*Given challenges in audio quality and understanding/hearing one or more of the parties in this meeting, despite our best efforts, we believe those reviewing this specific transcript may benefit by listening to the source audio when reading the document to ensure the transcript serves as a valuable resource.*

**PORTLAND POLICE BUREAU**
**Training Advisory Council**
**Training Division**

**Meeting Date: 09/10/2025**

**ALEXANDER:** All right, everybody. Thank you for coming to our TAC meeting. My name is Patrick Alexander, the chair of TAC. This is our September 10, 2025, TAC meeting is called to order. As of right now, we don't have enough for quorum, correct, still?
**FEMALE:** Correct.
**ALEXANDER:** Yeah. We don't have enough for quorum, so we can discuss some stuff, but we cannot vote on anything at this time. All of that is going to have to be pushed to the next meeting. All right. But we're going to get started, so I'm going to read the mission statement. The firearms for the (Inaudible), we can't really vote on to get that in, so. Now we'll just get the meeting going. The mission of TAC is to provide ongoing advice to the Chief of Police and the Training Division in order to continuously improve standards, practices, and outcomes through the examination of training philosophy, content, delivery, tactics, policy, equipment, and facilities. The mission of the Portland Police Bureau is to reduce crime and the fear of crime by working with all citizens to preserve life, maintain human rights, protect property, and promote individual responsibility and community commitment. All right. I'm going to save my chair announcements on the part of the agenda – if you see TAC member retention, that's when I will make my announcements there. All right. So after that, we're just going to move right along off to the training division.
**LT. SMITH:** (Inaudible) a lot of the agenda, so (inaudible). Sorry. Grant Smith, training division.
**FEMALE:** (Inaudible)
**LT. SMITH:** Say what now?
**FEMALE:** The microphone is over here, so.
**LT. SMITH:** (Inaudible, laughter). So totals as of September 2nd is 793 sworn members. Year to date, we've got 38 hired, 31 separations. Fiscal year – so from July 1, we've had 12 hires and 9 separations. In total, we have 91 folks in FTEP right now in various stages. We have somewhere between 20 to 24 being hired on September 25th of this month. That final number is still out. It will be a fairly large group. Our Advanced Academy 25-3 starts tomorrow. And then we had a Community Academy this last weekend, and we have another one on November 15th. I don't know how many seats we're going to have available. We typically had three in the past, but there have been a lot of know-shows from the Community Oversight Board which has to

attend one of these per charter, so those spots need to be taken up with them. We also had a TAC no show as well. So, again, if you volunteer to sign up, if you can't make it, it's all good. Life happens. But please let me know. Just not showing up – a lot of time, a lot of money goes into these community academies, and so (inaudible) just let me know if you can't make it. So that is what I have (inaudible).

**ALEXANDER:** All right. Thank you. Are there any questions (inaudible)?

**LITTLEFIELD:** Yeah. Todd Littlefield. Did any city councils or mayor show up (inaudible)?

**LT. SMITH:** Nate Vasquez was here from the DA's office, but I don't believe so. (Inaudible) folks, a few TAC members. A bunch of the community-based policing for, again, 13 out of 20 showed, so (inaudible).

**MALE:**(Inaudible)C – CVA (inaudible).

**COMNES:** Alan Comnes. With the CP – the fact that the community based hears what they like, if they're, like, intentional no-shows like, "I'm not going to do this" or –

**LT. SMITH:** Don't know. They have to per charter so – Grant Smith again. Sorry. They have to per charter attend. It's one of their requirements, so I don't (inaudible) behind it. So we had a couple members that (inaudible) either advisory council (inaudible) and a couple other groups there. I had one of the Community-based accountability folks. She's told me one person had already quit the board, so I don't (inaudible). I know some of them are still in background, but that wouldn't (inaudible) from coming to the academy, so I don't (inaudible).

**COMNES:** And Alan Comnes. Just do you have the date of the next –

**LT. SMITH:** November 15th. (Inaudible)

**LITTLEFIELD:** Todd Littlefield. Did one of the people come from (inaudible)?

**LT. SMITH:** Yeah. I had one (inaudible) that was on the board, and (inaudible) but I don't know how that process went.

**LITTLEFIELD:** The one on the (inaudible), not (inaudible).

**LT. SMITH:** Yeah. (Inaudible).

**LITTLEFIELD:** And how long do they have to complete the Community Academy?

**LT. SMITH:** I believe it before it starts (inaudible) –
(Inaudible)

**LT. SMITH:** That's why (inaudible) have to get 17. Four of them are (inaudible).

**ALEXANDER:** Any more questions?
(No response heard)

**ALEXANDER:** All right. Thank you. On to the next item of the agenda. The Officer of the Inspector General, the OIG, force report.

**BUCKLEY:** Thank you. Mary Claire Buckley, Inspector General. I just wanted to announce today that Lieutenant Roberts has been transferred to East Precinct, and so I have the pleasure of introducing our new force inspector, Acting Lieutenant Kyle Hefley who will be presenting to you tonight. Lieutenant Hefley is not a stranger to the OIG (inaudible). He's very familiar with the job (inaudible) join us. A lot of experience not only with us but as a sergeant doing the After Action (inaudible). I think the analysts can all tell you (inaudible) great job with (inaudible). So without further ado, I'll send it over to you.
**HEFLEY::** Okay. Yeah. Thanks for the introduction, Mary Claire. (Inaudible) and got to meet some of you, but I look forward to working with all of you. I've worked with the police bureau for a little more than 16 years. Most of that time was at Central Precinct, four years in the Behavioral Health Unit. This is my first TAC meeting, but I'm familiar with the work that you all do, and I'm grateful to have the opportunity to come talk to you (inaudible) look forward to working with you all in the future. This is the quarter 2 force data which would be April, May, and June of 2025. All right. So quarter 2, 2025, we saw an increase in custodies and calls from quarter 1, 2025. Historically, we've always seen a jump in quarter 2. Most likely (inaudible) weather, more people out and about, but no major differences. Just a little higher. Custodies and Calls: There is a slight 0.04 decrease in custody-to-force ratio, so a little bit of a (inaudible). Very similar to what we see (inaudible).
(Inaudible)
**HEFLEY:** Quarter 2: So we saw a 7.71 decrease in custodies during quarter 2 that resulted in force even though we had an increase in total custodies that officers made. Comparing this to quarter 2 of 2024, we see that big number of 10.8 percent of force being used in custodies. That was during the PSU library event, so that is a bit of an outlier right there from – if you're looking at quarter 2 of 2024 to 2025. But this quarter, 2025, we see a decrease. We saw an increase for calls overall, a slight increase in total custodies but a slight decrease in (inaudible) force used in those custodies, so. And then this quarter 2 with the 10.80 percent number – a lot of that force that was used were people we didn't end up taking into custody because the library and crowd control incidents (inaudible) force on numerous people that they weren't able to arrest for whatever reason, so that number is the (inaudible) almost purely attributed to the library incident. Force-to-custody ratio: This looks back from 2021 all the way through 2025, quarter 2. Top blue line is total custodies which we see is pretty steady throughout beginning in about quarter 3 of 2024. The precincts (inaudible) a lot more missions. The retail theft missions that were heavily focused on custodies (inaudible) proactive police work. So that

little spike there is mostly attributed to that. The bottom line force-to-custody ratio, which is more of what we look at, it's pretty steady there. You see that big jump around quarter 2 in 2024, that's just the library incident. That's almost all of that – what that big spike is attributed to. Then things start to go back down to normal, and then there's that drop in quarter 4 of quarter – quarter 1 from quarter 4 2024/2025. That's when we had a change in policy and switched from category 4 force that had been captured all of this to it's now called de minimis force, so it's not tracked the same. It's not – we wouldn't tally up (inaudible) all these calculations (inaudible) drop (inaudible) talk about more later if anybody has any questions about that.

**COMNES:** (Inaudible) clarification.

**HEFLEY:** Sure.

**COMNES:** So as far as (inaudible) it's four? Is it (inaudible) thousand?

**HEFLEY:** What's the question for?

**COMNES:** Alan Comnes. Force-to-Custody ratio had, like, four, five, six, 10. Is that four per 1,000 custodies?

**MALE:** Oh, I'm sorry. You're talking about the right axis? Yeah. So – sorry. That's the percentage. Sorry. It's a ratio, so (inaudible) look at any other numbers – if you go back one slide, please? So at 3.09 percent, and then if you go forward one, you can see that black line there is – that's (inaudible) right axis. That's the percentage.

