

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:02:09

All right, good evening, everyone. It's March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2026, this is a public meeting with the Portland Committee on Community Engaged Policing, Policy and Reform Subcommittee, and I will hand it to Tia and Kip to start us off.

[Tia Palafox] 18:02:28

Okay. Let's see here... my... For some reason, Kip, can you start? Because my screen is, like, miniature.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:02:39

Sure.

[Tia Palafox] 18:02:39

I need to... I need to expand real quick.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:02:41

No problem.

[Tia Palafox] 18:02:43

Thank you.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:02:45

Uh, my name's Kip Silverman, I use he-him pronouns. I have a bit...Bit of a cough tonight, so I'm gonna apologize in advance. I'm gonna try to mute before I cough out loud. Um, I am co-chair of Policy Reform Subcommittee, along with Tia.

Tia, would you like to take it?

[Tia Palafox] 18:03:03

Sure, I just expanded it. Uh, okay, thank you. My name is Tia Palafox, and I'll... Um, get everyone going here with the slides. Um, sorry, I can do it without the slides, but... And... do you want the slides back up, or no?

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:03:27

We're just doing intros, so if PCCEP members want to introduce themselves.

[Tia Palafox] 18:03:27

Okay, okay, sure, sure. My name is Tia Palafox, and I am the co-chair of the Policy and Reform Subcommittee of PCCEP. And thank you everyone for coming. Let's go ahead and get started with introductions. Oh, my pronouns are she, her. And Kip just went, Conrad, would you like to go next? Sorry.

[Conrad Hulen, PCCEP Co-Chair (He/Him)] 18:03:49

Oh, thanks, Tia. I'm Conrad Hulen, he, him pronouns. I'm currently serving as interim co-chair of the full committee and pass it over, bearing, uh, audio issues to Leslie.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:04:05

those fixed, um...

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:04:12

Oh, I think you muted, Leslie.

[Tia Palafox] 18:04:14

Yeah.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:04:18

I shouldn't be muted, I...

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:04:21

So, now you're... now you're here. You're here now.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:04:24

How about this?

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:04:24

you know, we can hear you.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:04:25

Yep.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:04:27

Okay, sounds good. Yeah, um, Leslie Martinez, pronouns she, her. And, uh, PCCEP member with the Policy and Reform Subcommittee. Um, thank you. I will pass it on to... Uh, Vanessa?

[Vanessa Perry (she/her)] 18:04:45

Thank you! I'm Vanessa Perry, she, her pronouns, I'm a PCCEP committee member. Fariya pass it to you.

[Fariya Vasquez-Potter] 18:04:54

Hi everyone, Fariya Vasquez-Potter, PCCEP member. Um, no subcommittee yet.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:05:02

Alright, I think that's everyone, and uh... now, city staff, feel free to jump in. Community members, um, please join us with introductions in the chat. My name's Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager.

[Liz Taylor, PCCEP Program Coordinator] 18:05:16

Hi everyone, Liz Taylor, PCCEP Program Coordinator.

[Judith Mowry, she/her, Office of Equity and Human Rights] 18:05:25

Hi, everybody. I'm Judith Mowery, I'm the Interim Director of the Office of Equity and Human Rights. And I appreciate that, uh, folks reached out to make sure I came to the meeting. Thanks.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:05:36

Thanks for being here.

[Kristopher Taft] 18:05:38

Uh, Kristopher Taft, he, him pronouns, uh, Mayor Wilson's office.

[Tia Palafox] 18:05:46

Thank you.

[Christopher Gryphon] 18:05:49

Chris Gryphon, Portland Police in the Chief's Office.

[Tia Palafox] 18:05:55

Thank you.

[Sgt. Butcher] 18:06:02

I'll go next. Hi, everybody. My name's Jennifer Butcher. I'm the Acting Lieutenant in the Behavioral Health Unit with the Portland Police Bureau.

[Tia Palafox] 18:06:11

Thank you.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:06:14

All right, I think we can... Oh. Maybe Captain Jackson? Saw him coming off mute.

All right, I think we can move on to the next slides. For now? And Tia, would you like to take it from here?

[Tia Palafox] 18:06:44

Sure. Um, our community agreements, like every meeting, are listened actively and respectfully. Share airtime, be present and open to new information and perspectives. Assume positive intent, respect each other, respect the group. Speak your own truth, communicate directly, honestly, and respectfully. Ask questions to clarify, call out bias, be okay with ambiguity. Thank you.

Uh, the overview of today's meeting are updates at 6:05, then we'll be talking about behavioral health drop-in centers and some other items along that line at 6:15. And these staff recommendation Tracker, And then the PPP directive on Deadly Force and In-Custody Death Reporting Procedures. Then, public comment.

Updates. Dori?

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:07:41

I can take the first couple updates, just more internal stuff. Um, I'll start with the one on the bottom. Which I already mentioned at the top of this, um, but we are trying to figure out this conflict, um, we do conflict this evening, and hopefully we... we'll be able to avoid that moving forward. Um, we're working on it. Uh, our community engagement coordinator, new PCCEP staff, starts tomorrow, which is very exciting. Uh, and then just a couple things on

the radar here. We have a member retreat coming up next Saturday, and PCCEP elections at the end of next month. Uh, and then I'll take the next slide as well.

[Tia Palafox] 18:08:22

Thank you.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:08:24

Uh, oh wait. Oh, yeah. I mean, I can cover this, because I think I'm the next one, too. So, yeah, just, um, keeping everyone updated that the PCCEP paragraphs, um, have officially been terminated from the settlement agreement.

[Tia Palafox] 18:08:28

Okay.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:08:38

Um, and as we discussed last meeting, the mayor's office has swiftly worked to um, put forth a number ordinance for the codification of PCCEP. In tandem with that action, um, we are hoping to get on the... evening council schedule for April, and um... yeah, we will keep everyone posted about those agendas, as they, uh...are released, um... Yeah. And then, next slide.

Okay, yeah, this one's the one I was looking for. So, uh, in PCCEP's last meeting, um, the committee adopted a recommendation to...hold, um, the community engagement... and a listening session around the PPA contract negotiation process. And so I just wanted to provide an update that the Bureau of Human Resources has agreed to co-host that with PCCEP. Um, it is currently scheduled for April 11th, which is another Saturday from 12 to 2.

Um, the... Uh, location they were originally working with is the port... was the Portland building. Um, we are looking into potentially more accessible venues, we will, um, update you uh, if we are able to move forward, um, with a different venue, uh, but yeah, so the news really is that, um, BHR does want to collaborate with PCCEP and committee members to co-host this event, so... Um, I scheduled some time for members to, uh, to talk about that on April 1st. And, um, you know, that might look like, uh, promotion shaping the

run of show for the event, and also PCCEP members supporting, um, the actual uh, like, how the events actually run. Um, so... so more to come on that, and... and discussions to be had around that. I just wanted to update you on that movement.

Um, any questions on anything I've shared?

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:10:48

Now, other than that's awesome, and thank you for working on that.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:10:54

Absolutely, yeah. Great development. Uh, anything else? Okay, I will hand it back to Tia for the rest of the updates.

[Tia Palafox] 18:11:08

Thank you. Um... Okay, on this...We're going to be having a meeting with the PPA president um... Schmautz.

[Tia Palafox] 18:11:20

What's his first name, Eric?

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:11:22

Aaron.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:11:22

Aaron.

[Tia Palafox] 18:11:23

Aaron, that's right. Um, to prepare for the listening session, that will be happening the next day. Sorry, I didn't have anything written for this. Um, just wanted to let you know that, um, PCCEP members will be meeting with PPA to get organized and hopefully build relationship. Thank you.

Um, the next update is... Um, mask restrictions for Law Enforcement. On March 6th, the Oregon... Oregon passed House Bill 4138. Um, part of the law enforcement visibility and account... Accountability Act. This will be restricting officers from wearing masks and requiring visible identification. This law applies broadly to local, state, and federal officers operating in Oregon. With limited exceptions, like undercover or medical use. Designed to increase transparency, prevent impersonation, and improve accountability during enforcement actions. The Portland City Council is advancing a local ordinance introduced by Councilor Sameer Kanal, as well, to ban masks for PPB, require visible badges and ID, includes language about allowing officers to verify identity, and intervene when others... Other LEOs cannot demonstrate legitimate law enforcement authority. And I have, LEO written somewhere, but I can't remember right now what LEO is.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:13:00

Law enforcement officer.

