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CASTLE: All right. I’m seeing (inaudible). Fantastic. We’re going to get started in a few minutes, and just give folks a few more minutes to get settled in. It looks like someone is coming in from outside, so we’ll let them get in. And just a quick announcement. I will ask everyone to mute themselves when you’re not speaking, and then unmute yourself when it’s your turn to talk; otherwise, there’s just too much background noise in the room. And if you find you can’t unmute yourself, just chat, and we’ll fix that for you. Can people join themselves, or do we still have to approve them?

ATWOOD: I think I still have to (inaudible).

SCHURR: (Inaudible) with Gina earlier today, and I think she’s going to be here (inaudible) and I misunderstood.

CASTLE: Okay. Thanks, everyone, for being here. We officially have quorum, so I’m going to start the meeting. Before we do, I’ll just thank everyone (inaudible). I’ll speak up, and I’ll also introduce myself. Nathan Castle, Chair. One of the important things to keep in mind – I’m jumping into announcements – but we have a transcriptionist listen to this and transcribe, and so if we don’t give our names, it makes it very hard for them to produce an accurate transcript. We didn’t do this last time. I might gesture or wave or just interrupt you if you don’t introduce yourself. Try to remember. This will be new for us (inaudible) hybrid after several years of COVID, so thank you for your patience. Let’s see. I hope everyone can see the agenda projected on the screen and shared to Teams. First item, Call to Order. We did that. Welcome. We’ve done that now. The next item is the reading of the Mission, and I will do that now. The mission of the TAC is to provide ongoing advice to the Chief of Police and the Training Division in order to continuously improve training 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. Great. Next item on our agenda is the approval of the prior meeting’s minutes. These were shared online. I’ll try to click this. It does not work, unfortunately. Just give me a moment. Has everyone had a chance to review the meeting minutes for any errors? Are there any corrections for the meeting minutes?

(Hearing none)

CASTLE: All right. Hearing none. The meeting minutes are approved. Thank you, all. First item accomplished. The next item on the agenda is community agreements which I will show briefly. These are – the formatting is unfortunately broken, but we can still read them.
Listen deeply. Step up and step back. If you are usually quiet, try to challenge yourself to engage more. If you’re usually taking up a lot of space, try to reserve space for other people who aren’t usually heard. Be mindful of privilege. Share responsibility. (Inaudible) to impact if there is harmful behavior. We can address that in a respectful and appropriate way. Self-disclosure is self-decided. We want to address ideas, not people. I don’t think this is – we’ve had any issues with the community agreements in the most recent meetings which is wonderful, and I hope we keep that up. Okay. Chair’s Announcements and Reminders: As stated earlier, please remember to introduce yourself when speaking. “Hi, Nathan Castle,” and then speak. And other reminders that TAC members are expected to participate in a ride-along once a year. If you haven’t, hopefully our Training Division partners will tell you about how you can get signed up for one. I’ve personally been on ride-alongs. I think they’re great. I think it’s a good opportunity to learn about the police bureau and the police officers that they’re advising. And let me just read through my notes. All right. That was quick. Oh, also – oh, go ahead, Jim.

KAHAN: I was wondering if the guests here who are observing could identify themselves.

(Inaudible)

CASTLE: Yes. Observing identifying themselves. Sure. Why not? Would any of you guests like to introduce themselves?

ROBERTS: Hi, I’m Mike Roberts. I’m the force inspector. I think I was (inaudible), so that’s who I am. (Inaudible). He’s a data analysts and is a member of the force inspector team. This is (inaudible) who is a sergeant in North Precinct shadowing me as the force inspector. I think we’re guests, but I appreciate the introduction nonetheless, so thank you.

CASTLE: Honored guests. Thank you. All right. Oh, yeah. You should have received – if you’re a TAC member, you should have received many emails from me over the past two months. If you haven’t, let me know, and we’ll work on fixing that. I try to email about once a week, not quite every week, with updates and whatnot. So, yeah. Let’s see. Next item on our agenda – I know we’re a little bit early, but hopefully they don’t mind. Training Division Updates.

SCHOENING: Sure. Franz Schoening, captain of Training. So, for updates – so, we just started fall In-Service this week, and we had some of your folks attending dry runs and part of feedback, and we really appreciate that as always. (Inaudible) be able to incorporate some of the feedback for bodycams. So, again, (inaudible) engagement (inaudible) feedback. Fall In-Service is a little bit of a departure from the norm. We’ll bring that from noon to 10:00 p.m. because of the space constraints and instructor constraints here at the Training Division. So, if you see people coming and going in the
evening hours, that’s when we’re doing these fall In-Service. The bodycam pilot program is well underway (inaudible) for that, getting feedback from the streets. Advanced Academy 2023-3 starts this week as well. It’s definitely (inaudible). Supervisor In-Service is scheduled for this fall, and we’re also going to be doing command staff In-Service this fall which is something we haven’t done in quite a while, so we’re looking forward to those. What else? We recently - just two weeks ago, we had the Force Science Methods and Instruction class here at the Training Division. There was a lot of media coverage, some media coverage, on that. (Inaudible) some concerns and questions. So, that was done. We did a debrief session today. Our instructors had a lot of positive things to say about the class. There was certainly some stuff that we’re not going to necessarily incorporate, or we didn’t have the (inaudible) for, but overall, it was well received by our membership. If you have questions or more detail about (inaudible), feel free to contact me or Dr. Rodriguez (inaudible) class. They were well-received by our members. What else? We’re starting to plan for winter In-Service, so starting in January ’24, what that looks like. We’re going to be doing some police (inaudible) operations training in January and February of ’24 out at Portland International Raceway. That’s a pretty big lift for our staff to do that. There’s a lot of new parts there. You’ve probably heard the news. The Independent Monitor LLC report was presented to City Council in the last few weeks, and if you read that report, there’s a number of training recommendations as part of that report. The police bureau is going to be expected to acknowledge the appropriate (inaudible). Part of that is a commitment to a more robust mobile field force training program moving forward. For those of you who were here in the winter of 2023, we had two days of full-day mobile field force training that your folks were part of. We’ve committed to continuing to refresh that training moving forward. So, as part of that (inaudible), we’re going to be posting position announcements recently for a full-time officer, a full-time sergeant here at the Training Division that will specialize in public (inaudible) mobile field force training. That position announcement closes this week, so it’s going through the selection process (inaudible) one new person (inaudible). And then the Department of Justice released their police compliance assessment. The report says we’ve moved back into substantial compliance. There’s one more paragraph of the settlement agreement, so we’re making progress here at the Training Division getting back into substantial compliance (inaudible) compliance (inaudible). That was pretty much all I’ve got.

HETTMAN: Hey, there. Casey Hettman. I think the only thing outside of that list is that we’re (inaudible) for an additional curriculum designer. We actually did interviews a few weeks ago. We’re inviting our top candidate to come by to the Training Division to do a site
visit and meet some folks and hopefully secure his acceptance of a
contingent offer. And we’re starting a recruitment for an Analyst II
in our data team after we’ve had a vacancy (inaudible). And we
talked (inaudible) about nine people we’ve hired, former police
officers that have experience with the training. That means hired on
as temporary short-term staff that could come alleviate some of the
pressure on our trainers by working part time hours as needed fill
in or augment our training programs. So, that’s getting off the
ground right now. We’re learning – we’ve got about nine people
identified and hired, and we’ll be working to get them scheduled to
(inaudible) next year to (inaudible) constraints that we’re having
with staffing.

