



The Portland Committee on Community Engaged Policing (PCCEP)

October 27, 2020 Full Board Meeting Transcript

Theo Latta:

Welcome everyone to the October PCCEP meeting. Thank you all for being here, it's an honor to share this space with you. My name is Theo Latta. I'm a PCCEP staff member. I want to start off by saying that in the City of Portland, no matter where you are, you're on Indigenous land. And I think it's important to recognize that. PCCEP is the Portland Committee on Community-Engaged Policing, for those of you who don't know. Thank you for coming, we're going to get started here in just a little while, but we want to go through a couple of slides first.

Theo Latta:

That's the mission of PCCEP. Essentially, PCCEP is charged with increasing equitable practices in the city, and increasing the trust between PPD and the community, and raising and elevating the voice of the community. These are the group values. It's important that we operate within these group values in this meeting and every PCCEP meeting, but also that we all together aim to combat white supremacy. That we aim to be kind and respectful and understand that reasonable minds can disagree sometimes. And it's important to go after the problem and not the person. Go to the next one. A couple of Zoom housekeeping items. Please keep your sound, your mic, and your video off, unless it's your turn to talk, so we can center for PCCEP members for a while until it's time for community comment, then feel free to turn on your microphone and your video.

Theo Latta:

Please use the chat box to communicate needs just to the staff. That's myself, that's Claudia, and that's Judith. We do have interpreters on this call. If you need to pin their video, there's a button that you can click on pin. This video will be recorded and live-streamed, and if you need your name changed for any reason, just let me know and I'd be happy to do that. Or if you need your video and your call merged, I'd be happy to do that as well. In the event of a Zoom bombing, staff will ensure to get that figured out as quick as possible. And I apologize in advance if that happens. It doesn't happen all the time, but it does happen sometimes. Again, thank you so much for being here. That's my contact information. My name is Theo Latta. Please feel free to email me or give me a call or shoot me a text. Yeah, I'm going to turn it over to Lakayana Drury. Thank you very much.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you, Theo. Thank you everybody for being here today. For our October PCCEP meeting, we're going to go through and do introductions. So name, pronouns, and committees that our PCCEP members serve on. Again, I'm Lakayana, co-chair of PCCEP, he/him pronouns, and I'll pass it over to Elliot for introductions.



Lakayana Drury:

Elliot has disappeared. We're going to go to Vadim.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Hey everybody, Vadim Mozyrsky. Thank you for joining us. Look forward to hearing from you all about today's meeting.

Lakayana Drury:

Could you let us know your pronouns and the committees that you serve on or any other positions you have?

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Yeah, I serve on the settlement agreement and policy subcommittee, and currently the secretary for PCCEP. He/him.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you, Vadim. Let's go with Ann next.

Ann Campbell:

Hey, everyone. Ann Campbell. I'm an alternate co-chair of PCCEP and I'm also on the settlement agreement policy. My pronouns are she/her. Thank you for being here.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you. Next we'll go to Elliot. Are you back? You are back. Okay, go ahead, Elliot.

Elliot Young:

Yeah, I'm sorry. It was the Russians hacking my computer. My name is Elliot Young, I'm the other co-chair of PCCEP and my pronouns are he/him. Thank you for being here.

Lakayana Drury:

Next, we'll go with Yolonda.

Yolonda Salguiero:

Hi, can you hear me okay?

Lakayana Drury:

Yup.

Yolonda Salguiero:



Okay, great. Sorry. My name is Yolonda Salguiero and I used to be on the youth subcommittee, but now I'm transitioning to the behavioral health committee effective November. Thank you all for being here.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you, Yolonda. We'll go with Amy next.

Amy Anderson:

Good evening, everyone. My name is Amy Anderson. I am chair of the behavioral health subcommittee, and I guess my pronouns would be she/her.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you, Amy. Next-

Amy Anderson:

Thanks Yolonda for joining us. That is awesome.

Lakayana Drury:

Next we're going to go with Jamari.

Jamari Etherly:

I'm Jamari Etherly, he/him pronouns, and I'm on the youth subcommittee.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you, Jamari. Next, we'll go with Taji.

Taji Chesimet:

Taji Chesimet, he/him. I'm on the youth subcommittee as the chair now.

Lakayana Drury:

I want to say that's everybody. Am I missing folks I'm not seeing here? Britt, Marcia? Are either of you all here?

Theo Latta:

They will be coming later.

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. And then we do have one of our recommended PCCEP committee people who is still waiting for an appointment from the mayor. Milana, if you just want to introduce yourself real briefly?

Milana Nyack:



Yeah. Hi, I'm Milana Nyack. I use she/her pronouns and I'll be serving on the youth subcommittee. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you. Last meeting, PCCEP made several recommendations for appointments as the current process is that they still need to be appointed by the mayor and go through their trainings and whatnot before they can serve, so we're just waiting on that. To open up the meeting, we just want to acknowledge a couple of things. The death of Walter Wallace last night in Philadelphia in an officer-involved shooting, and then also several shootings here in Portland in the community and the violence that continues to impact a lot of residents in our city. So, I want to open with that and a moment of silence for all the victims of gun violence around our community and around the country.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you for that moment of silence. Last thing I just want to do is make a plug to turn in your ballots. Today's the last day you can mail them in. Otherwise, you can go to a voter box and turn them in there. We are going to move to reports now from our subcommittees. And just want to ask that the chairs or representatives of those committees keep the reports brief, and then also direct us to your next meeting. We'll start with Amy and the behavioral health subcommittee.

Amy Anderson:

Don't worry, I'm here. This last month at the behavioral health subcommittee, we had a couple of fantastic speakers from Cascadia Project Respond. We learned all about the different functions that the programs offer and the different programs that are available throughout the community. And it turns out that the program I'm involved in called FACT, which is a Forensic Assertive Community Treatment team, we are the only one in the state of Oregon. So I didn't realize that that was so powerful. That's a really important thing. And so the guests were the manager from Project Respond and the senior director for forensic diversion programming at Cascadia. So, our next meeting for November is going to be canceled because of the elections. So, we're going to do a combined meeting with the racial equity committee and we're going to have some awesome conversations. So, make sure to join us on November 19th from 6:00 PM to 7:30 PM for now. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you, Amy. Next, we'll go to Taji and the youth subcommittee.

Taji Chesimet:

Yeah. Awesome. Thank you so much. So, in regards to updates real quick. So, the restorative justice recommendation we passed back in June, we're now talking with LPSCC about restructuring their strategy six subcommittees. So, I'm pretty excited to do that.

Lakayana Drury:

[crosstalk 00:21:02] to know what LPSCC is?



Taji Chesimet:

Sorry, the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council. It's a state-mandated body of public safety officials around the city... Or county, excuse me. We also have our new member Alana who joined us along with Yolonda transitioning out of our sub committee and me taking the position as chair. And then, we also are in discussion on changing the time of our meeting. But from my last check, it will be on the 9th of November at 4:00 PM. Oh, one more update is that we'll be working to have a youth organization coming to present. We're thinking of having it be either Next Up or PDX Black Youth Movement. So, we'll have updates on that hopefully soon.

Lakayana Drury:

Nice. I will give our racial equity subcommittee update. I chaired that meeting in Marcia's absence this month. We had a really great presentation from the training advisory council on their use of force report that came out in July and had a lot of implications around use of force against black community members. And that was given to us by Sean Campbell, who is the chair of the training advisory committee. We've met. PCCEP and the training advisory account committed council and the citizen review committee had been hosting bi-weekly meetings between the chairs to coordinate the efforts between our organizations. So, this was a really good opportunity to hear from some of the work that they're doing. And then we also presented a recommendation that's currently being worked on called the community policing recommendation, which will look at how to better integrate officers into the Portland community, including residency requirements. So, that is that. I'm going to turn it over to Vadim and Ann for the settlement agreement and policy subcommittee update.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

We met October 14th and we discussed initially the upcoming directives from the police bureau and we received an update from [Ameri Claire 00:00:23:12] on those. We also had our third meeting surrounding a truth and reconciliation commission and how to start that up. We discussed what might be the requirements for participation in that new commission, who people have recommended to be on that commission and the selection process. As well as just generally discussed some of the possible timelines associated with the formation of that commission. Since then, we received a recommendation referral back from the mayor. And as you can tell from this page that is being shared, he directed the Portland Committee on Community-Engaged Policing to form a new subcommittee, bringing the total numbers of subcommittees to five. They will be comprised of members, non-PCCEP community members, and law enforcement.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

And there is recommendation as to who those people would be from the various organizations, including the Albina Ministerial Alliance, as well as the Mental Health Alliance. And so we'll be working with that. We are planning to meet with representatives from the mayor's office in the first week of November to understand better what their expectations are, timeframes, and to also let them know what work has already been done, so they know what kind of community input we received in the past. So, we'll give updates from that at the next settlement agreement policy meeting, which is on November 18th. So normally it would be on November 11th, but that is Veterans Day, which is a holiday



for the city. So we moved it to the following Wednesday, November 18th at 4:30 PM, which is the regular time.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you, Vadim. As far as the steering committee, we met a couple of weeks ago and... Where did I stick my notes here? Gave an update on our PCCEP codification recommendation, which we will be presenting later on tonight. Got our Portland Street Response presentation set up for tonight, which will be happening right after this. Discuss some of the pieces of core patrol services and the need to continue to work with the mayor's office and understanding PCCEP's role in that, and then crafted out this month's agenda. I don't know if anyone else in the steering committee wants to add anything else that was discussed there or they thought it was important. Cool.

Elliot Young:

We also talked about the Coco report, which I think was going to come out the next day. And we did also agree to have the alternate co-chair attend our planning meetings, or our meetings with the mayor and with other city council people. So, those happen once every three weeks, I think. So, we're expanding a little bit of the group that's meeting with the mayor.

Lakayana Drury:

And I'm going to briefly turn it back to Ann who just has a little update following right off of that.

Ann Campbell:

Thank you, Lakayana. I just wanted to piggyback on what Amy said. We are having a meeting with the racial equity and behavioral health subcommittees on November 19th. We're going to have a representative from BOAC and also a representative from TIP NORTHWEST to talk about the services and the procedures for having what is available to the community after an officer-involved shooting or other use of force incident. What's available to the victim and also possibly bystanders and family members. 6:00 PM to 7:30 PM. We will be posting more information about that on our website. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you, Ann. I'm going to turn it over to Elliot to take over for our next piece, which is the Portland Street Response.

Elliot Young:

Okay. So, for the Portland Street Response, we have a presentation, I believe. But Vadim maybe you could introduce the person or set this up.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Yeah, sure. We have with us Robyn Burek, who is the project manager for Portland Street Response. And correct me Robyn if I have your title incorrect.



Robyn Burek:

Perfect.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Okay, great. And I don't know if we're still expecting Kristen Johnson from Commissioner Hardisty's office. Robyn, are you with the Fire Bureau?

Robyn Burek:

I am. So, I'm with the Fire Bureau and I have been with Portland Fire for two and a half years, and then this project came up last year and just became my thing. So, here I am. From what I understand you all... Also, I do not need to share a screen. Thank you, Claudia. I appreciate that. From what I understand, you all have some questions, so let me just provide some history and background and where we are right now and then I'm happy to take any questions that you guys have. Does that work for you, Vadim?

Vadim Mozyrsky:

It does. Thanks.

Robyn Burek:

Okay. So, as you hopefully know by now, Portland Street Response started last year. Last November, the city council had approved a \$500,000 budget to launch a year-long pilot for one team to be held in the Lents neighborhood. That pilot would not cover a full 24/7. It was just intended to cover 40 hours a week, Monday through Friday. So, then we started getting to work on that just because I think there was a perception that once the council approved that budget, we would be ready to launch. And that was not the case. It just gave us the go-ahead to continue to prepare for that launch.

Robyn Burek:

So, we started working on that and we continue to work with a number of stakeholder groups and then the pandemic hit, and just like every other business, you have to shift your priorities to address that public health crisis. And especially for us, as public safety bureaus, we needed to ensure that we had the right resources in place to address COVID. So, we had to take a small pause, unfortunately. We were initially set to launch in probably... August of this year was our goal date. And so we ended up with about a five month delay. In June of this year, we reconvened and we felt we were ready to devote our resources again towards really getting this going as quickly as possible.