[Tia Palafox] 18:13:01

Thank you. Also, our, um, local Judge Simon has restricted tear gas use at federal agents, by... used by federal agents at protests outside the Portland ICE facility. This was in the news. Tear gas and other munitions can only be used when there is an imminent threat of physical harm. This ruling came after lawsuits, including from the ACLU of Oregon, alleging excessive force against peaceful protesters and journalists. The courts found evidence of indiscriminate use of tear gas on nonviolent crowds, including children and bystanders. Um, that's... okay, thank you.

Updates to PPB directive review process. Um, there's a new update for direct... the directives. This is going to remove the first universal review stat. Due to low participation, low public comment, and feedback has often been already known or duplicate of known issues. Um, and it'll expand the public comment period, so now... Um, it's going to be 60 days, and this was formerly the second universal review. This will give, um, more time for the public to give input before policies take effect. It'll create ongoing open engagement pathways. Public can submit policy change ideas. Now, anytime new formal process and

upcoming web form to come. Um, it will allow minor administrative updates without public review. Formatting, definitions, references, can be changed internally. Um, clarifies... structure and purpose of directives. It will be adding definitions and updates on languages and what directives do and don't do.

And I wanted to...um, say that the directive...this directive is the, um, 10.00. If you're keeping a track on the directives that are coming up for review.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:15:24

All right, I think those are all of the updates. Any questions or comments on anything that was shared in that section?

[Leslie Martinez] 18:15:41

I got nothing.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:15:42

Alrighty. Okay, yeah. Alright, Kip, go ahead and take...

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:15:48

Yeah, so, um... In our previous meeting, we had some, uh, conversations around, um, the severing of, uh, some of the articles on settlement agreement around, uh, mental health and mental health issues, specifically. Um, around the behavioral health drop-in centers clause in the settlement agreement. And, um, being able to help folks with, um, uh, in need and, uh, make it easier for... interactions with police and others to, uh, have a place to bring people who are in a mental health crisis. Um, as you can see in the bullets here, uh, Mental Health Alliance and other Amici had concerns about terminating those paragraphs. Um, they... I believe they are now officially terminated, is what I heard.

Uh, please, somebody correct me if I'm incorrect. Um, that, uh, the...Only current, uh, center that will accept people.

Although there was an argument about actual drop-ins is Unity, uh, and is that in, uh, meeting the need or not? Um, and, uh, that without more opportunities and places to... Uh, engage and bring people that this create... can create more issues and, uh... unintentional

or bad outcomes. Uh, so now that the, uh, agreement, or those paragraphs have been severed from the settlement agreement, we have, uh, a ongoing... conversation, uh, that was asked by, uh, those folks in the Amici. Um, to, A, talk about further, finding out if we want to pursue, as a committee, um, uh, a, um... gathering more information, which I think we do, um, and... see what potential outcomes can come from it on... a... what other opportunities or possibilities are there for drop-in centers, or 24-7 services being available?

And also, discussion of... I don't think this got updated from our previous meeting, but that's okay... discussion of not only we understand that the county has specific roles to play in mental health, and... Uh, the city often has frontline workers, uh, first responders, interacting with people in crisis, but what came out of the previous conversation was wanting to... understand better how is the city working with the county currently on solving some of these problems, and... what, uh, might be upcoming, or what more can we do to facilitate that.

Does anybody have any questions, clarifications? Did I summarize that well for the other folks that...had attended? Okay, I like the thumbs up, thank you. Yeah.

[Tia Palafox] 18:19:13

I'll just, um, add, I know in the last meeting, Chris... Christopher did mention that on the website, Unity Center of Behavioral Health is... does say that they... provide walk-ins. That says they are an impatient mental health treatment center that, um, allows walk-ins and drop-offs, except for youth who are 9 to 17 years old.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:19:41

Right, but I think there was pushback on that, and that's why we're... going this route. I'm sorry, I'm off-camera because I was finishing my dinner, but um... Yeah, um, yeah, so I think there was pushback on that, and then it sounds like even Unity's own CEO has, like, also said that they don't um, that they're not, like, a walk-in... center as dictated by the settlement agreement. So I think that's what we're trying to do, and I... Barb put a question in the... chat about, like, why didn't we invite... Unity folks, I think right now we're in the stage um, of where we're just kind of exploring those recommendations, but I think...in the future, should this move forward, we definitely will.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:20:26

Yeah. And the purpose of this conversation is to have a conversation about what questions does PCCEP have? What questions do, uh... Our guests that have joined tonight are our community. And, uh, try to learn more about... where things are at, so that we can make a decision whether we should continue pursuing this, uh, based on the request from the Amici, uh, to... have a piece of keep looking into it. So, from that perspective, um...uh... trying to frame it through the framing... points that have been put here. Um, from a priority level, how do we feel, uh, this... the urgency on working on this?

Um, I'll answer that question first myself. Um, the entire settlement agreement was predicated primarily on, uh, the, uh, the not-great outcomes between interactions between PPB and people who were in mental health and other forms of crisis. Uh, so I feel when I join PCCEP that this was a core aspect of what I wanted to be working on is to, uh, work on public safety in general, and... Helping the city, PPB, and others improve those outcomes. Do we have other thoughts from community members on... uh... from a topic standpoint, uh, urgency or priority.

I see Conrad's hand up.

[Conrad Hulen, PCCEP Co-Chair (He/Him)] 18:22:27

Yeah, I mean, I think this poses an interesting, um, situation about where PCCEP fits in the conversation, because we report to the city, and as we've established, a lot of the mental health services are under the jurisdiction of the county and the state. But I do think it is... um, warranted that we... at least encourage, recommend, and push that the city should be um, partnering with their peers at the county level, and, um, at the state level, um, because the city can't do it alone, and short of us having a unified city and county, I didn't say that, um, you know, we need to actually work on solutions... uh, for those in mental health crises. So it is something that's very important. I think it's important to stay grounded that may be within our scope, we can only do so much. But we should do something, um, depending on how other committee members feel.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:23:30

No, I appreciate that. Anyone else have thoughts?

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:23:41

Barbara, why don't you go ahead?

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:23:44

Oh, Barbara, sorry, I didn't see your hand up.

[Barbara Bochinski] 18:23:47

Portland Copwatch feels that, um, this is very important. It's like the whole point of the settlement agreement, almost, or a big part of it, so, getting rid of the drop-in centers, um, well, like, and uh... maybe Unity Center says in their website that they do some, but they sent a, um, letter definitely saying that they are not a drop-in, walk-in drop-off center. Which they... I believe, is different because Unity Center has Psychiatrists and other... um, trained psychiatric personnel. And a drop-in center would be more low-key and have peer counseling. Maybe Barb knows about this, I'll leave that part for her. And, um, which more people would be willing to go to, and they wouldn't have to wait till they're totally in a crisis, and they kind of get the... try to get things calmed down. Um, and so... So anyway, the whole point of the settlement agreement is... or the big part of it is, um...law enforcement not having to deal with people in mental health crises, because they're not... therapists, or psychologists, or social workers.

[Tia Palafox] 18:25:00

Right.

[Barbara Bochinski] 18:25:00

Thank you.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:25:07

Go ahead, Barb

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:25:07

Yeah, Barb, go ahead.

Barb, you're on mute if you are talking.

[Afrita Davis] 18:25:31

There we go.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:25:32

Yes.

[Afrita Davis] 18:25:32

Yes, we hear you now.

[Barb.] 18:25:33

Not... not because I can't hear you today. Flipping between two things. Okay, sorry about that. First of all, I'm curious, and I, of course, I should have looked it up, what is the definition of a drop-in center? That, as in what they're looking for from the settlement agreement, that's... that's sort of my first comment.

And, um... Unity, I think you guys... I'm not sure how much you...experience, anybody here has with Unity, or is willing to share? Um, but they're the number one place that they do take people in crisis. Um, and they get to hang out in...uh, basically, like, dental chairs... bunch of chairs kind of lined up in the same place, and then if it's longer term than, like, 48 hours-ish, I can't remember the rules. They do have... Um...slightly longer-term psychiatric beds.