**COMNES:** Not to be (inaudible) that's really a force-to-custody rating, percentage rate.

**MALE:** So, sorry – we – so we say ratio.

**COMNES:** I know, but it's really a rating.

**MALE:** Sorry. Okay.

(Inaudible)

**KAHAN:** Some of us have hearing issues. Could you please be a little slower?

**HOLLANDS:** Sure. Yeah. I'll slow down. This is Will Hollands. (Inaudible) analyst in our office here.

**MALE:** Thanks, Will (inaudible).

**HEFLEY:** Quarter 2, 2025 summary: Not a lot on here other than we see the increase in applications of force and call numbers (inaudible) slightly up from quarter 1 to quarter 2 which it's just more calls that officers are going to (inaudible). There's a quarter – 67 percent decrease which is a pretty significant decrease quarter 2 2024 to quarter 2 2025. That will be attributed to the whole PSU library when you see that huge decrease right there. And just a small increase compared to quarter one, and the subjects of use of force up 4 percent (inaudible) attributed to more calls and more custodies (inaudible). And then trend wise, I understand this was discussed in some previous meetings potentially. Some interesting

numbers here. The pointing of the firearms, we see a big decrease there, 40 percent compared to quarter 1. During quarter 1, they were doing a lot more vehicle intervention strategies when typically you see a pointing of the firearm. So I think they had 26 in quarter 1. They only had 18 in quarter 2, so that is – would explain that up – that big drop that we see there. Then there's a huge decrease in tear gas applications which is usually attributed to SERT calls. They have just – they've had two force cases this entire quarter. They were pretty heavily active in the previous quarter, so they're just not (inaudible) quite as much this quarter, so the tear gas numbers are significantly down for the quarter. Pointing of a firearm application, the PFAs, from quarter 1 2024 through quarter 2 is pretty low in the beginning. This big jump in quarter 3/quarter 4, that's when we were doing a lot of (inaudible) missions (inaudible) around that time. So those are the two, like, previously discussed. You'll see a lot of the pointing of the firearm applications. Quarter 1 2025 (inaudible) on vehicle missions, a lot of SERT calls, and then quarter 2 (inaudible) kind of slowing down, so that's (inaudible) see that number come back down for (inaudible) applications. Tear gas: This one you see the big jump there. That's the – quarter 4 2024, that's when SERT went full time. (Inaudible) quarter 1 2025 an even bigger jump. That is a bit of an outlier, and in one of those cases, there was over 24 applications of gas that not all were effective, so that number is a bit skewed. And then we see the drop off in quarter 2 (inaudible) SERT not being active (inaudible). Like I said, (inaudible) that's the entire quarter that SERT was involved in, so very low (inaudible) numbers. Custodies and calls: Minor increases this quarter. Nothing really significant on this front other than tiny increases in calls for service are up 8 percent. Total custodies (inaudible) 5 percent. Slight decrease in force being used in those custodies, 0.04 decease. So a little bit of one, but that's, again, (inaudible). Quarter 2 did not have any OIS incidents. There was the in-custody death in June 27th which is an ongoing thing, so I'm not going to discuss that. But (inaudible) pretty slow on (inaudible) quarter 2, and then I'll wrap up a pretty quiet quarter (inaudible).

**MALE:** I'm curious (inaudible) gas applications.

**MALE:** Are you familiar with (inaudible) before I got on the team.

**MALE:** Okay.

**MALE:** So, it was – it was a barricaded subject, and it just (inaudible) –

**LT. SMITH:** There's a lot of times it's (inaudible) what room somebody is in. Like, if it's a bedroom, put gas in the bedroom (inaudible) there (inaudible) gas doesn't really get out of the door and go everywhere else, so you can maybe lob quite a bit in there. It's also sometimes it's just a cumulative effect. I mean, it's just like communication. If you're talking to someone for five minutes,

maybe it's not effective, but if you're continuing to apply that irritant, eventually it gets people to comply. I stared on team as a detached lieutenant back in May (inaudible) 25-27 callouts, either warrants or activations, and we used gas on one. Sorry. Grant Smith again.

**MALE:** (Inaudible) so, I also – I audited that specific case that I believe (inaudible) that the subject was barricaded on the (inaudible) floor of an apartment building. So where they were trying to get gas into the building was from outside on the ground floor. So they were trying to get in through the window. So it was particularly difficult because you get a lot of missed applications because they didn't hit a window or they had to get into multiple different windows. And I think (inaudible) but that another officer who was on another balcony was able to use pepper spray, and that was also effective in getting compliance from the subject. But really, it was just failure to – like, they couldn't get gas into the building. And because of the force policy, we count attempted applications as still applications even if they're not effective. So, for example, if they had tried to shoot a bunch of (inaudible) at somebody and they didn't hit, those are still counted as force applications (inaudible) as tear gas.

**ALEXANDER:** Okay. (Inaudible) question. Jim and then Todd.

**KAHAN:** With (inaudible). Okay, (inaudible) events 102 times force was used, and that's 102 incidences of force which is the first time that we have been able to get that kind of datum (inaudible), and I very much appreciate being given it. But here's the question: For how many of these incidents was body-worn camera footage reviewed by the force inspector or a delegatee? How many of the 102?

**MALE:** So during Q2, we would review all of the body-worn camera during the – the force reporting policy (inaudible). So supervisors are required to review the force incidents, so all the supervisors reviewed the footage. We actually did an audit recently assessing that, and we – we in the OIG's office will review the footage to – we'll review the force, and then the inspector reviews 100 percent of the ones that we audit, and then we'll (inaudible) all of them, so –

**KAHAN:** So you do you audit all 102 incidents?

**MALE:** I'm sorry?

**KAHAN:** Do you audit all 102 incidents?

**MALE:** No.

**KAHAN:** No.

**MALE:** We audit – so we audit 20 percent of the incidents, the baseline, and then we pick up additional ones that are mandatory audits (inaudible) just in case. So in general, we've been a little between (inaudible) percent.

**KAHAN:** Any time you do audit, you watch the BWC?

**MALE:** Any time, even if it's not an audit, we watch the BWC.

**KAHAN:** Thank you. How many times of the ones you audited was the use of force flagged or possible – I'm not saying actual – just possible out policy out of the 102? Out of all of the uses of force that you looked at, were there any where you said, "Whoops. This might be out of protocol. We have to (inaudible)."
**MALE:** So Lieutenant Roberts has a spreadsheet with all that info on it. I'd have to pull it all from there but –
**KAHAN:** (Inaudible)
**FEMALE:** He wouldn't do that. The inspector does that.
**KAHAN:** (Inaudible)
**FEMALE:** I don't have that number off the top of my head.
**KAHAN:** Is it a large number or a small?
**FEMALE:** It's a small.
**MALE:** I would say it's a smaller number. I have a general idea, and I'll have to give you –
**FEMALE:** We'll get you the information (inaudible).
**KAHAN:** And my last question was for how many of the incidents was there an escalation of force? By escalation, I mean force was used and then force was used again, and somebody said, "You didn't really have to do that." Did you look at that?
**MALE:** That would be the same answer because it would be out of policy, so.
**KAHAN:** Okay.
**MALE:** So your definition (inaudible).
**KAHAN:** Okay.
**SMITH:** So basically that would be – if you're saying – Grant Smith again. It will happen every time I speak. So you're conflating two different things. You're calling one escalation which is multiple uses of force, or are you talking about escalated (inaudible) use of in-force policy and out-of-force policy. So all of those would – the minute somebody triggers, like, this is an out-of-policy force application, IA gets those.
**KAHAN:** Okay. Jim Kahan again. The force – the one that you were mentioning earlier, that big lots and lots of tear gas, I would not consider that to be an escalation because the problem was you tried to use tear gas. It didn't work, so you kept on trying until it did work, and once it worked, you got the results you wanted. I would not call that escalation. I would call that a problem implementing that particular use of force. And I think that nobody would say that using all of that tear gas until it worked was out of policy. That makes perfect sense to me. That is something that you should do because you decided use of tear gas is appropriate here. Sure sounds like it was. So you used the tear gas. Only it wasn't working for reasons that had nothing to do with the subject, and eventually it worked. So I'm good with that. That's not escalation. Escalation is doing something when things seem to be resolving, but an extra use

of force, an extra kick, an extra takedown, that caused things to go a little haywire. That's what I mean by escalation.
**MALE:** So buy definition, that would be out of policy.
**KAHAN:** Okay. Thank you. That does answer my questions.
**MALE:** If officers are escalating (inaudible) made it through IA, we look at all of that stuff: Satisfactory performance, application management. If they're the ones escalating it and causing additional force, that should be (inaudible) seen on bodycam (inaudible) policy, so.
**KAHAN:** Thank you very much.
**LITTLEFIELD:** How many got referred to IA?
**MALE:** That was I think the same question. We'll have to – we should try to get those facts and (inaudible).
**ALEXANDER:** This is the Patrick, the chair. So they send it to me. I'll make sure that the rest of TAC gets it, so we'll have that (inaudible). All right?
**LITTLEFIELD:** Todd Littlefield. How many officers and/or suspects were seriously injured or went to the hospital or –
**MALE:** From those force (inaudible) – something we track (inaudible)?
**MALE:** We do track subject disposition, and so that – you're talking about (inaudible) would be that, so we can pull those numbers and refer those to you because that is – yeah (inaudible) we track. So I don't know off the top of my head of Q2. But those would be – all be serious uses of force which are also an automatic category 2, and we also – those go into an actual database (inaudible). So, yeah, I don't know off the top of my head. I want to give you the correct number, but, you know, that's few and far between serious uses of force.
**ALEXANDER:** Jim.
**KAHAN:** Well, thank you. Jim again. I understand why you can't report on cat 1. Can you at least tell us the number of incidents that involved cat 1 in the quarter without doing any other detail about (inaudible)?
(Inaudible)
**BUCKLEY:** There were no other cat 1s.
(Inaudible)
**MALE:** (Inaudible) there was one.
**FEMALE:** Right. Yeah.
**MALE:** So it was the in-custody death (inaudible)
**BUCKLEY:** Yeah.
(Inaudible)
**BUCKLEY:** And that was on –
**KAHAN:** Okay. (Inaudible)
**BUCKLEY:** Except there were no officer-involved shootings. It was an in-custody death in this (inaudible).
**KAHAN:** Okay. Yeah. And there were no other cat 1s to (inaudible)?