Robyn Burek:

And at that same time, the council had basically taken money that was from the police bureau and transferred it to Portland Street Response so that we could launch a larger pilot. So, all in all, it was about \$4.8 million is what was granted to us. And so we revisited Bob Kasi, who is on this call as well, his team. We had a couple of offices from PPD and then my team from Portland Fire came together to talk about what that bigger pilot might look like. And we decided that given our current infrastructure in place, we really couldn't launch any bigger than two teams right now in the Lents neighborhood.



Robyn Burek:

So, what we are going to do is we will still have the first team operate Monday through Friday from 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM. And those hours are deliberate because we looked at the call data, and we looked at when the peak times are. And then six months into the pilot, we're going to add a second team to come in. And that second team will basically work in the late evening. So, they will start at 4:00 PM and then work till midnight and they'll cover some weekend shifts as well. So, hopefully we'll get as close to 24/7 coverage in the Lents neighborhood for the first year. Not quite but close.

Robyn Burek:

Our teams will consist of... It'll be a three person multidisciplinary team. So, in fire we will start with our paramedic, who is Tremaine Clayton. And we are in the process right now of hiring a licensed mental health crisis clinician, along with a community health worker. And so, those three people will be dispatched to non-emergency related calls, both from police and fire. And they will basically address mental health, behavioral health type calls, they'll address [inaudible 00:32:15] and welfare check type calls, those three categories. Again, all non-emergency, all not life-threatening. If BOEC is on the phone and they decide that there is a risk, that any of these, the overdose or anything could be potentially life-threatening, they will not dispatch Portland Street Response to that.

Robyn Burek:

And just one thing... I heard you guys talk about Project Respond and some people have been asking us, "What's the difference?" And so, police will still be able to utilize Project Respond anytime they have some of the calls that they respond to. They can also utilize us. They can ask for our assistance as well. But Project Respond does not get dispatched from 911, they get dispatched from police, when police requests for assistance. Portland Street Response will be dispatched from BOEC, from our Bureau of Emergency Communications. So, slight difference there. I think pretty much covers the gist of everything, but I want to make sure I address any questions you guys have. What can I answer for you?

Elliot Young:

Yeah, thanks for that update. I had a question Robyn. From the outside, when Portland Street Response was initially voted on a year ago, and then there was this additional money given in June, all along, this was supposed to be a priority. This was the number one, in many senses, reforms to a policing system in which consistently over 50% of the people arrested are homeless people. And I'd like to know who made the decision to put it on hold because I understand COVID happened to all of us, but it seems that in the midst of a health crisis which is affecting homeless people, that this would even be more important to roll out.

Elliot Young:

And then in June, when \$4.8 million was given, it's not clear that there's any urgency behind getting this out. And from the outside, it looks like the mayor wants to pull the money this year from this project because the thing hasn't been rolled out. So who is responsible for the delays? Is this a decision that the people hired in Portland Street Response made? Is this a decision of the mayor? Who made that



decision and how would you explain to the public who believes this should be a priority? How it's been a year now and we still don't have Portland Street Response and then when will it actually hit the ground?

Robyn Burek:

Yeah. So let me answer that last question really quick, and then I'll get to your other questions. It will launch in January 2021.

PART 1 OF 5 ENDS [00:35:04]

Robyn Burek:

It will launch in January 2021. I understand there is a lot of urgency from the community and even from our elected officials that everybody wants to see this deployed and they would love to see it even deployed beyond lens night. I totally understand that, but there is a lot of work that goes into launching a program like this. [inaudible 00:35:22] We actually had to create brand new positions that the city has never had before. And that takes us time. We have to do market analysis, HR has to go out and do that. That takes them usually five months to do that. In addition to that, we've developed a training curriculum. We actually also had to go out and find a charting system because we never hired a licensed mental health clinician before. So we needed a HIPAA compliant program and that also takes time to go out and purchase that through city protocols and whatnot.

Robyn Burek:

So I totally understand from the outside it doesn't look like we're doing anything, but I promise you we've been working tirelessly on this. We really have been. And Bob, I don't know if there's anything that you want to speak to in terms of BOEC and your end from that.

Bob:

Yeah. Thank you Robin and thank you everyone. From BOECs perspective, our job basically is answering the 911 calls and then dispatching whatever's appropriate. Once Portland street response is up and running, that is the appropriate entity that will be dispatching. When Robin was talking about the process, it is a lengthy process to get through all of the hurdles. And most people aren't aware of everything that has to happen behind the scenes. There's a lot. And part of it has to do with training, the first responders, the firefighters, police even on what Portland street response will be going out on what they won't. That takes a lot of time. Of course, we're training our dispatchers. That's a fairly easy task because we do it through what we call continuing dispatch education modules. And it's not, it doesn't require us bringing them in for special training.

Bob:

However, I just gave a presentation today to commissioner Ryan, so he could have kind of a clearer picture of BOECs perspective in the rollout of Portland street response. And the idea is to have a vision beyond the pilot and then BOECs case, a Bureau of emergency communications. It takes a year and a half to two years to fully certify a new employee. So if we're looking at having a pilot project starting in, in our pilot programs, starting in January, we have the staffing to absorb that work because it's only one



unit. But if we look at what many of us envision as a wide response, multiple units, that requires an additional dispatch channel specific for Portland street response in order for us to not steal away our call-takers from answering nine one one, and putting them at a dispatch net, we have to hire new people and get them trained.

Bob:

So for all intents and purposes, it's going to take us about a year and a half to two years for our infrastructure at BOEC to be able to handle the workload of a set aside dispatch net specific for Portland street response. Some of the background information that might help kind of fill in the blanks for you. There was never an intention, certainly from my knowledge, to stop the process. [inaudible 00:38:56] did indeed get slowed down because of COVID because the public safety responders were focusing on keeping themselves safe, keeping the community safe, and then navigating the COVID craziness that we've all been navigating. I think Robin said that put about a five month delay on that.

Robyn Burek:

In regards to your question about the 4.8 million budget as well. So right now, what we have deemed that we'll use for the pilot year is for certain about 1.2 million of that 4.8, and then we've identified a few extra items where we'll probably need to tap into additional money. So similar to what Bob was saying, that it takes them 18 to 24 months to get somebody through the dispatcher trained and ready to go. And they have to add staff in order for us to expand citywide. Our apparatus, our vans that we use takes a 12 month lead time to order because we custom make them in order to meet the needs of our call responses. And those are about 100,000 a piece. So even thinking about our expansion citywide into January 2022 and 2023, we actually have to prepare for that a year in advance.

Robyn Burek:

And we have to kind of extrapolate how many teams we think we might actually expand to city-wide. So that even though that 4.8 million may not get used for this pilot year, we still have to plan for the expansion piece and we'll still be tapping into that 4.8 million. We're just not entirely sure how much of that 4.8 million we're going to need right this minute in order to be able to think expansion wise. So, yes I know there's a conversation happening between commissioner Hardesty and the mayor about what to do with the additional money that may not be used for the pilot year, but I'll leave that conversation for them. I think that they can hash out the politics of that. All I know is that I commissioner Hardesty has definitely prioritized that that 4.8 million be available to us so that we can plan for the expansion citywide. And I'm confident we'll probably have more than what we need. Yeah.

Elliot Young:

So is, is the 4.8 million? Is that per year or is this so in other words, this money, if it's not used this year, we'll, do you know whether it will be saved for Portland Street response? Or is that the discussion that's happening at city council?

Robyn Burek:



The, the discussion right now is that the mayor would take whatever we don't use for the pilot year and just reallocate it to COVID related, I believe it was COVID related initiatives, then come 2022, everything would be restored to us. So we would have an ongoing budget of 4.8 million each year available to us.

Elliot Young:

Okay. So there are a few questions. We've got Amy, Vadim then [Luciana 00:47:14] . Amy.

Amy Anderson:

Yeah. Robin, given that I work in the street arena now as a forensic peer specialist, I work with corrections and I work with the seriously mentally ill and criminal justice. So I've got to ask you, why did you choose a community health worker, which does not have this training or lived experience with mental health?

Robyn Burek:

I appreciate that question. And we actually did have meetings with peers out in the community. We also had representation of peers on our stakeholder group. We also met with the Oregon health equity Alliance and we spoke with a number of people. I just want to say, this is a starting point, right? So, and also in our job description for the community health worker, we did specify that we wanted somebody with lived experience with mental health or homelessness or substance use. So, that was a requirement of our job.

Amy Anderson:

But you do realize that's not their forte, right?

Robyn Burek:

Yes. We understand. This is a starting point. It's just one team. And then we're adding a second team and that skillset might vary. So we are standards. We've been talking to a lot of people about having one community health worker and one peer support specialist in the pilot year. We're playing around right now. I want you to understand we're playing around with what are the different types of skills and people we want on these teams. That's part of the pilot is to explore, what's going to work for us.

Amy Anderson:

Then I would like to invite you to come to our meetings because this is my specialty. I'm an [inaudible 00:08:42]-

Robyn Burek:

Yeah absolutely. I would love that.

Amy Anderson:

... fully vetted across the board. And I really need it to work. Okay. Because I'm working with about a hundred who absolutely need this service, and they don't need to go back to jail time and time again,



but there's a lot of nuances that I'm not sure everyone's aware of when working with the dual diagnosed population. So I really want to keep up with you and hope that you come to our meetings on a regular basis because this topic is near and dear to my heart. And a lot of other folks who have been waiting for the peers to be able to do work in the community and find a way to help you get it paid for.

Robyn Burek:

Thank you.

Amy Anderson:

So there's a lot of things I can assist you with in the knowledge of how the industry operates.

Robyn Burek:

Yeah. Thank you so much, Amy. And I've just dropped my email into the chat box. So if you would like to reach out to me and send me an invitation, I will gladly attend. And I guess we'll just want to put this out there too. I actually am a licensed marriage and family therapist. I've been in the mental health industry for 13 years. So I do have some knowledge and understanding as well. The mental health needs that are out in our community.

Elliot Young:

Thanks, Amy. So Vadim you're up next.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Robin, have you all reached out to cahoots to kind of see what their best practices are in order to formulate what you're going to be doing down the road?

Robyn Burek:

Yes, we have. We've been very actively engaged with, and actually we're in the process of completing a contract to have them come out to help us with our training. They're going to be a very important piece of what we do. So they're going to be actually even shadowing us for a couple of weeks and working with us on some of our call responses.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

And do y'all have any kind of policy documents or something about how this, the workflow will happen if someone in the community and Len sort of call 911 with an emergency that ends up being a mental health crisis? How it gets routed? Who addresses it? Who was they get to refer to? Or something that the community or public can take a look at?

Robyn Burek:

I have something similar to that, but I'd be happy to kind of modify it so that it takes it from a user standpoint. Right now the thing that I have is a process map for our team of when we would maybe



partner with other agencies given a certain response, but I will gladly, I think that's a great suggestion, I will gladly modify that document and share that with your group.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Thank you. And then lastly, I just want to echo what I guess has been said already \$5.8 million is a lot of money. And even if it was distributed \$30,000 per person to put them in housing that would have housed about 200 homeless people. So sitting on it for as long as it has been, whoever's responsible for that. I'm not casting stones or pointing fingers, but we really need to get people out there. As Elliot has said the courts, the jails, the police are crowded with these sort of calls. And if we can do anything to take these people out of that system, the quicker the better, even if it just means putting them in hotels, putting them into apartments, doing whatever it is with that money. And I hope you all the best of luck in the quickest of time in order to make that happen. Thank you.

Robyn Burek:

Thanks you.

Elliot Young:

Thanks. Luciana.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah. I just want to understand Robin just from my notes. So it's a three-person team, but it currently is not operating yet?

Robyn Burek:

That's right. We're hiring. So actually have posted the positions for mental health crisis clinician and for the community health worker.

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. And then it's the targeted start date, as you said is January,

Robyn Burek:

January.

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. And then to access it, people will be calling 911 at the start.

Robyn Burek:

Yes. Thank you for clarifying that. Yes, they will go through, they call either the non-emergency number or the 911 and both dispatchers will figure out the appropriate responder from there.