Um, so I implore you guys to figure out before pushing for something that we clearly don't have in the city. Um, and we're working really, really hard at the... on the county level to bring the... Pathway Center online as much as possible. Um, and that will have sobering... and to be honest, there's a bunch of politics around what else it may or may not have as far as psychiatric help. There's at least one... County Commissioner, that is...strongly pushing toward that. But I will say that... the last budget cycle... there was an ask of the city to put money into... The Pathway Center. And the city chose not to do it at that point. So, I know that has soured some of the relations between the two groups,

Um, around that. And then the last thing I just want to say is, one of the things that's important... um, to realize is that... the county is the local mental health authority, and they

hold the power... to... let their...their clinicians, do holds on people. Like, the city doesn't have that power at all. But the county is the one that...puts that there has it. And so that's why Project Respond can write holds, and... Portland Street Response can't if anybody was wondering.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:28:33

Right.

[Barb.] 18:28:33

I think I'm done for now. Thank you for letting me talk. I hope I helped somebody somewhere

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:28:37

Yeah, no, thank you for that. Real, real quick, uh, Sergeant Butcher, um...under React? Uh, if you see React at the bottom of your Zoom screen, you should be able to click that, and that'll give you the opportunity to raise your hand. I just wanted to be able to answer it. I can't type right now because my cat is sleeping on my keyboard. Um, but, um, also, along with that, uh, yeah, let's hear from Sergeant Butcher first, and then... Uh, we could address a couple of questions that Barb had, or... clarifications. There are comments in the chat with what the

[Sgt. Butcher] 18:29:18

Yeah, and sorry, I'm really not really familiar with, um, the technology, so I apologize for that. It might seem pretty simple for some, but it's complicated for me. Um, however, I just wanted to add a little bit, you know, there has been some pre-questions answered, if you will, just so I was a little more prepared for today's meeting. Um, but we have not had that experience, nor have we had that feedback as far as pertaining to Unity and it not being a drop-in center. That is really, um, new information to me, and now I can... it gives me an opportunity that I can circle back around, um, and, uh, speak to maybe Melissa Eckstein and, um, you know, other people within Unity, and maybe get a little more clarification on... Your website says this, however, it doesn't seem to be the perception of everybody that, um, folks can walk in. Um, I also wanted to make note of the urgent Walk-In Center, um, off

of, um, 42nd Division, run by Cascadia. I don't know if anybody has had any experience with that location. I know over this last year, um, they've had, unfortunately, some... some budget cuts that have restricted their hours a little bit. Um, however, that is something I know our patrol officers do use, and it is... what I think most people think of as a drop-in center, like, here's an officer who has a contact with somebody, um, not holdable, but needs, you know, needs some assistance, needs a connection, and they are able to take them there. But like I said, it is kind of limited as far as their availability, but... Um, I will make note of... of the Unity question, and hopefully be able to at least provide an email back to somebody as far as um, you know, maybe some additional clarification.

So, that's all I had to add to that.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:31:02

No, thank you. I don't know that in previous conversations, because this has come up multiple times. Over, what, the two and a half years that I've been here on PCCEP, that um, this is a ongoing challenge, and I don't think anybody...has actually mentioned, uh... that Cascadia had a drop-in center on division. So that's news to me.

[Sgt. Butcher] 18:31:26

Okay.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:31:27

Uh, but, um, also, like, uh, Kat mentioned and you mentioned, that... hours are... have been shortened, so... I think that goes back to, um, one of the main... challenges is that the city and the county both own part of this, um, obviously, and, um, there's always going to be some crossover. It's not so...simple, uh, just like housing isn't simple. And, uh, as Conrad suggested, short of having a single government that can do all the things, theoretically. Um, are there, uh, and, and, and...Kristopher, maybe you might have some input on this. Are there efforts... Um, to... bridge those, uh, conversations between the city and county, to address some of these things, um, I... I'll make one more comment, and then I'll hit, or I'll let folks that have knowledge try to answer, but I did reach out to some folks on the community and public safety committee, about, uh, the... holistic, uh, public safety plan coming out. And there weren't a lot, if any, specific areas around addressing mental health needs. And, uh, once again, like I said previously, this is something, whether we're the city's

directly responsible for or not, has a major role to play in it, because... our first responders are... the first responders. So if anybody has any input answers, or...ideas on what is currently happening... uh, I'd love to hear it. Um... And if there aren't any uh, cogent...uh, things going forward, I think that will help inform our potential opportunities to work on this.

[Sgt. Butcher] 18:33:49

Kip, can I just go ahead and... I'll just go ahead and speak. Um, you know, I can't say for certain what conversations are being had or aren't being had, um, but I do agree with you that this is... um, even though it's, you know, certain paragraphs are removed from the settlement agreement, it doesn't necessarily mean that you know, all of... all of this has been, I want to say, fixed, if you will, right? We still have a population of people out there that are still not getting the services they need. Now, I think primarily, you know, some of those services, or a lot of them, do end up in the county, but I agree with you. I think the city, we, as the first responders who are going, um, you know, we have to still search for answers. We still have to search for solutions, um, and not give up until we find those solutions. I can't say we're in control of them, but I think as long as we are invited to the table, and we continue to show up and share our voices, and bring to light that, you know, there's still a tremendous amount of work to be done to help our community, um, that we don't let that, you know, we don't let that fall off the table, if you will.

Um, so I know, you know, Captain Jackson, and then, you know, uh... Chris Gryphon will do their part to at least take it back to the people that need to hear it as well. But then, in the circles that I travel, in the behavioral health world, um, we will continue to search for, you know, other options, and how do we, you know, connect those gaps, if you will? Because it's obvious if, you know, Cascadia, because they are county, like, if they're, you know... They're facing budget crisis, as well as the city, right, and cutbacks and whatnot, like, somebody still has to fill those gaps, you know, and those conversations still need to continue. I know that's really not a great answer, but... I guess for me, it's like, I am committed to continue those conversations, um, because there's still a need, and it's... it is, you know, far from being, I guess, um, you know, remedied, if you will. Um, so... That's what I have to offer.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:35:41

No, I really appreciate that. Thank you, and I think just...Just the acknowledgement that there's more work to be done is an important thing. Sergeant Schmautz had said, maybe a year and a half, maybe two years... Two and a half years ago, I can't recall, I think it was

November, uh, 2023, possibly... uh, 24... I'm not sure, sorry. Uh, but that when, uh, when, uh, an officer is engaging with someone who is in a mental health crisis, or any kind of crisis, the nexus of options are basically uh, in the realm of law enforcement, right? Are they breaking the law? Are they... listening to, uh, compliance commands and stuff like that. And that that can tend to create situations that, uh, that police officers are not prepared for. It's really critical we do address that.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:36:44

I'm just gonna jump in to kind of, um... wrap us up with this conversation, but I want to pose a question, which is, um... If we were to talk about this again, what questions do members or anybody have? Um, and who... Would you want to potentially talk to, um... Yeah.

[Fariya Vasquez-Potter] 18:37:20

I can jump in. Um... Oh, sorry, Leslie, didn't see your hand. Um... I just have questions on is you know, is Unity able... to take... to continue this process of... of... what is happening now, the current status? And, um, I guess more... uh... input from the county and the city to have those conversations. I know that there are things in progress, it looks like, um, in the community, and... I think just holding space for the city and the county to... just update us on, you know, what are the long-term goals? How soon can we reach a place where we want to be, and... In the meantime, is... is, uh, depending on Unity, to fill those gaps a strain to them. Um... and their perception of... of... how it's going.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:38:28

That's great. Uh, Leslie, did you want to add anything?

[Leslie Martinez] 18:38:32

No, it was just the same question around Unity, because, like, that's the one missing component we haven't spoken. Um, where it's like, you know, we've heard that they, you know, the websites as they are, but folks are not experiencing them that way, so I think, like, a clear answer there um, would be good

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:38:49

Okay. So what I'm hearing is, um, clarity about Unity's status, comments they've made versus their website and how they are actually functioning. Um... and then, just more transparency about how the city and county are working together on these issues, and... their assessment of how things are going, um, is... broadly what I heard there.

Um, Kip, do you want to add to that?

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:39:18

Yeah, no, you... you, uh... hit, uh, or you nailed what, uh, the primary thing I wanted to mention, uh, but also... Yeah, what are the opportunities for intergovernmental work to, uh, to address some of these issues? Um, if one... if one government agency doesn't have funding, for certain thing, but another might, or they can combine and work with the state. I really feel like there's a lot of opportunities that don't seem to be being pursued, and I'd like to understand if... if there's... maybe we need an intergovernmental committee to work on it a PCCEP for mental health or something, I'm not sure. But yeah, I'd love to be able to talk with folks that are in that realm of the policy space to find out what could be happening.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:40:14

Cool. Um, alright, I think those are some good... next steps as far as, um, how this might surface in the future. Uh, I think we'll... we can wrap up this discussion, but um...