**FEMALE:** No.
**ALEXANDER:** All right. We've got two more questions. Let's get Alan then Todd.
**COMNES:** Yeah. Alan Comnes. You mentioned, like, if there's an injury or (inaudible) to the hospital for that. Does any of the use of force get systematically reported up to the FBI database or other national databases? Like, is there –
**HOLLANDS:** So – (inaudible). So, there is a template that (inaudible) that we fill out that is – I believe it goes to the FBI. (Inaudible) force events that involve hospitalization that is a trigger for those. So, yes, there is a specific template for it. It's different from the way we report force. There's (inaudible) that they collect that we don't collect and we –
**COMNES:** Is there a national data that's like you can go look at crime stats compared by (inaudible) cities. You do that with use of force?
**HOLLANDS:** Yeah. I believe so, but I just – again, I want to clarify that the way that they're reporting force, like, that – if they're collecting PPB force incidents, they're going to see, like, some (inaudible) because we don't have a lot of serious uses of force. And that's not really reflective of what – how we count force. The – they're looking for more high level –
**COMNES::** Sure.
**HOLLANDS:** High (inaudible) possible (inaudible) outcome that's usually – that's what we would (inaudible). And we exclude hospital admittance for reasons like mental health. For example, like, if someone is admitted for mental health treatment, then that wouldn't trigger (inaudible) uses of force, right, if that makes sense.
**ALEXANDER:** Todd.
**LITTLEFIELD:** Todd Littlefield. So of the 120 uses of force or subjects, how many were repeat offenders, and how many were – do you guys do, like, a toxicology? How many were on drugs, alcohol, or that kind of a thing?
**HOLLANDS:** So – Will Hollands. So we don't collect – we don't do, like, a toxicology – we don't have that access to that data. What in our office we do is we record the officer's perception. So if the officer perceives the subject to be under the influence of drugs or alcohol or something like that, we would record that, and we do have that data. I don't know off the top of my head for that quarter. As to your other question with repeat offenders, I don't – we track individual subjects' case events. So, for example, if one person happens to be the subject of force in one case in April and then they were also the subject for force in May, they would be (inaudible) as two individuals basically because that's just separate incidents. However, we do have the data on whether that – their specific identifier would appear multiple times, so we could get you information as to whether that's (inaudible). Again, I don't

– I can't speak – I don't know the exact numbers for Q2. That's – I think it has happened in the past. It's quite infrequent that you have the same person happening or hearing multiple times in a quarter.
**LITTLEFIELD:** Todd Littlefield. If you can put that in the numbers, I think it would be helpful for us to better understand who it is that we are talking about.
**MALE:** So you mean putting them all together – specifying that one subject could have multiple events?
**LITTLEFIELD:** Well, a repeat offender (inaudible) –
**MALE:** How many were (inaudible).
**LITTLEFIELD:** And/or if they were deemed to be on some kind of drugs or –
**MALE:** Yeah. So I think – let's –
**ALEXANDER:** This is Patrick, the chair. (Inaudible) get clarification of that too because (inaudible). So you guys are saying you just go by the officers observing? Like, the officer – this guy is having – the subject right here is having – under the influence. That's how you guys go by instead of (inaudible) he went to the jail and they took blood, they took a breathalyzer, and stuff like that?
(No response heard)
**ALEXANDER:** Okay.
**LITTLEFIELD:** I just think that would be helpful to have that breakdown so we could better understand.
**MALE:** So on – (inaudible) – so on the (inaudible) report, we have a – as for the precincts, there is breakdowns that show actually not just (inaudible) they're – whether they were drug or alcohol affected or mental health crisis, but (inaudible) there's a cross reference to those too. For example, like, people with weapons or perceived to be intoxicated. So I would just – if you want those, those numbers are in the report. They're not presented. We didn't present them in this slide deck, but in the report, you can pull those.
**MALE:** Okay.
**LITTLEFIELD:** So that would be (inaudible) weapons.
**MALE:** Yeah. That's a specific case in the report.
**ALEXANDER:** All there any more questions?
(No response heard)
**ALEXANDER:** All right. Just got a – this is Patrick, the Chair. I got a clarifying question. So, like, when you guys are using tear gas, do you automatically give them medical attention, or it's just something they ask for and then you give it to them?
**MALE:** SERT has medics that deploy with them, so they'll get seen by a medic.
**ALEXANDER:** Okay.
**MALE:** Yeah. (Inaudible).

**ALEXANDER:** Oh, okay.
**MALE:** Yeah. The Portland Fire Bureau are part of the rescue medics (inaudible).
**ALEXANDER:** Okay. So on a service call, they go on there?
**MALE:** Yes. They deploy. The rescue (inaudible).
**ALEXANDER:** Okay.
**MALE:** All full-scale deployments. So if it's a full team, SERT, CNT. Some of the lower-profile warrants (inaudible) car stop on somebody, no. But if it's one of the big ones that you see on TV, SERT was in this neighborhood, there's a medic there as well.
**ALEXANDER:** All right.
**MALE:** (Inaudible)
**KAHAN:** I'd like a little bit more clarity on when a use of force gets analyzed by a force inspector. Is it all cat 2s get analyzed, a random sample of cat 3s, or is it a random sample of everything, or how does that work?
**HEFLEY:** Well, it's every – from my understanding – I'm still getting -
**KAHAN:** (Inaudible) –
**HEFLEY:** Yeah. Every (inaudible) is on the force inspector. (Inaudible) is to look at every single case. I don't know if that's (inaudible) a little bit (inaudible) every audited case (inaudible) watch (inaudible). But every force case gets sent to me. I'd love to be able to watch them all and it's bodycam (inaudible) reviews all of the time, but in an ideal world (inaudible) all myself, but right now, I think that the SOP is (inaudible) percentage of the ones that (inaudible).
**KAHAN:** Jim again. You told me before the meeting began that you doubled your staff which I think is a great idea. (Inaudible) you said you have about 6 people – 6 analysts to 12.
**HEFLEY:** 6 analysts to 12 (inaudible)
**BUCKLEY:** (Inaudible)
**KAHAN:** So if you have 12 analysts – but if you have 102 force cases, do the arithmetic, it's possible to look at (inaudible)
**BUCKLEY:** Well, easier said than done, Jim.
**KAHAN:** I'd have to be told why that's the case because when I do the math, you know that you've got a use-of-force incident. It may well be one application of force. It may well be 356 applications of force. And granted the 6 – 356 will take more time, but the vast majority of them are single digit uses of force. And so you can really cover a lot of ground looking at it. So that's why I have difficulty looking at the 102 dividing by 12 and (inaudible) be able to do a reasonably good job, and if it looks like a really serious thing rather than the tear gas that we heard of which is really very easily explained and doesn't need much analysis, and that was 50-so odd uses right there (inaudible) worry about. But the ones you have to do, worry about, you can really give an intensive look. And I

think we would be helped if we had some more granular observations of problematic cases. It's after all our mission is to look at problematic cases and see if there's any way in which we could be better – that PPB could be better trained to deal with those cases. That's what we're told to do. We're trying to do our job. That kind of information would make our job information easier.

**MALE:** Okay.

**KAHAN:** And that's what I'm asking.

**MALE:** (Inaudible) going back to Kyle (inaudible) going back to the escalation (inaudible). That's one thing officers really embraced over the last few years. They're required by policy if they see escalation and other officers are escalated, they're required (inaudible) enact ABLE. And I know the officers have (inaudible) and they try to do (inaudible). And that's another thing built in our policy to prevent the escalation. So if they see it, they don't just stand by and – ideally, they don't stand by and say, "All right, guys." (Inaudible)

**KAHAN:** And if we had a quorum, we would be bringing up a recommendation that discusses exactly that point, but we don't have a quorum, so we can't do it. Maybe next November.