Lakayana Drury:



And have there been any, and I know this will be a trial period, but has there been any trials of this unit anywhere in Portland yet?

Robyn Burek:

No, but I'm actually Tremaine Clayton went last week to cahoots to shadow them some more and then there'll be coming up in December to do that.

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. And then my last question was just as you guys envision for the future, is there any talk about partnering with Trimet or responding to calls on Trimet or things of that nature? I know that they're one of the things that they're considering is a mental health crisis response team, kind of some combination of those words. And I saw it in their proposal and I was asking them about, and they said they had had some talks with you guys about that. But I was just curious, as far as sharing resources, if there's any envisioning of you guys responding to calls on Trimet the way that the [inaudible 00:48:47] police Bureau used to do,

Robyn Burek:

I imagine we will get dispatched anywhere and everywhere Trimet included and wherever the need is, that's where we will go. For sure.

Lakayana Drury:

Great. I'll follow up with them because I would recommend that there is some kind of partnership, especially for them to create their own unit when you guys are already doing it could probably save them some money.

Robyn Burek:

Yeah.

Elliot Young:

So I see on the Chat [inaudible 00:49:14] has asked, if you could post a link to the job sites, I don't know Robin, if you have that link, but that would be great. And next up we have Ann and then we're going to open it up to the public for questions and comments. So Ann.

Ann Campbell:

Thank you. And thank you Robin for being here. I have a question for you and actually for Bob, from BOEC too, you both talked about your timelines and the time that it takes you to vet people, train them, purchase of that. So since you have been operating almost a year and you said it takes about a year and a half and you have one, Will it take you another year or year and a half to have the second one due to your timelines?

Robyn Burek:



No, no. Because I'm now at least from the HR standpoint, I'll talk about the positions the positions have now been created. So now we don't have that five month bottleneck from HR to create more positions, it's done. So we'll have to do is basically post the position and we'll hire them come April and train them so that they're ready to go in June. And then it should be easygoing. I mean, that was our biggest bottleneck right there. It's from here on out, it should be easy to go. The apparatus, the vans that's the only bottleneck that from our end, we just have to think ahead and be prepared for. And we've already placed the order for our second team for their van. So it will be ready by June of next year. So that's, yeah, it won't take another year for us.

Bob:

[crosstalk 00:50:48] perspective. We have 12 new trainees in an Academy right now, and we know that if we want to be able to expand the program, we're going to need additional staffing. And that's why we're requesting eight more staff for the next budget cycle so that we can be ahead of that. Right now we're able to absorb the pilot unit. But once it grows beyond that to multiple units citywide, that's where it can be real challenging because we don't want to call takers away from answering 911 to sit in a dispatch position.

Elliot Young:

Okay. So are there any questions from the public to Robin or Bob?

Amy Anderson:

Barb had her hand up?

Elliot Young:

Barb. Yes Barb please.

Amy Anderson:

Yeah. Let me put the video on.

Speaker 1:

[inaudible 00:16:42] the video.

Amy Anderson:

Oh, okay. Go ahead.

Speaker 1:

Hi, I'm going to be the voice from the side. A couple of things I know you've talked to peers, you haven't talked to enough peers, you haven't talked to the right peers. Somebody that works in a clinical situation like at unity has no idea about some of the people say at sisters of the road, do you know [Art Rio senior 00:52:17] ?



Robyn Burek:

Do I do? I'm sorry [inaudible 00:00:52:13].

Speaker 1:

His name is Art Rio senior.

Robyn Burek:

No. I don't.

Speaker 1:

He comes to mind as like, he already does all this stuff, but it's not something that peers can't handle. Some peers and not be able to handle it, but that's not for a small number of peers to decide. So I'm really hoping that you push forward and you utilize the peer support specialists because yeah, the lived experience and dealing with people is priceless. Really? It is. Yeah. I'm going to leave it there.

Robyn Burek:

Thank you Barb.

Elliot Young:

Okay. Thank-

Robyn Burek:

You're one of many that I hear from about the importance of using peers and I just want to let you know, I hear you. And I do have every intention of going down that path, we do as a program. So, like I said, this first team as a starting point, and then we will grow from here and we will definitely utilize peers.

Elliot Young:

Okay. We have a question from Joanna.

Joanna:

Yeah. Hi. I have a question about the 911 system. You said that as we expand teams, you're going to have to have more specialized dispatchers, but given that so many of the 911 calls about the problems here, I don't understand why it's the system. Isn't going to be able to handle these questions. It seems like the difference is, who is going to respond to them. And I would see why you're expecting, do you understand what I'm going with this since the vast majority of calls into 911 appear to be about how this person's, which in people in mental health crisis, which is what these responders are responding to. And it's a very big, extra expense. And it's adding a huge amount to our timeline for expanding the program to other neighborhood who need it.

Bob:



Yeah. Thank you, Joanna. I appreciate the question. It's a little bit complicated, but let me start by saying right now when you call 911, we're not able to answer the phone quickly enough, certainly by national standards. But my personal standard is being able to answer 911 within 10 seconds or about three rings. So if you think about this, how long would you expect if you have to call 911, how long would you expect to have to wait for somebody to pick up the phone? Most people would say they may not notice it. If it rang one or two times, maybe three times.

Bob:

The problem is we're not able to meet that. Only about half the time are we able, right now, are we able to answer the phone within that ten second window. And that's a problem. That's a problem for me because I live in the community and I have family that lives in the community. I care about our community and I want to be able to answer 911 quickly. We're not able to do that now. With the addition of Portland street response, effectively what we're doing in the initial stages when it's a pilot, one of our fire dispatcher is doing their normal fire dispatch job plus dispatching the one Portland street response unit, the pilot unit.

Bob:

Once the program begins to expand, we talk about a span of control or the ability for one dispatcher to track all of the units that they would be responsible for. And when we get to two or three, in addition to what they're already having to dispatch, that's where the problem begins. And we need to then take a [inaudible 00:56:42] away from call taking to sit in a fire dispatch position, dispatching Portland street response. And in order to do that, we are not impacting our 911 call answering in a negative way. We need to make sure that we're able to hire up for that in advance.

Elliot Young:

Joanna, does that answer your question? Okay. I don't hear her. So it looks like that is the questions which we've heard from the public. I guess what, you know just to sum up and we do need to move on. I think all of us in the public and on peace app really support the rollout of this program, want you to be successful. And it sounds like the problems are above your pay grade. And I've heard this from commissioner [inaudible 00:00:57:44], the enormous problems in get thing, just things through the city bureaucracy.

Elliot Young:

If it takes five months to hire someone through HR, that is a human made problem that hopefully we can address by getting the city to work more efficiently. I can assure you that if we had an earthquake, it would not take five months to hire people or find vans. So I think the sluggishness of this is a suggestion that this is not being viewed as an emergency and for the people on the street. And those of us who care about the people on the street, this is an emergency and it should be handled like a public health crisis. So thank you for doing the work to get those up and running as quickly as you can. And we are here to support you in whatever way we can to make that happen. I'm going to turn it back to lucky Ana for the next portion of our agenda.

Lakayana Drury:



Thanks Elliot. We are going to turn to some information from the Portland police Bureau. I want to invite deputy chief Chris Davis to give an update on what the police Bureau is working on right now. This is something that asked to be part of our regular part of our agenda is to have PDB report back on things that are relevant to the community. Deputy chief, thanks for being here.

Chris Davis:

Absolutely. I don't have a whole lot of the big things going on in the police Bureau right now are obviously we have some public safety issues that we continue to work through in the city. We are up to, I believe 45 homicides for the year about 41 of which have occurred since June. So, and then that number has been accompanied by a very large increase in gun violence in the city. And so we continue to try to work with partners like the office of violence prevention and other community partners, the community peace collaborative, and others to address that issue. That is obviously a very concerning trend in public safety. We're also starting to see what was the nightly unrest taper off, and it's becoming a little more sporadic. So that's a step in the right direction.

Chris Davis:

We have seen over the last few months, a dramatic spike in response time for calls for service, especially the highest priority calls in some precincts have gone up over 12 minutes. And that's for your priority one through three emergency calls. These are not calls that are optional or can wait. So we're trying to move resources back to patrol from a lot of public or policing duties to address that. And we are starting to see those come down, although they're still well above the council mandate of many years of five minutes for those type of calls. We are staffed now at about 870 sworn police officers. That's about where we were in 1995 with the city two thirds the size of the one we have now. So we're just continuing to work on ways to be as efficient as we can with the resources that we have.

Chris Davis:

And then the last thing I'll mention is there's obviously a very robust and public discussion about our budget with the fall budget monitoring process happening with city council. So we're working out some contingencies for what will happen at various levels of budget cuts that are being talked about right now. But as of right now, none of those things are fully formed yet council still has some discussion and some work to do to determine what if anything will happen by way of modification to our budget. And that's pretty much the high points of what's going on in the police Bureau.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you, deputy chief. I know that there are a couple of questions, so I'm going to turn to Barb. I know she has one and we might take just a couple more and then move on to our next piece. So go ahead, Barb.

Speaker 1:

Okay. So the question I put in the chat was how many medics and firefighters have been injured because the police couldn't respond ahead of them? And you might not know that-



Chris Davis:

I don't have that information. I would have to try to get that from the fire Bureau. I don't know the answer, whether it is any or what the number is.

Speaker 1:

Right. Sorry, Bubby, is just too much right now.

Lakayana Drury:

There's a question. If you can speak anything about the status of the federally deputized police officers within the Portland police Bureau right now?

Chris Davis:

So in terms of status, I mean, what the deputization status was meant to do when the superintendent of the state police had that done in advance of the September 26th events was to his stated purpose for that was to provide some additional protection for Portland police officers, especially in cases where they're assaulted in the course of dealing with events at federal facilities. You know, we like to try to have federal officers not come out into city facilities like our streets and sidewalks to deal with things that happen outside their buildings.

Chris Davis:

And so that entails sending not only our local police officers, but also Multnomah County Sheriff's deputies and state troopers to deal with those events. And so the superintendent, when the governor essentially took over responsibility for policing in the city for September 26th, the superintendent of the state police had this deputization done. It was really intended to just provide for federal charging in cases where there's a nexus to some federal thing, like one of their facilities of officers that were assaulted. We've had ... the last number I saw is pretty old. We've had 140 injuries to police officers. I'm sure it's more than that by now over the course of the summer. And so that was what that was intended to do. That deputization technically comes with the ability to enforce some parts of federal law, but we would not have our officers do that for a few reasons.

Chris Davis:

Number one, we've had, we have some policy positions about the inappropriateness of use of local police resources for things that are really just federal mandates, certainly like immigration enforcement or anything like that, we wouldn't have anything to do with. And also our officers haven't been trained on what those federal rules say and what elements of federal crimes are and some pretty important things that they would need in order to take any of that action. And so as a practical matter, they can't really make probable cause arrest for federal offenses or anything like that. And really the only thing that deputization did was provide the US attorney's office and prosecution options in some fairly limited circumstances. That status was put in place through the end of the calendar year.

Chris Davis:



I'm still not exactly sure why that is, normally federal deputization, as I understand it lasts a year, but there is still obviously some conversation going back and forth between the city because city council and the city attorney's office have taken the position that that deputization has some constitutional issues. And since the federal government has declined the city's request to rescind the deputization, the city attorney's office, and the council have gone to court to take action there. So we'll await the outcome of that process. But as a practical matter, there's not much difference with those officers and the rest of us who haven't been federally deputized outside of that, unless one of them is assaulted in the course of some kind of work in securing a federal facility. Basically.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you. We're going to take two more questions. We're going to go with Elliot and then Ann.

Elliot Young:

Yeah, thanks for that report. So two questions. I heard you say that they were deputized to protect [inaudible 01:07:53] officers, but in fact, the deputization doesn't really protect them. What it does is provide for the ability for federal prosecutors to charge people and doesn't end run around our local DA. So I'm wondering to what extent that is a usurpation of our local control over our local police and our local DA, who is elected versus the federal DA, who we don't have any ... my other question to you was about the policing of protests and use of force. The most recent report from the compliance officer. And there are discussions with the police Bureau suggested that there was a lack of reporting in the past. And I'm wondering where you are now on catching up and subsequent months, July, August, September, October, and whether you're caught up with that. And when the results of that analysis will be published?