Yeah. Get the slides, please.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:40:29

Right on. Thanks, everybody.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:40:38

Okay, and I think we have Leslie up next, if you want to, um, just kind of jump into this, Leslie. I put a summary here, yeah.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:40:46

Yeah, yeah, I can do that. Yeah, for sure. Um, so we are... trying to put our recommendations into a dashboard that will be an interactive, like, searchable thing, um, because right now, all of our recommendations, like, you can go back and see them, because they're hosted on the websites on the webpage, but there's... it's just a long list. There's really no organization to it. Uh, so the dashboard is meant to be a little bit of a, you know, give folks a better, better visibility into PCCEP's recommendations um, and impact.

Uh, so that's where we're at right now. Um, and so the goal with that, um, as it says here, is, like, we are going to be able to evaluate, kind of, where our recommendations um, our recommendation process. It might even give us insight into, like, recommendation topics that we're... tackling a lot versus not, um, things like that, that we can't see right now. Um, so our first step is to basically get all of our recommendations that we have, into a spreadsheet. Um... and then, uh... I am going to share that and walk folks through... what that looks like. So this will be a little bit of a working session. I think I have the permission to share.

I do not have the permission to share. Uh, so I'm sending a request.

Okay. Should be good now.

Okay, so here is the recommendation tracker as it currently stands. Um, can everybody see this spreadsheet okay?

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:42:35

Yes.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:42:36

Okay, so on the first column, you'll see this is a recommendation name. I'll just walk you through the columns real quick, the date that it was approved by PCCEP, the permanent link to the recommendation as it is in the PCCEP web landing page. When it was adopted, um... the responses, like, who responded, um, and then there's a link to that response as well. Um, so this is, like, very standard stuff. The info... the data that we're populating right now... Um, is whether it was adopted or how it was adopted. And then who the recommendation was made to. Um, through a simple formula, it was, uh, it, we show here how long it took to respond to that recommendation, and that's important because, as we know, um, the commitment is to respond within 60 days. And then we get into the fields that need to be populated. Um, and this is where we're not gonna do that in this meeting,

but where I'm... hoping to get some volunteers to help us flesh these out. And it's not a long list of... recommendations. I think it's, like, 27 or so uh, recommendations that we need to populate, but the idea would be, um, that we... populate the implementation, which means, like, what were the direct actions based on the recommendation that the mayor or the recommend... like, whoever we made the recommendation to, took based on the... recommendation. And then, uh, we also want to populate and make... and make sure that we track these recommendations. Um... in reference to, like, what kind of recommendation they were, and there could be multiple types of recommendations, but these were pulled from the PCCEP plans, um, which, you know, so those are categories for the type of recommendation in order to give us some organization is the Constitutional policing piece, the youth support piece, the interactions with people experiencing behavioral health crises, and then racial justice. Um, so that's where we pulled those recommendation categories, and then affinity groups engaged is another... um, column, and that'll be, like, the communities that we spoke to in order to create that recommendation. And the idea there is that it will give us the opportunity to see communities that we're engaging with on a regular basis versus not. Uh, you know, show us maybe some... areas of opportunity there.

Um, the current status would be eventually a drop-down, and kind of with the idea there is that we would we're still figuring out exactly what the labeling system would be, but it would be a simple drop-down where we um, label the recommendation as, like, right now, for example, would be on track, not on track, and complete. We're still figuring out exactly what that status is, we're going to align it with what the city is going to use uh, for their own kind of tracker that they're working on. And then any updates, this will be a narrative field where we will... Um, you know, kind of type in from time to time, uh, potentially what, uh, like, the... most recent outcomes of the recommendation. As we know, sometimes, like, um, I think one example would be the, uh, contact survey, right? That has been a long process, and so every once in a while, we would go in here and update where it stands now, uh, to give the community an idea of, like, the progress that it's made there.

So those are... that's kind of, in a nutshell, the columns. And then, to give you all an idea, just visually, of what this will... it potentially feed into, I mean, it's definitely in the early stages. I wanted to share a very rough draft, like, please don't judge me, this is... partially, uh... hand-drawn, partially computer. But I wanted to show you all... like, our draft... dashboard. So you can see how all of these pieces fit into that. One moment. Okay.

Okay, so this... oops. It went away. One second. Okay, there we go.

So this is, again, a very, very rough outline of the... of the potential dashboard. As you can see across the top here, we have our filters. So, our recommendation body, which is typically two, it's either the police chief or the mayor. Sometimes it could be the council, so

it could be three. Um, but that way, it would filter and affect all of these um, different data segments. Another filter could be year, so we can filter recommendations by the year they were recommended and see if there were more recommendations one year versus another. And then the current status, uh, that could be important, and that's why it's a drop-down. So we know, like, how many recommendations are on track. I foresee people using this as, like, probably filtering down to the recommendations that are in progress or not on track or something like that, so that they can see um, so they can dive into those a little bit more and drill down. Um, one... For example, is this, like, approval timing that we could take a look at and see across the x-axis, we have, like, the request recommendation type. Um... And it would be, like, the time to response, uh, would be in days, so that we could see if certain recommendation types took longer to respond than others. That could give us some insight. Um... into that, um... This one here would be the request count. So again, the request type being, like, being those, um, categories from the PCCEP plan, and letting us know if we're... Yeah, and letting us know how many... recommendations for that specific request type we are making so that we know if we're making a lot in a certain area versus not. In other areas of the... of the, um, of the communities we're supp... or the... categories, I guess, that we're supposed to serve. And then affinity groups, one idea is to have it be in, like, a pie chart um, so that we can see how often we're consulting specific, like, certain affinity groups, and see... if we're, you know, consulting some more than others, and what we're missing, and stuff like that.

Um, and then...This would all be just, you know, filters and drill downs and stuff like that, but where we would really end up being like, where I think a lot of people would go is, like, once they drill down to, like, the specific saying that they're looking for, they could... they would get a table of recommendations that fulfill those, like, categories that would link them to the specific recommendation, uh, like, language, so that then they could... explore that themselves and read more, um, through the permanent link of the recommendation.

Um, so... In a nutshell, again, this is all, like, very early stages, like, maybe some of this is not super important, um, and we can definitely pivot. But that would be the idea of how the spreadsheet would fit a feed this type of dashboard. Um, and yeah, going back to the spreadsheet... We have a majority of what we need, but we do need, uh, folks...hope is to get a few volunteers to help read some past recommendations. For the future recommendations, I think we could... be building them out with these... fields in mind, and this data that we're... looking to collect in mind, but... In the absence of that, for the past recommendations, we do need some folks to help us, um... you know, populate these areas. Um, but yeah, that's kind of where it stands, and I'm...very, like, open to feedback from folks and want to hear, like, what you all think so far. Anything that we're... missing that

you think is... would be super important, would love to discuss and see if... it makes sense to add and... whatnot.

[Tia Palafox] 18:51:16

I just had a question on the numbers on the, um... well, I have two questions. On the time... time to respond, those days... is that how many days it took to get a response?

[Leslie Martinez] 18:51:28

Yeah.

[Tia Palafox] 18:51:29

Okay, thank you. And when we do a... when we write a recommendation, does the mayor and the chief both have 30 days to reapply, or 60? Or is that taken into account here?

[Leslie Martinez] 18:51:45

No, this is just the time to... that it took to respond.

[Tia Palafox] 18:51:49

Okay. When we don't get a response, is there... Um, is that implementation... Well, we'll, um, can you continue to ask for... and I'm sorry. I'm just wondering what we do when they don't respond, or when... It's not implemented. Do we just let the recommendation be, or do we keep working on it?

[Leslie Martinez] 18:52:17

Well, I think that's... the... so, like, when they don't respond, I... maybe that's what these mean, because there are some fields that we don't have days for. Um, but I think, like, I mean, this is, again, like, from the point that we submit the recommendation to when they respond um, to us. I don't know that we've had that issue, Dori?

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:52:41

Yeah, I don't... even the missing ones, I... it would be impossible for me to know. If... because record keeping prior to 2022 is really pretty bad, so it would be impossible to know if those two actually didn't get responded to. I kind of... I... I'm not sure. Um, or if they're just lost.