**HEFLEY:** Thank you.

**ALEXANDER:** All right. Thank you. All right. So now we're moving on to our DOJ monitor. I got to (inaudible) –

**FEMALE:** Yes.

**ALEXANDER:** I got to meet with them about a couple months ago. We sat down, and we talked. And I don't know how many people know about what they do here or (inaudible) part of TAC. And so I asked them to come just to kind of give us a brief rundown on what's going on (inaudible) a chance to ask questions about (inaudible) job as monitoring the DOJ settlement and all that. So without further ado, we'll get out of the way and let them introduce themselves some more. (Inaudible), but I think we need to (inaudible).

**M. SMITH:** Chair Alexander, are we ready to go? Pardon me if my audio is kicking a little bit. Is the room ready to go?

**ALEXANDER:** Yeah. We're ready to go.

**M. SMITH:** All right. Thank you for allowing us this time. I'll just say as I start, for me – and I'm not sure if the same for some of my online colleagues, the audio occasionally is a little bit distant or choppy, and so if I have a blank stare or trying to hear what's happening in the room, please forgive me. Not a critique but just something that is a little bit tough to hear from online occasionally. But Chair Alexander, I just want to thank you for the opportunity to be here tonight. We really enjoyed the meeting that we had with you, and it just made sense as we talked, and you mentioned this a moment ago, for the monitoring team to come and have a connection with this advisory council, and we're very happy to do so. I'm going to hold off on introductions of myself and my

team members for just a moment at the risk of doing things out of order. We'll get to that in just a second. But I really want to talk about the fact that this for us is an opportunity not just to – both to talk and to listen. We're happy to talk a little bit about the settlement agreement and the basics of it. And Patrick, we had talked about the import of doing so particularly for some maybe newer members of TAC and – or just making sure that people are all on the same page with regard to what that agreement is and what the monitorship is, and so we'll do that. But in addition, a part of what we do is to listen. We want to make sure that as we go about this monitorship, which, again, we'll talk more about in just a moment, we do so hearing the voices from across Portland. Everyone who is a stakeholder or has a point of view, a concern with regard to how Portland police are operating with any relevance to the settlement agreement is something that we want to hear because I think without listening genuinely, the job that we have to do would not be done as well if we don't have those voices in our ear. So we meet with a lot of different advisory councils, community groups, government entities, clergy, et cetera to try to make sure that we have – we maintain a listening ear to a broad spectrum and make sense for us to be listening to this Training Advisory Council. I just want to say also I appreciate I've only been to a couple meetings, and I appreciate that I hear the mission statement of the advisory council. It's important. As you'll see from my teammates and I, we believe in groups like this one. We believe in their import, and we believe in their value to a policing agency. And so I think the job that's done by this council is critical and can be critical to finding improvements. And so that stuff is really important to us, and I appreciate the chance to connect with you for that reason tonight. So let's go ahead with introductions, and I'll get back to a little more discussion about the settlement agreement and what the monitorship is. My name is Mark Smith. I'm the lead monitor over the settlement agreement that exists between the city and the United States Department of Justice. My career has been spent in civilian oversight of law enforcement, and that's really holding police departments to account with regard to constitutional policing; professional policing; policing that squares with a department's own rules, regulations, and policies as well as relevant laws. It's really finding ways to ensure and maintain accountability in policing. I've had the pleasure of doing that in a few different places around the country which has allowed me to see different styles of policing, different things that work for one place that may not work for another place. I've done that in Los Angeles, both the city and county in Chicago, and the California Bay area as well. And the other thing that I want to mention about myself, and this goes for some of my teammates as well, is that we've got experience in a number of different cities that have been

at different stages of a settlement agreement of their own, or sometimes there are consent decrees as opposed to settlement agreements, but they serve a very similar function. We have worked with jurisdictions and cities that have been headed into a settlement agreement where Portland was over a decade ago before this current one was enacted. We work with cities that are kind of partway through or reaching the end of their consent decree or settlement agreement and had the opportunity to see what was necessary to finish the job. And we got work with departments that have successfully emerged from consent decree or settlement agreement. And we've been able to see how the reforms that were made, the gains that were made, the progress that was made can be lasting and durable. And so that's part of what we bring to this role. So that's my background. I'm going to ask my colleagues who are here on the call today to introduce themselves, and then I'll come back and talk a little bit more again about some of the basics of the settlement agreement and the monitorship. So I'm going to turn it to Deputy Monitor Russell Bloom.

**BLOOM:** Thanks Mark, and thank you to the council for the invitation to be here with you all tonight. I, as Mark said, just really appreciate the opportunity to learn from you all and watch as you engage in fulfilling your mission. I have come to this role as deputy monitor on this stellar team that I'm with really with a background in civilian oversight, similar to Mark's, not for as many years as Mark. But I spent the last 10 years as the independent police auditor overseeing the Bay Area Rapid Transit Police Department. I retired from that role earlier this year. But I also have had an opportunity to work with councils, commissions, boards, many like yourselves who have been formed from community members to play an active role in improving policing. And in fact I came to civilian oversight of law enforcement as a volunteer police review commissioner in the city of Berkley which is really where I developed my passion for doing this work. So it's exciting to be able to be virtually in this room with you tonight. I'm glad to answer any further questions about my background or my experience, but in the interest of time, let me just say thanks again for having us. I'll pass it on to Dr. Robert Fornango.

**FORNANGO:** All right. Thank you. And I'll reiterate as Mark and Russell both mentioned that I appreciate the opportunity to be here with all of you and experience your meeting and your activities in this area as the advisory council. My background is a little bit mixed. I hold a Ph. D. in Criminology and spent a considerable amount of time doing – as an academic working at the university level doing research in violent crimes and law enforcement interventions to reduce violent crimes, a lot of program and policy evaluation when it comes to law enforcement and policing interventions. And then I've also spent about a decade working in

the healthcare quality improvement arena pretty much doing the same thing as a data scientist working with a large team of analysts to help evaluate programs and policies for improving the quality of care that's given to Medicare and Medicaid patients across the country in the United States both for the federal government and approximately 18 different states. So my background has really been largely around data analysis, data science, and being able to translate quantitative and qualitative information into usable and actionable public policy and quality improvement. So that's my perspective and a little bit about my background and what I bring to the team for the purpose of this monitorship. So I will turn it back over to Mark, and as Russell mentioned, I'm happy to speak any more about my background if people do have questions.

**SMITH:** Thanks very much, Rob. Thanks, Russell. Russell, I did hear the dig, the fact of how old I am because I've done this for a long time. I got it. Yep. I understand. We actually have nine total members on our team. You've heard from just a few of us tonight. If I've missed anyone here in the Zoom – in the Microsoft Teams universe, please let me know. We have nine people in total on our team, and we really combined a few different areas of expertise. You've heard a few. There are two retired law enforcement executives on our team, both of whom who have worked with, as I mentioned before, consent decrees or settlement agreements as well as another data scientist as well as folks who have expertise in community connections as well as some homelessness expertise. So we bring sort of all of that to bear on the job that we have to do which I will again talk about in just a moment. Patrick, when we met, there was talk about just making sure people were sort of on the same page and on the same level with regard to the settlement agreement. I'm going to start with that, and I'll be very careful to not attempt to do a history lesson here because (a) I'm probably not the best person you could find to do it, and (b), it would be just devastatingly boring. So I'll try to make it sort of the short version as much as I can. Some of you or many of you I'm guessing have familiarity with this already, but just in case there isn't, I'll go over the basics, and we can talk in more detail insofar as it's helpful. So back – all the way back in around 2011, the United States Department of Justice conducted an investigation into policing activities by the city of Portland and Portland Police Bureau. Found a pattern of practice of force that was inappropriate. They brought a lawsuit on that basis in 2012 against the city of Portland. The DOJ as a plaintiff and the city of Portland as the respondent or defendant agreed to a set of reforms that became the settlement agreement in 2014. A number of reforms that they agreed to implement in order to get the case dismissed. And once they proved that they had met all of the reforms that were required, the case would essentially be subject to dismissal on that basis. The settlement agreement – so it's, you