RODRIGUEZ: Rebecca Rodriguez. I think the only other couple things
to add to that that are pretty exciting are in addition to the
additional curriculum design specialist, our existing curriculum
design specialist is really working with the Training Division
management and folks here to (inaudible) offer ongoing (inaudible)
basis. So, folks are coming into the Training Division as
instructors, and we’re getting them tooled up in some good
foundational (inaudible) strategy and instruction strategy. And then
we have an initiative that we launched that – of the instructor
growth and development where once a year, we’ll sit down with each
instructor, identify instruction goals, and then they’ll have two
classroom observations, and we do dry runs all the time. We’re just
kind of formalizing it. Then we have a presentation and facilitation
(inaudible) that aligns with (inaudible) learning strategies, and
then the feedback gets looped in through that rubric. So, it’s a
little bit more formalized. You know, it just adds a bit more
structured to the feedback (inaudible) exciting. Everyone has been
super excited about that and (inaudible).

LEVINSON: Phil Levinson. Any problems with doing ride-alongs with
the officers who are part of the trial run on BWC?

MALE: I think they’ll find out.

LEVINSON: Okay. I mean, I’d like to do that, and, you know,
basically just see how it’s being employed and to just kind of get
an idea of what issues there might be. And that’s all out of Central
Precinct? Is that correct?

MALE: Central Precinct and then Focus Intervention Team

LEVINSON: Okay.

MALE: (inaudible).

LEVINSON: There’s two more weeks left in the –

HETTMAN: The pilot – this is Casey Hettman. I believe the
pilot was set to go for 60 days, so two months, and I believe it
started August 21st.

LEVINSON: Oh, so we’ve got several weeks?

HETTMAN: (Inaudible).
LEVINSON: Okay. So, you’ll let Nathan know, and he can send us a note?

(Nothing heard).

LEVINSON: Okay. And then just basically go through Central Precinct and say I’d like to do my ride-along with somebody with BWC? Great. Thank you.

CASTLE: All right. Any other questions on the Training Division updates?

RODRIGUEZ: I just want to address that comment. I’d be willing to talk offline (inaudible) different way (inaudible).

CASTLE: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you, Dr. Rodriguez. All right. Next item on our agenda is task group updates. So, I’m going to share another tab. Just for background – oh, I forgot to mention myself. Nathan Castle speaking. Just for background, we formed task groups at the July meeting. I’ve been emailing, possibly excessively, trying to get confirmation of the membership and everything, so I’ll use this both as an opportunity just to confirm that I have reported everyone’s task group membership correctly and also to get updates on the status of the task group work. You know, I do want to also acknowledge that we’re coming off of the two – you know, two months of summer, and a lot of groups strategically took summer breaks which is totally fine and acceptable and within expectations. So, it's okay if you’re update is there is no update, and we can make a plan for moving forward. So, without further ado, I will pass it to the Advanced Academy and Instructional Design Task Group to share any updates, and I have membership reported as Bill, Chris, Corrine, Barry, and Albyn, and Tony as well?

PRYOR: That’s correct. And we’re delighted to have two members: Chris (inaudible).

CASTLE: That was Bill speaking.

PRYOR: (Inaudible). We had an organizational meeting on Monday at (inaudible) – Kate and did find instructors and analysts and (inaudible) space or whether instructors available, speed, size of class (inaudible) identify those classes (inaudible).

CASTLE: All right. I hope it capture that. I should have mentioned – this is Nathan Castle speaking. I should have mentioned that I’m taking notes, and I suspect this is not as big as it needs to be for people to see, so I’m going to zoom in, and hopefully this works better. Have I approximately captured what you said correctly? I’m going to take that as a yes. Okay. Thank you. Any other updates?

(Hearing none)

CASTLE: All right. Thank you. The next group is the Restorative Justice Task Group, and that is a continuing task group with Sarah, Gina, Patrick, Cheryl, Kwame, and Don. Is anyone from that task group – oh.

SCHURR: Here. Unless – Cheryl, unless you want to speak to this from the cyber world. I’m disappointed that things are not moving
along the way we hoped. We tried to - you know, we took a little bit of time off this summer, but then we’ve been waiting to hear from our police partners in this. And when we gathered at the end of the last TAC meeting, we sent them an email saying, “You still wanting us to help with this? Still doing this thing?” They’re like, “Oh, yes! Yes, yes, yes, yes,” and we said, “Great! Let us know when we’re going to be.” I’ve still not had - still don’t have a meeting, so we’re kind of waiting. And so, I think we’re going to talk - the Restorative Justice group is going to talk during the breakout time today and figure out where to go from here. Did I say that okay, Cheryl?

(Hearing none)

SCHURR: Not hearing any complaints unless you can -
CASTLE: Unmute.
SCHURR: Unmute.
ATWOOD: And this is Catlyn. Sarah, just so you know, I’ll catch up with you during that time. (Inaudible) update.
SCHURR: Thank you. Appreciate that. Oh. Cheryl -
EDMONDS: So, this is Cheryl. Yeah, you - I think you accurately reflected that we have reached out asking our police bureau partners to identify when they’re available, and we haven’t heard back.
SCHURR: And I do look forward to (inaudible), Caitlyn.
CASTLE: Okay. Thank you, Sarah. And that actually raises an important reminder that I should have brought up earlier. At the end of the meeting, we do have time set aside in the agenda for task groups to work together in person if they’d like. That’s optional but encouraged. Fantastic. Barry’s here now. Okay. The next group on the agenda - and I think I forgot to introduce myself. This is Nathan Castle speaking. I’m going to be super annoying about that, but I’m just trying to get into the habit and remind myself so I don’t forget. Officer-Community Relationships and Perceptions. I have that recorded as Kristina, Gregg, David, Corrine, and Kwame. I hope that’s correct. If that is incorrect, please tell me. And who would like to share an update.

FEMALE: I actually have not been contacted (inaudible).
CASTLE: Okay.
GRiffin: So, I’ll go there.
CASTLE: Gregg?
GRiffin: I don’t - so, we haven’t had a chance to meet at all. David sent me an email a few - a couple weeks ago, and we haven’t had a chance to touch back. I thought that some of us were not actually able to meet. So, are we still - so, it’s Kristina, David, and Corrine, and Kwame still here, and are they still willing to actually continuing?
URSIN: This is Kristina. Yes, I am, and I, yeah, agree. We need to meet. We had some ideas. David and I had some ideas at the meeting last time about how to move forward. And I was going to ask - I saw
Ambush on the call. I don’t know if you were – I think you weren’t at the last meeting. Were you still wanting to be a part of this team as well? Ambush says, “Yes.”

GRiffin: Awesome. So, do we want to initiate another meeting email?

URSIN: Yeah. So, I’ll initiate an email to get us started again after our summer break.

GRiffin: Okay, awesome. Thanks.

CASTLE: All right. Thank you. This is Nathan speaking by the way.

The next group is the CQI Community Involvement and Training Delivery plus Body-Worn Cameras, and I see Jim has his hand up. Jim?

KAHAN: Hi, this is Jim, and the first thing is the change in the title. It is Community - CQI is taking up two projects this year. We met in July. One project is community involvement and training design, delivery, and reinforcement. The second one is BWC, and both of these are sort of progressing beyond the little bit of work that we did last year. With the community involvement training, we’re going to be working with the – in the chief’s office, the Office of Community Engagement, fairly closely. That’s not yet been started, although we have a commitment to meet Natasha sometime in the near future. I will let Phil talk about BWC because he’s the lead on that.