[Tia Palafox] 18:53:00

Okay.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:53:03

Um, but Tia, I don't think... I mean, I guess... This tracker would be a way to document if something isn't responded to, but that is...

[Leslie Martinez] 18:53:09

Yeah.

[Tia Palafox] 18:53:10

Yeah.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:53:12

you know, a requirement, and... generally, in the last... you know, 5 years or so has not been a problem. Yeah, implementation is sort of a whole other question, which I think is really a huge, um, asset of this... tracker, um, is really, yeah, one of the great things about this idea.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:53:33

Mm-hmm.

[Tia Palafox] 18:53:35

Thank you.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:53:38

Uh, Kip?

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:53:40

Yeah, first of all, this is awesome. Uh, you... this is... everything I could have wished and hoped for for the last couple years, so great job. Um, uh, be happy to help with whatever I can on it.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:53:52

Thanks.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:53:58

I did have some, uh... I like how you broke down the different categories, uh, and the green there. I think that is, like, a really phenomenal...

[Leslie Martinez] 18:54:05

Mm-hmm.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:54:10

Um, addition to the previous incarnation? I don't think I saw it previously. Uh, but yeah, I am really curious on... Maybe creating some... process around how we... evaluate the implementation, um, and uh... I think the only thing that... would... that's missing that I think could be subjective is efficacy. Uh, like, uh, what, what we recommend. Um, uh, if it is accepted and implemented. Are we seeing the results that we had hoped to see from it? Um, over time while it's in... when it's in place. And that would maybe be a next phase of doing this, because I think we'd have to figure out how do we evaluate that in a consistent manner.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:55:11

Mm-hmm.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:55:12

But, uh, this is phenomenal, and... I think you should get the very first PCCEP, uh, data gold star.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:55:23

Thanks, Kip. That's very kind.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:55:24

You're welcome.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:55:26

Um, yeah, I think one of the challenges I think you're nailing it on the head, is around the efficacy piece. I feel like the... The couple of pieces that are a little bit... subjective, uh, are hard. Like... Implementation, I think we have a pretty good idea because these are, like, the direct actions taken, like, so we'll know. Um, when it comes to, like, update and current status, that is a little bit of a concern for us, and how to, like. How do we say, like, it's on track or not, or, you know, um... Or if we hear about something. Can we directly tie it but... and it kind of sounds like a direct... like a recommendation that we send out, like, can we... reasonably attribute it to that recommendation, so there are... still a few questions there.

Um,

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:56:25

I think it... go ahead, sorry.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:56:25

There's also... mhm. Oh, no, I was just gonna say that there's also a challenge around, like, how do we keep this updated. I think Dori and Liz, um, brought you know, obviously, uh, will be the... Members will fall off and on, but, like, Dori and Liz would be the folks staying on, but even they, like, you know, would they... be able to continuously update this, you know, like, there's a... there's a bandwidth like, um... thing there, because especially as recommendations grow, then the scale of updates is going to grow, because you're not just updating the handful of recommendations, you're also... Uh, so we... so I think that's... in addition to, like, the efficacy, that's one of the things we need to figure out as well, like a process, like, at what point do we... you know, do we go, like, a year, and then that's the last update?

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:57:29

Right. No, no, I appreciate that, because, like, the one that came to mind would be, like, Normandale. Right? Normandale has a specific outcome, but also had some general... on, uh, updates on communication when an event happens. So, anyway...

[Leslie Martinez] 18:57:44

Right.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:57:44

Yeah, one... one thing, Leslie, uh, and Liz and I discussed, so I think moving forward, Leslie alluded to this, PCCEP could do something with the recommendations, like, add something that says, like, implementation- like, successful implementation would look like X. Um, and create, like, build some of these metrics into the actual writing of the recommendations.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 18:58:04

Hmm... Mmm.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:58:10

Um, because it does need to be... because they're all so different, um. Yeah, it's gonna be a challenge. Um, I do think it will be a lot harder for the, the... past recommendations, maybe some of them would be attainable, um, or, you know, we could figure out implementation. I don't know about others, to be quite honest with you. Um, but opportunities to kind of... bake this into the process moving forward.

Kristopher, I saw your hand up, maybe it's just what you put in the chat. Um... I don't know if you wanted to speak on that?

[Kristopher Taft] 18:58:54

Yeah, that was all... I just wanted to say about the 60 days. And then new codification

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:58:59

Cool, thank you, yeah. Any other, um, comments or questions about Leslie's project from PCCEP, or community?

[Leslie Martinez] 18:59:20

both... and volunteers to come.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:59:21

Yes.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:59:22

Help fill out the data?

[Tia Palafox] 18:59:25

Right.

[Leslie Martinez] 18:59:28

Honestly, I feel like if we could take... if we... among the PCCEP, current bodies, if we each could take two recommendations, and just help flesh out. Um, that would, like... hopefully not be too much of a lift, and we could, uh, crank this out pretty quickly. Uh, but yeah, uh...

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 18:59:54

Yeah, so... So, Kip volunteered, and I think maybe now that other folks are more aware of, um, the project, we can connect about it via email, too. Seeing some more ideas about it in the chat as well. And I also saw that...

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:00:10

I think we should draw names out of the hat at the retreat.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:00:15

I also saw that Barb, um, volunteered to help, and I do think that's something you could... I mean, that's something you, um... could decide, as a committee as well, um, if you'd like to engage community in supporting the actual work, um, I think that that would be completely fine.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:00:33

Cool.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:00:34

Um, that's the decision that you all can make.

[Leslie Martinez] 19:00:34

Yeah. No, I like... I love that. Um, I don't see... I mean, this is all public, so I don't see any... reason to gatekeep. Uh, Barb, I will be reaching out to you.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:00:50

Great. Anything else on this?

[Leslie Martinez] 19:01:00

Comments from the community? Cool. I will stop sharing. Thank you, everyone.

[Tia Palafox] 19:01:12

Thank you.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:01:13

Thank you, Leslie. Really appreciate your work on that.

All right, and we just have one more item for this evening.

Jumping into another directive that is, um, up for review. Uh, Kip, do you want to introduce this, and... in tandem with Tia.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:01:34

Yeah, um, so, uh, this is, uh, a... directive that is in Second Universal Review. Um, it is...

Can you go back a slide? Because I don't remember the full name off the top of my head. It is a directive around deadly force and in-custody death reporting and investigation procedures.

Uh, okay, you can move forward now, thank you. Uh, and the reason, um... We brought this forward as an agenda item was that it was... First of all, uh, the reporting and investigation aspects directly pertain to what PCCEP does, um... And like many, uh... directives, they are... complicated and kind of dense, and the changes that were... recommended or recommended redlined in the Second Universal Review. Um, we had a lot of questions about um, what the intent was. Uh, why certain things were struck, why things were rephrased, and, uh, there was a meeting with, um, uh... I'm sorry, I'm drawing a blank, it's been a long day.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:02:57

I think Ashley Lancaster?

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:02:58

Lancaster, thank you so much, Chris. Uh, to discuss and go through some of it, and there were... some notes that were taken, uh, that this slide speaks to, um, and just some clarification. Uh, that this is not about using deadly force, it's about the reporting and investigation aspects of it. So, want to be... very, very clear of that. Um... that, uh, the primary changes that they made were for clarification and cleaning up, which is what many of the directive... changes are focused on, uh, making things clearer to the PPB members that have to, uh, execute against these.

Um, and also there were some policy clarifications. One that jumped out to me was the objectively reasonable and constitutional force standard. Why the... in the definition was being struck, but hadn't been, uh, referred to in the actual ordinance itself, and... Uh, that was a clarification that it didn't need to be in there. Um, and then, uh, this was really interesting, because this was unclear to me as well, uh, that the... there's a difference between an involved member... Meaning, uh, an officer that had used or contributed to... use of deadly force, um, or witness member who was there but did not contribute to it. Um, so... there are a lot of different, um, I would say, uh, perfunctory clarifications and changes that were made in the text of it.

Um, can we move to the next slide?