know, more than a decade old now. It, you know, really was entered into and approved by the court in 2014, so we're just about 11 years out from when it was approved. It's a long time, but it's also unfortunately not unusual for agreements of this stature and agreements of this nature. Other cities that have comparable experiences with this, it varies from place to place, but it's not unheard of at all for an agreement to extend this long. And I can think of places like Seattle and Los Angeles that have gone through – Albuquerque I think has completed theirs, and it went a little bit faster over all, but these things take time to implement. And so Portland is I think toward the very end of their agreement at this point which is good, but it is not complete just yet. The agreement has gone through a series of amendments over its life, over its decade plus in existence. And there's a particularly notable set of amendments, notable for us and notable for the current situation. In January of last year, so January 2024, the city had proved that with regard to just about half of the requirements in the settlement agreement, which numbered I think just over 100 in total, right around 100 – the city had proved that they had indeed met their requirements for those paragraphs, and they were summarily terminated. So roughly half of the agreement disappeared. In addition with regard to the remaining half that were still to be implemented, the city and the DOJ agreed that they wanted an independent court-appointed monitor to come in and basically assess the compliance with those remaining paragraphs. They had not had an independent monitor previously. There was another body that, again, many of you I'm sure are very familiar with, the COCL, Compliance Officer Community Liaison, that have been doing some measurements with regard to compliance, but it wasn't in the role of a court-appointed – an independent court-appointed monitor. And so the parties being the city and the DOJ saw fit to introduce a monitor to look over the remaining portions of the settlement agreement. The main areas that remained were paragraphs in use of force in training, which is of course of great relevance to this council; community-based mental health services; crisis intervention; the Employee Information System or EIS which helps track officer behavior; officer accountability; PCCEP which is the Portland Committee on Community Engaged Policing which you may be familiar with; and then there's some additional remedies that were added on later that included body-worn cameras. They include the new oversight system that's being stood up right now. So those are the main areas that the monitor was brought in to assess. There's something really critical I want to mention about the monitorship that differs from the past when these amendments came through, and it's that we are independent of either party. And so I know it mentioned on the agenda – and, please, this is not a critique or bothersome – it mentioned on the agenda I think something like the

DOJ monitor. We are independent and completely separate from the DOJ and the city of Portland. We don't answer to either of them. We report to the court, and our reports on the city's compliance with the remaining portions of the settlement agreement are public. And we basically are charged with making objective assessments based on our collective experience and knowledge and work in this area and reporting those out to the court and the public. Again, we don't answer to the DOJ. We don't answer to the city. We are meant to be – as Judge Simon, who is the judge presiding over this case for the last, you know, 13 years or so – as Judge Simon has often said, we are independent of both parties. We make our judgements base on what we think is right, and we do so objectively. We don't lean one way or the other. We don't lean toward the DOJ; we don't lean toward the city. So what exactly do we do? We receive information, compliance information, from the city, evidence that shows how it has complied with the remaining paragraphs of the agreement, and we make independent assessments of whether or not that evidence that they provided us shows that they have substantially complied, which isn't necessarily a perfect standard, but substantially complied with each one of the remaining paragraphs, yes or no, and then we report on that publicly. And once the city has proved that it has indeed reached substantial compliance with all of the remaining paragraphs of the agreement, eventually then the agreement will be terminated as I mentioned. So that is the main purpose, but I'll emphasize once more that as we do this work, as we make these assessments, as we put pen to paper figuratively and literally on making our assessments, we want to do so in an informed way. We want to do so in a way that is listening to the community's voices, to stakeholders who are working with the bureau as this council does regularly, to people who are impacted by policing in Portland. We want to be informed by that as we do our work. And so the opportunity to come and talk to you today but also listen to you today – I know I've been doing a ton of talking here, and I'm going to try to end that in just a moment here and do some listening as well and try to answer some questions – that's the broad sort of overview of what the monitorship is, who we are, our independence from either party, and the role that we have to basically make judgments and assess whether or not the city is meeting its requirements. I'll say one other thing that sort of popped in my mind. Our role is very specifically defined and our authority is defined and limited by the settlement agreement itself. Although we want to hear all the voices that I mentioned, and I mean it very genuinely I want to be informed in making our assessments, we may agree with some of the things that we hear; we may disagree with some of the things that we hear, but want to hear all of it. The mistake would be not to listen. And so that's what we want to do, but what we do with that information informs our assessments, but we

don't have the authority to expand our role, to change the agreement. Our authority is to make judgments based on the information give to us of whether or not the city is meeting its obligations, and so that's what we do. Maybe I'll – I'll finish with this: I'll put into the chat – we have a website that you're welcome to visit. It includes more information about our team. It includes all of the documents that we file publicly with the court. It's – I'll put it in the chat, but it's portlandpolicemonitor.com. It also includes our contact information, how you can reach out to us, and we are always happy to hear from you. One of things that's there on the website is our first semiannual compliance report – thank you very much, Kathryn, for that. Appreciate the assist. For those of you in the room, the chat now includes our website which is helpful. Thank you. The one document on there, and then I'm going to end after this and see if there's any discussion that we can have with the members in the room – one important that's there is our first semiannual compliance report. So we have one report out so far that shows our assessments, and we welcome commentary on it before we finish it. We have a public comment period that's required by the settlement agreement to take input before we finalize it. But it's our judgment on how the bureau is doing with regard to the 55, 5-5, remaining paragraphs that were subject to some form of monitoring. We are in the process of producing our next report now. We have received material from the bureau. We are reviewing it. As we speak, team members are reviewing that material, and we will produce our next report which will come toward the end of the calendar year, and that will be our second report, but that's available for everyone to see. That was a lot. I apologize. I told myself not to talk for as long as that, and I went against it and did. Let me just check in with my teammates very quickly to see if there's anything to add, and then I'd like to have a discussion in the room. Russell? Rob? Good?

(No response heard)

**SMITH:** All right. That's the broad overview. Patrick, I hope I did okay. If there are things that you want me to focus on, let me know, and if there are questions and discussion people want to have, we're open to it.

**ALEXANDER:** All right then, Mark. We got some questions for you coming in.

**KAHAN:** Jim Kahan. We've met twice before via Zoom, twice last year. I have two questions for you. The first is you're talking about being independent. My understanding of what Rosenbaum and the COCL did, they were also equally independent, and we have seen a shift from them to you that maybe had some different components. The story changed, but it was still based on independent observation. So my first question is is that (inaudible) difference between the COCL's mission and your mission. My second question is about your internal

working (inaudible) corporation for over 20 years, and though it was very important to us there was we had the internal quality assurance process of our own, and nothing went out the door without that quality assurance process. Could you describe your own quality assurance process? Thank you.

**SMITH:** Thanks very much for the questions, Jim. It's good to see you and hear from you again. And as you mentioned, yes, we've had opportunities before, not necessarily with the entire council until now, to do this introduction but with some members of it and the CQI group which I really enjoyed. We appreciated the comments and, I hope it's okay for me to say, some of the frustrations that were expressed to us. That is part of what we valued in listening to as we went about our job, and we will continue to do so. So thank you, Jim, and thank you to the CQI members for the previous conversations we've had. With regard to the COCL – I'll be careful. I don't want to sort of speak out of turn. Before the monitor came on scene, you know, this was not a scenario or a landscape that we were familiar with. We applied in a process to be selected as the monitor, and we're fortunate to have that selection, but we weren't really sort of invested or involved with the structure of things as they were before. We do have a lot of familiarity with the COCL for sure. We have reviewed really all of their reports to some degree in the past and really appreciated the work that was done and the information we were able to gather from it. But as far as the differences in structure, to my knowledge, the – our team is the only one to be appointed by the court as an independent body that reports directly to the court with our information as opposed to sort of sharing information that the parties can use and that the DOJ in particular could use to base its own monitoring reports off of. Before, the monitor – this independent team was in place, I believe that technically or maybe sort of in vernacular – to be honest, I'm not positive which – the DOJ was deemed the monitor officially of the case, but they're a party to the case. And so although they had information, including from the COCL, to base their monitoring reports on, and they produced I believe seven periodic monitoring reports over the life of the settlement agreement. Those monitoring reports including based on COCL information, again, were not independent in my opinion being that they came from one of the parties. And so that's where a lot of the independence I believe comes from: Appointment by the court, reporting directly to the court, and not having the reports that we put out be by a party. Rather it's by an independent body, and those I think are some of the crucial changes. With regard to internal quality control, I hope I won't put you on the spot but, Rob, I'd love – just because I worry about me using my voice way too much here and, again, being as I said before – I think I used the phrase "devastatingly boring." I'm sure I'm already at risk of approaching that. Rob, if you could

talk about some of the things that we do when we make our assessments and our measurements to make sure that they're balanced, that they're fair, that they're objective, and that they're based on sufficient information to have a confidence in them.

