all of us can think about it. And the other thing is if unfortunately you can't make it, maybe somebody else can, we just have to look at it as a larger group operation and see what everyone feels like, because it's getting the darker and later, and maybe harder to be on the internet later on in the evening. It's kind of interesting. But I did want everyone to know that everybody's welcome. The steering committee members would represent what the officers would be now, but the room is always open to anybody who wants to come.

Amy:

We want more people to come, so we could have a larger community conversation too. So I just want to clarify that. This is not a small party operation. We're just taking over the positions that are ending in the November anyways. And oh, we talked about this being sort of maybe a temporary or a trial, we'll look



at it, see if it works and then down the road, we'll reevaluate our process. So this system isn't set in stone either, we want to make it flexible, but we want to give it a chance until we figure things out.

Zeenab:

Is that what we voted on just now? Was that included?

Ann Campbell:

Yeah. What we voted on just now was that the members of the steering committee are the chairs of the various subcommittees. Amy, I appreciate your comments, but that is what we voted on. So thank you for that. Okay. And what I think we'll do is I'll put out something, I do want to change the meeting to 6:00. I will send something out to people. Lakiana, back to you.

Lakiana:

Thank you. I do want to just recognize too that... I was just chatting with someone that the steering committee now comprises of all women. So I think that's a really awesome thing to see and yeah, welcome to everybody, and I know there's a lot to still kind of work out and put together, but excited to see where things go. And I think this is also probably one of the more unique structures within all the committees that exist within the city. And I think that's one thing that PCCEP has always been great at is blazing our own trail, no pun intended. So excited to kind of see where that goes. So the last piece of our agenda is the PCCEP quarterly report. Speaking of steering committees, the quarterly report has traditionally been drafted by someone on the steering committee, but the steering committee is a lot of work. So Theo, I believe you drafted this one and that's kind of where the direction that we've moved in, correct?

Theo:

It's always been a team effort piece of stuff in collaboration with steering committee members. But yeah, we put this together, kind of we're doing in a different way because when it used to be done, it was really short. It was maybe like a page, a page and a half. Now I was just checking and I think it's like eight or nine pages. So if that's not useful to you all, then please let us know because we don't want to produce things that aren't useful to you all, because if you wanted just a clear and concise one or two pages, then we can certainly do that. But if this format is useful to you, then we're happy to keep doing it this way is as well in collaboration with you all of course.

Lakiana:

Thank you. So just going to do a brief run through that. The document is 10 pages. It includes reports from the agendas of all of our subcommittees, the meetings that they hosted, as well as the videos from all of those meetings. It includes recommendations. This quarter's recommendations included a request for data transparency, the court filings and reports, all of our public meetings, which by the way, this ran from July 1st, through September 30th, 2021. Team building activities that we engaged in, trainings, vacancies. The only vacancy that we had was Elliot at the end of August. Talks about some of the challenges we faced, including maintaining that pool of applicants, which is a challenging thing, something that's going to continue to... It's a complicated process. The workload, the PCCEP website,



COVID 19, officer input and attendance, the turnover in the mayor's liaison to PCCEP which I'll say, I think Sam and gosh, I'm blanking, both Sams. It's two Sams. Yeah.

Theo:

Lakiana, do you want me to share this document real quick?

Lakiana:

Sure. I can share it from my screen since I'm kind of just scrolling through it. No, nevermind. You should share it. It won't let me share. I'm on page six. Let me just close so I can take a look now, public meetings, team building, we were in the challenges. Keep going a little bit more. Workload, court restrictions, officer input. Keep going a little bit more. Liaison which I just mentioned, keep going. Yeah. If you can just do a slow scroll from here that would be great. Yep. You can keep going. So special-

Theo:

Real quick. I wanted to note that we thought this deserved a change just because we've seen so many rank and file police officers attend subcommittee meetings, which is something that PCCEP members have asked for and PPP has followed through on. I did want to note that during quarter three, we had Stephanie Lorenzo step into that liaison position and Stephanie, she did a really wonderful job. And we also noted that Sam Diaz has been tremendous to work with. He's always showed up at every meeting. He was never technically a liaison. So I did want to mention that he's no longer with the city, but I wanted to mention that a shout out to Sam Diaz.

Celest:

Theo, hasn't Stephanie Lorenzo also stepped down though?

Theo:

Yes, but that's not a part of this quarter.

Celest:

Oh, okay. I'm I was confused. Okay. Thank you.

Theo:

Sorry.

Lakiana:

Okay, if we want to scroll down a little bit further.

Theo:

Sorry about that. Okay. Here we go,.

Lakiana:

No, it's all good. Were you done?



Theo:

Yeah. Thank you.

Lakiana:

Okay. So we had the Core Patrol Work Services session which wrapped up. These reports-

Theo:

Yeah. I'm sorry to hop back in Lakiana. This is going to be an Excel thing, but for ease, just for tonight, this was the Core Patrol Services little update, kind of tracker in Excel. So the status was all filled out and maintained by the mayor's office. So this is all at the Core Patrol Services recommendations and where they're at in implementation phase. So we'll happen done and then all the way down. And then finally the last call for applications.

Ann Campbell:

Can I ask a question?

Lakiana:

Yeah, we'll open it up to PCCEP questions.

Ann Campbell:

I'm wondering if moving forward, we could have this emailed out maybe the week prior to the meeting so people could review it and if they have any questions or comments, they could be here at the meeting, prepared with them. Is that something that we could do, have it by the week prior st out to members?