LEVINSON: What we’re looking at is the use of BWC in a variety of different departments as well as data analytics so that basically the information that I’ve preliminarily got is very little of BWC footage is ever analyzed. It’s primarily used as evidence in criminal cases or anything that has to go to trial, and it’s also used primarily in if a complaint is filed against an officer to protect the officer. Our interest is trying to move the use of BWC, body-worn cameras, in a way that they allow the department to become proactive in terms of things that they do in the community versus reactive. So, that requires looking at all sorts of ways to - that are available to analyze data. There’s artificial intelligence systems that are out there now that are available to analyze data. And so, we’re looking at that. But, again, trying to move the bureau into a proactive way of using body-worn cameras as opposed to just reacting to anything that drops in.

KAHAN: There are three of us on here: Sylvia, Phil, and I. Phil is the lead on BWC. Sylvia and I are going to be doing a lot of the community engagement. All three of us are involved in both (inaudible), and if anybody wants to join us, you’re more than welcome. Just contact Phil or contact me.

CASTLE: All right. Thank you, Jim.

LEVINSON: Can I - Phil again. I just want to add one more point. Another component with BWC is officer safety, using information that is gathered from body-worn cameras to ensure officer safety. That’s another (inaudible).
SCHURR: Actually, while we’re talking — this is Sarah. I have a question about what your idea is about being proactive. Are you thinking about, like, just randomly looking at footage and seeing, like, how’s it going out there, or do you have other great ideas?

LEVINSON: I’ll give a real example. Oakland Police Department ran a study, and the hypotheses that they had was that officers, regardless of their color, treated people of color less respectfully. And so, they analyzed 900 views or body camera footage.

SCHURR: Randomly selected?

LEVINSON: Randomly — say again?

MALE: Force.

LEVINSON: Yeah, with force. I’m sorry. And —

SCHURR: Randomly selected (inaudible) clips?

LEVINSON: Right. And basically determined that, yes, in fact, based on linguistic analysis of the audio, there were — the officers, regardless of color, were less respectful in the way they spoke to people of color. So, the idea is in terms of being proactive rather than reactive is that, if the viewer were in a situation where there were some issues that came up, some information was coming out of the community, you could formulate a hypotheses that said, “We believe that this situation is occurring, and there is” — I’m blanking on the terms now, but there’s ways of using artificial intelligence to analyze the speech that comes off the body camera. And there’s also artificial intelligence mechanisms to look at the visual stuff that comes off the camera. So, you can ask a question, “Is this happening,” or you could formulate a hypothesis and say, “We believe that.”

SCHURR: Then that could inform the training because then you know that this seems to be a trend, and you could help train officers to not fall into that natural pitfall.

LEVINSON: Yes. Absolutely. Absolutely. And it just — sometimes it gives you the opportunity, gives the bureau the opportunity, to begin to ask questions about things before you start getting a lot of griping from people in the community. And (inaudible) very open about what they’re looking at and what they’re trying to work on.

SCHURR: Thanks, Phil. I appreciate that.

FEMALE: (Inaudible) example that was (inaudible).

LEVINSON: I don’t have that data with me.

FEMALE: Was it significant?

LEVINSON: It was. The data was significant that the — and I don’t know to what statistical — Jim?

KAHAN: Yeah. Jim. This was a serious scientific study, so they took data on who did what and compared it to the population of Oakland, which was the subject, and (inaudible) they probably adjusted statistics to correct for the actual population (inaudible) that they’ve got. So, it’s a (inaudible).
CASTLE: Great. Thank you for those updates. Tony, I saw you with your hand up.

MARICK: Yeah. Tony. Shouldn’t you mention that there is a title change to one of the -

(Inaudible)

MARICK: I don’t think that was captured.

KAHAN: Yeah, he talked.

MARICK: Oh, he did? Okay.

KAHAN: The three (inaudible).

CASTLE: All right. Thank you. And I just - Dr. Rodriguez?

RODRIGUEZ: I’m just pointing that I think somebody had their hand up.

CASTLE: Yeah. I see a hand up. I just want to point out we do have time in the agenda for public comment at the end.

RODRIGUEZ: Oh, sorry. (Inaudible).

CASTLE: Yeah. Unless it’s something like you can’t hear in which case we want to address that immediately, but any comments on the content of the meeting I’ll ask you to reserve for the end. Thank you for respecting that. Okay. Returning to - this is Nathan Castle by the way for the transcriptionist. Okay. I see the next item - or the next task group is the data analysis, and I think this isn’t quite a task group but just a project group, sort of informal. So, I see that recorded as Avi, who isn’t here; Barry; Jim; Albyn; and Patrick. And I see Jim eagerly has his hand up. Jim?

KAHAN: This group has a meeting (inaudible). That’s where we are.

NEWMAN: And I will - I will interject that we actually - because this is data analysis regarding the task - the use-of-force data which was my impression as to what we were doing for data analysis. It’s not just kind of a generic data analysis thing. It was specifically supposed to be looking at the use-of-force data that gets presented, and then we always have a lot of questions, and the questions are always the same. So, the - you know, the rationale behind this was that we were going to look at the data that’s being collected, what other data might be collected, and how it’s being analyzed, and how it could be put together better. And we’ve had a couple of emails into support staff. There’s been some delays on that related to my work schedule and my recent surgery. But we’re hopeful that we will, you know, have the chance - we have a list - we have a list of things that we would like to find. Avi who is on the PCCEP actually found what we need for the use-of-force data. They just had a presentation for the data for stops, so that’s what we need to find for us, you know, for the use of force, but we don’t have that. So, we’re still trying to track that down, you know, in terms of who is in charge because the person who is doing that for that Stops data, you know, said, “Oh, we don’t do that. You’ve got to speak to them,” and then they said, “No, you’ve got to speak to them,” and then they said, “No, you’ve got to speak to them.” And
so, we’re still trying to track that down. I believe we have the
427 correct people, but we haven’t heard back from them yet. So,
428 hopefully, we’ll get some answers soon, and then we can start
429 looking at what is being done. So, that’s all. So, that’s where –
430 (Inaudible)
431 KAHAN: It’s all you, Barry. I’m saying you were the speaker, Barry.
432 CASTLE: Thanks. Barry, we’re trying to have people announce their
433 names before they speak just for the benefit of the
434 transcriptionist.
435 NEWMAN: Oh, I’m sorry. Yes. I’m sorry. Yes. This is Barry Newman.
436 Yes. Apologize for that. I got here late.
437 CASTLE: Is there any – thanks, Barry. Any other updates from the
data analysis project group? Do I have the membership recorded
438 correctly? Avi, Barry, Jim, Albyn, Patrick?
439 NEWMAN: Yes. And this is Barry Newman. I would put a parenthesis
440 after the “data analysis regarding use of force.”
441 CASTLE: Thank you, Barry. Moving on to the Crowd Management/Public
Order Policing task group, and I see that’s Barry and Gregg. Any
442 updates?
443 NEWMAN: Yes. This is Barry Newman again. I’ll get off fast. But, in
any case, the – we have not yet had a meeting, but the – I’ve been
444 in touch with Gregg. We – I had to find the archive of our public
445 order policing and crowd management, you know, literature, et
446 cetera, from when we had our task force two years ago. So, I found
447 that and did share with Gregg the archive of – there’s a lot of
448 reports, a lot of papers, a lot of recommendations from inside and
outside, you know, PPB. And, you know, I spoke to Casey Hettman, and
449 he gave us a number of people that would be worthwhile to speak to.
450 So, as per similarly for the other, you know, the other task force,
451 we have – I have emails into Caitlyn, and she’s about to go on
452 vacation, but hopefully we’ll be able to get some – we have a number
453 of meetings that we’ve asked to be set up if we can. So, that’s
454 where we’re at right now.
455 CASTLE: Thank you, Barry. Any other updates?
456 (Hearing none)
457 CASTLE: All right. Thank you. And then the next task group is a
458 task group of one, Instructional Methods and Training Design for
459 Adult Learners. How’s it’s going, Tony?
460 MARICK: Hey. We just rolled into the (inaudible) community, so the
461 Advanced community, so you can take that off –
462 CASTLE: Okay.
463 MARICK: (Inaudible) the subcommittee. Yeah. It just makes sense to
464 just roll that into the Advanced committee unless there’s a specific
465 need, but I think it just makes sense to just (inaudible).
466 CASTLE: Fantastic. Thank you. And I want to make sure – okay.
467 Great. That wraps up our updates. This is Nathan Castle speaking by
468 the way. I’m just going to share another document quickly just as a
reminder to make sure that task groups know this is available.