**FORNANGO:** Sure. Thanks. And thank you for the question, Jim. In terms of the process that we use internally, a lot of our information – we basically have sort of – think of two buckets of information that we have. One is there are some analyses that are done by PPB where they – their analysts run some numbers, and they provide us with information in a report that they've compiled and they've produced or multiple reports. There's actually quite a lot of documents that they give us. And so these are some basic tabulations that they run that we have. But there are also analyses that we do where we're looking at specific case documentation, you know, particular uses of force where we've taken a random sample of cases. We've said, "Give us all the case documentation." So we see the FDCRs. We see the After Action Reports. We see the narratives that are compiled by the officers. We have access to the bodycam footage. And we'll go through and review those cases. And one of the things that we've done is compile a number of standardized evaluation instruments. These are basically what I would refer to as a visual abstraction tool. So as our team is going through reviewing this case documentation or body worn camera footage or what have you, we're coding and answering questions about those particular events for whatever part of the monitor – whatever part of the settlement agreement we're monitoring. To make sure that those are being done, obviously having one person doing that coding is not an ideal situation. We want to have more than one person doing that. You want to make sure that you're not reliant on just one person's judgment. So we have multiple people assigned to each of the categories – each of the components of the settlement agreement. And when we're performing our evaluation, we're breaking up the pieces that need to be evaluated having different people do the evaluation and then basically we swap and go back and review each other's work to make sure that we're all in agreement on what everyone is seeing. So in a way, this is a type of data validation where we're actually doing a double – in some ways a double review. One of them is probably a little more depth than the person that goes back and does the validation because they don't – they may not have to go through and read everything in quite as much detail to make sure that it's all captured appropriately, but they're doing that double check in the evaluation. And then we can go back, and if there are discrepancies, we can get together, reconcile those discrepancies, and then be able to come to a decision that we feel comfortable with as a group where we understand this is what we believe happened in this particular case. After that then, we have a number of quantitative analyses that we perform with the data that we've

collected. And for that, it's myself, and we have another data scientist on the team. So we've written the programming code to do the analysis. We both review the code and review the output as well as other members of the team who have to work with that output. We'll – they'll review it as well. And so basically, everything that we have from a quality assurance standpoint – everything that we're doing, we have multiple sets of eyes on as we're going through the review, the analysis, and then compiling the reports. And when it comes to compiling the reports with Mark and Russell taking a big chunk of the lead on bringing all of the pieces together, the teams for each section in the settlement agreement are going through that process, developing the drafts, and then there's an iterative process back and forth through the team as we discuss the results, write up the results, and then, you know, try to land on where we are with the final report. I think that covers most of the question about what does our quality assurance process look like. If I didn't cover something you were interested in, please let me know.

**KAHAN:** Unfortunately, you didn't. Quality assurance demands that somebody who is not related to working on the project before it goes out your door reads it and says – somebody who knows something about the topic – reads it and says I have nothing to do with it. I'm reading this. Does this pass muster? What you've done is you've given me a very good description of your methods, and they sound sound. I have to say that. Sounds reasonable. That's what I would do if I was given the project. But I don't hear the quality assurance which is somebody who had nothing to do with the project but is knowledgeable – even if you have to go outside and hire them as a consultant – reading it and giving you the "Okay, this makes sense. You seem to have covered all the bases. You've justified what you've done adequately." And what you've just presented, I didn't hear that.

**ALEXANDER:** All right. So thanks, Jim, for that we're going to – do you guys want to respond to that? If not, we have a question here from Alan.

**KAHAN:** Let Alan go now, please.

**SMITH:** I think just maybe just a brief response if I could. The – I think – so the general umbrella – and I'm not a data scientist, so I'll be careful with – I'll try to be careful with my terminology here. The general concept is sort of a peer review which is what I'll relate your question to even if that's – I know it's not your term for it - is I think something of value, something that we see even in my space, in a non-science space, in terms of civilian oversight of law enforcement. There are peer review processes to look at, different systems of accountability, different systems of oversight, what can be done better by someone who is uninvolved with it. So I think the concept of it – I fully understand – it's not part of the monitorship or the contract that we have with the city.

So a part of this monitorship was the city was required to enter into a contract with our team which they did to include an outside entity or have that functionality as something that's beyond our authority or control and would be something for the city to do if they should want to. We do – I mentioned this very briefly, and it's not quite exactly what you asked, but I think it may be relevant still. We do have, again, a heavy public comment period on the work that we do. We want to hear from the public about what they think about our work. Their involvement with PPB that is not in a monitoring function. Their experiences to see if it comports with what we're saying in our findings. And when we hear from the public, we listen to every single comment we get. There's a period of 32 days that's required by the settlement agreement before our report can be completed that it needs to be subject to public comment, and every single thing we get back, we take into account. I mentioned this before. We may concur with some; we may not concur with others, and some may be things that we don't think are relevant to making a change to our report. But oftentimes they are relevant. Oftentimes they do cause us to make a shift, and we focus on every single one that we receive. And so it's a little different than your question I fully recognize, but that public comment period is critical to us, and so I thought it was worth mentioning still.

**ALEXANDER:** Thank you for that, Mark. For the sake of time, we're going to move on. Alan, ask your question, please.

**COMNES:** So Alan Comnes – and actually – so I have two questions. One (inaudible) public, but I'll be brief, and (inaudible) second question is a little more (inaudible). So the first question was just I think just (inaudible) what the public comment period was. So my understanding, unless I'm missing something is these semi (inaudible) reports that can be your main purpose. They'll lead us either into continued reform or get us out of this settlement is my understanding. So I guess maybe it's three questions. So question one is am I wrong in that assumption, or is there some other document that's sort of giving us a rate or a score that we should be watching. So that's on question. The second question is just the art of the semiannual reports – like, you had one that came out in May. It finalized at the end of June. That's great. I didn't – as someone who probably would (inaudible), it didn't seem very clear about when the deadline for comments was. You just mentioned the timeline. And also, even, like, your – you had a public workshop – I think it was announced by the P-C-C-E-P, but I – I don't know. I didn't hear about it until it was almost happening. So just a little bit about the process of these semiannual reports, and are those the main body by which we are monitoring this – monitoring the monitor, I guess. And then my second – my third question or last question is if I read the settlement, you know, in this relationship with the Training Advisory Council – you know, in the end, it says nice

things about both of us, but in the end, we're just one other source of information for you. That's how I read it. And I don't consider that bad, but am I mistaken in that? We're just, like, another source (inaudible) – so those are my questions.

**SMITH:** Thanks, Alan. I'll do my best here. Again, there was – please pardon me. There was just one or two little cutouts in the beginning, but I think I've got it. If I don't, just tell me and I'll redirect. The semiannual reports. Yes. So those are filed with the court when they're finalized, and only once are semiannual reports deem that the city is in substantial compliance with all the remaining paragraphs can the parties, being the DOJ and the city, motion the court to end the case that led to the settlement agreement. There's a little more nuance to it than that. You might already be familiar with this. It's all laid out in the settlement agreement which is on our website should you ever want to read it. The nuance is that once we deem a set of paragraphs – that's referred to as a discreet section. There are groupings of paragraphs – once our team deems a discreet section is in substantial compliance, there are a couple different factors of how that discreet section could then move to a secondary phase called self-monitoring where the paragraph still h`as effect. It's not terminated yet, but the city is now responsible for doing the monitoring of that paragraph. And our team works with the city on its plan of how they're going to do that self-monitoring and then evaluates whether they did their self-monitoring in accordance with their plan, and only then once they have successfully done that for two semiannual periods, then that discreet section, that group of paragraphs can move to termination. So that's a lot of little steps in between. Again, I have a feeling that some or all of you know some of those steps well, and so pardon me if I've kind of walked through them. But to say it basically and try to get back to your question or what I believe it was, yes, it's our semiannual reports, our assessments, filed with the court that only once everything gets into substantial compliance, and only once that self-monitoring phase has been completed for all the paragraphs as well can then the parties move to dismiss the case. So those are the critical reports. As far as the timing for public comment, it is a 32-day period. That's, again, written into the settlement agreement that it will be 32 days. It's after both parties have a chance to look at the draft report and make some comments on it, and we can then respond and react and make any changes we see fit to those comments. Then we release it to the public for 32 days, and we will not finalize the report until we get those comments back from the public. And that really kind of sets out the semiannual rhythm to these things. So, yes, our last report was released at the end of June. This report will be released sort of mid to end of December and so on. So the public comment period this time around – pardon me. I should have

this. I apologize for not having it in front of me. I believe it's basically the month of November. It roughly overlaps or covers the month of November before we finalize and file that report. We did do our best to try to really advertise that public comment period as widely as we could. We circulated the report multiple times to distribution lists from our own work in Portland, from the city, from other advisors that wanted to be included on the list including clergy and community groups. And it was – I forget the numbers – well over 200, possibly 250, different places we circulated to. We did so multiple times, but that list continues to grow, and it will be bigger next time. If you want to be on it, please, you know, just send us an email. I'm sure the – or let us know. We'll be sure to include you if Patrick – what I was thinking is, Patrick, if you want to make sure the entire TAC is included, you can let us know, and we'll make sure that gets onto the list. But we continue to grow that list over time. We'll continue to do so. We want everyone to know that it's out there available for them. And it was similar to the town hall, and I'm actually going to ask Russell if he can chime in here with how we really made effort to try to make sure we had a broad point of view and some good attendance at the town hall.