Theo:

I think so. We've ran into trouble with that in the past. And Judith has the institutional knowledge that would be helpful in this regard, but we've ran into trouble about having those kind of meaningful dialogues via email outside of the public meetings, outside of the public eye, because the public doesn't have the ability to make comments. So are you asking for just an email to be sent out so you can all read it but not provide feedback or-

Ann Campbell:

Right. So that we could read it and have our comments prepared for the meeting. I don't know if it's something... I hear what you're saying, so we want to have the community have a chance as well. I'm wondering if we could post it on our website a week prior so that people come tonight, it's a lot to digest and read and then ask questions. So I'm just wondering if we can certainly have it sent out at least a week in advance, moving forward?

Theo:

We'll do that. We'll send it out to the entire public, right? So we'll send it out to PCCEP members, at the same time as we do the public a week in advance from here on now. But I do want to follow up on my



initial question of length because it is a lengthy document. Would you want to keep bit like this? Is that helpful? Or do you want to shorten it up substantially or is there consensus?

Lakiana:

I'm in favor of longer? I think people can pick and choose what parts, but I would rather have a document longer than shorter, but I would like to hear from some people, get a couple more opinions, so can someone else share?

Theo:

Looks like Zeenab has her hand raised.

Zeenab:

Are you calling on me now?

Lakiana:

Well, we just wanted-

Zeenab:

[inaudible 02:05:24]. There's couple things that I want to say. This document isn't new, is that correct Theo?

Lakiana:

I don't think we caught the question.

Zeenab:

Is the document that you were just sharing lastly on is not a new document, is that correct?

Lakiana:

It's not new? It's the quarterly report. So it's just the-

Zeenab:

When was this quarterly report completed?

Theo:

So this is the new quarter. So this quarter was just put out today.

Zeenab:

Okay. And so, yes, I will agree with Ann because I didn't know this was a new document for a new quarter. That was confusing through this whole [inaudible 02:06:11].

Theo:



Zeenab, if you're still talking, we can't hear anything that you're saying.

Lakiana:

Oops, we'll come back Zeenab as soon as you get connection, but it's a new document and it has the-

Zeenab:

You can't hear me?

Lakiana:

We can hear you now.

Zeenab:

Oh, okay. I must have cut out. I was asking you Lakiana, what was the document that you were just sharing with us?

Lakiana:

Yes, so it's the quarterly report from July through September and it's new. It was just shared today.

Zeenab:

Okay.

Lakiana:

Yep.

Zeenab:

So I will agree with Ann, because I did not know there was a new report shared and if we can get this in advance so that we can review it, because I'm on the phone and I don't have information in front me, so it be great to be able to review information before our meeting. Thank you. And also I agree that the documents should be long because I think there's a reason why we move to this direction in the first place. While the links may be an issue, which I understand because links can always go away, I do believe what Lakiana said, a longer document is much more efficient, especially after you do a lot of work and you want to present that information. Thank you.

Lakiana:

Yeah. One thing about our work is there's a lot of eyes on it and a lot of people like all those granular details, so I agree. Okay, other questions from PCCEP before we open it up to community comment?

PART 4 OF 6 ENDS [02:08:04]

Lakayana:

Okay, we'll open it up to community comment, any input on the length of the document, those things you want to see, comments on getting it out ahead of time. Yep go ahead Dan.





Dan Handelman:

Just so for the record, I waited to see if anybody else raised their hand first. This is Dan Handelman again with Portland Copwatch. I am very glad that the idea of sending this out a week ahead of time has come up because it's very unreasonable for you all to be looking at this for the first time and to try to vote on it tonight. I hope that you're not going to try to vote on it as it is. It's also telling that, I couldn't tell what page that you are on because the page numbers are not on the pages themselves, it's only when you're scrolling through the PDF when you know what page you're on, so one thing I would say is to add page numbers.

Dan Handelman:

And I agree with Mr. Drury, I'd like to see a longer document. In fact, three pages are going to disappear once this table gets moved out I think. But I think some of the things that the descriptions are helpful for the general meetings where I said, these were the topics that were covered. But in the subcommittee meetings, the only information there is a link. And if somebody that didn't have time to click on a link and watch the whole meeting to figure out what it was about, it would be nice to just say "Main point of this subcommittee meeting was..." Fill in the blank, whatever it is, and then that way you don't have to go watch the whole meeting to figure out what it was.

Dan Handelman:

And then there's a section that has to do with disagreement I think, and it says something like, "Letter to Judge Simon" and it should be clear that's the PCCEP's letter to Judge Simon for the court hearing that happened on August 24th, because that's unclear. I mean, I know what it's about, but it was unclear to me. And then the other two documents that are listed, I think are documents that other people created. One is the compliance officer's report, and one is the amended settlement agreement. So I think that should be clarified as well, like whose document's there. Because if this is your report, but you didn't create those documents right.

Dan Handelman:

And then while I still have the floor, if there's extra time and members of the committee are open to it, you've got lots of people on the phone from the community tonight. You used to have these great public conversations during the uprisings last year. And a lot of stuff is going on, including that there were two grand jury hearings about the two people in mental health crisis that were killed by Portland police this year, it just happened in the last couple of days. So I'd be really happy to hear some of your conversation, and other community members thoughts about that kind of thing, if you are willing to use the time for that. Thank you.

Lakayana:

Appreciate it Dan. Amy?

Amy Anderson:

Yes. What comes to my mind with this document and with everything we're talking about is what I call PCCEP administrative responsibilities, and maybe this is something we need to bring as a starting point for our gathering as a steering committee, because there's a lot of foundational things that are required



of us. Certain reports, certain meeting times, certain town halls, and we can't ignore that going into this new changeover. We have to set time to talk about the foundational things that have to accomplish, which should help get our materials out sooner, is if we can talk about it on a timely basis. So Theo, does that make sense to you having a section of time reserved for everything that everyone needs to know, like what do we need to do? What's happening? Who needs to be on the agenda for the big meeting? Kind of like do an administration [crosstalk 02:12:10].