Chris Davis:

You broke up a lot there, but I think I got your statement and your question. I'll have to find out exactly where we are in the backlog. It's not that reporting wasn't done or that the process won't happen for uses of force. It's just that events have been really unprecedented in terms of the amount of strain that they've placed on the systems that exist to do those things. And so any system, when you overload, it will slow down, but I'll have to get back to you on exactly where we are in the backlog.

Elliot Young:

Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Ann, you got the final question.

Ann Campbell:

Thank you. Thank you. I have a question that's kind of a little bit similar to Elliot's ...

PART 2 OF 5 ENDS [01:10:04]



Ann Campbell:

-Shouldn't that's kind of a little bit similar to Elliot's you said in your presentation that the officers were deputized to protect buildings, it wasn't to protect citizens. I'm wondering about that and they were deputized for the event September 26th, which was an event not around any federal buildings, as far as I know, that's my first question and then my other one is regarding the reporting. I don't know if you've had a chance to look at the [cocoa 01:10:34] report. It appears that there was a decision made not to process any after action reporting for the entire month of June. So I'm wondering if you have caught up on that one. Thank you.

Chris Davis:

Well, again I'll have to find out exactly where we are and how caught up we are. There was not a decision not to do it [inaudible 01:11:02] just slowed down though. The system slowed down because of a tremendous amount of stress on the organization in general, which I think given the unprecedented times that we're in is understandable. Although we are still committed to meeting our obligations under the settlement agreement, and we're going to do everything that we can within the resources that we have and in the reality that we live in to live up to our obligations there. I apologize if I gave the impression that officers were deputized to protect federal buildings, as it was explained to me by the Oregon state police the officers were deputized in order to provide them the protection of federal statutes. When people assault them in the course of something connected to it's not just any time somebody assaults a police officer, who's been deputized that they could be charged federally as I am.

Chris Davis:

I'm sure the US attorney's office could provide you a lot more detail on exactly how this works. But if there is some federal nexus, then the US attorney's office can prosecute someone who attacks one of our police officers. I do know that there has been some coordination and you might ask, I think the district attorney's office and the US attorney's office would be better able to explain the coordination that goes on between those two offices on who prosecutes what, because I know those decisions... My understanding is those decisions are not just made in a vacuum on either side, that there is some communication that goes on between those two offices.

Ann Campbell:

I just want to just follow up with a quick piece to that. So they're deputize to protect officers not to protect the public. I just want to make sure I understand exactly what you're saying.

Chris Davis:

Well, what I'm saying is that when I talked to the now retired superintendent of the state police, his explanation to me of why he asked that these officers be deputized when they were essentially under his command, was that he wanted to provide protection for police officers who as I'm sure everyone knows that [inaudible 01:13:41] assaulted at pretty high rates at some of these events and so he felt that that was appropriate for him to do that. I'm reporting the explanation that someone else gave me though, for an action that they took.



Ann Campbell:

Right, I appreciate that. That makes me wonder we are deputizing people to protect officers, but what about all the citizens that we all know had violence perpetrated upon them by police officers and others? So I just wanted to make sure I understood. Thank you very much.

Lakayana Drury:

Chief, are you staying on to answer any questions about these directives? Are you aware of these that we're going to be looking at tonight?

Chris Davis:

I can certainly stay on if you'd like me to, and I'll take a look at the agenda and do the best that I can to help you.

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. Appreciate that. So part of PCCEPs charge is to look at directives from the Portland police Bureau that are up for public comment, and we have three of them on the agenda tonight. If I can just pull this up, the first one is, would establish a collision board, which would... Thanks, okay. We'll start with this one then. That's the four 16 critical incident. So it's temporary altered duty, just a really quick rundown of this. This is for any officers that are involved in either a use of deadly force or an in custody, death, and places them on a week of administrative leave in which during that one week period they're required to attend at least one session with a licensed mental health professional and then if they do return to duty until the incident is reviewed, that they would be on like "desk duty." Oh, my videos off.

Lakayana Drury:

So that's, I'm just going to go through all of these just to give you guys a brief overview of them. The second one is policy six 40.52, which is our collision review. A [inaudible 01:16:16] would establish a collision review board, which would investigate all collisions with the Bureau or city vehicles. Yeah and look at anything that happens in those incidents.

Lakayana Drury:

Finally, the last one is directive 650, which deals with search seizures and investigations. It specifically highlights probable cause search warrants and the exceptions for those. Then also inventories, which is when people's possessions are seized during an arrest such as a vehicle or personal property. How that property is inventoried by the police Bureau. Chief Davis I don't know if there's anything you want to add on any of these directives as they're being reviewed. Other than that, we can open it up to questions from PCCEPs and then the community.

Chris Davis:

I don't think I have anything to add. I think you've given a really good summary of them, but I'm familiar with all these and I'm happy to try to answer any questions that people have.

Lakayana Drury:



Cool. So we'll start with PCCEP comment and then go to a community comment after that and we'll start with, Ann, looks like you have your hand up.

Ann Campbell:

Thank you. Thank you for staying on to answer questions. I have a question about directive four 16 critical incident alter duty. I'm wondering if... I know that there has been comment, public comment before about the definition of what a critical incident is, and because that is very important, is that a critical incident to the officers that are critical is an incident to the victim? That kind of, I'm wondering about, I'm also wondering on directive six 50 search seizures and inventories, the stop and frisk portion. I know there's been some public comment on that. And if you can comment on that, thank you.

Chris Davis:

So critical incidents are defined in the policy has a pretty broad and atypically traumatic event that causes physical, emotional and or Psychological [inaudible 01:18:57] harm that is to the member because this policy talks about our obligations to our employees when they're exposed to critical incidents in the course of their work and so [crosstalk 01:19:13]

Ann Campbell:

I'm sorry, you're kind of cutting out and I want to make sure I hear you.

Chris Davis:

How about now?

Ann Campbell:

I think [crosstalk 01:19:27].

Chris Davis:

The critical Incidents are... This policy has to do with our obligations to our employees or the way we deal with our employees when they're exposed to things that are defined in this policy as critical incidents. So this would apply to our employees, that's the purpose of this policy. Then with regard to stop and frisk, can you tell me what's your... I'm not sure I understand your question on stop and frisk and directives six 50.

Ann Campbell:

What I'm wondering about is that behavior that kind of the stop and frisk mentality and procedure doesn't go towards building public trust. So I'm wondering if when that comes up, I'm reading some information about past community comment on this, and I'm wondering if it has been reviewed by the Bureau, if they view that as something that they could look at in order to piece up, we're here to help build community trust. That was one of the things we're doing and so I'm just wondering if there's been any more thoughts on that?

Chris Davis:



Are you talking about a stop and frisk policy, for example, like the one used in the New York police department for several years, that's been subject to a lot of media coverage and court action.

Ann Campbell:

Yes.

Chris Davis:

We don't have one of those in order for a Portland police officer to stop someone, they will need to have either reasonable suspicion that a crime has occurred or in the case of the traffic charge, probable cause to believe that a traffic violation has occurred. So in New York, what they did, there was a little different, they encouraged their officers to go and just basically stop people on the street and check them for weapons. In order for our officers to do something like we're going to need to be able to articulate a specific legal basis for doing that.

Chris Davis:

So generally under the constitution searches as has been pointed out in the chat and in our policy in general searches by police officers require a warrant, except for in certain exceptions to the search warrant rule that are the subject of extensive case law. So we train our officers pretty thoroughly on search and seizure law, and we expect all of any, any stop or search that they do to comply with all the applicable constitutional standards. As a professional, I can tell you we just have not embraced the stop and frisk mentality. Like some other police agencies most notably the New York police department.

Ann Campbell:

Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Elliot, you're up. You're on mute if you're speaking Elliot,

Elliot Young:

Sorry. So section 2.1 of that last, the policy six 50 does refer specifically to stop and frisk as something which can be done without a search warrant. So I don't know what you mean by stop and frisk, but the directive here refers to it specifically. So it sounds like if it's contemplated within the directive of the police Bureau to do stop and frisk, it also refers to something called protective sweeps. I don't understand what that is. So if you could tell me what those two phrases protective, sweeps and stop and frisk mean that would help.

Chris Davis:

You're seeing this in section 2.1 of directive, six 50.

Elliot Young:

I am,



Chris Davis:

Maybe we have different versions of it then because I'm looking at this and I see section 2.1 is entitled search warrants.

Elliot Young:

Search warrants and exceptions. And then as a general, I'll put in what I have, which is what is linked from the piece up website. [crosstalk 01:24:46]

Chris Davis:

We have a version [inaudible 00:01:24:51].

Elliot Young:

Okay. So I put it into the chat, but that you'll see under the... It says there are exceptions to the general rule wherein a search warrant is not required as a search prerequisite to conducting search I E administrative automobile exception, community care-taking consent, emergency aid, exigent circumstances, hot pursuit, incident to arrest, et cetera, protect a sweeps and stop and frisk.

Chris Davis:

So in this context, I think what this is getting at, and I apologize because this is different than the version that I have in my own files from this policy discussion. But police officers under Terry, you know the Supreme court decision and Terry versus Ohio under certain circumstances can do a cursory search for weapons, colloquially known as a frisk. But in order for them to do that, they have to be able to articulate some reasonable belief that the person that they're doing this with is armed.

Chris Davis:

In order to stop someone in the first place, they still have to have a lawful basis to make a stop, which is either going to be reasonable suspicion for a criminal offense. Or like I said, for a traffic offense probable cause. So it's not like police officers are legally allowed in Portland to just pick people randomly and walk up to them and search them. They have to be able to have a legal basis for the stop in the first place. Then if they choose to Pat them down for weapons, they have to be able to articulate why they thought the person was armed. We don't just stop people on the street corner at random and frisk them.

Elliot Young:

So protective sweeps, what does that mean to

Chris Davis:

Protective sweep is a term of art really, where I'll give you an example where this is most commonly used. So you have an alarm at your house and it goes off and we get dispatched to the alarm. We go there and we find forced entry to your house and we don't know if the burglar is still inside under the law. We have the ability to go inside and check to make sure there isn't a burglar there. It gets complicated if in the process of looking for this burglar, we see some evidence of a crime on your part



and we actually... I think we're in and I can't remember off the top of my head. I apologize where we're at in the process of developing a policy on alarms that were eventually what we'd like to move to is when you get your alarm permit, you indicate whether or not authorize Officers. If they find those circumstances to do a protective sweep. Then if you don't authorize it, we don't come in and check. If you do, then we'll come in and check. But that would be a protective sweep.

Elliot Young:

Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Any other PCCEPs comment before we turn to public comment for these directors? Okay. Let's open up to public comment. If you can use the, raise your hand feature in the participant section, or just physically raise your hand and we could see you we'll do that. Yeah. Go ahead Dan.

Dan:

Hi, this is Dan handle North Portland. Cop watch and I un-muted on your end. Can you hear me?

Lakayana Drury:

Yep. We can hear you.

Dan:

Yeah, I appreciate some of the comments I've got brought up, echo the comments that we sent out yesterday to the Bureau about these directives and the traumatic incidents. It's still, it's incredibly vaguely defined in the directive and it sounds like essentially the traumatic incident happened to a community member in most cases. Then the officer suffered secondary trauma from either being part of it or witnessing it. The compliance officer's report had a list of specific kinds of cases that this might involve. They talked about child abuse and officer-involved shootings and assaults upon officers. But it's... One of the things we pointed out is it doesn't talk about sexual assault, which I imagine is traumatic for everybody involved, perhaps, except for the perpetrator. But so we were hoping that that that list would be added to the director to be more specific. And in terms of the stop and frisk.

Dan:

Yeah, it's, it's very strange that the chief, deputy chief was telling us that port police don't engage in it, but it's written into the directive of as something they can do without a warrant. Several years ago, I was trying to find the actual reference. But several years ago, the Portland Tribune ran an article about possible racial profiling and they follow it around this car of officers. They got out and talked to some young black men and said, "Oh, do you gentlemen mind if we Pat you down before we have this conversation?" It's like it's not a mere conversation.