**BLOOM:** Yeah. Thanks, Mark. I appreciate that. Similar to the way that we did our best as, you know, newer to Portland learning how to reach people, how to make sure people understood what we were up to, where the town hall would be, when it would be, what to expect, how to access it, we really did rely heavily on our community partners. One of our team members, Antoinette Edwards, is just a long-standing community elder in the city of Portland, and we certainly relied heavily on her contacts and her awareness and knowledge of how best to spread the word. And I'm sure that we learned a lot about how to reach even further into areas of Portland and agencies and organizations that we may have somehow missed, and we look to continue to do better each time. But as Mark said, you know, we would love to have the entire TAC on our constant mailing list for all types of things including community input and comment and also awareness of the town hall and an opportunity to attend either in person or remotely. The town hall also – the video is available on our – via our website if you want to go back and see what that was like. But going forward, we certainly want to make sure that there is a greater awareness. And there was some learning curve for us about how to most effectively host an event like that, and we will continue to fine tune our processes including outreach, engagement, and awareness efforts so that nobody feels like they didn't have an opportunity to attend if they wanted to. So thanks for alerting us to that, and of course, I'm sorry that we didn't find a way to make you feel more aware of what we were doing with the town hall. Look forward to our next one, and I will make an extra effort to make sure that this body is fully informed about the location, et cetera.

**ALEXANDER:** All right. Thank you for that. For the interest of time, we've got two more questions real quick, and I will email you guys a list of everybody on our TAC team – who is part of TAC – with their email address.
**SMITH:** Thank you, Patrick.
**ALEXANDER:** All right. We've got a question from Tony, then we've got a question from Sylvia, then after that in the sake of – in the interest of time, we're going to have to kind of speed things up here a little bit here. All right, Tony.
**MARICK:** Yeah. Tony Marick. So since this is the Training Advisory Council, I'd like to know what areas of improvement you're still looking for specifically to TAC since this is the whole group. What progress has been made? What areas (inaudible) still see necessary as part of that settlement agreement? You don't have to go into super specifics but, you know, maybe the information would really be helpful.
**SMITH:** Yeah. Thanks for that. I have to say as noted in our report, the training paragraphs of the settlement agreement were an area of strength for the city. We felt that with regard to the requirements in the report, the city performed quite well and showed itself to be substantially compliant based on our assessment. That's not to say that there isn't more improvement to be made. I mentioned this kind of really, I don't know, briefly in my earlier remarks from now a long, long time ago, but I meant it very intently and genuinely. The people on our team, the nine people who work together, we believe very strongly in bodies like this one. We have seen them – Russell mentioned them in his introduction as well. We have seen them in different forms and in different places all around the country frankly between the nine of us, and we think that they are critical to constantly improving practices and questioning practices. To be honest with you, I really appreciated a lot of questions that I heard earlier tonight that you were asking to the bureau as they made their presentation of data. You were asking for more information, and can we have more information about substantial injuries? Could we have more information about, you know, out of how many uses of force that were recorded in this period, how many became part of the audit that was done? Can we have more data on that stuff? I think those are exactly the types of questions that a body like this should be asking to continue to improve practices by the department, to improve training divisions including PPB, but I can speak more broadly about other law enforcement agencies as well. So there is never a time to stop doing that. But back to your original question, with regard to the training paragraphs – and I'm going to try to count them up very quickly here. There were I believe six total paragraphs in the training that we looked at. It was an area of strength for the city. They had showed substantial compliance in those areas, and all six have now moved onto the self-

monitoring phase. So the city is now monitoring their own six training paragraphs that exist in the settlement agreement. I mentioned – and I know I'm going long here – I mentioned one other sort of nuance about how things get to self-monitoring – again, all of this detail is in the agreement itself, and I won't try to read you everything – but it has to be not only from our assessment but a combination of our assessment plus the DOJ's most recent assessment or the COCL's most recent two assessments. It's got to have all of those things together measuring substantial compliance or resulting in substantial compliance in order to move to self-monitoring. All six training paragraphs did so. And so both or predecessors as well as our team felt that that was an area of strength for them. But there's still improvement to be done as you watch training, as you go to citizen police academies, as you sit through force option simulators, as you do the tasks that you do on this council, don't stop holding the bureau's feet to the fire. Don't stop making suggestions on how they can be better. I do not undervalue in any way the role for that despite the fact that it was an area of strength specifically on just the settlement agreement paragraphs. That's not to say training in general, training overall. It's just those six requirement that we felt were done well.

**ALEXANDER:** Thank you for that. Sylvia?

**ZINGESER:** This is Sylvia Zingeser speaking. Mark Smith, I was at the settlement (inaudible), and I testified. And one of the reasons we went was we wanted a clarification on paragraph 86 because we were told by the force inspector and the inspector general that we had – the only data that we could use was the force report which doesn't – the data that we need for the continuous quality improvement is that we need events data and I'll – you know, I may ask Jim to explain that a little more, but I had explained it. I worked as a medical technologist, and so I have been wanting for years – I came for the Crisis Intervention Training Advisory Board to the TAC board and know that getting a quality assurance program where we can look at policy and procedure and equipment and to reduce the number of injuries from police officers, to reduce the number of incidents of people in a mental health crisis ending up in officer-involve shootings and whatever. That's the purpose of this. I'm with NAMI Multnomah. I'm a NAMI Multnomah family member. I don't represent them, but I am a member of them, and we didn't – what Judge Simon said to us is that we needed to work, collaborate, with the people who came together to put together this – these paragraphs because we cannot use the force report when we were told that that's the only thing that we can use, and it's not going to give us the data that we need. Now when we heard you speak, you were able to collect a certain amount of data by working with Portland – the analysts, and I'm – I'm assuming that they got that information for you. We don't know whether you got the kind of data that we could

use for our recommendation. So that's one of my questions is can we do that. Yeah. But that's kind of a – that's kind of both of them. We still have to meet with at least two other groups, and you're one of them, and then we have to go back to Judge Simon to tell him whether or not we accomplished what we – because he can't – he cannot – he can't tell us or tell anyone what is going to be in that – the paragraphs. It has to come from the city attorney, so it has to come from the (inaudible), and it has to – you know, the COCL – you have replaced the COCL, so you are the other body. So my question is when can we meet with you again. We've already met with you, but now that you know that we're going have to go back to Judge Simon, we're going to see if we can't talk to the city attorney – this is not – the problem is interpretation of paragraph 86. We couldn't find (inaudible) in there that say we only can take the force report, and that goes against us trying to really drill down in these events to see if we can write a recommendation, and then the training division can take it from there. Well, we can't do that. We've been – we've been stalled.

**SMITH:** Sylvia, thank you for that question, and thank you for your dedication also. With regard to a time for a meeting, in the interest of being careful with the council's time and Chair Alexander's time, I'll ask you if you can simply send us an email, give us a call. Our contact information is all in the chat. We will be – we are ready and very glad to set up another meeting with you and multiple meetings with you if you'd like to have them. We've yet to turn – in our year plus of monitorship, we've yet to say no to my knowledge to someone who has asked to meet with us. So, please, just drop us a line. We'll be happy to find a time that works for everybody on everyone's calendar. With regard to paragraph 86, I'm glad you brought that up. It's one of the things I had in my notes to think about speaking about tonight. It's the one remaining paragraph that has a direct intersection with the TAC. It's the one place that talks about a responsibility for the PPB and the TAC together. We – I cannot speak for PPB or the OIG or the city or the DOJ for that matter. I cannot and do not speak for them. What was said or wasn't said, I have no voice on that whatsoever. What I can tell you is as far as the monitor is concerned, we read paragraph 86 very directly. It requires a few things. It requires the force inspector to – I'm paraphrasing here and reading the short version. There's more in the paragraph itself, but I won't read it all – to present data on a quarterly basis regarding patterns and trends and officers uses of force to the TAC. They've got to present data. That's a requirement. The training division has the authority and the responsibility to make recommendations as I know you all know this to the chief regarding proposed changes in policy, training, or evaluations based on the data that's presented to it, and the chief has a responsibility to assess any use-of-force patterns identified

by the TAC and implement necessary remedial training. Those are requirements we look for. Is that happening? To my knowledge, this language does not talk about what data specifically is included, is not included, how much data. Is it, you know, 18 pages? 700 pages? 1 page? There is nothing about that in this paragraph. There is a requirement to present data on a quarterly basis to the TAC. There is an authority and responsibility for the TAC to make recommendations as it sees fit based on the data presented to it, and there is a requirement for the chief to respond to those recommendations. Our job is to look for compliance with that paragraph insofar as working out sort of what data is presented. Again, I think that's – those are important discussions to have, and the parties have responsibility to meet with TAC and to do that, and we'll be part of that too, but when we look at this paragraph, look at the language of the paragraph, that's our responsibility in making an objective assessment of it (inaudible).