Speaker 1:

I would love that. Zeenab and Theo and myself had a meeting last Friday and that was brought up, that there needs to be an increase in collaboration between this new iteration of the steering committee and staffs, so all of the parties can be really prepared for these meetings going in.

Amy Anderson:

So you guys already were thinking what I've been thinking all along and Barb is getting time to set our structure every month so that we don't fall behind, or we don't end up like tonight with all these raw documents we haven't even seen, so I'm in agreement. I just don't know how much time we're going to need given that I think our steering committee last month, it was this month was only an hour, I think we're going to need two to do a lot of this stuff. I think two hours is going to be maybe enough time to have the administration discussion, and then what we determine is going to be needed for the next meeting could be probably a half an hour. You see where I'm going this?

Speaker 1:

Sure. And I think Lakayana suggested a while ago that the steering committee really be that body, really function that way to act like a work group to synthesize all the information from community members, or from subcommittees and bring it into one thing and really exist as a work group on a group.

Amy Anderson:

Yeah. So we have to have a specific set of time that fits what we need to accomplish that month, whatever it is we have to adjust our time.

Lakayana:

Yeah and I'd be happy to talk about any other insight from my time on the steering committee. But as we said, using that as project work time, I think would be an excellent use of the time. Okay, we have to vote on... Amy looks like your question is answered. Zeenab is that a hand up?

Zeenab Fowik:

Yes it is, thank you for a wonderful job, and I hope that we're getting this. I like Amy's comment and I've been talking about this. I've been talking about it directly with Theo and the team, but I really have problems when we are... This meeting seems like it's going along somehow, and we still haven't met even to cross-check. I mean, we all giving a lot than accomplish. And sometimes we come for our meetings and then having said on the agenda, like the last meeting with the Cocal, and there was a lot going on, that we need to really figure out how we manage our [inaudible 02:15:02] so that we can



accomplish the things that we want to accomplish. And I think I saw a note from Byron who said, maybe we should have additional meetings.

Zeenab Fowik:

And so are we taking suggestions from other members so that we are getting to something that we can agree on? Because I'm not going to be a part of the steering committee, but I want to make sure the information that we're getting from our full board meetings are getting back to the steering committee and they're taking this information into account, and bringing it back to us about what decisions we should be making. And so if that is a steering committee, I really want to suggest time management. Thank you.

Lakayana:

Time management of this meeting or the steering committee meeting?

Zeenab Fowik:

Time management. I don't [inaudible 02:15:49] steering committee. I'm going to time the different meetings that I've been to, staff meeting, they felt like I've been to different meetings that there's a lot on the agenda and not enough time. And there's not really always a lot of follow up and who's responsible for following up with the information that we had from the previous meeting to the next. Our last meeting was a very heavy conversation and we have not [inaudible 02:16:14] report at all, and maybe I missed it at the beginning. Again, it's just one of those things where if we set a goal, like someone mentioned, if we set a goal annually as a team, then we should be focusing on those goals.

Zeenab Fowik:

And when things like what's happening in the community arise, because we're having no control over it, well, it's for us to address those things as well. And those just like 2020, when those things came in, you had to stop and turn. And we have to take that into account with our time, because the community is depending on us to really look at this settlement agreement and look at the how of being done. And we're often in different process, let me just say that. I just hope that as we continue to the plan [inaudible 02:17:05] to focus in, with members who are bringing ideas, of course we will get together to the great structures, and we can do this and be more accomplished in what we're doing. Thank you.

Lakayana:

Yeah. I agree on that. At the start of the pandemic hours, these monthly meetings were two hours and then I suggested because things were getting so jammed in there that we extended it to eight. My caveat was that if we don't need to use all the time, not to, because a three hour zoom meeting is long in the evening. I know we just got the suggestion from Dan to use some extra time tonight to discussing things and I'm happy to do so, but I think it is a fine balance to what you're saying Zeenab of being strategic about what we're putting on the agenda, using our time efficiently, and then using the time, but then not just taking up time for the sake of taking up time, because we have three hours on a zoom, because I know it is long.

Lakayana:



And when the new strain probably steps in, you'll see that the time just kind of seesaws, it's like for a while we were way ahead of schedule at this meeting and now we've like gotten further back. So it's a balance, but I think that that could be one of the tasks for the new steering committee to look at. Ann go ahead.

Ann:

I just wanted to comment on all that's been said. I think it's really terrific, and I think that some of these issues can be further flushed out in the strategic plan discussions that we'll have. And then I also wanted to say in my... I think I'll be two years on PCCEP this March. I personally think that the people on PCCEP and people in our meetings are incredibly committed, and I feel like we've been able to flex to important topics, and I think generally had enough time, but we can always improve. So I look forward to moving forward with our new structure.

Lakayana:

Agreed. So we have to bring this to a vote. So basically we're just voting. I'm passing this quarterly report. So we'll just go right down the line of individuals and get your votes. Ann.

Ann:

Excuse me. I thought we were going add some of the changes that were discussed tonight. And are we voting on the amended, the changes that people suggested, I'm a little confused. I'm sorry.

Lakayana:

For the quarterly report?

Ann:

Yes.

Lakayana:

Yeah. Theo, can you read off what those updates have been?

Theo:

Sure. So that will be including the number in the attendance of everybody who's come to the meetings. That'll be including a synopsis for all of the subcommittee meetings at the bottom, kind of like the key topics that's included in the general body meeting, to appropriately tag or I guess, title each of the report and court filing. So the response to Judge Simon with the PCCEP response to Judge Simon. The amended settlement agreement will be the DOJ document.