Dan:

I don't go up to my friends and say, "can I Pat you down and see if you have weapons on you?" That is an intrusion, a fourth amendment intrusion on the community and I don't know whether the Portland



police are still doing that kind of thing. But it certainly seems inappropriate, but it seems like it would be allowed by the way the directive is written. We also had some concerns about the other policy about the collision board, particularly the Portland police association is being given a seat on that collision board, even though it's a conflict of interest because their job is to protect their members from being disciplined and having them sit on there and then vote on whether or not they thought the officer was in or out of policy. It seems very inappropriate and hoping that either PCCP or somebody from the Bureau could follow up on those comments. Thank you,

Lakayana Drury:

Chief. Do you want to respond to that?

Chris Davis:

You know, we can certainly get those comments and I appreciate Dan you're, especially, I know you've been interested for a long time and the collision issue cause we've had conversations going back for several years on that. Now I think the idea of the critical incident definition was to be broad enough to encompass something, this could encompass a sexual assault investigation, just depending on the circumstances, if it impacts a police officer in one of these ways, because there are some of those cases that do impact our employees that way. I mean, there are some really awful things that happened to people in our community that our police officers are called [inaudible 01:32:10] with. Then as far as stop and Frisk goes, I think maybe where some of the issue might be, I would just suggest is the way that term has been used, to describe what I understand the kind of emo of stop and frisk was in New York is a little different than how we require our officers to have a legal justification for all of these actions that they take.

Chris Davis:

Dan I know you're referencing something that the Tribune did several years ago. I can tell you that all of our practices are informed by court decisions and when we find out that a practice that our officers are engaging in has been ruled unconstitutional, we expect that they won't do it anymore. Consent is a valid exception to the search warrant rule under constitutional law. But that issue of how to ensure the voluntariness of consent is a big one in the profession right now and I know that that's one that we're dealing with in the policy development process for... I'm trying to remember the directive that we're working on right now that touches on this issue of consent searches and just making sure that they are actually voluntary.

Lakayana Drury:

Thanks, chief we're to go with Zainab for our final question and then there was a question in chat that I'll respond to after that. Go ahead Zainab.

Zainab:

Thanks. Lucky Ana, thanks, chief. The chief Davis. So I'm glad that because it says cop watch. I always say cop watch, but I'm glad that you spoke up about the issue on search and frisk. What I was thinking as you're talking chief Davis is that a lot of people don't know their rights in the streets. They don't attend



meetings that like educate them. Like I did with the trainings that I've come through a piece up, you don't get this kind of level of education, even with you re referring to certain referendums and laws. People don't know that. So what we do is we watch social media, we see a lot of social media and in areas where police officers are not following what we consider to be considered like [inaudible 01:35:00] . And so when you made that general statement that we don't do that here in Portland, I lost you on that one because I'm trying to figure out how do you know that for sure and how many people actually put complaints to your departments related to this issue. Have there been any complaints related to this issue over the years? Thank you.

Chris Davis:

I'm sure we have had complaints about these issues and obviously I can't comment on specific complaints and you certainly bring up a good point that a lot of people don't know what they're rights are in an interaction with a police officer and I can't control what level of knowledge a member of the public has. We all as citizens and as members of the community, I should say, have our own obligations to know what our rights are and I know that there's been a lot of work done in the community to try and educate people as to what their rights are and some people avail themselves of those opportunities and some people don't. I can't control that. What we try to do to manage these issues then within the organization is we know that first of all, if an officer anything an officer does is subject to review later on by a court.

Chris Davis:

So, we're bound by the case law that comes out of the process a lot of times and I would... I'm always a little bit careful about how much information I get from social media, because it's, it can sometimes present varied levels of reliability in terms of the information that you get off of it. But at some point we have to train our officers as well as we can in what the rules are and we have to be as careful as we can to make sure they're following the rules and that we hold them accountable when they don't follow the rules. Then that's all backstopped by the court system that if I go out tomorrow and I commit an unlawful search and I arrest somebody off of that unlawful search, I'm going to have a judge throw the whole thing out, which is not a good outcome.

Chris Davis:

So that's the system that we have to try and prevent misconduct in the application of search and seizure rules. But the search and seizure rules are things that courts and lawyers spend a lot of time arguing back and forth about. Sometimes an officer might just make an honest mistake in the midst of a very complicated system with a lot of back and forth, and a lot of changes to what the rules are and in a case like that, then maybe accountability for that looks more like training or releasing some information Bureau wide about a change in search and seizure laws. So it's definitely one of the many challenges that we deal with in our profession and trying to keep it clean.

Zainab:

Thank you for that response and I feel that one, training is important and again, training and accountability to the community comment. No, it's not you. Yes you're one person, I get that. But because you're the chief of the Portland police Bureau, it is important that you work with your team to



help those in the community, be informed about their rights while we say it's our responsibility. Yes, it is but those who are out there who are suffering through mental health crises may not know. And it's just one of those unfortunate things where education varies on every level, that everything that's put out is not on a eighth grade level or a fifth grade level or a fourth grade level. So until that happens I would just implore you and your leadership role as well as those on your team to think about that and think about how much we can reduce a lot of incidents and just by just talking and communicating and educating and training. So thanks again.

Chris Davis:

That's a fair point. Thank you very much.

Ascena Lawrence:

May I interject for a moment?

Lakayana Drury:

Yes go ahead, listening. Can you just introduce yourself too?

Ascena Lawrence:

Thank you, absolutely. Hi everyone. My name is Ascena Lawrence. I'm a senior policy advisor in Mayor Wheeler's office. I wanted to let everyone know that you will see the search [inaudible 01:40:09] and the inventories directive for public.

Speaker 2:

Ascena you are breaking up. I'm sorry to cut you off Ascena you are breaking up right now.

Ascena Lawrence:

That's okay. Can you hear me now? Maybe without my video?

Speaker 2:

Yeah.

Ascena Lawrence:

Okay. I apologize. I hope everyone at least caught my name. I'm Ascena and I work in Mayor Wheeler's office anyways. So next month you will likely see the search seizures and inventories directive come back for public comment period. My office is working with the police Bureau right now on the language around consent searches. We want to ensure that people know their rights when it comes to what they're consenting, and there will be a script of sorts that officers will be required to notify people and what their rights are around consent searches. Then we'll have some sort of documentation that people have given either approval or a denial to the police officer. So we're still working out the details and more than happy to update you as we have things fleshed out. But I just wanted you to know that this is something that we take seriously and that it provides transparency. It protects the officer. It certainly



protects the resident and in the event that the person does English is not their first language, or they're not comfortable in English. We'll make sure that there are translation services available through language line.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you, Ascena appreciate that. The final question that we're just going to dress as more of a show. I just want to make up and make sure I quite catch it. We'll piece up excellent. Actually, thoroughly reviewing these directives and be responding to PPB, or will it just be a chat session? I think that's a really important question. PCCEPs still trying to catch up and how we incorporate these as, as something that PCCEPs of it is mandated to do, but hasn't ever traditionally done. And so we moved a step in that direction by getting them onto the agenda tonight. But I also do agree that this is not a review of the directives. And my suggestion is that we send them to maybe have the steering committee, farm them out to sub committees that they most, that they represent they fit best with and have that committee do a review of those so that it actually is a review session. And then invite a representative to that, meaning from PPB to answer similar questions like this, so we can actually give reviews of these.

Lakayana Drury:

So that is my suggestion on that. Rochelle, I don't know if you have anything to add to that, or if there's anything other piece that members have as far as suggestions in regards to that. Cool. Okay. We're going to keep it moving. Thank you, chief Davis, again for staying on extra and answering those questions for us. I really appreciate it. It made the discussion much more thorough than it otherwise would've been.

Chris Davis:

Happy to help.

Lakayana Drury:

absolutely. So I'm taking the next section. It is a presentation of our PCCEPs codification recommendation. So I'm going to just share my screen to go through it. This is the third time that this recommendation will be up. We had it at September meeting. We looked at it again at the October PCCEPs at meeting PCCEPs steering committee meeting. And so we made, we've continued to make additions and changes to it, just to give folks an overview PCCEPs currently exists within the settlement agreement. And this recommendation would provide PCCEPs insight to the mayor's office for its codification of PCCEP into city code, which the mayor personally has stayed on many times that he wants to do. And then we've worked with the staff of the mayor's office as far as logistics around this. This was developed using the PCCEP plan outline, but it is a document used to help guide the codification process, but does not necessarily reflect all of the language that will be in the city code around it, but it brings what PCCEPs ideas are for it. And the-

PART 3 OF 5 ENDS [01:45:04]

Lakayana Drury:



Brings what PCCEP's ideas are for it, and the mayor's office will then take this recommendation and craft out what specific things would go in there, and what things could be added, [crosstalk 01:45:11] otherwise, places like the bylaws or what have you. Just want to give folks attention to that. And then the only PCCEP that I'm really going to talk about tonight [crosstalk 01:45:23]

Speaker 3:

I'm sorry about [inaudible 01:45:31]. I muted everybody, but feel free to unmute yourself.

Lakayana Drury:

Appreciate it. Just for as far as what I'm going to go over tonight, I'm just going to go over the revisions from the steering committee meeting on the 13th. We updated the mission statement, which is right here and it is to convene and amplify the voices of communities of Portland to support improved outcomes of the Portland Police Bureau regarding community safety, accountability, and equitable practices and culture. And then the other revision we made was to section 10, which is the deliverable product and added points six and seven, which again I will go over.

Lakayana Drury:

Point six of deliverable product is PCCEP shall meet at least twice per year with the chief police commissioner, PPB precinct commanders, PPB neighborhood response teams, and representatives of the office of neighborhood involvement in crime prevention to assess and solicit comment on PPB's activities in regards to community outreach, engagement, and problem solving. The PCCEP shall also provide the con provide the opportunity for public comment at any town hall and round table meetings to keep open lines of communication with the public at large. The PCCEP may also invite testimony from other city bodies, including but not limited to the Portland Commission on Disability, Behavioral Health Unit, Advisory Committee, the Training Advisory Council, Human Rights Commission, Citizen Review Committee, and the citizen members of the Portland Review Board.

Lakayana Drury:

And then number seven, the PCCEP shall show host, and we switched it from three to two, so there's a slight typo in there. Two town halls within the year to connect with the public at large with the police commissioner and the police chief. Currently that's the same person, but it could be two folks in the future and others and how they feel the Bureau is performing as an organization. Following the town halls, the PCCEP shall produce and submit timely community scorecard annually based on information shared in four categories, use of force, transparency, accountability and community engagement.

Lakayana Drury:

All of the additions to the PCCEP plan throughout this document have been highlighted in yellow, but basically just some of the other highlights is it more clearly outlines what PPB's responsibilities are, gives PCCEP some increased powers and it writing job descriptions for police officers, includes us in the hiring process for the chief, embeds us into the PPB universal review process and has PCCEP select its own members via a hiring committee, which would include PCCEP members, PCCEP staff and community representatives from organizations and the community at large. With that I'm going to stop sharing my



screen and turn over to PCCEP comment on the recommendation. I see we got a couple of hands already, and then we'll go to community comment after that. I'm going to start with Elliot and then go with Vadine. Elliot are you there? I'm going to go with the Vadine and then we'll come-

Elliot Young:

There I am, sorry. One of the things I thought we dealt with at the steering committee and I put it in the chat was that the last sentence of the mission to just take out the first and from that last sentence, accountability, equitable practices and culture. I thought we had discussed that. It's just a grammar thing. It's not a [crosstalk 01:49:47]

Lakayana Drury:

I thought I'd added it in there. I thought, because I had just taken it right from there, so we'll make that change.

Elliot Young:

Just get rid of that and, thanks

Lakayana Drury:

Yes sir. Vadim.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Just to follow up on the appointment of PCCEP members. The highlighted area seems to show that there's a recommendation from the interview committee and then the steering committee on PCCEP appoints members. And then further down there's an unhighlighted area where it says that the mayor appoints and then the city commissioners vote on that. Is the highlight what we're working for and that unhighlighted area, that's a little further down a few paragraphs down. The process for selecting members, shows there right now where it says, six mayoral appointments, seven council confirmation. Is that just a relic of the past?