**KAHAN:** (Inaudible)

**ALEXANDER:** Jim, we can't Jim.

**KAHAN:** (Inaudible).

**ALEXANDER:** Jim. Jim. We can't for the sake of time. We cannot keep –

**KAHAN:** You're lying.

**ALEXANDER:** Thank you for all that, Mark. We appreciate you guys showing up today. You're going to have to let that go, Jim, for some other time for the sake of time. We still got other stuff we need to discuss here about the meeting. Thank you.

**SMITH:** Understood. Thank you, again, Patrick for having us. Jim, I'm sorry you feel that way. Happy to talk to you. I respectfully disagree, but we're happy to talk whenever time allows. Thanks, everyone.

**ALEXANDER:** I didn't mean to cut people off, but we have to. It's like 8:04 now. The meeting ends at 8:30. You may not agree with everything that's been said, but it's what was said, and we have to deal with it. Moving onto the agenda now, we're going to talk about – I'm going to come – I'm fixing to start combining some things. TAC member retention and the task group template. First, I'm going to talk about the task group template. I don't know if everybody got a copy of it or – it was sent out to you guys, right? Look at it and talk about the task group and their mission. When we're talking about what the motto is for the task group, people stepping up saying (inaudible) the task group, so, like, when we do have meetings like this, we can say, hey, this is what this task group is about and then to give the quick synopsis of it. CQI, you already turned yours in but – remember that when I talked about it?

**KAHAN:** (Inaudible) filled it out.

**ALEXANDER:** Yes.

**KAHAN:** Right.

**ALEXANDER:** Thank you for that. And that's all this is about (inaudible) that will help kind of speed up the process for people, give them a better understanding of it. All right? So it's getting passed out right now, so that's – we recommend just please look at it. If you have any questions about that or anything, you can please email and talk about it later. Then another thing we're going to talk about TAC member retention. Now for you guys to understand, since the beginning of this year that we've had our TAC meeting, after each meeting (inaudible). I have talked to people into trying to stay a few times and stuff, but now it's to the point of why aren't you talking to people about saying that it's coming to a point to where I feel like (inaudible) all of us about this. I do not want to have another TAC meeting then we have – and I get a couple emails from some people who say, "That's it. I want to quit TAC," and then they give their reasons why. I know myself I've talked to a few people – talked them out and ended up quitting anyway. I know from PPB, I talk to people about it, and they end up quitting anyway. And so as you see now tonight we don't even have enough for a quorum. As I keep telling you guys, this is – after my term is up at chair, I'm done with it. Because the goal for me is this – when I joined TAC, and it's like (inaudible) what type of change are they willing to make? What are we in here this group for? Why did we join? (Inaudible) some of the rules are clear about what we're about to do, what we're about. You know, but sometimes some of our discussions gets carried on, and I understand we're passionate about what we talk about, but then it also comes to a point in our life where we see sometimes if we're not going to agree upon something, sometimes we got to agree to disagree and learn how to move on from things. Like (inaudible) because it's about getting people in and allowing people to speak up, share their voice. Because all of us joined this TAC for a reason. Whatever our personal reasons are why we joined – and then it's like when people come here and they their (inaudible) they would like to (inaudible) and all of a sudden it seems like their voice is not being heard. They're being overshadowed, being overtalked. So I just want people to start thinking about this for themselves. Like, what is the real reason why you joined TAC. That's not – I got you, Jim. Let's not have another – I do not want to have another TAC meeting where I get some more emails of people wanting to quit TAC because, honestly, I'm not going to talk – I'm not going to talk them out. I'm going to thank them for their time and say hopefully maybe next go somewhere else and join another ground and maybe hope you come back a year later or so whenever we have another opening. I want people to start thinking about the questions that (inaudible). Think about some times when we do have these meetings and we're talking, think about maybe I've talked enough. Let somebody else get up and speak (inaudible) this time. It's not for me to talk today even though I

may feel something, I'm passionate about something. Send me an email. I have no problems with replying to it, talking with you on the phone. I may not answer you that day, but I will answer your email within the next couple of days. That's all I'm asking. Yes, Jim?
**KAHAN:** I agree with your problem.
**ALEXANDER:** No. It's all of our problem.
**KAHAN:** I'm about – I'm about ready to quit myself because I'm tired of being quiet.
**ALEXANDER:** Okay.
**KAHAN:** And I'm being lied to by multiple people, and you're not one.
**ALEXANDER:** All right.
**KAHAN:** I want this to be clear. But when we are told that paragraph 86 requires the data of the Use of Force Report to be in exactly the form that it's delivered to us, and Mark read paragraph 86 aloud, and it doesn't say anything about what's supposed to be in there. And when we say – and we wrote a recommendation that was passed by this body in January that the use of force in their present form cannot be used by us to make recommendations because they're inadequate, and then we spoke twice with Mark in 2024 and told him this, and he just went through a whole rigamarole telling us how he listens to everybody. And we told him that. We told him twice, and we sent him documentation about –
**ALEXANDER:** Let's – hold up.
**KAHAN:** Wait a second.
**ALEXANDER:** No, Jim.
**KAHAN:** Then we are told –
**ALEXANDER:** (Inaudible) but Jim, we are going over the same issue again. This is –
**KAHAN:** No. I am told – let me finish.
**ALEXANDER:** This is one of the issues –
**KAHAN:** Let me finish.
**ALEXANDER:** Jim, I will let you finish, but this sounds like we're going over the same thing about.
**KAHAN:** No. I do not –
**ALEXANDER:** You're not getting the (inaudible) information that you want.
**KAHAN:** Let me finish (inaudible).
**ALEXANDER:** But then we – this is but – this is one of the issues that we've been dealing with for a long time.
**KAHAN:** Okay. I want to finish by saying that we talked to him. This was as he told us today input into how he wrote his (inaudible).
**ALEXANDER:** Okay.
**KAHAN:** We gave him evidence, and he ignored it. We didn't just not (inaudible) his report. That's why I reacted.
**ALEXANDER:** Okay. But, Jim, listen.

**KAHAN:** (Inaudible)
**ALEXANDER:** But, Jim, we're going to have to – I know that but –
**KAHAN:** Okay. I'm done.
**ALEXANDER:** That's fine.
**KAHAN:** I am done.
**ALEXANDER:** Thank you. But you still have other stuff to deal with.
**KAHAN:** Yes. And I am done with this group.
**ALEXANDER:** Thank you, Jim.
**KAHAN:** I quit. Goodbye.
**ALEXANDER:** Okay. All right.
**KAHAN:** I've had it. You guys (inaudible) -
**ALEXANDER:** Thank you for your time.
**KAHAN:** I don't deserve any thanks for my time. I busted my ass to try to make this happen. I have written the vast majority of all of the reports of the past three years, and now you're telling me to fuck off, so I –
**ALEXANDER:** Nobody told you that whatsoever, Jim. Thank you for your time. This is, like I said, I'm not here to try to talk anybody into staying in TAC. Like I said, we've had – I came to – this is, what, my second year. Like, as soon as I joined and became the chair of TAC, every meeting we had somebody quit, quit, quit. We beat the – we've talked about a lot of issues over and over again. It's like how do we move forward. I don't want Jim to quit. I don't want Jim walking out feeling like someone told him to F off and all that stuff because that's not the point I'm trying to get at. That's not the point – I don't want nobody (inaudible) about joining this TAC. That's not why I joined. The point is sometimes we're not going to get everything that we want to do what we're supposed to do, but we still have to do what we're called to do and figure out a way to get around. But it just seemed like some issues we get stuck at one point. We can't do this. Okay. They told you what they – what they're willing to do. They told you what they're willing not to do. You've got to learn how to work with it. You do it. We've had our jobs before. We've worked for other people. We've worked – I've worked in corporate America. I worked in nonprofit. They told us some stuff sometimes – they said, "Hey, this is what you've got to work with," and guess what we did? We worked with it. I don't see what's the difference about same with this up here now. So if anybody else got expressions how they want to feel about what just happened, I have no problem with discussing it, but right now we're fixing to move forward and end this meeting. Yes?
**MALE:** I just want to thank you, Patrick for your – what's it called? Well, leadership, but that's not the right word. Diplomacy, neutrality in handling the situation.
**ALEXANDER:** Thank you. (Inaudible)
**COMNES:** (Inaudible) going on here, and I probably someone who also speaks – this is Alan Comnes. I probably speak too much too. But

just to – well, first of all, I think we can persevere through this because I think the mission of Training Advisory Council is very important. This is a practical matter. How many people do you think you're short? And one think I just want to put out there – I want to make a recommendation is that maybe 20-22 is the target –

TAC 09-10-2025
Transcribed 10/12/25 @ 5:05 p.m. Elice Turnbull (1008et01)