Theo:

I do think it's important to include to Dan's point. I think these documents are important to include because they give a good history for those who are interested in what the history of how this goes, and all that kind of stuff and a little bit of the context, but you're right to point out they should be appropriately titled. And then the Cocal report that'll also be titled correctly. And finally, the Excel



spreadsheet will be just the link to the download, it won't be the actual spreadsheet itself. So it won't show up all funky on everybody's computer.

Ann:

Okay. And thank you for that. I saw a note from Barb. Can we maybe review this with the new additions and vote at our next meeting, or do we have to vote tonight?

Theo:

It's just in service of you all it's whatever you all want.

Lakayana:

Personally, I think the changes can be taken into consideration and passed, we just completed a vote of a structure change, of our committee without the actual bylaws of it. I think that we can vote on this as well. It's literally a report of what we've done. It's not going to change any outcome of things. So I would suggest we vote on it tonight, but it doesn't honestly matter too much, but I think bringing it back up next month is just going to... to the point of trying to be keeping up with the work we're doing, I think it would just take space.

Zeenab Fowik:

Well, Lakayana I'm just jumping because I had my hand up. I don't agree, I wanted just to stop you, I want to read it, I want to prove what it says. John, I thought Jury's [inaudible 02:22:36] coming from a previous report, I didn't get this report in event, so I prefer to be able to look over it and see what's different between what it was before and what it's now, and also just to review it. And so if it's just at the beginning of our meeting, the next meeting just saying, incredibly feel about let's vote on it. We can all agree. We could be more aware and everyone who's here will be able to have opportunity to review it, and go through it from there and know what we're thinking about the structure to be going forward."

Amy Anderson:

Forward and she hasn't seen the doc?

Lakayana:

I'm seeing a similar statement from Theo. I see Gloria also has her hand up. So let's go with Gloria.

Gloria:

Lakayana, I'm a linear person. I have to look at it. I have to see it. I have to see where the words fit in before I can really make sense of it. So I would like to review it.

Lakayana:

Yep. That sounds good. We've got three people in favor of that. It sounds like Ann, you were also in favor of that. If we can just get some thumbs up, if folks are okay with...

Amy Anderson:



Lakayana are we on a timeline?

Lakayana:

For tonight or for in general?

Amy Anderson:

No, for this document to be "Voted on" or can we just agree to accept it as it is, and then we do the next one and make changes?

Lakayana:

Well, the changes would have to be to this one. I'm sure that there is some constraint of us doing it. I'll leave that to Theo, but I don't think it has to be this meeting. Let me just ask it though.

Speaker 1:

No, I don't think it has to be this meeting. It's not a recommendation, it's just PCCEP has said that they want to put out quarterly reports, they've said that, that's going to be part of what the PCCEP does, is create and disseminate these quarterly reports. So you've seen the quarterly report it's been put out. It doesn't have to be posted on the website, doesn't have to be adopted, doesn't have to be voted on. So you get it just the way you want it.

Amy Anderson:

Yeah, is what I thought. Yeah.

Speaker 1:

[crosstalk 02:24:44].

Amy Anderson:

The previous ones we've done this way.

Speaker 1:

And for context, there was almost a year where PCCEP didn't do any quarterly reports. So, it's important that we do these moving forward, or that you all have this evidence of everything that you've accomplished, everything that you've done in a way that you all like it. We want to make it the way that's reflective of everything that you've done throughout the quarter. So it's not intended to be like, "You have to accept this right here, right now." No, honestly just in service of documenting everything that you've done, so you're comfortable with it, you're broadcasting it to the community with your names on it.

Amy Anderson:

Yeah. So we could use it as a framework to design what the next round documents would entail. We could all create that together, this to revamp all these documents together. And then everybody's voice is included.



Lakayana:

So I think what we're going to do is, we're going to table this one and we'll pick it back up but the clarification is that it doesn't necessarily need to be voted on per se. So, that's what we will do. Time check, it's 7:21. Dan, I know you had brought up something that you wanted to discuss, we're into the new business section. You had something that you want to discuss, so let's go with that.

Dan Handelman:

Hi. Yeah. What I mentioned is that the two cases where people in mental health crisis were shot and killed by the Portland police, who were the two families who received condolence notes from the city at your request. The Townsend and Delgado families both went through the grand jury process, and both grand juries came back with no indictments for the officers. And there was kind of details from the grand jury transcripts and the newspaper. I haven't read through the grand jury transcripts myself. So that's one thing. I also offer it in the chat, if people want to hear more about the police oversight commission, I am a commissioner on that body. I'm not really sure how much I can speak about without being... This becoming a public meeting of the commission, but since they're already in a public meeting, maybe it doesn't matter. But I do have some information about that if you're curious.

Lakayana:

Yeah. Why don't we get that update second? I know we still have chief on the line and I don't know if there's any other PPB representatives that would like to speak to these two cases. Was there a specific question you had around them or was it just a matter of wanting an update on just kind of what had happened with them?

Dan Handelman:

I was just sort of wanted to know if there's kind of community reaction, any reaction from the PCCEP members themselves or other people in the community that were kind of came into a new era around police accountability where we've seen an indictment where an officer used force inappropriately. And that's never happened here in Portland. The only time in the last 52 years that an officer's been indicted, the officer was fired and then took his own life. So he was never tried. So it's just kind of this ongoing issue where there's not a lot of police accountability from the legal aspect of it.

Lakayana:

I think that's great. And so I guess we're not getting PPB to speak, we just want to open the space up to community. What I will say, me and Ann have been having some conversations with PPB around this specific thing when incidents like this arise. I've noticed, and a lot of times it comes to PCCEP that people want to talk about these, and so we were considering an idea to hold a joint space for these individual events that could be held virtually where people could come and ask questions that wasn't like a press conference or update, but just literally a space that could be meant for these things.