There’s a very long delay between what I do on my computer and when you see it on the screen, so apologies for that. This is an internal resource available to TAC members. It’s the handbook. If you’re a new task group or you’re a task group that has a lot of new members, I highly recommend reviewing this. Again, I’m going to zoom in, but the key thing to point out is this really just captures the traditional pathway to success for task groups. Ultimately, this is a volunteer thing. You can do whatever you want to do, and this isn’t an obligation for anyone, but I think if you follow this process, it tends to lead to productive outcomes for task groups.

And there is also a helpful timeline with sort of suggestions for where you want to be throughout the year as you sort of manage the project to producing a recommendation report as an outcome of your task group. As you can see, at this stage, typical in the past, task groups have started doing some research, defining the project that they’re interested in working on, sharing initial findings, coming up with a lists of people to contact, and really just beginning that research phase of the project and then reviewing various documents. And so, it’s just a resource that I’m making available to you for your work. Again, it’s optional. I don’t want to make it sound like I’m bossing anyone around. This is just a tool in the toolbox available if you’re interested. And this is for the months of September to January. Just continue working on stuff. The other thing I’ll point out that tends to happen with task groups, and one of the reasons why I put this together, just like any project, there’s a tendency to not work on it for eight months and then scramble to get it all done in the last one month. That’s a natural human tendency. It’s a lot more fun and enjoyable if you don’t do that. So, I will stop talking now and transition over. If the force inspector - oh, my goodness. We were running ahead of schedule, and now we’re late. So, I apologize for keeping you waiting. Lieutenant.

If you would like to present -

ROBERTS: Hello, everyone. (Inaudible). I brought some teammates with me (inaudible). This is Mike Roberts. I am the new force inspector. This is a new role for me. Not to pander, but I just want to thank you for all for being here tonight. It means a lot. I am a member of this community, and I appreciate (inaudible). Thank you. Thank you for being here. And I am going to do my best to try to give you the information that you need to move forward so that you can get what you’re looking for and advise Training (inaudible). Sometimes I will have answers that are what you’re looking for, and sometimes the answers are we can’t do that (inaudible). So, I apologize ahead of time for anytime (inaudible). So, just to introduce myself, I’ve been with Portland Police Bureau for the last (inaudible) 16, going on 17, years now. I worked patrol most of those years. I’ve been in various assignments at various positions,
and I’ve landed (inaudible) force inspector. I work with six
analysts, and I work under Mary Claire Buckley (inaudible) meetings.
(Inaudible). She is unable to attend tonight but is with us in
digital spirit. The way we work in the office, I’m sure you know,
but I want to review just so that I’m accurately passing the
information forward that we’re really going through.

SCHURR: And actually, I’ve been on the – this is Sarah. I’ve been
on the TAC for a couple of years, and I don’t know, so thank you.

ROBERTS: Well, great. So, any time you have questions, please feel
free to just stop me and ask me, but don’t expect me to stay on
topic, because I get all – I’ll go down rabbit holes. So, the way
that we work in our office is there are two phases (inaudible). We
only deal with non-deadly uses of force. We’ll get to the questions
that we had prior to the meeting, and some of those will be about
deadly uses of force, and unfortunately, I can’t answer any of
those. That is not (inaudible) look at non-deadly use of force.

Phase one audit (inaudible) there, and what they’re looking at is
the data points that are the agreements in the settlement
(inaudible) Portland Police Bureau (inaudible). I think there are
150 plus points – is that correct? 151 data points, and we report
these force incidents. An After Action is done. The officers fill
out a Force Data Collection Report, and these are the – these are
basically the questions that are responding to what we agreed to
(inaudible). They are looked at through two lenses. So, that first
lens is that phase one. They’re going through the forms (inaudible).
(inaudible) looking for several different things. We’re looking at,
one, making sure that our membership is meeting the mark that we set
for –

CASTLE: May I interrupt? I just saw a comment from –

NEWMAN: Yeah, hello? Hello. This is Barry Newman. I had my hand
raised, but it’s not getting recognized, but at least one other
person put in the comments about two-thirds of your stuff is coming
through, and about one-third is not coming through. Would it be
possible – is there a microphone that can be put closer to you?

CASTLE: Can we do that or –

ROBERTS: I can go stand next to the camera if that helps. Is that a
microphone up there?

ATWOOD: Yeah.

NEWMAN: Yeah. That would be great if we could do something because
we’re missing a good chunk of what you’re saying. I’m sorry – I
apologize for interjecting.

CASTLE: How was it earlier? Were we cutting out before the
presentations?

NEWMAN: This is Barry again. Yeah, Nathan, I heard you great. You
know, and we can also put in – there’s a couple of people whose
phones or whatever are not muted. If they could mute themselves,
that would really be wonderful also, I think. Thank you.
ROBERTS: Barry, is this any better when I’m speaking now?

NEWMAN: Oh, yeah. That’s great.

ROBERTS: That’s what we’ll do. I’ll just stand in the front of the room, in front of a room of strangers that will soon become my friends. It will be perfect. So, like I was saying, our first portion of the analysis is we’re taking a look at these data points that are the agreements within the settlement, right. We’re finding efficiencies. This is the data that you were talking about before. Someone was mentioning we’re looking for data that leads to designating something as a trend that we might find to be, you know, a positive or a negative trend, something we can work on, something we can better the organization with for our service to the community. That information is eventually passed over to me who is in the phase two portion of this, and I’m taking a look at the same information, and I’m looking at these same reports and these same After Actions. And what I’m looking for is I’m looking at it through, number one, a practitioner’s lens, as somebody who has been a practitioner of, you know, using force and/or assessing force for many years, and I’m taking a look to see, okay, was this actually what we trained to do? Was this appropriate? Did this meet the directive, and did this meet the agreement that we made with the Department of Justice when we said, “Hey, we agree to do things the way we’re going to do them.” Quarterly, when we meet, and you’ve looked at the quarter two information, but we meet quarterly with the commanders and captains at each of the precincts. These are our patrol precincts, and this is where the force is being used. We are coming up with all that information. We’re taking it; we’re assessing it; we’re looking at it. We’re trying to determine did we have members that maybe broke certain thresholds according to our agreement? Did we have members that perhaps were using more force per force event or assessing for the amount of custodies or calls to service that they had? How many of these led to force, and is there something that we need to take a deeper look into? And this could be from many different lenses. It’s not like an “I got you.” It’s like maybe this is a dangerous part of town, or maybe this is an officer who has got something else going on, and we want to address that through a (inaudible). That information is presented to the commanders and captains, and they, as the commander and captain of their precinct, start taking a look at the people who work for them. So, that’s kind of the overview of what we do. The six analysts and myself and this new body-worn camera program, we’re excited to see how we’re going to keep up with the flow of information as we finally move into this new phase (inaudible) digital information match with the written information which is generally how we deal with things in the past. Okay. So, there’s my spiel on who I am and what we do in the office. What my plan is, and I’m not making any promises, but I do want to tell you what I would like to do with the
TAC. What we were able to do this time was we gave a little bit of notice. We’re going to supply you with our Q2 information so that you can take a look at it and come up with a series of questions. And I apologize. I didn’t have enough time to respond to the questions in writing and send them back to you so that that could potentially facilitate a better conversation which I’m hoping is what we do in the future. I’m hoping what we’re able to do is have a little bit of information exchange so that I can come up with some good information which I think is what you’re looking for. You’re looking for the information – I keep hearing people ask for data. That is something that we have –

CASTLE: I just interrupted again. I’m sorry. We’re getting another comment about audio cut. Can you hear me right now? Sorry for the technical issues.