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah. It'll follow the section in yellows for both PCCEP seats, regular members seats, and then youth seats.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

I still think that PCCEP appointing its own members only will lead to people appointing individuals that they know or work with or are friends with and so on. And even though it's a selection process that's fairly similar to what we have right now where, and I believe that chairs as well as possibly PCCEP staff and other outside groups are able to interview people. It still seems that it leads to people self-selecting if PCCEP now has membership that is approved by the mayor and or city council, I think that gives at least the perception if not the reality that members are being weighed in their qualifications and their representation of community organizations by outside groups other than PCCEP people who are perhaps willing to select people that they know. I prefer to leave it the way it currently is where there's,



I would want city council to appoint people rather than PCCEP vote in order to have some perception of there'll be no perception of impropriety in the selection process.

Lakayana Drury:

Wouldn't that open it just up to the same way, but just in reverse that city council could then just select members that they approve of?

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Well, that's up to the city council of course. They have to answer to the voters, who do we answer to? Nobody really, so... City council right now points as far as I know, membership of every single board and committee that is out there. And there's of course, a lot of committees that are appointed either by the Bureau directors or individual commissioners. So this is a very unique opportunity where, and there's a self-selection baked in and to my knowledge it's the only commission or committee that would have that. And I'm not sure what the reason behind that is if all the other supposedly impartial entities that the city supports go through some election process through either Bureau heads or city council.

Lakayana Drury:

I appreciate that. And just to follow up with that, is that a concern shared by other members of the committee? I know you've bring it up a number of times, Vadim. What are other folks' thoughts on that particular issue?

Elliot Young:

I would just say that in terms of the practice of how we've been running, which is we've been recommending people and then the mayor has been basically approved all of our recommendations. I don't see there, in practice, there being any check on direct recommendations that we've made. And in terms of the process, I've never been in an interview or as far as I know, invited to an interview with any of the prospective members. I think maybe the process that Locke Anna lays out would involve the PCCEP members more actively in choosing. And I do think that we as a body have probably more insight into the qualifications that are needed and work commitment that's needed for people on PCCEP rather than the city council or the mayor who is somewhat just stemmed from that.

Lakayana Drury:

And just to add on to that-

Elliot Young:

[crosstalk 01:55:11] us being more involved in the process of selecting.

Lakayana Drury:

And just to add onto that before I let Amy go too, the mayor said he was in support of that process as long as it was clearly outlined how members would be selected so that it was a impartial process. Amy, go ahead.



Amy Anderson:

I'd like to reinstitute and I know you probably think you're already doing it, a nomination committee comprised of community members, PCCEP members, PCCEP staff that are running 12 months out of the year, reviewing applications, moving forward those individuals that they think would be a good interview for the PCCEP steering committee, and just have a formalized process by which the public gets to participate just like they do when they do a hiring panel for the County or the city, there's a huge process by which people are hired. And then at the end they have a panel that of folks to get to ask questions. And then the staffer though, or the city or County get to make the official choice, but in the end we can do it, but we would keep a nominating committee running all year long for anyone applying to PCCEP.

Amy Anderson:

That way we have a continuous loop of alternate and we don't have to worry about taking time out of our schedules to do interviewing because we'll already get the interview ease. Does that make sense? If we laid out a nominating committee and then staff that committee with people that maybe can rotate or different chairs, I think we could do a good job and that's what I've seen done at most other committees, is a group of people just constantly running through applications. What do you think?

Lakayana Drury:

That's what we have in here. Initial screening by applicants by an interview committee convened by steering committee with support of PCCEP staff shall include at least one PCCEP staff member, at least two PCCEP members, two community members seats, and two seats for community organizations.

Amy Anderson:

Yes. But if we call it a nominating committee, then people will understand what our task is. Interview committee, to me sounds a little bit not quite I guess the standard label I'm accustomed to seeing. Concept you're right, concept is great. But instead of an interview committee, I would do nominations committee that runs all year round and not just one where we have seats open. That's what I'm getting at is it functions all year round and then it reports to the steering committee on the applicants say that showed up in a month or in a quarter, however, you all want to do it. We could always be meeting new candidates that way.

Lakayana Drury:

Thanks for the input. Let me stop my screen so I can see where we're at. Any other PCCEP member comment?

Yolanda:

I can provide a quick comment. I just wanted to say that I think at the beginning when Vadim and a few others expressed the same feeling, I also felt similarly. I agreed with Vadim, but when I think about it more in practice, our every month meeting and who's here and we're missing some members tonight and we only have a few folks on reserve. I think for practicality, for people who are willing to actually do the work and show up at the meetings, I think that the way it's written now makes the process a lot



more efficient and for us to be able to move forward. And this codification process has been going on for several months. It just seems like it's been a while, so thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you, Yolanda. Any other PCCEP member comments before we go to public comment? Okay. We will open it up for public comment. I got Zainab up first and then we'll go with Barb. Zainab you there? Maybe that was Zainab's hand from before. We'll go with Barb.

Barb:

Barb, the voice from beyond.

Lakayana Drury:

Yes mam.

Barb:

That makes me feel so old looking. I did circle the things that I wanted you change, the behavioral health thing in one place or in both places that we pointed out. And then I found it somewhere else and didn't circle it, so let me get back to you in a couple of minutes.

Lakayana Drury:

I can Search it up here too. What was it? Change mental health to behavioral health?

Barb:

It was like it had been before where it said people with behavioral health, period, which makes no sense. It was an unfinished statement, wait.

Lakayana Drury:

The only other one that we have is right here where it says people who have lived experience with mental health is the only instance of mental health mentioned in this document.

Barb:

That limited experiences with mental health challenges, mental health diagnosis, it's missing the last part of speech it needs. Does that make sense?

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah.

Barb:

Okay. Thank you. And thank you for changing the other ones.

Lakayana Drury:



Any other [crosstalk 00:17:03].

Barb:

How do you think you can compel the union to come meet with you once a year?

Lakayana Drury:

Say that again?

Barb:

How is it that you think you can compel the police union to meet with PCCEP once a year?

Lakayana Drury:

Did we outline that in here?

Barb:

It looks like it was.

Lakayana Drury:

I don't see that being a problem if it's in here. Under the current system, PPA has met with us at any time that we've asked.

Barb:

Okay, cool. That's what I wondered. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

I see no further comment. We're going to put this to a vote. We have a quorum of members, Vadim, Elliot, Amy and Yolanda, me and Taji and Brit are currently on the call. Is that correct? Yes. Okay, cool. That's a quorum. We need five votes to pass. I will call your name and you'll vote yes or no. We'll go with Taji.

Taji:

I vote yes.

Lakayana Drury:

Brit.

Brit:

Yes.

Lakayana Drury:



Me, yes. Yolanda.

Yolanda:

Yes.

Lakayana Drury:

Vadim.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

I'm still not a fan of self selection, but yes.

Lakayana Drury:

Ann.

Ann:

Yes.

Amy Anderson:

Yes, but with a protest. Yes, you did a really good job. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you for that. Elliot.

Elliot Young:

Yep.

Lakayana Drury:

Good. That's a seven zero vote. It Passes, so we will talk with, I think I see Amanda on the line here, but we'll talk with the mayor's office post this, and again, what actually gets written into city code could look different just in terms of what's actually taken out of here and what's left for other pieces, but appreciate the support of everybody on this and the somewhat lengthy process of getting it through. But that's how we do it and make sure that things get done right. I'm going to turn it over. I was [inaudible 00:19:35], okay. I'm going to turn it back over to Elliot for a statement on our COCL meeting, the response from the COCL meeting from last month. Maybe it was earlier this month.

Elliot Young:

Thanks, Lucky. You'll find the statement on the agenda. Maybe I'll just send the link, put the link in the chat, or should I share my screen? I guess I could share my screen. Host is disabled, participants, screen sharing. Well, I can't share my screen. Now I'm co-host and now I can share my screen, great. Share my screen and turn to this. This is a statement which Anne and I drafted and it was based on our reading of the COCL report, plus the public comments at the COCL town hall and let me read it. PCCEP accepts the



COCL 3Q 2020 report. We wanted to highlight some areas in which we are in agreement with the report and to reflect the feedback we received at the October 14 town hall. We wholeheartedly support the following statement that helps provide important context for the protest following the murder of George Floyd. I'm not going to read their statement, but there it is.

Elliot Young:

Then it goes on, PCCEP would like to affirm the COCL's requests that the Portland Police Bureau address areas of non-compliance. PCCEP is very concerned that our citizens are not receiving safe and adequate policing from PPB. As noted in the recent COCL report the majority of PPB's officers have not received any recent skills training and crowd management, deescalation, procedural justice, crisis intervention, or the critical skills for preventing, or minimizing the use of force. Additionally, a total of 485 officers did not receive the required eight hours of use of force training for state certification. Furthermore, PPB has not produced sufficient representation of after action reports and forced data collection reports as required to demonstrate maintained substantial compliance. Additionally, a PPB official decided that the PPB officers did not need to provide after action reports for the entire month of June. Absent required information PPB cannot demonstrate continued substantial compliance, nor can it modify its policing practices based on those reports when reports are neither collected nor analyzed.

Elliot Young:

While we understand that COVID and nightly protests since the murder of George Floyd have complicated the situation, the city must find a way to maintain its basic training and reporting functions, even amidst a crisis. The COCL report notes that several PCCEP recommendations made since June 2020 have not received any response from Mayor Wheeler, in spite of a mandated 60-day period for such official responses. As of October 22nd, 2020, we have no response on four recommendations. PCCEP has organized a number of listening sessions for our community to weigh in on various issues relative to policing. PCCEP then develops recommendations from those community sessions and forwards them to the mayor and the police chief. When we do not hear anything from the city gives us the impression that neither nor the community is being heard and that it doesn't matter to city officials. We look forward to the city bringing itself back into compliance with the settlement agreement in the near future.

Elliot Young:

Members of the public raised the issue of the COCL reports, citing data indicating the Portland's police budget was only 4.4% of the total budget and ranked second lowest and expenditures of the 50 largest police departments. While this data appears to be accurate, the public and PCCEP members would like a fuller picture of how the PPB budget has changed over the last 30 years in relation to the crime rate in the city.

Elliot Young:

We would also like to see more of an acknowledgement that in spite of the training and other mechanisms to create a self reforming Bureau, the latest use of force data and traffic stops data suggests that black Portlanders, the houseless and those experiencing a mental health crisis are much more likely than others to be stopped and subject to use of force. The data also suggests that the



situation in terms of disproportionate policing has been getting worse and not better. If COCL is monitoring, whether the training and accountability systems actually work, then analyzing this data should be an important part of the report and is largely missing or glossed over. Ann is there anything else you will want to add other than the report, which I just read?

Ann:

No, I think that says it all. Thank you.

Elliot Young:

Why don't we open it to PCCEP, any PCCEP comments on the statement and then we will have public comments. Vadim.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Thank you. My first statement is if I'm trying to follow the path of the COCL report and one of the reasons of course they said that some of these items that PPB is tasked with, were not met was because of the protest in response to the protests. And the integral part, not only was the statement that you included in there about the protests, which the COCL acknowledged the need for protests and free speech and in fact, quoted John Lewis about good trouble, necessary trouble. But then the very next paragraph I think is integral to that which is their rationale for perhaps some of the labs that have happened. And that says the COCL team fully supports the first amendment rights being exercised in Portland. But we must also condemn the use of violence to achieve any end and expect the Portland police to both help prevent such violence and respond to violence and other serious criminality when it occurs.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

The enforcement of laws is essential if we intend to live by the quote social contract and maintain an orderly society. The police are expected to protect protestors, the public and themselves during these events. Violence regardless of the political, social or organizational affiliations of those who engage in it is unacceptable. Throughout the protest these have been arrests, applications of force, injuries to both community members and officers and questionable actions by both community members and officers alike. I think that, that paragraph together with the paragraph that was quoted in this recommendation, or the statement gives the full context I think for the later critiques as well as some of the, what may solve those critiques in the future. I think that, that paragraph would be an integral part to any statement or recommendation.

Elliot Young:

You're proposing adding that paragraph, is that...

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Yeah. I propose those two paragraphs that one leads into the other.

Ann:



And that paragraph is the paragraph that COCL wrote in their report, is that correct?

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Yeah. It's directly after the paragraph that she quoted from the report. The one that says clearly our nation's entering an important moment in history. And then the following paragraph flows up from there.