Lakayana:

But I'll open it up to the floor if people want to share. I believe we had Mr. Delgado's sister on a call of hours in the month that it happened. And I know some of our members had reached out, but is there



any PCCEP comments on either of these cases, or community member comments on your thoughts, reactions, feelings, questions, any of that? We just kind of open the floor up.

Lakayana:

(silence).

Lakayana:

Zeenab, go ahead.

Zeenab Fowik:

It's very interesting that we are now silent right now, especially because this is what we are here to do and focus on because, does this thing cover the settlement agreement itself. And so I'm hearing where Dan is coming from, what can PCCEP, what can we do as a team? What can we talk about? What can we recommend any further that can support holding people accountable, especially when they're timed out. And so, when it moves out our jurisdiction, or out our hands, what do we do as a Portland Center Engaged Policing Membership Board? What can we do? I think we need to talk about that.

Zeenab Fowik:

And this is opportunity that one, where we sort of had addressed this, but it's being brought into this particular meeting. And so if you and Ann discussed this at the steering committee, I'm going to say this, was it ever brought to the full board? Was it ever brought to the full PCCEP, so we can talk about it together? I have really not receive an email about this conversation, and so perhaps you can give an understanding about that. If we're going to put everything out, let's put everything out there. Okay. And so one of the things that I'm hoping is going to happen moving forward, is that members are going to begin to talk with each other, been engaged in this way, so that we're not silent.

Lakayana:

It's a great point. I will just comment that the first PCCEP silence, I think it's important, I think we do need to give people time to just process some of these things and think of their answers. So I didn't see the silence in the beginning as necessarily a bad thing. This question of PCCEP speaking on these issues goes back to the beginning of our committee, and I think it's really, really important. When we discussed this idea that I was talking with Ann, it wasn't on any particular topic, but since PCCEP has been around, there has always been a question of when does PCCEP speak up? How do we do so? We are in this position of, we have to be the bridge between the community and law enforcement. So I think that's also a consideration that we have to take in, of striking a tone and utilizing some of our resources.

Lakayana:

We have the ability more than any community members to get meetings with the chief, to get meetings with other people and find out more information. What we've traditionally done in instances like this is that, somebody from PCCEP committee will email us and email the group as a whole and say, "Hey, such and such incident just happened, I think we should put out a statement." And there's been a little give and pull depending on what the incident was. Some incidents have been very clear cut and everybody's like, "Yep, we should definitely put this out." Some have been like, "I support it," or "I don't see it." But I





100% agree that as a committee around policing and community engagement, I would view that silence if an incident happened and PCCEP didn't say anything, I would find that strange, or maybe we don't care about the issues, I think it's important that we say something just to acknowledge it, but the process has been kind of clunky.

Lakayana:

So, that's just a little bit of background. And I would love to just hear from other members. I don't want to take up the space, but I just wanted to give folks some context as far as what we've done before. And so like sometimes the steering committee has wanted to put out a statement, but we can't make the statement until the full board meets so we can vote. So because what we do, our structure's set up, it makes it a little clunky, but I do think it's important for us to speak on these issues, and I think that's why we had had Mr. Delgado, we've had a lot of other members even, gosh, what's her name? The young woman that was killed in the early 2000s, her mother, I'm blanking on her name at this moment.

Lakayana:

We've had at her mother, we've had other folks as well. But I do know, I would also say, and I don't think this is necessarily our problem, but I sometimes feel that... Kendra James, thank you... that I know law enforcement so it feels a certain way about these incidents too. And then, it's not to say that we shouldn't make a statement, but I think that this time we consider, but I digress. Amy, go ahead.

Amy Anderson:

Wow. That's a lot Lak. Thank you. What comes to my mind at certain points is that I've been in this work over 30 years now, and what I've learned is everybody's got a set of boundaries or rules that they have to follow within. What we need to learn is, we need to learn where the union comes in, where the arbitration comes in, where all of these different political entities come in and say, "We can't do that" or "We have to go through this chain of command or this authority." We need to really hear from people the truth about what our boundaries are and not. Where can we go? Jury keeps saying, "This is the floor, not the ceiling" but policy and procedure seem to get in our way a lot when we want to check things.

Amy Anderson:

So is there a way we can ask the experts like going forward, what our boundaries are, as far as things we have control over changing and things we don't? I think that would help a lot of people if we just got more real or more defined about what it exactly... whose responsibility is what to do with whom? That's why it gets clunky. It's not real clear yet.

Lakayana:

That's a great point. Before we get to the next folks, I haven't heard from Byron tonight, I don't want to put you on the spot, but is there anything that you wanted to chime in on this? And if you don't have anything at the moment, if you do raise your hand later on I'll put you at the top of the queue.

Byron:

No, I have nothing to say right now. I'm just listening and hearing everything out. I have nothing to say, but thank you for asking me though Lakayana.



Lakayana:

Yes, sir. We definitely see you there. Okay. So next we have Gloria, then we'll go with Ann, and then Celest. I think that's the order the hands we raised. You're on mute, Gloria.

Lakayana:

(silence).

Lakayana:

Nope, still on mute there. You're still on mute.

Byron:

You're fast forwarding for some reason when she talk.

Lakayana:

There we go.

Gloria:

Can you hear me?

Lakayana:

Yes ma'am.

Gloria:

Okay. It seems that it was in the Sunday, November the 14th, 2021, that Oregonian officers, witnesses describe police shooting at Lance Park. That was the title of the article. But it seems like to me, from reading the police's response, it says that, the police said, "Hey man, can you put your hands up and walk over to me?" DeLong said, "Yes, Delgado" in a calm, relaxed manner. But Delgado's demeanor suddenly changed from what DeLong described as a catatonic state to completely enrage. It seems like to me, that was a time for the police to back off and call someone for mental health, or the street response team, but instead he went back, got his shotgun, got in his car and drove it up across the park. I would've been afraid and sometimes fear makes people react differently. I think it could have been handled with more care. But that's just my comment, my personal comment.