Um, so, some of the... updates in it, um, and again, we brought this up because... these are complicated, we are generally not subject matter experts on it. And, um, that, uh, the... Um, uh, being able to have clarity around all of this helps us do our jobs better. So, I just want to frame that. That is also... uh, how we framed it when, uh... Dori did her, uh, coordination meeting. Um, but, uh, there were some investigation process updates that were substantial, I think. Um... the 48-hour rule affirmed, uh... some training and oversight changes, which I think could be spoken to as well. It'd be great to understand more about those. And then, uh, the administrative updates, which we're referencing, as you can see, uh, body-worm cam... cameras and other terminologies, and how that may impact, uh, the investigation and reporting process. So, that is kind of like the high-level overview of what we wanted to discuss tonight.

Um, I think I'll start by asking PCCEP members if there's any, um... any questions around this the discussion part of, or the framing of the discussion, as opposed to, specifically to the directive.

And yes, Tia, as always, we want to bring these important things forward, and get input from the community, because that is why we are here.

So, um... And if not, if I... I do have a couple questions I'd like to pose if... It's okay if I go first. Can we bring the...second to last slide back up... If you don't mind, Liz, thank you.

So, um, one of the questions I have around the... investigation process updates that there was a... uh, change of the order of the statement process of, uh, talking to, uh, witness members first, before... uh, involved members made statements. Um, and I understand the aims to limit premature statements uh, made, and then that 48-hour rule are kind of combined in the questions that I have, but... I'm curious about, um... the, uh, internal affairs staff that are available to do these interviews, and if there's a potent... if there's a specific reason for doing it as a cadence, rather than, um... to have a handful of investigators take the statements within... Uh, as right after an incident happens.

I'm not sure I fully understand the 48-hour waiting, and I know that's been a... point of contention in previous meetings also, but... uh, on the first point, um, is there a reason that there aren't enough, uh, investigators to take reports at the same time, theoretically at the same time? Does that make sense, that question?

[David Jackson] 19:08:31

Jackson, um, currently the captain at, uh, training, but I actually worked as the lieutenant at Internal Affairs before this assignment, so I can answer it a little bit for you. Um, I can tell you there's two internal affairs investigators...

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:08:39

Thank you. Okay.

[David Jackson] 19:08:43

...that are, uh, on call. Now, part of the benefit of the 48-hour rule is that, um, you know, it allows those IA investigators to gather as much information on the scene of that call as possible. Um, because if they were able to respond, they really don't have a lot of

information, because it's still being gathered on the scene. I mean, detectives are working on that case for sometimes days, weeks, or months later, just trying to gather as much information as they can. Um, so really that 48 hours, I mean, the IA investigators behind the scenes, and you gotta remember, there's two different parts to this. There's a... Criminal investigation that's going on behind the scenes by detectives, and then there's an IA investigation, which is more administrative in process, looking at policies and directives.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:09:21

Mm-hmm.

[David Jackson] 19:09:23

And then there's also a training review, which is a third lever... or a third layer on this as well.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:09:27

Hmm.

[David Jackson] 19:09:28

So that IA investigation, you know, they're trying to gather as much information as they can before they do those initial interviews, which is reviewing the call. Um, you know, they can review body cam footage other than from the involved member. They can, you know, take a look at evidence that's gathered by a forensic evidence division. They can start looking at some of those things, looking at the call history, and you know, 48 hours seems like a long time for them to gather that information, but it really comes up quick on him.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:09:54

Okay, yeah, no, I appreciate that explanation. And on the reordered of the statement process, uh, is it... Because there are two on-call at any time, so you're limited as to how many... interviews you can actually do in a particular time frame.

[David Jackson] 19:10:14

Well, so the 48 hours applies to the involved members. So the witness members are typically giving statements to detectives on scene.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:10:24

Okay.

[David Jackson] 19:10:24

Now, the involved members are the ones that have the 48-hour. And in terms of that, that's always kind of been the priority. You're trying to get as much information from witness members on scene without having to interview those involved members, because they do have rights. They've got, you know, criminal rights, as well as Garrity rights, which is... for, you know, administrative investigations. So you're trying to get as much of that information, and ideally, you're not going to put them in that moment on the scene while they're on the call there, um, after they'd have been involved in this to provide that statement, unless you absolutely have to.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:10:54

Okay.

[David Jackson] 19:10:55

And that's just, you know, from the sergeant perspective, you're trying to gather as much information as you can. Without having to rely upon them at the time.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:11:02

Okay, cool. No, thank you.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:11:02

And I think when I heard your question, Kip, it does sound... specifically, like, you... I don't know if we were clarifying the difference between witnesses versus involved members. And

just like the captain had said, I think you'd mentioned, you know, like, why aren't there enough, like, investigators to talk to all the witnesses within 24 hours? Um, and it's important to clarify the difference between witnesses are being interviewed right away involved members are different.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:11:29

That's a great clarification also. It wasn't clear to me... when people were interviewed, and what... you know, if there were... 8 officers at the scene as a hypothetical, what... how it's all figured out, right? So, but that makes sense that you would talk to witnesses, uh, sooner. And then you have that 48-hour waiting period. Okay, that helps clarify things in my head. I really... Appreciate that.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:12:01

Barb, did you want to ask your question that you put in the chat?

[Barb. Rainish (she/her)] 19:12:08

Can you guys briefly explain why you're talking about the 48-hour rule? Um, and what that means, and also I meant to add, isn't that... Also part of the bargain... the collective bargaining, Junk, stuff. Important things... I'm getting bored to laugh, I like that. That's it. That's my question. I don't know who's gonna answer it. Mary Claire's gone

[David Jackson] 19:12:37

Well, so I can tell you, it's part of this directive, so it kind of outlines it in the directive, as well as, uh, I believe it's in the PPA contract. But I mean, this is in the directive in terms of administratively. I mean, this directive is much more of an administrative directive as opposed to how the force is applied. It's actually more how the force is investigated. So this kind of outlines how the investigative units are conducting those, uh... reviews of those cases. So, I mean, the 48-hour rule basically says, uh, involve members involved in a, uh, Category 1 use of force or a deadly force scenario have to be interviewed within 48 hours.

In the 48 hours is the maximum amount of time. Typically, those are occurring earlier than that, because some of these OISs are incurring at, you know, middle of the night or early in the morning, so we're not trying to bring people in at midnight or 1 o'clock in the morning for

those interviews, so we try to get those things scheduled, but they all occur within 48 hours, and that's... The involved members are interviewed within 48 hours. I hope that clarifies

[Barb. Rainish (she/her)] 19:13:38

Thank you, Captain Jackson.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:13:45

Do we have other questions out there? Not yet? Okay, uh, I'll... I...

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:13:56

Is there... is there anything else, um, you all, uh, Lieutenant Gryphon and Captain Jackson, wanted to speak to?

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:13:57

Oh, sorry.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:14:03

With regards to this directive, I know that you also talked to Ashley before this meeting. Anything we missed?

[David Jackson] 19:14:11

I mean, I think I would say that the biggest thing is, like Ashley had said, the directive is up for second universal review up until April 15. So if people do have comments or feedbacks, make sure you put that in the police directives are on the internet. I keep confusing internet, intranet, because that's an internal system, but it's at both places. Um, but that's where people can make their comments and feedback, uh, for those directives as part of the process for those. And just of note, I mean, this directive was last updated in, like,

2017, so it has been a while since it was updated, so... it's definitely a key, uh... time for people to make those updates and comments.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:14:50

No, I appreciate that, and I was... I did want to ask about the body-worn camera inclusion. And I know it references back to the body-worn camera policies, but are there... Uh, are there any aspects to that that you can... Uh, add to on how, um... The inclusion of that with the investigation process will... Um, uh, impact, uh, investigation and reporting.

[David Jackson] 19:15:22

So I can tell you, when I was in Internal Affairs, we had the first, uh... you know, use of body-worn cameras in an officer-involved shooting investigation, and it was just kind of, uh, you know, a learning experience for us, because we had policies in place, and I think this is really a chance for that directive to kind of capture what we've learned from... from the... from those investigations since then about how we collect the body-worn cameras, kind of clarifying for the members what the expectation is for supervisors on scene, detectives on scene, internal affairs, and just kind of everybody has a common understanding of how they're used in investigations.

And like I said, I think because the policy was last updated so many years ago, I think that, you know, body cams have been, uh, you know, we've had them for the last few years at this point, but... I think this is a good opportunity to clean up some of that stuff, since it wasn't in there before.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:16:11

Oh, great, thank you.

Barb.