Elliot Young:

Thank you Vadim. Amy.

Amy Anderson:

Forgive me and please don't take any insult, but this sounds rather political in nature. And I prefer to come in with both good reporting and missing reporting rather than total negative reporting. And I really don't think your first paragraph in the middle belongs in there. I think this needs to really be focused on the settlement agreement and what Vadim said about the, why we're lacking in certain categories at COVID played a major part in the rearrangement of the training protocols and that a whole lot of officers have met the basic training protocols. They're just missing some additional because we really don't have crowd control policies.

Amy Anderson:

As an individual, I think that statement really needs to be rewritten from a more like neutral perspective and not so much what I perceive as a negative perspective, because if you remember, right, the police did come up with a three digit plan to put on their helmets, which is huge, that was done in a very short period of time. And I think it's important to praise people for the good works they do in a terrible situation. We need more positive along with the things that are hiccuped, and we need to explain why they're hiccuped and not just so emotionally driven. That's just my take on it. I think it's too emotional and too political and doesn't reflect a settlement agreement.

Elliot Young:

Thank you, Amy. Any other PCCEP comment? Vadim.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

If I can just ask a follow-up question. I might've missed this and I apologize if I did, but is this just a statement or is this a recommendation to somebody?

Elliot Young:

I understood it as a statement that we had reviewed, not only we had reviewed the COCL report, but had held a town hall, got public feedback. And as a result of that public feedback We're providing to both the COCL and the city, our response official response as a body, if we agree on a response.

Vadim Mozyrsky:



Just, just to follow up real quick.

Elliot Young:

Is that how you understood it?

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Yeah. It's how I understood it also. And I agree with Amy is that it's very critical and doesn't point out some of the highlights of what has been doing right, or what has been done. Right. But also the report points out things that PCCEP has not been doing such as putting up our minutes and times, putting up our videos in time, and there's a few things in the report about not meeting our own goals. I think if we're here to critique PPB, we should also point and critique ourselves and what the COCL report says about us not meeting our internal goals. I think that would be even handed.

Ann:

I want to break in here just for a second. In my mind this is a statement on the COCL report and COCL report's findings. As Elliot said, it's that information and what we heard from the public, but I appreciate Vadim, your comments and Amy's.

Elliot Young:

Next.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

I appreciate your comment as well, but what I said was in the COCL report about PCCEP.

Elliot Young:

Sure. Next up we have Tom Kristoff.

Tom Christoff:

Hi. I just wanted to clarify one part of the statement. In the statement it says that our report, it says that someone in PPB decided that PPB offices did not need to provide AAR reports for the entire month of June. This is inaccurate. What PPP did was they temporarily halted their review and their audit of FDCRs and after actions for the month of June, but at no point did they relieve officers or supervisors from the responsibility to complete those reports. I just wanted to make sure that, that's clarified in the statement. Thank you.

Elliot Young:

Temporarily halted, boarding would be more accurate is what you're saying?

Tom Christoff:

No. Officers and supervisors still were required to complete the FDCR and the after actions. The after actions and FDCR are still went up and up the chain of command for the chain of command review.



What was halted for the month of June temporarily was the force inspector and the force inspectors analysts conducting the audit of those. But it, it doesn't have officers and supervisors were not required to complete those reports. So that normal process still happened to be the audit is what was temporarily halted so that they could complete the quarter three audits and they would return to the June ones. But that doesn't mean that force was not reported or not reviewed by supervisors.

Elliot Young:

I thought that the report indicated a concern that those after action reports were not being completed at the time. And that you were worried that to do them after the fact, maybe after several days or weeks would, would create a problem of memory. Is that not true? And do we have, do you have evidence, have you seen all those after action report?

Tom Christoff:

We were not provided those documents. We are anecdotally informed that some after actions early on in the protests were completed after the 72 hour timeframe, that's required by the settlement agreement, which does cause some concern for recall, but the statement in your statements is that PPB, halted reporting after actions for an entire month.

Elliot Young:

I understand that's an accurate, so if we say temporarily halted the forest inspector audits, that is accurate.

Tom Christoff:

Correct.

Elliot Young:

Okay.

Ann:

Reviews. Elliot, if I can just expand on that their reviews, there are certain reports that we are required to do on a quarterly basis. And we're all talking about PPB. I was the one as the head of that unit to make the decision that given the overwhelming number of FDCRs that were for the month of June. We normally have about 10 FDCs a week. We probably had 10 an hour. Initially at the beginning of whatever, it was an unprecedented, an overwhelming number of force reports during the beginning of the protests. And I only had three analysts and one force inspector to do all the same work, but on a huge increase in number. Rather than continuing I knew...

PART 4 OF 5 ENDS [02:20:04]

Ann:

Increase in number. So rather than continuing, I knew we were going to be late for the second quarter report, so rather than continuing with the second quarter report, which we were already going to be



dinged on for not being in compliance for the timeliness of the report, I made the executive decision to move to the third quarter, so that we could get back into compliance and then we would go back to June and finish those. And so, I fully anticipate that when our third quarter report is submitted on November 15th, that not only the third quarter will be done in a timely fashion, the reporting will be done.

Ann:

But we will also submit an amended second quarter force report which will contain the page that was missing in the second quarter regarding crowd control force. I would also remind everybody that all the rest of the force reporting was done in a timely fashion. So, all the day-to-day kind of force stuff was done as it always has been, and why we've been found in compliance previously, but because of the crowd control issue, those were the cases where we were overwhelmed and could not get. The force reporting was done but each sergeant has to review every force report within 72 hours.

Ann:

And there are a number of times at the beginning of the protests where that was not possible to be done, or it didn't get done because of the overwhelming number. And throughout this process, we have adjusted our system to try and deal with that. And so in the third quarter, we did a much better job, I do believe. By increasing some resources in certain areas. And so, when you see the third quarter report, you'll see more detail about the numbers of uses of force. It is not an audit. The audit for crowd control is only done annually, so that will come out in the spring, but there is a report, a review, an account, of the types of the use of force, as well as the types of force included in our quarterly report.

Elliot Young:

Thanks.

Ann:

So, I hope that clarifies the questions from just not now, but earlier I think Ann had a couple more.

Elliot Young:

Yeah. Yeah. Thanks for that Mary Claire. So I put in the chat the revised language additionally at PPB, officially temporarily halted the force inspector reviews for June, 2020. I think that gets to your language of review, not audit.

Ann:

Thank you.

Ann Campbell:

I also want to ask an additional question. I know that we heard in the meeting with the COCL that some of the data had not been shared with them. Is that on track to be given to them?

Ann:



Yes. It will be. It was not ready to be given to them at that time because we had to put it all together. I would love to share with you the owner's manual process this takes to attach. What happens if somebody writes a force report then a sergeant will review it and write an after action. And in crowd control there are also associated police reports.

Ann:

So the analyst has to go and find not only the force report, the after action, and all associated and pull them manually, pull all the associated police reports which could dozens out of a protest evening. And pull those all together. So it just was, as I said, a really overwhelming task initially because there was so much going on and we weren't frankly ready for such a thing. Nobody I think was. But we are now in the process of finishing that up and they will be asking us for a sample of our FTCs and the after actions. And we will provide those.

Elliot Young:

Thank you. Are there any comments from community public members about the statement? Portland Copwatch Dan you're muted I think.

Dan:

I'm double muted because I have a telephone. So this is Dan Handleman again from Portland Copwatch and I guess I'm going to try to address that last discussion first. Well, first of all, the police wouldn't be overwhelmed with writing these reports if they would use less force in the first place. And the fact that 500 after actions, or 500 forced data collection reports were written for one protest is very alarming. That's a lot of uses of force. And they said that there were over 100 for several other protests. So that means that there were thousands of uses of force over the last several months.

Dan:

And it was pointed out by the compliance officer themselves that the settlement agreement does not differentiate between force using a crowd situation, and forced use in a day-to-day routine police encounter. So the fact that they've been separating out the force at protests in the quarterly and annual reports is not consistent with that philosophy of the settlement agreement. And we've been pushing for them to be included in the other data. One other thing that is not mentioned in your summary, is that the PPB was supposed to provide you the PCCP with a draft of their annual report by June.

Dan:

Because in the past years they had either not done a report or started way too late. And as far as I know, you don't have a copy of that yet. There was some discussion somewhere they were going to try to get it done this month. But it's an annual report for last year and we're already almost at November of this year. But finally, and most importantly, I think the issue about funding that the compliance officer has made an issue out of giving more money to the police when many of the people were on the streets are calling for the police to be defunded. I think that the fact that he cherry-picked out of a paragraph in an article that said, this is how much money each Police Bureau or department spends on their police.



Dan:

He cherry picked out the percentage of Portland's budget, which includes the sewer bills that people pay. That's not true in every city, right? So most of the discretionary fund money goes to the Police Bureau here. And that's not reflected in that 4.4% figure. He should have instead looked at the figure that said that we are the 31st out of those 50 cities, third 31st highest in spending at \$245 million, and then perhaps done some more analyzing to see compared to the populations of other cities what that's like. And compared to, as you point out, to the crime rates in those other cities how does that compare.

Dan:

But the 4.4% figure, it may be accurate you say, but it's not the appropriate figure to be looking at. And it was a diversion, and he refused to back down on that. Even when several community members called him out on it during this town hall. And I find that very discouraging. The compliance officer does not live in Portland. He likes to say he used to be from Portland, but he kind of constantly pushes aside concerns from community members. And I think this is a very serious one that you should revisit and make more clear and emphatic that he should have used a different figure from that same article to say that we spend the 31st amount of any of those big 50 cities, not the 4.4%, the 49th out of 51.

Elliot Young:

Thank you, Dan. Other public comment, maybe Tom, do you want to clarify that or respond to anything that Dan said?

Tom Christoff:

Sure. I just put my clarification in the chat. Our report noted that we received one production that contained approximately 500 FDCRS in one after action. However, our report doesn't say that the single after action that we received was for all 500 at FDCRs. So I just wanted to respond to what Dan had said that there was 500 FDCRs under a single after action. That's not what our report says.

Elliot Young:

Okay.

Ann Campbell:

What about the budget piece that he brought up?

Tom Christoff:

That's a comment that we heard. We're presently putting together all the comments that we receive from all community members, and we'll provide responses to those. However, just in terms of a factual inaccuracy, I just wanted to clarify that. But absolutely we'll get a response to the budget comments that we heard. And as we do every quarter, we put together a spreadsheet with all the comments that we receive, we provide a response and we'll make revisions where appropriate.

Elliot Young:



Okay. Thank you, Tom. So it seems like we have no more comments. So I think we can move to a vote before we do-

Lakayana Drury:

Not a comment but Barb continues to say this houseless versus homeless piece. I don't know where it is in your document. I've been looking at it. I don't see it but-

Elliot Young:

Barb do you want to explain what you're referring to?

Lakayana Drury:

And while she's coming on, there was also a piece- [crosstalk 02:29:57]

Amy A:

You referred to quote the homeless. And it's not the homeless, it's people experiencing... Houselessness is preferred because you can be houseless and still have a home. Do you get what I'm saying?

Elliot Young:

Yup. I get-

Amy A:

Thank you.

Elliot Young:

... loud and clear. Thank you.

Amy A:

All right. That's one-

Lakayana Drury:

The other piece in here just really quickly and I've lost it now, but oh, here it is. So as of October 22nd, there's been no response on four recommendations. So according to Theo we got the recommendation responses on October 15th. So those we have had responses.

Elliot Young:

Well, when I looked at the matrix and we have not heard on the... The tear gas is not even on the matrix. I don't know Theo. I'm very confused about what we've received because the matrix does not have the information. And I have looked for this information. And so from my records, we have not received responses on four of them. We received a qualified immunity, but they're four others that are missing.



Theo Latta:

Well, as I said, the matrix isn't perfect. It's just a draft for right now. I sent out an email on the 15th to all the PCEEP members. We also posted on the website that the signed recommendations from June, there were five from June, and Mayor Wheeler signed those. So that was on the 15th.

Elliot Young:

Okay. So we do have now all of them?

Theo Latta:

We don't have the ones that were after July. But the July one was a statement and that one didn't need to be signed or anything like that. So we haven't exceeded the 60 day amount.