NEWMAN: Yeah, this is Barry. We can hear you.

CASTLE: Okay. Sorry for the interruption.

ROBERTS: Okay. All right. I apologize. Maybe it’s my voice. Okay. Where were we again? We were on the plan in the future. So, in the future, what I would like to do, and I’m not saying I’m going to be able to develop this immediately, but what I would like to do is get that information out to you early. I would like to get you the quarterly information so that you can come up with these questions that you have, and I can actually respond and write. I don’t know that I’m going to be able to do that every time. We’re working at a breakneck speed in the office. There’s a lot of information for us to work through, and I have other assignments trying to determine if we’re seeing trends and whatnot. So, this is a part of that, and I want to get that information out to you, and so my goal is to try to get it out to you sooner. So, that’s hopefully where we’ll get to, but it might take us a little while to get there. Let’s hope I stay in the role for long enough to establish a good rapport back and forth with the information. So, that said, we did send the information, and we did have some responses. This is where I get to my caveat from the beginning where I told you there’s some things I just can’t do where they are. I don’t know who asked what questions, so I’ll just kind of go through a few of these questions. If you were the person who asked the question, we can talk offline if my response to you isn’t satisfactory, or maybe we can just visit there really quickly in the form without breaking the timeline on the agenda. So, the first question I was asked was can we compare use-of-force applications between other jurisdictions in the local area, or if not in the local area, (inaudible). The answer to this is unfortunately no. This is – it’s not even an apples to oranges. The way that the Portland Police Bureau judges what is a use of force does not at all line up with what other agencies are doing. So, you have many agencies that are not collecting information at all. You have many agencies that will consider something to not be a use of
force. They will call it another word like a show of force. For example, Gresham police have a category of force called a show of force which is when you point a firearm at someone. We call that a use of force. So, it’s – there’s no real way for us to look at the way they collect information and the way we collect information without some kind of a universal language that we’re all using. In this case, we don’t have a universal language. It would be great if we had a national language, but we don’t. So, unfortunately, I’m not able to take those comparisons and come up with a “Compared to them, this is what we do,” at this time. Hopefully, we’ll get there.

Someone asked a question about use of deadly force. Again, we don’t deal with deadly force in my division. We deal with non-deadly uses of force. So, these are – that’s something that’s going to be something that’s going to go to the Internal Affairs Division. It’s going to go to the Detective Division. It’s going to go to the District Attorney’s office, but that won’t go to my office, so I won’t have any of the information on it. Someone asked many questions about formatting including decimal points. Is that person in the room by any chance? Okay. So, in terms of formatting, the format that we present the document to you, this is the same document that we’re presenting to the DOJ. This was agreed upon between the Portland Police Bureau, the COCL, and the DOJ, the format that we would present it, so we are not going to recreate that document and present it in a different way because we feel like that would be creating – taking the same information and creating two different versions of it, and I don’t think that would be transparent (inaudible). So, what we’re doing is we’re taking what we’ve agreed upon in the DOJ settlement agreement, and we’re giving you exactly that format. So, unfortunately, if you are a person who is, you know, high up on your data IQ and you see things through a lens of a numbers person, you’re welcome to do what you want with those numbers, but we are not going to present it from our office in a way other than way (inaudible). Hopefully that doesn’t hurt someone’s feelings. Someone asked a question of what are we comparing our force – we talk about force comparisons. We’re looking for trends. This is a quarterly comparison, generally. So, the chart that you have on our Q2, our quarter 2 data, that is compared to quarter 1. However, there are times when we’ll see a trend start to develop over a number of quarters. We will start looking at those sequentially, not just quarter to quarter. It’s really hard though when you’re taking information – it’s a small number. Our force applications – it’s a really small number of force applications if you look at the amount of calls to service we have. Sir?

KAHAN: Do you do year-over-year comparisons?

ROBERTS: Do we do year-over-year comparisons? And this is what I’m getting to. So, it’s not that can’t, and it’s not that don’t. The hard part about that is that you have some years that completely
throw off the data. For example, 2020 is one of those years where this was something that Portland Police Bureau and the nation and the world had never seen, so we are looking at an anomaly maybe, or maybe this is a new world that we’re going forward with. We don’t know at the time, but what we know is that hasn’t reoccurred yet, so it's (inaudible). We’re not only happy to look at deep ties, we’re looking for creative ways to find information that will better our response. Like, that is the goal. The goal is to better our response to the community, to increase or production, and to, honestly, just do great police work, and serve. You know, that’s the goal. So, it could happen, but generally, we go quarter to quarter because that’s a better measurement. Sir?

LEVINSON: Phil Levinson. Is there data available that separates use of force in mental health situations versus use of force in situations that aren’t based on mental health issues?

ROBERTS: Yes and no. So, this is one of those – we don’t have mental health professionals that are police officers that do those things at the same time. We might have a police officer that is outside, you know, a doctor or whatever, but that’s not what we’re doing. What we’re doing – we’re having officers in the moment use their perception and decide was there a mental health component to this event? And we’re trying to narrow it down to was this – did you perceive at this moment, like, that mental health actually played into it because there are times when there could be a mental health underlying condition that has nothing to do with the force event, and I can get to that. Because our categories of force, we’re really trying to capture all force events. So, for example, pointing a firearm at a stolen vehicle – because this is what we train to do, right. It’s a felony car stop. We point our firearm at this vehicle. We don’t know at the time that perhaps you suffer from a mental health condition. We just know that we’re trying to keep everyone safe involved. So, yes, we do keep this information but because it’s perspective-based, we don’t always have this, like, perfect measurement. So, yes. (Inaudible) answer the question and kind of (inaudible) –

LEVINSON: Well, sometimes you also get a call for service that indicates at the beginning of the call that there’s a mental health component.

ROBERTS: That’s true and – totally.

LEVINSON: And is that looked at?

ROBERTS: So, yes and no, right. Yes, because it all depends on, again, perspective. So, I can call in and say, “My dog is acting crazy.” Now, all of a sudden in our call history it says, “Crazy dog, needs a response.” Obviously, I’m making up a bizarre scenario. Nonetheless, it’s not (inaudible). So, what we’re trying to do, especially through, like, the information that we are gathering – these are from force events. So, a lot of the questions that we want
answers to are more global. They’re more of, “Hey, when the Portland police respond to a human being, what are they really doing?” You know, are they using good tactics? Are they using kind-hearted intentions? Are they compassionate? Are they caring? That’s the global call. I’m only looking at the calls where it led to a force event. It’s a really, really small percentage of our calls. So, to your point, yes. Okay. You had a question, please?