Lakayana:

Thank you for sharing your truth on this. Really liking this conversation by the way. Let's go with Ann.

Ann:

Actually, I think I want to take my hand down. I appreciate all the comments and I appreciate Zeenab your thoughts, I agree, but I think we all kind of process things a little bit differently. And I feel really clear that PCCEP is, and my work in PCCEP is to do good work, and to hold PPB accountable and to try to root out white supremacy in our city. So, that's all I wanted to say.



Lakayana:

Thank you. Appreciate your truth. Celest.

Celest:

I've got two thoughts and I hope I...

PART 5 OF 6 ENDS [02:40:04]

Celest:

I've got two thoughts and I hope I can keep them relevant. One is in response to the idea about being protocols that we have to respect and processes. I think it's really important that we do think about how making an apology or making some kind of consoling statement and gesture, how strong that is to trust building and community building and healing. Healing for all parties involved. One of the challenges though, is I believe as a body PCCEP should be a voice to the community and also reflect the community's voice back to the public safety and the police. If we are the ones that are making, say an apology, or just some "official statement" that doesn't necessarily hold the same value as it does coming from the bureau that is more intimately engaged in that situation.

Celest:

Where I feel a strong responsibility to the public to say my condolences and my sympathies for what you have lost, what has happened. I don't see that it's necessarily going to give the whole effect we want, but I also want it to be in partnership with the police. The challenge is to say, for me, who says what, when and who brings forward the parties to the table to talk. Does that make sense? Does that seem relevant? That's my concern. This is not the first meeting we've had where we said, "Hey, has anyone reached out to family?" We actually had somebody referenced a family member to come here. I'm concerned that it is taking us so long. That goes to my second question/statement.

Celest:

If we need to have someone make the first step, it should be this community, this committee, this group, and we should initiate efforts to bring the parties together. I see that as being one of our functions because as Jared has said, we are supposed to be a voice of the community to the city and the police and public safety, as well as being reflecting the processes of the police, et cetera, back to the community. We should be those bridge builders. If we feel we have a role, we should just take it. We should not talk about what should be done. We should make that process and do it, make it as popular culture says. I would move us to think where and how do we do that comforting, compassionate outreach/gesture and then we just get to work on that.

Laquiana:

We are lucky to have you on our steering committees, that's really well put points. I want to offer an opportunity before we continue with some of the PCCEP folks. Is there any community members that wanted to chime in on this, on things that they've heard. Where they expect PCCEP to speak up or how they think we should do it. Any other thoughts that this conversation has sparked. Mr. Barnett. You're on mute.



Barnett:

Okay. I think I got it. Thank you for the opportunity. It's a real tough tightrope. Ideally somewhere along in the past, this organization might have been useful to have thought about this particular kind of problem. It's a little different from your original assignment, mainly as [Celesse 02:45:18] has spoken to, but in carrying out the functions of a bridge builder, there has to be some prior thought into what you should do and how you should do it. It's really difficult to try to do something once an incident, like the ones that Dan has brought up has occurred because it has potentially good and potential difficult challenges.

Barnett:

For instance, if we didn't do the precise best thing that needs to be done in terms of bridge building, we could get the community upset. If we didn't handle it in a way that could help the police department be more responsive, we could have the police upset. There's potential of bringing them both together and I think that can be done, but boy, it shares a careful thing that needs to be handled just right. It's really, really difficult seems to me to do it on the spot. For instance, like tonight to come up with something off the wall, without having given it some thought and looking at both sides where on the one side you're looking at what are the protocols or constraints or obligations under the contract, under the settlement agreement and yet not be so bureaucratic that we're caught up and just be a critique to where we get immobilize. All I'm saying it's really got to be thought through. It's a difficult thing and I fully support the notion, at least the very attempt to fill that bridge builder role.

Barnett:

It's really critically important. That's what my thoughts are. I got to tell you my personal feeling and this is unfortunately because it almost going to sound like it undercuts what I said. I really believe in what I said, but on the other hand one of the things that this organization, as well as organizations all across the United States, many kind organizations have repeatedly given the call that unless police culture changes, they're not going to be willing to do anything but Stonewall, obfuscate, find a bunch of reasons why they can't or won't or shouldn't. We all know that we're talking about the culture.

Barnett:

So to set up some kind of a bilateral process or mediation between the two sides and all that, you have to have two willing partners. You have to have two sides that are willing to acknowledge it. Otherwise, they're going to find all kind of reasons why, oh, you're just off to get me. You're trying to make me look bad. I'm not just talking about the individual police, although they do that, but the institution does that. I don't know what the answer is. I know the idea is definitely on like track in order to make some progress. But boy, that's why I say it's a tough road. I don't have no immediate answers.

Laquiana:

Mr. Barnett, thank you for your wisdom. I appreciate it. We appreciate it. Any other community thoughts before I turn it back over to Zeenab, then I can follow up with thought of my own. Okay, Zeenab go ahead.

Zeenab Fowlk:



Thank you. I really want to say, I really appreciate hearing everyone's thoughts, very motivational. I'm very excited about the members part of PCCEP. What I'm thinking more about is how we structure our meetings when it comes to things like this, especially since we did make the recommendations to do condolences to family, that we should have something that follows up. I'm not making a recommendations, I'm just saying there are things that we can do to just help the team to recognize those who are struggling. One of the things that I learned from the Racial Equity Subcommittee, when Ms. Kendra James's mother attended, you can tell it was still traumatic because she said it was still traumatic for her. How do we help not just with the fact that yes, there are going to be issues that people are going to hold strong to of what they did or what they didn't do.