Elliot Young:

Okay. So we would need to change that we only received the response to the recommendation on October 15th. Okay. Thank you for that. Let's move on. So far in terms of a procedure changing the line that Tom and Mary Claire clarified changing the language around houselessness. But I think the first substantive amendment that was proposed by Vadim was to add that paragraph and Vadim I don't know if you want to put it in the chat the paragraph following the other paragraphs that we quoted from the COCL report. If you could put that in the chat. And then we could vote on whether people would like to amend the report.

Lakayana Drury:

Theo looks like he has a question.

Theo Latta:

Well it just looks like Tracy has a question [crosstalk 02:33:15] I just didn't want it to get lost.

Elliot Young:

Yeah.

Theo Latta:

Thanks.

Elliot Young:

Tracy.

Tracy Reeve:

Yeah, I just wanted to point out one thing from the language of the statement and I don't have the writing in front of me, but it said something about the responses from the mayor that hadn't been provided in 60 days. And it said something about, as is mandated under the PCEEP plan or something.



And the language of the PCEEP plan says that the mayor will endeavor to respond within 60 days. But I don't think it's mandated. And I just wanted to refer you to the language of the PCEEP plan. Thank you.

Theo Latta:

That's accurate.

Elliot Young:

So what would you say what does the language say we'll endeavor to respond?

Theo Latta:

Within 60 days.

Elliot Young:

Okay we'll endeavor. So sort of recommendation. So that could be changed to reflect that we received a response on October 15th beyond the suggested or recommended 60 day period would be more accurate representation of that statement. But let's first vote on the paragraph that Vadim is suggesting adding and it's in the chat there. And do you want to say anything more about that? I think everyone could read it and you've already kind of read it. But Vadim do you want to add anything more before we vote on that?

Vadim Mozyrsky:

I guess what I said earlier. It gives balance to the report. Thanks.

Elliot Young:

Okay. So let's go down the list.

Amy A:

Elliot what about amending that paragraph right at the beginning and taking it out? It's too political.

Elliot Young:

Well, if you want to make a proposal, you can make a proposal. But you have to be specific about what... You want to just eliminate the paragraph?

Amy A:

Yes.

Elliot Young:

Is that what you're saying? Okay. First-

Amy A:



[crosstalk 02:35:32]to be more balanced.

Elliot Young:

Okay. You want the first paragraph eliminated? Is that what you're saying?

Amy A:

The one where you started out in quotes. I don't have it in front of me, but it's the very first big paragraph.

Elliot Young:

That is a quote from the COCL report. You don't want the quote from the COCL report? Is that what you're saying?

Amy A:

I don't know what I'm saying. Let me find it.

Elliot Young:

Okay. Let's first deal with Vadim's amendment and then we could come to yours.

Amy A:

I'm hoping that's what it said.

Elliot Young:

So Lakayana this is a vote including Vadim's proposal to include that second paragraph from the COCL report. How do you vote?

Lakayana Drury:

I honestly don't think it adds that much to it. I want to say I abstain but I'll just vote no. I don't think it honestly adds that much to... Unless Vadim if there's something you can say. You just feel like it balances it out the report more? Is that what you're saying?

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Well obviously the report critiques PPB to a large extent for their failings. But I think this paragraph gives context to what happened. So earlier in the day we had Portland street response that was backlogged for five months just to hire two people because of COVID and all the other things that are going on in the city. And we're saying that after action reports are delayed by one month basically and it makes them fall off compliance, taken out of the context [crosstalk 02:37:12] it looks bad but that paragraph provide some context to what's what's going on and the things that PPB has been dealing with.

Vadim Mozyrsky:



The previous paragraph says that these are certainly applaudable things that are happening in the city, people standing up for free speech. But it leads directly to that second paragraph. If you're going to quote the first, I think you got to quote the second because that's basically what the COCL was laying out for some of the reasons that AAR reports and other things were not met in a timely fashion.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah-

Elliot Young:

The one thing... Go ahead.

Lakayana Drury:

I was going to say no. I think the first paragraph, because I think it was specifically looking at certain things. I think if people want the full context that they could read the report and since it's already in there. I feel like that's enough. It's just for this part I'll just say no.

Elliot Young:

Yolanda. Have I frozen?

Yolanda Salguero:

Oh no, I'm here.

Elliot Young:

Okay.

Yolanda Salguero:

Yeah. I'm having mixed feelings. Yeah, I think I'm going to abstain from the adding that part.

Elliot Young:

Okay Taji. Is Taji on the call?

Theo Latta:

I'm sorry Taji had to leave. It's a 9:30 his time, but he let me know that he would vote yes.

Elliot Young:

On the amendment?

Theo Latta:

No.



Elliot Young:

Okay.

Theo Latta:

Sorry he didn't vote on this.

Elliot Young:

Okay. So you can't vote on this? Amy. Amy?

Amy A:

Yeah. I'm here. I don't mind it going either way. So I'll vote yes.

Elliot Young:

Vadim I'm assuming yes.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Yes.

Elliot Young:

Ann?

Ann Campbell:

No.

Elliot Young:

Britton?

Britton Masback:

I have my reservations about it, but I'm going to say yes because I don't really... Like Amy I don't think it matters anyway.

Elliot Young:

Okay. And my feeling about that statement, I like the idea of providing the context, but the whole raising of the violence at the town hall, lots of members of the public questioned what that meant in terms of the protesters use of violence. And I know we've had lots of discussions about that. And so without it being specific, I think that it means a lot of different things to different people, including property destruction. So I'm going to vote no. And so that's one, two, three nos. One, two, three yeses, and one abstention. So I believe that it does not pass. Have I gotten everyone who is on the call? I think so. Okay. So next up, Amy, is there a specific proposal you would like to make for an amendment?



Amy A:

Yeah. I'm not equipped at this time. I don't the document in front of me. So I'm going to leave it alone.

Elliot Young:

Okay. So let's move to voting on the document as amended through our conversations in terms of what Tracy informed us about changing that language, changing the language to reflect what the COCL report said in terms of the reviews and also the language around houselessness. So we will vote on not the amended but the statement minus the paragraph Vadim suggested. So Lakayana?

Lakayana Drury:

I'm not crazy about the statement. I think that there's some work on it. But I think overall it's good. But in the future I think that there's just some things that need work on it, but I'll vote yes.

Elliot Young:

Yolanda?

Yolanda Salguero:

Yes.

Elliot Young:

Jeeva it's yes. Amy?

Amy A:

Can we see the finished copy before we finalize our vote? Isn't that typically what you do? I'm going to abstain until I see the final version.

Elliot Young:

Okay. I mean, I could get you the version, but it would take me five minutes of editing it to send you the whole thing. I mean, basically there's three changes. There was the change... Well, I said what the changes were. So if you want to abstain, that's fine. Vadim?

Vadim Mozyrsky:

As a statement currently stands is just a slanted attack on PPB. As I mentioned, they've had thousands of reports that they actually filed and none of that has been brought to light, or discussed, or upheld that they're actually doing their best to meet the requirements. And the one statement that provides any context was voted down for no good reason I can tell. So because that's just another attack on PPB by PCEEP, I don't know.

Elliot Young:

Britton?



Britton Masback:

Yes.

Elliot Young:

And I vote yes. So that's one, two, three.

Ann Campbell:

And I vote yes.

Elliot Young:

Oh, Ann I'm Sorry.

Ann Campbell:

I vote yes.

Elliot Young:

Okay. So that's one, two, three, four, five, six yeses, one abstention, and one no. So I believe that passes and I will work up those revisions and that we agreed to and send those out. So I'm going to pass it back to Lakayana for the final section.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah. In closing that just want to acknowledge the various opinions that were just shared and that can be somewhat challenging work on our committee. I actually am going to hold off on our recommendation. Originally when it was put on here we were going to present it. But it's still being worked out and we presented it at the racial equity subcommittee meeting. So we have some feedback on it already and want to continue to work on it.

Lakayana Drury:

Essentially it's a community policing recommendation that would have residency requirements and other training suggestions for new Portland police officers in an effort to integrate them better into the communities that they're going to serve and connecting them with members of that community so that they can learn the history. So that's all I have on that. I also do want to say that the PPB annual report is going to be coming out. It was originally going to be discussed today, but because it isn't out enough time for people to digest, it's going to be moved to the policy and settlements subcommittee meeting in November. When is that date of that meeting?

Vadim Mozyrsky:

It's going to be November 18th. It was supposed to be November 11th, but that's Veteran's day. So November 18th at 4:30 PM. One week after the typically scheduled time.

Lakayana Drury:



Okay, perfect. And then PCEEP's next.

Ann:

Lakayana can I just say that I sent that to the office and they're going to send it out to the members and post it on your website as well. So people will have good within three weeks to have a chance to review it and get us comments. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you. Yeah, it's really important on our half behalf too that the community has time to digest it. We will also go through it briefly at the meeting, but just want to try and honor that. So that's all we have for the meeting tonight. Appreciate folks being there. If there's any other final comments. I think it would be-

Elliot Young:

I would just like to ask Mary Claire is the annual report, has that been published yet?

Ann:

No, I provided PCEEP a draft. The settlement agreement requires that we give you a draft before we actually publish it on our website. So you will look at it first, and then after you have that opportunity to review it, then we will post it to our website.

Theo Latta:

Mary Claire will you double check? We haven't received that yet.

Ann:

Boy, I sent it. Okay. I will, because I hit the send button to you and Claudia or... I think it was a meeting with starting, sorry, but I will check it again because it's done and I'll get it from my phone myself. Yeah, I'll give it to you right now.

Elliot Young:

Okay. We have Portland Copwatch Dan, do you have a comment?

Dan:

Yes I do. Am I unmuted on the computer?

Elliot Young:

Yes.

Dan:



So our early in the meeting you talked about... Well, so the mayor did respond to some of your recommendations, kind of in a flurry around October 14th, shortly after compliance officer's report came out, pointing out that he had missed the deadline, the voluntary deadline-

Amy A:

Dan.

Dan:

In one of them, it says that, and you've mentioned this, that he asked you to please create a new committee to oversee the truth and reconciliation process. Now, the mayor has said from day one, this is your committee. You get to decide how you want to run it. And the fact that he's said it, it basically says, I'm ordering you to do this. So this is a new dynamic where the mayor's ordering you to do something. And I find that kind of discouraging, especially as you're going into this idea of becoming codified, where you're going to have more independence in theory. So I don't know what your response to that is, but I found it unusual.

Ann Campbell:

Thank you Dan. Vadim and I and others are going to be... We reached out to Nicole from the mayor's office that are asking for clarification regarding the formation of the truth and reconciliation. And we'll be sharing that information. We're hoping for a meeting this coming week, but thank you for bringing that up.

Lakayana Drury:

Theo has some info, he can add to that too.

Theo Latta:

Yeah, I believe in the PCEEP plan, it states that the mayor specifically can ask PCEEP to investigate things of interest, and this is certainly of interest.

Elliot Young:

Okay. So thank you. It sounds like we're going to follow up on that recommendations. And I think all the recommendations we'll have to end the responses look at because I've been turning to the matrix, which is apparently not updated and doesn't have the full information on it. So maybe we can, as per Vadim suggested that we need get our house in order and make the work that we do legible to ourselves as well as the community. Because it's a long time coming and that we've been asking for this and still the matrix does not reflect the work that we're doing.

Elliot Young:

So I'm a little bit frustrated by that. But thank you all for sitting through our very long meeting and working through some difficult issues. Even when we disagree, hopefully we could agree to disagree. And there are lots of the subcommittee meetings coming up. There's some kind of election happening in



a week I hear. That will have an impact on all of our lives. And hopefully we will be meeting under a happier sky when we next meet. Lakayana do you have any final thoughts?

Lakayana Drury:

Nope. Just want to thank PCEEP staff for their work on everything, the ASL interpreter for their time, all the other various folks that are related to this, PPB office for their staff for being on here late. Jared, City Attorney Tracy, everybody, just appreciate the community members too. Because you guys make this work, and check us, and hold us accountable. So I appreciate that.

Elliot Young:

All right. Take care you all.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Have a good evening everybody. Nice seeing you. Bye bye.

PART 5 OF 5 ENDS [02:52:30]