FEMALE: Yeah. I have a question (inaudible). So, since the DOJ (inaudible), and there are many federal agencies that are enforcing the law with a geographic region (inaudible). I’m just going to use national language (inaudible), but (inaudible) federal government, and then are parameters for federal agencies as far as what is acceptable (inaudible) interrogations. (Inaudible) understand better (inaudible) federal agents (inaudible) and how things are classified (inaudible).

ROBERTS: Sure. And so, some of this is going to be an anecdotal response because I don’t want to speak for my federal partners, and I’m not going to – again, there is no comparison that I can use. What I can tell you is that the Portland Police Bureau responds to a much greater (inaudible) calls to service than our federal partners, specifically in the area, perhaps nationally. It’s just the way that the system is designed. Our rules, like what we call force, are much more strict than perhaps some of our partner agencies, but it’s not for me to interpret that. Like, what we have right now is the agreement that we all signed off on, so this is what we’re going to use as our (inaudible). It’s just really hard to take that and compare us to the standards of someone else when it’s not going to change the way that we are going to do business. I think what we have are some really, really strong rules that help us narrow the scope of what we decide is appropriate and what’s inappropriate. So, even if we could find that information, it’s not going to change the way that we are using force (inaudible).

FEMALE: (Inaudible).

ROBERTS: Totally. And I totally get it. And, like, the more I look at things, and I’m going off track – and I’m just not your force inspector talking to you. I’m just a student of life. You know, it would simplify things if we could say everything was used in the same way, but the truth is, you know, there are agencies on the East Coast that deal with a completely different set of situations than we see on the West Coast. That’s 3,000 miles that covers that distance, and there is a lot of cultural expectations that change as you move from place to place. So, I think it really is regional. It really – this is the system we have, so within that system, what I’m looking to do, especially with my relationship with the TAC is I want to get us the information that is going to actually help you find what recommendations you think would be appropriate, and we have to narrow that scope and always keep it to what training can we
advise the Portland Police Bureau on. What information will add to that conversation. So, again, this is one of those - I’m saying, you know, a negative when I really mean it in a positive way. What I’m hoping to do is really enrich this relationship that we’re going to have, come up with some good information. I’ll keep moving down the list. How are we doing on time, Nathan?

CASTLE: So, we’re a little over time, but we also started you late, so I want to be respectful of that.

ROBERTS: I will skip through to a couple of little points. If you have some questions for me, I’ll get to that. There were a couple of questions where we were talking about the calls to service in quarter 2 versus the calls to service in quarter 1, and the comment was overwhelmingly like this seems like the same number. Almost. You know, why don’t you just call it that. I want to be clear. We’re not going to use language that at all leads people to a decision. We’re going to give you data. You can make your decisions on that. We’re not going to say, you know, “It’s mostly this” or it - sir?

KAHAN: Okay, Jim here. I wrote that comment. Problem is no matter how you do it, each expression of use of force filled out by an officer or a sergeant has the possibility that it might be a little bit different from the others. And what this means in statistics talk is there is an inherent error of measurement there. Things can’t be perfect. So, if in one 91-day period, you have 252 incidents, and in the next one, you have, 91 days, you have 250, if you say it’s a little bit lower, that’s deceptive because within the error of measurement, they are very much the same, and you can’t say higher or lower. You could just say these are the numbers if they’re insisting on using those numbers.

ROBERTS: Right.

KAHAN: So, that’s why I said I really don’t want you to say, “a little bit higher” when you’re 0.02% greater in the next quarter because it’s not true.

ROBERTS: Okay. But, I mean -

KAHAN: I’ll defer to my colleague.

ROBERTS: And I’ll go up to you in just a second, but, I mean, quite literally, again, I’m - from our office, we do not want to weigh in on (inaudible).

KAHAN: Then don’t take the position. Don’t say it’s a little bit lower. Just say, “This is the number,” and “This is the number,” and leave it there. You are (inaudible) when you say -

ROBERTS: I hear you, but I’m going to refer back to my earlier comment which is we have a methodology that we agreed to with the COCL and the Department of the Justice, so some of this is going to be tied to that. And I can find out exactly what is, but, again, this is going to be a data document, and so it’s put together from one of the analysts, but I can’t deviate from what we agreed upon with COCL. So, I understand you’re probably right, and again, my
data IQ, you know, I’m still working on it. I’m in my 50s, but I’m hoping to get there sooner or later. At this point, what I have to always lean on is we made an agreement; we have to follow that agreement, and sometimes it might not give the best or the more accurate version of this to somebody who really understands and talks in the lingo of a data analyst, on your side of the house, but I have to follow –

KAHAN: Then in that case, I would like to see that language –

ROBERTS: And again –

KAHAN: (Inaudible) you have to say something about the comparison of the two rather than just presenting –

ROBERTS: And we can talk offline about that, and I’m happy to – I mean, you have (inaudible)?

KAHAN: (Inaudible).

ROBERTS: Do you have the settlement agreement?

(Inaudible)

ROBERTS: It’s available online. I can make sure – Okay. I can –

(Inaudible)

ROBERTS: Sir, did you have a follow-up to it?

JONES: This is Albyn Jones. So, along the lines of what Jim was just saying, I’ve been looking at these quarterly reports for a couple years now, and as Jim was noting, every quarter is like, “Oh, this is two-tenths of a percent different from last quarter.” Sometimes it’s up; sometimes it’s down. But I indulged myself in computing the variance of these things given the small numbers, the variability is huge. And, you know, when you see a two percent, two-tenths of a percent, change in something, that’s just noise. And so, you say it increased by this much, or it’s decreased by this much, you’re implying that that’s meaningful it’s not meaningful. It’s just random - as far as I can tell, it’s just random fluctuations. What I would like to see is, you know, not a comparison of quarter two to quarter one but a whole string of quarters so you can see how the variation goes from quarter to quarter, see if there are seasonal trends. Is quarter one always higher than quarter two and things like that. There, I mean, maybe some kinds of offenses that lead to use of force are more common in the summer than in the winter –

ROBERTS: I understand where you’re going with it.

JONES: And so, having more than just quarter two versus quarter one.

ROBERTS: The agreement that we made was to compare quarter one to quarter two to quarter three. And I hear what you’re saying which I say we do like to do those deep dives. It’s just not the mechanism that we measure things for.

JONES: You know, you can give the feds whatever you want to give the feds, but when you’re showing something to me, I would like to see meaningful data.
ROBERTS: I can throw this one thing out. There is one very obvious thing that we see from the data — and, again, I’m new to the position, but I am looking at the data. I’m looking at what we have, and what we have is — it’s like a trend of consistency. Like you’re saying, we never see a lot of variation. What we have is a really low number of force events. It tends to be consistent. It tends to run from quarter to quarter similarly. And what that tells me is that we’re doing something right. We’re keeping that number low.

There are the anomalies, right. There are the 2020s. And, you know, I grew up in a house with a nurse who was a volunteer firefighter, and she wouldn’t work on full-moon nights because she said full moon nights just kind of lead to the thing. This was just her thing.

JONES: This is Albyn again. So, I apologize because I didn’t submit any questions to you ahead of time, so I’m kind of jumping on you —

ROBERTS: No. I really appreciate the back and forth.