Zeenab Fowlk:

At the same time a life was lost or life were lost and it still brings pain to the community and it still brings division. Celesse, I really appreciate what you said about the bridge building. We have to really think about that. I really hope that we, as collective members can come together. Even if it's during a retreat, even if it's during something that will help us and know how we each think so people know what we're really recognizing that this is something that's necessary to happen, so that we can look at bridging those gaps that we're seeing. It does sadden me that we didn't acknowledge this at the beginning of the meeting. That's all I'm saying. I don't live in Portland, Oregon, so I don't follow the news all the time.

Zeenab Fowlk:

But when I hear about my community, believe me it's a lot you have to deal with because it's everywhere. We know it's everywhere. I just don't our people to be in pain. Okay, they suffer in pain alone. If can be that conduit for them, where they can feel their people are still thinking about them, recognizing that there was... We have no control over what happens in these courts, but we know that they suffer. So we all suffer at the same. That's where I want to share here and thank you all for... I didn't look at the silence at the beginning of the conversation, more, the silence that we didn't have at this meeting or in the agenda. That's what I was really speaking to. But thank you so much.

Laquiana:

Thank you of those comments, Zeenab, bring up a couple thoughts that I had and some that I want to go back to what Celesse had said. In to Mr. Barnett's point, it's such a tricky area and I've PCCEP do it well and sometimes I've seen it not do it so well. It's almost like we need to develop a policy to help us know when we make these statements, but they're so fluid that it's really tricky to do it because each one is different. Right? Are we acknowledging death by officers versus death by gun violence of the community. Who gets acknowledged? How?. It's traditionally been left up to the steering committee and honestly just the co-chairs like, pre-meeting like someone would say, oh, this happened or it's George Floyd's birthday or it's this or that or whatever it is we want to acknowledge.

Laquiana:

We used to do this thing that was started with one of our former members, Lakisha where we would have a moment of silence, and then we had some candles that we would light. This was way back in the days before COVID. We also had like a bowl where you could write someone's name on it, place it in there, and then we took a moment of silence.



Laquiana:

When I look at PCCEP talking about people's deaths, what I think about them is acknowledging it. I don't think it's really on us to apologize to Celesse's point. It's not really our place to do it. We weren't the committing body. It doesn't really hold weight. What I would look for if I was in random city and this is the community group, I want to see are they acknowledging that the event happened? I think it's really important that events gets knowledge and a statement is made because otherwise it's like, did you not see it? Did you not care about it? Also, it might help community form their own opinions, like well let's see what this leadership group kind of said in regards to that. I think that's also tricky too, because you have to make sure that the statement to the best of your ability comes off as... I don't want to say neutral, but just a balance because you have to, as Mr. Barnett said, you're balancing a tightrope and there's still things that have to come out, evidence, but we can also say that the events are wrong.

Laquiana:

Like with Mr. [Delgado's 02:54:37] death, right, we don't need to know all the evidence to say that was a tragedy. That loss of life was tragic. I think the police bureau should welcome that kind of-

Amy:

Feedback.

Laquiana:

... feedback, and criticism like that's the point. We're not here to just pat everybody's back. In some instances when things are messed up, we do need to say this was wrong. I would say that it sometimes feels that when we do that, we get this perception that we are being anti-police if we condemn we, and we never used that language, but just around it. Some of us, myself and [Marcia 02:55:18] had worked with a number of officers in the top leadership of PCCEP or PPB to work on that relationship because one of the things that has come out is that there is sometimes a friction between the Portland Police Bureau and PCCEP. I think it's important that you all are aware of that and also aware that the comments that we make individually outside of this, especially on social media, make the rounds. So it's important that we realize... I'm just imparting some closing thoughts that we realize that we're members of this committee and people will see us as that.

Laquiana:

Even if you decide to go stand in the street and say your own comments, it's still going to be reflected on PCCEP. I think that's unfortunate, but it's also the world we live in. So being aware of that and how that could impact the relationship with PPB. I think we're been working to try and mend that relationship, because it's critical as sometimes PPB or PCCEP can be of PPB, it's coming from a place of wanting to see the bureau be better.

Laquiana:

We're not just hurling insults at them for the sake of trying to tear it down, which I think some groups and people have done. I think that we sometimes get that reflection on us. I think that's unfair, because I can speak for every member in this community that we don't show up to just insult PPB. We are actually trying to find solutions. It's a complicated situation, but I think we owe it to the community to



say something. I would hope that the bureau could take this in and see that as an opportunity to push to be better. Those are just some of the thoughts I've had from my time on this. I'll turn it over to Amy for the next comments.

Amy:

Wow. You, you are so difficult to follow out. You're like so truthful. When I was a new PCCEP member, I really wasn't sure how everything was being done. Over time, I realized what a great writer you and [inaudible 02:57:26] and Elliot and Andrew were about knowing how to write something that totally relates to what you're saying, that fine line of communication, getting everyone's point across without being rude or negative. I think this is another layer that we need to investigate as a new group and find folks who are really skilled at writing and understand the rules and principles. Together we can learn from each other what we do best and lean on each other for where we need assistance.

Amy:

We as a PCCEP body at that time voted to make the co-chairs part of the lead in a lot of the stuff we're now going to take on as a group. I do want everyone to know that our leaders, our chairs have actually done this work and we really didn't get to worry about it because we knew they were really good at what they did. Now we're going to assume that position. I'm looking forward to being educated and having a chance to work with all of you who are also very skilled in writing and finesse. I think together we'll be good. So my comment is I really appreciate you Laquiana you were excellent at facilitating, making those letters functional. Thank you.