[Barb. Rainish (she/her)] 19:16:17

Hey, I just want to let you guys know that the body cam footage has been kind of cool, um... the BHU Advisory Council, the BHUAC, um, every March hears about, um, the officer-involved shootings that, um, have cleared enough that we can hear about them, and then

also about... the uses of force and how that... um, compare and contrast with people, um, in mental health crisis. Um, and that first one is actually going to be posted or the second one, sorry. It's gonna be that I said... it's gonna be posted on the BHUAC website. Eventually, and I'll try to tell you guys... when, but I have to say that having... this is the first year that, I think, that I recall that they used the body-worn cameras as part of their presentation. Um, and that... that made it... a lot more interesting, I guess, in terms of... in terms of hearing about that stuff, being able to see some of it. Just wanted to throw that in there.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:17:31

Cool, thank you, Barb. Appreciate that. Um, I do know that there are rules around, uh, body, uh, how... body... body-worn cam footage is used in different types of use of force events? I'm assuming none of that had changed as part of it. It's just being referenced from... this, so... My apologies, this cough just won't stop. So, um, I know that we had some other folks that were going to join, but I don't see them out there. So, um, are there other questions from PCCEP members, clarifications, or from community... that, uh, questions for our, uh, PPB liaisons.

[Tia Palafox] 19:18:19

Uh, I... I can read something that wasn't mentioned yet off my notes. Um, when trans... when a police officer is transporting the person, they are an involved member because they were in their custody. And an in-custody death, shooting or any reason, when they died in police custody, they're still going to do an administrative investigation, no matter how they died, in police custody. Like, if they had a heart attack, or... natural causes.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:18:57

you know, what is your... I hear that. What is your question?

[Tia Palafox] 19:19:00

I was just reading my notes from Ashley today.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:19:03

Okay.

[David Jackson] 19:19:10

And I can confirm, uh, when I was an internal affairs cases that did involve, they called them in-custody death cases, uh, you know, until the medical examiner gave a determination that would go through that typical review process. So... and those decisions would be made, you know, between DA's office, you know, detective division, internal affairs, professional... like, there's a lot of people making that decision, but I think, you know, those are investigated, those cases are looked at.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:19:40

Cool. Thank you for that. Is there anything else out of the directive changes that you guys would like to highlight? All out there to be read. So, okay, cool. Um...

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:19:58

Yeah, oh.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:19:59

Conrad.

[Conrad Hulen, PCCEP Co-Chair (He/Him)] 19:20:01

just really fast, I just wanted to call out, and I think we'll share it with the full committee. It's just good habit that we... review directives as they come up. There's a lot of folks, uh, credit to the Bureau, that's a lot of administrative morass. That's my words, no one said that. But just getting cleaned up, but there are... there are stuff that does and will have downstream effects. Um, and this is a really good community... um, opportunity to bring them to light, right? Sunshine's the best at disinfectant, we know. Um, so I think it's just a really good habit, and I really, really appreciate Kip, Tia, you continuing to shine a light, so thank you for the work.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:20:47

Thanks, Conrad. Um...

[Tia Palafox] 19:20:47

Thanks.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:20:48

And to that note, one of the first directive updates that we mentioned was the update to the directive update process. I'm never not gonna enjoy saying that. Uh, but I... I know that we have brought this up in previous meetings, that there were some accessibility challenges with the current process. And, uh, everything I read about that update sounded like, uh, even though we didn't do a recommendation on it, it sounded like... feedback from the public and from PCCEP had been heard in I really do appreciate rethinking what Jared, who used to be our DOJ liaison, had said was a country-wide gold standard in public feedback on police directives. So, I'll, uh... I was gonna say pile on to Conrad, but, uh, to add on to Conrad, that we appreciate this process of being able to have these conversations, and... have clarity and community input and feedback on it. I think it's really important.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:22:03

Yeah, and Conrad, again, to build on what you're saying, you know, as you guys review policies that come up, uh, as you find them, we don't have to wait for this platform to talk about it, and we're happy to talk about it also here, but, you know, you can contact any of the liaison, the PBB liaisons, um, we can talk, um, whether we can pick up the phone and talk, or just through email, or meet it in person for coffee and discuss it, and then also bring it to this platform so everyone can hear it. But it doesn't have to wait for this platform to have the discussion. It's very helpful to get this information early, because we involve, uh, like, Ashley Lancaster, for example, who's one of our policy... our lead policy writers that can give us a lot of clarity and... into why some of the depth of why we're making some of the changes we're having. And answer your questions and the community questions very thoroughly.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:22:55

Yeah, thank you.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:23:01

Yeah, I was just gonna, uh... add, like, I've been thinking about, you know, I think, um... There is desire... on PCCEP's part and some community members to know more about PPB policies and, like, we know that it is clearly a very, um, significant part of what governs PBB's work. But also acknowledging that, like, it is, uh... it's hard to parse. It is dense, it is confusing, and so I think that's something we're gonna be... exploring moving forward is how to bring that into this space, or maybe not always in this space, um, but... you know, figuring out the best way to work on this, um, in a community setting, um, whether it's purely informative, whether there are desired changes, whatever it may be. Um, and I think that will also be aligned with the increased community engagement that we're going to be doing. Um, yeah, and so just acknowledging, you know, uh... there are probably better ways we can do this, and that's something I think we're interested in exploring more. Um, so we appreciate, uh...

[Chris Gryphon] 19:24:08

Yeah, I think this is a good start, though. I like how this looks, where, you know, on the front end, you... we all talked about this policy, you had a chance to look at it, Ashley answered a lot of questions.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:24:10

Yeah, I agree.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:24:18

And then in this format, you can highlight the changes, and then anyone can ask the questions about, you know, like, the changes that are happening. And we can do our best to answer them here, or we can ask them outside of this, and then also bring those questions here. But it does help to see, you know, you can lay out the changes in the format so everyone can look at it, and it's... instead of poring through pages and pages and pages of policy, uh, this makes it, I think, pretty simple for most people to digest and look at, and...

and look at the changes and say, like, why is that happening? Or maybe even think... People may look at this and have a question later, um... that may pop up, and then we're still available, any one of the members can reach out to us and say, hey, like, I thought about this last night after the fact, and I want some clarity on, like, why is this a thing? Um, we're happy to answer those questions, too, after the fact.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:25:07

Appreciate that.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:25:08

Great. Love it. All right.

Anything else, guys? Uh, I think, you know, we have a little bit of time if there's anything.

Uh, Leslie?

[Leslie Martinez] 19:25:22

Yeah, sorry, going back to the, um... the recommendation tracker. One thing that I had that I think is challenging, and I kind of want to make sure to mention this in this setting so that all of the PCCEP members here. Uh, is this bit. Um... I'm going to share my screen again. Is this the affinity groups consulted? Um, we have been having... oh, sorry, I didn't finish sharing. There we go. Um, is this bit of the affinity groups consulted? Um, because there's several ways that we could talk about that. They can be demographic groups. They can be, uh, community groups, they can be... you know, pretty much, like, uh, committees or something like that, organizations. Um, you know, so I... kind of going back to our, uh... There it is. This, uh, our... like, PCCEP categories or communities. Um, we don't really... I guess we haven't really defined what kind of demographics we are trying to measure with this piece, although the only thing we know is that it is important to measure the community democracy... like, the impacts on, like, a demographic level, and that's kind of what we're trying to get to with this. Um, so I... I want to, like, put a plug out that we're still thinking about what affinity groups' definitions mean. And we want to... I kind of want to, like, think about that with the group um, you know, that could be... again, going back to geographic groups, like, we could be going back to, like, PCCEP categories, uh, like the way... so, yeah, just want to throw that out there and see if anybody has maybe not now, but could think about it and provide thoughts and feedback. But yeah, I'll leave it there.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:27:41

Yeah, no, uh, Leslie, I think that's going to be one of the other challenging things, uh, to pursue with that. I do know... previous conversations around directives, we did have questions from Community and PCCEP around the... uh, public feedback process of it and being able to um, understand where different, uh... influences came in on... Changing the directives, and maybe that'll be a recommendation to the directive change, directive change update at some point in the future, so... but, uh, I think that's a... interesting vector of, um... of understanding, uh, the community listening part of the PPB.

[Leslie Martinez] 19:28:29

Right, yeah.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:28:38

Excuse me, sorry. Um, other thoughts, questions around... this directive or directives. In general... General...

[Tia Palafox] 19:28:57

Right? No.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:29:03

Barb?

