Appropriate Identification for Police Officers

Author(s): Youth Subcommittee (Taji Chesimet, Britt Masback) & Brian Betcone

Date Authored: September 20th, 2020

Date Approved (by PCCEP): September 22, 2020

Summary of Recommendation:
The PCCEP Youth Sub-Committee, working with Brian Betcone, hereby implores the Mayor's office to stand up for police accountability and update current officer identification standards to ensure instances of misconduct are properly identified. This summer, in the midst of a scaled up protest operation, police leadership granted officers authority to obscure identification (namely officer name badges), under the assumed pretense of preventing doxxing of officers. The result is multiple instances of misconduct, caught on camera that are now unprosecutable because the officer can't be identified or because the civilian victim was not able to identify the officer during the incident. Part of the problem stems from PPB Police Directive 0312.50, which has not been updated since 2015 and leaves wide discretion for officers to display identification on their uniform or share their name verbally most often simply at the direction of their direct supervisor approval rather than PPB Leadership.

While Portland continues to deal with the issue of identification, the Oregon Legislature has introduced multiple legislative concepts to tackle the same problem. It's time to act now and build transparency and trust by updating the policy directive, increasing uniform identification requirements and, barring the obfuscation of identification. The PCCEP youth subcommittee spoke with the Mayor and he shared his efforts to identify and hold officers accountable, video being a large part of these efforts. Similarly, we spoke with Ross Caldwell, director of the Independent Police Review. As a sub-committee we reached out to Caldwell to get updated on the effectiveness of the BHR numbers that were used to replace personnel contact info (like their last name and first initial). He expressed that during protests it's already an extremely difficult process to identify the actions of an individual officer and that identification is thus a valuable resource and necessity for transparency and accountability.

To continue, despite former Chief Resch's order to cover up identification specifically implemented as the protests began, it was cited bureau-wide officers were covering their credentials outside of the realm of downtown protests — in clear violation of the outdated Policy Directive 0312.50. Furthemore, Caldwell spoke about the issue of doxxing and expressed that the few incidents of doxxing that have occured have been a result of officers wearing a uniform, not drawn out events involving identification.

Finally, the Policy Directive change and review process is something that was out-right ignored in making this specific change. PPB has a duty to follow due processes and in the instance of changing policy to allow for masking identification but in reality only causing another scapegoat for accountability, as we continue to fight for racial and social equity, the youth sub-committee will not stand by this injustice.

Details of recommendation:

- **Update of uniform**: Officers shall have a label attached to the outermost area of their garment that displays their name, a identification number on their helmets and on the back of their outermost garment.
- **Update Policy Directive 0312.50 (1.2.1)**: "Members in uniform will visibly display their Bureau-issued badge and name tag on their outermost garment and carry their Bureau-issued I.D. while on duty." Said rhetoric *should be updated and include a formal process with community review*.
    - **Reviewing and updating 0312.50 (2.3)**: "Supervisors are required to document in an appropriate police report or memorandum any authorization given by the supervisor to relieve a member or members of identification mandates (e.g. uniform requirements, detail assignments, safety concerns, impaired performance of police duties, etc.)" as it relates to the mandate Chief Resch instituted allowing for office discretion to display their identification."

How does this recommendation redress barriers to racial equity?	Black, Indigenous, and People of Color communities are disproportionately policed relative to their white counterparts. This power dynamic between police and the average citizen begets a clear divide in equity. Communities of color are most often over-policed leading to higher degrees of incarceration, lower attendance rates in schools, higher criminal or misdemeanor charges for youth, and

	indiscriminate use of force. By removing barriers to identifying police, BIPOC individuals are better able to hold officers accountable for abusing their power. Furthermore, excessive use of force by police disproportionately affects BIPOC communities. Being able to identify officers who break bureau policy in any capacity is a necessary prerequisite for disciplining these officers and preventing them from committing even more egregious acts in the future.
How were marginalized and underrepresented communities, including those who will be affected by this recommendation, engaged to shape, write, and otherwise develop this recommendation?	The drafting process for this recommendation began after testimony from a community member and PCCEP put together the pieces of the recommendation through the course of public meetings and with community input. The recommendation acknowledges that many underrepresented communities seek redress but don't have the proper information or access to follow through on a claim against an officer or PPB member. Furthemore, the inspiration for this recommendation is the concerns expressed by the Portland community, particularly Black individuals, who do not feel that police are properly held accountable for misconduct. This recommendation seeks to acknowledge this concern and provide better police accountability—something many Black and Brown people have been demanding for decades.

Signature Of Adoption:

Mayor Ted Wheeler or Chief Charles Lovell

Date:

Resources

Please list all relevant resources to this recommendation.

1. [Current PPB Directive — Last Updated 2015]
2. [Current Oregon Statute related to minimum standards for officers]
3. [Oregon Legislative Concept 743 — Identification Requirements]
4. [Legislative Concept 18 - Updated LC 743]
5. [2016 Bill — Allowing Withholding of Identification (Died in Session)]
6. [OPB Article — Police Leaders Say Portland Officers Can Cover Name Tags At Protests]

Example Images:

94985
84769