Laquiana:

Yeah, you're welcome. There's a lot of people who are doing it from a lot of meetings. Someone will always... Whatever incident has happened in community, someone we'll email off PCCEP and be like, Hey, we've got to respond to this. We've got to say something. I think that's what makes PCCEP unique. I think there's a lot of committees that choose not to say things, but that's never been the case with PCCEP. PCCEP has always stood up and said something.

Laquiana:

I think that's one of the things that was framed against PCCEP when we first were created was that everybody wrote us off because we were out of the mayor's office, like whatever the mayor says is what PCCEP's going to stay. PCCEP has shown time and time again that we have been willing to take a different position or make our own statements. So I would definitely encourage that. Is there any other closing comments before we wrap this up. Chief, if you're still on and not working on some other things, if you wanted to chime in on any of this. We'd be happy to hear your feedback on this as well.

Chief:

Yeah. Thanks Laquiana, I appreciate the conversation listening and it's such a personal thing that is the pain of losing a loved one. Then you throw in all the kind of circumstantial stuff that comes around the work that we do in police bureaucracy as it will, right. I've got family members who have struggled with mental health issues, addiction, been on the street. When you have an incident like Lent's park, you think to yourself, that's a call my family could get one day from somewhere involving my family



member. How would I feel? What does that look like for me personally, despite what uniform I wear. What rank I hold. It's just a real thing. We as human beings with family and relationship and loved ones can connect with the pain of having someone you love not be here anymore more.

Chief:

I think to the extent that you could just connect with someone who's lost a loved one, despite from the circumstances and say, "Hey, that's a tragic loss." I wish that didn't happen. I wish you weren't going through that pain, I think is just human thing to do. For me, I remember it was a few years back when PCCEP actually had a recommendation to have the city or police bureau actually reach out within a certain amount of time and do this. It became convoluted. I don't think the actual recommendation passed, because it wasn't agreed upon during the meeting, but I can remember thinking that's a good idea in theory, if we could just get around all the other stuff, the time, what it has to say, what it doesn't have to say.

Chief:

The truth is like in these situations, typically there's a lawsuit. So what words do you put in a letter. If you're a family member, how much does a letter mean if you know, it's mandated a policy. I mean there's all these things that are happening. A lot of times it takes time to reach out to family. Someone mentioned Kendra James, that was probably pushing close to 20 years ago and that's [inaudible 03:02:21] difficult for that family member. Imagine contacting someone to have that conversation 48 hours later, it's difficult, but I think really it's just about the human connection and acknowledging someone's pain and being in that space with them that makes the difference. I think the ways that we could do that organically and really genuinely is what we should strive for.

Laquiana:

Thank you, chief. My ask to you would just be that you encourage the bureau to take peace of criticism as an opportunity to grow and maybe from time to time speak with the members and just help them understand that you are taking their feedback. If there's times that you all feel that a certain message was too critical, I think they would appreciate that feedback so that we know... We do want to strive to make statements, but also make them in ways that are supportive of you all too, as much as they can be.

Chief:

Sure.

Laquiana:

We'll take one closing comment and chief, I do appreciate you sharing your thoughts in there with us right now. I'll take one closing comment from someone, maybe someone we haven't heard from, if they want to add something. It could be a statement and then we'll wrap things up.

Speaker 3:

Laquiana, we need to start looking at the person behind the badge instead of the person with the badge. Then we can build trust with the police department. Again, we are not trying to get police in gotcha





moments and try to make them look bad. Maybe we can have a recommendation. Maybe the cop that was involved in a situation come talk to that family. Meet those people face to face, maybe they can come to agreement and there can be some closure in that sense of helping that person that's grieving. It's just a quick little comment. I've been listening and I don't have much to say. I'm just listening and just watching, but I do have a lot to say, but just not right now. I prefer to listen and watch.

Laquiana:

I appreciate that comment. I think that's really important for us to realize that everybody's going to have a different response. There's probably a lot of people that haven't spoke tonight. Doesn't mean they're not thinking or saying things. We'll take Tia as the final comment of the evening.

Tia:

Well, I don't think this is on the agenda, but since we're talking about it at the end here, I got on thinking that we were actually responding to people after they went to a police incident or after their family member being injured or killed. We were kind of their voice and to bring recommendations from their situation. I feel really comfortable reaching out to those families and helping bring their voice to the group if [inaudible 03:05:25]

Laquiana:

Thank you for sharing that, appreciate that. I think that's a great comment to kind of wrap us out for the evening. Want to thank Dan for bringing this up? I think there's more space needed for this. I'm not sure if it's always in this PCCEP meeting because a lot of times these agendas get packed. Like I said, I was suggesting that maybe PCCEP and PPB hold joint meetings like this on incidents, especially when they're fresh to allow people that time to share, talk, ask questions to people. We find more community in that when we have a chance to speak what's on our mind. I want to thank everybody for being here tonight. It's been a great run. I'm still going to be around. If there's things and support you all want, please let me know and just wish the committee success and all of our future endeavors and look forward to working with you all in different capacities. I want to thank our ASL interpreters, the community members that hung around, the staff of the various groups that we're here and just everybody that's been participating in our committee.

Tia:

Thank you.

Speaker 2:

Thanks.

Speaker 3:

Thanks a lot Laquiana.

Speaker 4:

Thanks Laquiana.



Laquiana:

Yes ma'am. Thank you all.

Tia:

Well, miss you,

Laquiana:

Likewise, I'm going to miss you all too. Tia's got the after party location. So you all head them up.

Speaker 5:

Great meeting [crosstalk 03:06:58] Great to have you here, Mr. Barnett.

Celest:

Yes, it was a pleasure... [inaudible 03:07:04]

PART 6 OF 6 ENDS [03:07:40]