[Barb. Rainish (she/her)] 19:29:08

Tia started to say something, and I'm happy to speak, but Tia, do you want to say something?

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:29:10

Oh.

[Tia Palafox] 19:29:12

Uh, I wrote it in the chat, and then I saw your hand go up, so I... I just got confused because I saw... two different statements in the directive, and they... didn't... and they're... I wrote, I couldn't... And one statement says they... talk about the constitutional force standard. The legal basis when officers can use force, but in the same... um, directive, it says... That it doesn't tell an officer when they can use force.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:29:50

Okay, so I... looking at that, I think, are you asking... Are you asking about this policy and why we're removing this language from... this particular policy?

[Tia Palafox] 19:30:02

Now, when I was reading the directive, and one... there's one sentence that says... um, it gives a legal basis when officers can use force, but then it says it... That doesn't tell an officer when they can use force. So I... I'm just confused around that part.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:30:23

I think I remember this from our conversation with Ashley, Tia. I think that the... doesn't tell officers when they can use force but refers to... the overall directive, 1010.10, right? Which doesn't govern that. It's 1010.00 that governs that.

[Tia Palafox] 19:30:44

Okay.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:30:44

Right. I think, yeah, I think what we're trying to get at with this policy is this policy isn't governing the use of force. This is... this policy is all around the investigation of the use of force.

[Tia Palafox] 19:30:55

Right. Right. Right.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:30:57

And Captain Jackson can jump in if maybe you have a different understanding. Um, but that's kind of... I think you're asking, like, why are we striking some of... or changing some of those words, or removing that from... this particular policy, and it's saying, if I remember the slide. It's essentially saying that we're removing those because it doesn't relate to this policy. It doesn't fit into this... into this, uh, policy. Is that what you're referring to?

[Tia Palafox] 19:31:22

Yeah, thank you.

[David Jackson] 19:31:25

Yeah, and Chris, I'm... It sounded like, from what Ashley had said, they had definitions when they originally wrote this policy, uh, years ago, and they never actually applied those definitions anywhere in the policy, so they just used those words, and they were actually never written into the formal policy itself, so that's why they were removing them, because they more... they better fit in the 1010 directive as opposed to this directive, which was administrative in nature and just the process and how it was investigated.

[Tia Palafox] 19:31:51

Right, okay.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:31:51

Right. So I guess, like, really to get to the... maybe to the point or the crux of, like, what your concern is, because I... what I'm hearing is, like, a concern of, like, why are we removing... the constitutional standard for use of force from a policy, a police policy, it is still in... like, our policies, it's gonna be in a different policy.

[Tia Palafox] 19:32:07

Right.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:32:09

Um, that where it's more applicable. Does that make sense, and does that maybe address your question?

[Tia Palafox] 19:32:13

Yeah. Yeah, but that wasn't my concern. My concern... my only comment was I heard two different things in one... and one directive. One where it said, you can, but the other one, it said you can't. So... but Dori explained it to me a little... I understand what you're saying now.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:32:32

Okay.

[Tia Palafox] 19:32:33

I wasn't that concerned, but I'm good, thank you so much.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:32:34

Okay.

[Tia Palafox] 19:32:38

Sorry.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:32:41

No, I'm glad we can, um, answer that question.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:32:46

All right, um... Shall we move to wrap up? Chairs?

[Tia Palafox] 19:32:53

Sure, yeah.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:32:53

Yeah, well, open to... yeah, uh, the agenda part of it, and open to any public comment if we're... done with our part.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:33:06

Go for it, Barb.

[Barb. Rainish (she/her)] 19:33:09

I'm confused, because I thought there was something else on the agenda, but I can't find it to pull it up. Um, but what I had... no? Okay. Um, what I had wanted to say before... And I can't remember the exact details of it, but... somebody else, like Dori, hopefully will, that PCCEP actually has the power to... ask for a review of... certain directives that... that... that... are related to the settlement. I was gonna say that are affected by the settlement agreement, and then I kind of got into a chicken and an egg thing in my head. Um, and I don't know if that's changing. As things are rolling off the settlement, um, or if you guys have the same power from... to do that, with the same ones you had three years ago, if that makes sense. But my comment is mostly, to remind you guys of that power, because I thought it was a cool power.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:34:19

Yeah, I can... I can answer that. So, um... what you're referring to is, uh, language in the PCCEP plan that talks about off-cycle review. Um, my understanding, actually, is that with the changes to the way they're doing directive review, that will be a more open process to pretty much anybody now. Um, so I think PCCEP certainly could still request that, um... But Ashley Lancaster PBV Policy Director talked about how they are trying to formalize the idea of open and continuous feedback from um, the general public as well. So, there might be some kind of differences in... I don't know exactly what those things mean, um... But yeah, I think broadly, it is going to be more open process for everybody, um, and PCCEP will still continue to be able to do that as well.

[Afrita Davis] 19:35:32

Okay, so at this moment, we're in open public comment, so we can still remain, um, to take comments on the topic at hand, or we can open up the, um, open up the floor to comments that deals with any of the work that PCCEP is doing. So please raise your virtual hand, and we'll call on you for open public comment.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:36:00

And PCCEP members, if you all have anything else you want to...

[Afrita Davis] 19:36:02

Yes.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:36:04

Sure, that also applies to you.

[Afrita Davis] 19:36:07

Yes. Uh, go ahead, Judith.

[Judith Mowry, she/her, Office of Equity and Human Rights] 19:36:10

I wanted to say what great work I think you're all doing. Um, I am incredibly grateful for it. And, uh, I've been around the PCCEP stuff since way in the very beginning with the DOJ, and I... I just think it's so great to see it just doing so well, so thank you. It's nice to see some old friends in here, too.

[Afrita Davis] 19:36:33

Thank you, Judith. Others? Comments or questions?

Kip, I saw you come off mute.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:36:57

Oh, uh, no, I was just off mute. I had a thought, then I decided not... Let's say that if there's time left, we should all go, uh, rush over to the CBPA meeting and... rush them and ask a bunch of questions of them, so... but... Um, sorry. It is interesting that, uh, because of the intersectionality of the work that we do, that, uh, uh, we really do need to get to a staggered schedule so that we're not impacting each other's meetings. So, Dori... and Liz, thank you for working on that, I really appreciate it.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:37:41

Well, I'll just add, it will... it would not hurt for their members to hear that directly from you all. So if you feel so inclined, um, you can email them.

[Tia Palafox] 19:37:52

Okay.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:37:54

I... yeah.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:37:58

Yeah, my understanding is part of the problem is that, um, um, they are... and understandably, they have... a lot of work in front of them, um, but they are kind of scheduling meetings ad hoc at the end of meetings, um, so they'll be like, okay, let's meet next week, let's meet next week. And so, that's a little bit of what's going on, and what we're trying to figure out. But maybe if they were more aware of... other conflicts in the city and heard it from other community members that might, um... Uh, that just might be a good thing to share.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:38:33

Thank you.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:38:38

All right, shall we wrap up? Uh, Kip and Tia, want to close us out here.

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:38:46

I've done enough talking. Yes, please.

[Tia Palafox] 19:38:50

Okay, I can. What's next?

On Wednesday, April 29th, we'll be having PCCEP's book committee meeting. Hope you all can be there at 6 o'clock. And it says till 8, but sometimes we're there till 8.30.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:39:06

And, uh, I did a bad job of making this slide, um, but I'll just add that, uh, in that full committee meeting, um, PCCEP will be doing its elections.

[Tia Palafox] 19:39:09

Okay.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:39:17

Um, and... then also, hopefully, sometime in April, um, we will see that piece of emergency ordinance, uh, for codification coming to Council, so that is also, um, an event to be aware of. Um, yeah. And... that's all I wanted to add.

Thank you, everyone. Appreciate, uh, all your contributions tonight.

[Tia Palafox] 19:39:44

Thank you all for coming tonight. See you next... next time, next week. Thank you for your time.

[Dori Grabinski, PCCEP Program Manager] 19:39:51

Take care, have a good night!

[Kip S- PCCEP Policy & Reform Co-Chair] 19:39:52

I think so. Take care.

[Leslie Martinez] 19:39:53

Good night, everyone

[Tia Palafox] 19:39:54

Good night.

[Barb. Rainish (she/her)] 19:39:54

Thanks, you guys.

[Chris Gryphon] 19:39:56

Alright, thanks, everybody.

[Tia Palafox] 19:39:59

Bye.