JONES: Exactly along the lines of what you just said about consistency, I was looking at the quarter two data, the total from the previous year, 2022, and the numbers almost perfectly match the year-long data proportions for 2022 and which reinforces my belief that what you’re seeing is fluctuation of about an average —

ROBERTS: Totally. But let’s break that down for one second. Let’s take what we’re looking at, which we’re looking at numbers. We are — all of us in this room, really, we are — we have the advantage of looking at it through the Monday morning (inaudible). Let’s look at what we’re really compiling. We’re really compiling data which are individual force applications that are individual force events. When looking at numbers that are real events that are happening to members of our community and that are happening with members of our police force. It’s still — the consistency itself to me is still really speaking to (inaudible). But I would love to continue this conversation about data more. Yeah?

STRAINING: This is Rob Straining. I think Barry made a point that there’s a group that focuses on the force data and just kind of deep dive into the force data analysis (inaudible).

ROBERTS: I think that sounds great.

STRAINING: That setting (inaudible) meeting.

NEWMAN: Yeah, hi. This is Barry Newman. I have respectfully had my hand raised for the entire time here, so I’m going to just open my mouth. I apologize for jumping in here. But I think that the points that are being raised about the data and how it’s being presented, et cetera, a lot of people have fairly consistently asked similar questions at each of these meetings, and for some reason, it doesn’t seem to get really adjudicated. So, that was kind of the thought behind why we set up a group to look at the data and to discuss how it’s being presented, et cetera. So, rather than sitting here and, you know, discussing, you know, all of the nitty gritty stuff about that, perhaps it would be helpful if we could meet with you at some
point and have a chance to look at the data. We are having our first
meeting tomorrow at 6:30 if it’s at all possible for you to come but
- and even if not, it would, you know, probably be very helpful for
us to be able to set up a time for the members of our group to talk
with you to go over the stuff because there’s a lot more - there’s a
lot more things that need to be discussed that probably we could
scratch the surface here and still fill the rest of the time for
this meeting. So, I would respectfully suggest that perhaps we take
the conversation offline and continue this, you know, with that
working group that was set up specifically to address these kinds of
questions.

ROBERTS: Yeah, Barry, that’s a good idea. I cannot make a meeting
tomorrow. I will probably communicate to the TAC with an email and
let you submit some of those questions in writing. I just want to
finish this off by saying I still have a lot of restrictions, and we
are not in a place where we can change our methodology with the way
that we collect data and with the way that we present the data. But
I’m super excited to connect and (inaudible) one my - Michael, did
you have something you needed to add to this, or are you good? One
of the members of our analyst team, and that sounds like a good
plan. So, moving ahead I’ll finish up with our last thing. We talked
about - I’m so sorry. Go ahead.

SCHURR: I’m Sarah. One, I want to appreciate the non-
defensive and
respectful way that you’ve handled all this. I really appreciate
that. I’m the person who asked the question about - the lethal force
question. I appreciate that that’s not your department, and I
appreciate that it is our department as the TAC. So, if you can’t
address that, cool, but next time there is a lethal force in the
report, can someone else come and address that?

ROBERTS: So - and this is - I guess that’s not really in my
wheelhouse to make that decision.

SCHURR: Right. Okay. (Inaudible) have a say in the thing -

ROBERTS: What I can tell is you anecdotally if we had a use of
deadly force in this recently, they are probably not something that
they are able to speak about just yet. You’d have to wait for
adjudication on that, I believe, but I do think there is probably
some value in that conversation. I just don’t know where we fit.

SCHURR: I just think that if the TAC is going to look at things
like resistance to handcuffs, we probably ought to look at whatever
it is happened there, you know.

ROBERTS: Yeah. Again, I really appreciate the service that you’re
all putting forward, and I hope I - I hope when you say I wasn’t
coming across defensive, I hope I wasn’t because I really mean to
speak to you with all the respect in the world. I really appreciate
what you all do. Sir, can I just finish my last point, and if you
still have questions, then we can jump on it, okay? So, what we
decided to look at when we were looking for what are - what trend
might we be seeing? We want to present some real data for you to take a look at. I did - we looked through some of the quarter three and quarter four from 2022 and then quarter one and quarter two from 2023, right. So, we’ve got that fully (inaudible) that you were asking for. We were looking at that I saw a little bit of a rise in was pointing of firearms. So, in quarter three of 2022, we had 11. In quarter four of 2022, we had 17. Then in quarter one of 2023, we had 17, and then we saw this big jump to 24 in quarter two of 2023. This is something that I want to keep my eye on. I want to look and see if this is a trend. There are some reasons why things like this anecdotally happen. And so, I can tell you off the top of my head, I know that we’ve been running a stolen vehicle mission. And, again, when we talk about pointing a firearm, we do have this felony car stop protocol where we are pointing our firearms at a stolen vehicle where oftentimes we’re going to find a firearm inside that vehicle, especially after it eludes the police or, you know, behaves in certain ways. So, potentially, that could be a reason why, but I’m not going to say that’s why. I am going to look for, you know, more information, but I do think that’s the kind of information I want to bring to the TAC, provide you with that so you can do whatever you decide to do (inaudible).

KAHAN: This is Jim. I appreciate what you’re just saying. My question is - I know that the settlement agreement requires that you deliver these quarterly reports to us. My question is is it possible that we could get from you the raw data so that we could look at it ourselves as opposed to the analyzed data where you break things down to percentages and sorts and things like that. Could the raw data be made available to the TAC?

ROBERTS: So, will you include that in the questions that Barry is going to send me, and I’ll be able to -

KAHAN: (Inaudible).

ROBERTS: That sounds great. Because I don’t want to come up with a fictitious answer right on top of -

KAHAN: (Inaudible).

ROBERTS: Everyone’s above my pay grade, especially you tonight. (Inaudible). Okay. Folks, before I walk over to this end of the room, is there anything else I can answer for you? Is there anything I can bring to this next time that I haven’t spoken about now that might be more helpful that hasn’t been mentioned? Sir?

MARICK: This is Tony. At the very beginning of your presentation, I think you mentioned something about body-worn cameras. So, is that being incorporated into the reporting data collection, and is that going to make things more efficient, or is it just going to add more to your workload that you’ve got or (inaudible)?

ROBERTS: So, they’re starting to trickle in now, the force events that are - that folks from Central Precinct and the Focus Intervention Team (inaudible) force events. Yes to everything. Like,
we’re getting a ton more information. I can tell you it’s taking me a lot more time. As the one sworn member of my unit, I don’t know how I would be able to keep up with this because of the amount of information that I’m having to watch. If it was one member who gets into an event, that might be, you know, anywhere between a 10-minute and a 40-minute event. When I have 7, 10, 15 members responding to this, not all of the members used force, but members that respond to a call – that’s a lot of footage to watch. So, it is adding exponentially to the workload. I think it’s great. I think we’re getting a great view of the work that we’re doing. We’re going to get to find ways to improve. I mean, it’s information. I love information. We can take information and build on it. But to your point, yes, it is good. It is giving us more information, and it is a lot more work. (Inaudible). Yeah. There you go. I’m going to go home and watch more body-worn camera footage. Thank you much, folks, for inviting me tonight.  

CASTLE: Thank you, Lieutenant. All right. So, we are a little bit over time for – you know, behind schedule. I’m going to suggest that we let Emma give her presentation for the next 20 minutes. I’m going to encroach a little bit on the task group work time since I think most task groups aren’t here together in person anyways. I think there are very few task groups that are complete here. Any objections to that before I invite Emma to speak?  

NEWMAN: No.  

CASTLE: All right. Hearing none. Emma, are you online, and are you prepared to present? Sorry for the delay in scheduling. Sorry. What was that?  

(INAUDIBLE).  

CASTLE: I think if you’re here, it would be great to hear your presentation. And, yes, (inaudible), but I think we’re good to proceed.  

NEWMAN: This is Barry Newman. I don’t know if anyone’s hearing. I’m not hearing a work.  

CASTLE: We’re still getting set up. Just for the benefit of – I realize not everyone can see the whole room. Emma’s here in person, and she’s getting set up to present.  

(INAUDIBLE)  

CASTLE: oh, sure. And Lieutenant Roberts is going to come back while we’re waiting.  

ROBERTS: You asked me a question about raw data. I don’t know if I have a full answer for that yet. I just wanted to make sure – and I wanted to say in on camera, so people like Barry can take a look of this. Are you aware of the open data portal that we put out?  

NEWMAN: Yes.  

ROBERTS: Some yes. Some no. So, that –  

NEWMAN: Yes, I just found it. I found the data sources first – this is Barry Newman. Because I knew that the use-of-force reports were
there, but I didn’t realize that all of the data points, et cetera, you know, was there, but it’s going to require a little bit of looking into and a little bit of discussion with you in terms of what those things mean and how they can be correlated. So, in any event, we need to continue this later for sure, so I’ll track you down. Thank you.

(COVELLI) I’m sorry. Okay.

(ATWOOD) (Inaudible).

(COVELLI) Oh, cool. Okay. So, sorry for the delay. And when do you need me to stop?

(CASTLE) I think as long as you’re done by 8:25 at the latest –

(COVELLI) Okay.

(CASTLE) That would be great.

(COVELLI) Okay. Great. So, I’m Emma Covelli, and I’m one of the analysts in the Training Division, and I facilitate the process for the Training Needs Assessment, and we’ve been asked to talk about that tonight, and some about our training planning and how those roll into each other. And I’m the one that facilitates it, but I also want to be sure to acknowledge that it’s actually the work of many, so – including you all. You all’s reports get reviewed often times multiple times during the process. So, we have full staff, and we – a lot of the analyst work is involved, other people’s training evaluation, and the research of the lead instructors as well. And so – and for the members online, Caitlyn is going to be kind of watching for questions and helping me out with that. So, please flag us down somehow. I won’t probably be able to see what’s happening there very well. So, the Training Needs Assessment process is for identifying training needs for informing the training planning. The official report is usually due in October to the DOJ, and then the training, annual training, plan in December 1st. We’re working on moving up the timeline for the annual training plan though. And some of the strategies for the identification of training needs is looking at training requirements. So, we have a certain amount of training requirements from the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, and we have some new requirements from the Oregon Accreditation Alliance, and we’re working – we have to also integrate requirements from Taser and OSHA, so those are also tracked. We do integrate the continuous quality improvement principles of taking a deeper dive into certain areas, particularly if it’s an area of high risk or community concern like use of force, high-risk vehicle stops, control tactics, and procedural justice and communication. And I’ve been reading your report regarding that which is greatly appreciated, and I will continue to review it to work on integrating that more as it fits in. And then we also look at retention rate, so looking at how frequently people need refresher training in certain skill areas. There’s a couple of
things that are particularly challenging about law enforcement training for the Training Needs Assessment and training planning, and that is one – one of them is just the wide range of skills that are needed for this job. So, there is everything from an active shooter incident to regular, common everyday calls, traffic stops, things like that, and they all take – I mean, there’s some similar skillsets, but a lot of them use very different skillsets too and very different situations where sometimes they have time and more ability to interact with people, and other times, there’s no time for that, and they just have to take action. So, this brings about challenges, especially with our limited training time, and the Training Division is actually currently in the midst of looking at ways of how to better identify training priorities and training planning and training methodology to be able to ensure that we’re maximizing the time as best as possible. And then the other challenge is a split-second decision making in situations that are stressful and certain rapidly evolving. So, where I – if I need a refresher in a certain stat skill like hierarchical linear modeling or something like that and I haven’t done it for years, I can, you know, take a break, take a look, and read up, and refresh my skills in that area. And for law enforcement for a lot of these situations, they don’t have that opportunity and luxury to do that. So, we really want our officers to be able to have the memory – skill memory and be able to utilize the skills at a really high proficiency level under situations that are very, very emotionally and physically taxing. And so, this is important just, you know, for the obvious functional part of it, but also they have a greater cognitive availability for decision making for that. So, sometimes people, you know, don’t fully understand the value of having that automatic and that really, really high skill set in some of these tactical skills, but it actually is benefitting many community concerns because that officer then has a lower stress level, less physiological response to the stress, and they can take in more of the nuances in the scene and improve the decision making and communication. Researchers have stressed that over practice and over learning has been shown to decrease the impairment of task performance in stressful situations and that stress can weaken the fine motor movements and decrease task performance. So, that is very important for them and probably for me but (inaudible) before that happens. So, PPB, the main components of the Needs Assessment – these categories here are all driven by the DOJ agreement. Those are the hazards the officers face, complaint data, use of force, having input from PPB members of all ranks in the community, court decisions. All of those are written explicitly in the DOJ agreement. So, we have those components. And then for functional purposes, we also added these components to make it a more robust Needs Assessment. And so, we have the recertification requirements; a
section specifically for DOJ priorities; crowd management now
recently just from, like, two years ago; and crisis intervention;
and then the five main law enforcement core skill disciplines. And
oftentimes, people ask where the communication is included, and that
actually is incorporated into a lot of our training categories here,
so—or resource categories. Complaints section has some trends
regarding communication, officer input on training needs. They
provide us information: What would be helpful regarding
communication training, community input, and research on best
practices. So, that gets integrated into a lot of these different
areas. The sources for the Needs Assessment: These are just a few
of them. We have—we utilize a really mixed-methods approach
utilizing quantitative data and qualitative data. So, some of the
data sources are officer feedback surveys; IPR data, so the
Independent Police Review complaint data; IA data; collision data;
injury data; things of that nature. And we actually do—you all
asked during the force about over-the-time analysis, and for the
Needs Assessment part, we do do that and find that valuable, and
we’ll have an example of that here in a minute. And then we also
have people sources. So, we actually meet with the IPR director and
staff, Training Division command, and lead instructors, policy
analysts, you all. We present occasionally here, but I also—every
year I look for updates on the reports and review those and
integrate those into the Needs Assessment. And then we get feedback
from city attorneys and sometimes the Bureau of Emergency
Communications as well. And then last year we did an example and got
(inaudible) to kind of demonstrate more of their (inaudible) how we
analyze data for the Needs Assessment process. And so, I’m using a
different one because a lot of you were here for that presentation,
so I don’t want it to be too repetitive. So, this year, we’re taking
a look at use-of-force firearms as an example. And for that, we use
the use-of-force statistics, so those are coming from the force
inspector and auditor team. And we used officer-involved shootings,
so the training reviews and feedback as people return to duty.
Feedback from the force inspector and teams. So, we look at the data
for the trends, and they help us with that as well. But then that
gives us an idea of, like, the counts and how frequently things are
being utilized, and I’ll show here in a sec how we analyze that. If
you all have recommendations, that’s totally welcome. And—but it
doesn’t provide us all the context. So, we do meet with the force
inspector and team each year to get more information regarding the
context of the use-of-force usage and the quality of that. And then
we have—at times, we’ll pull After Actions to review within the
Training Division too to have more detailed information. We are
looking at retention rates again, so how frequently they need
training and firearms, which we’ll go through more thoroughly here
in a minute. Survey and learning assessments from the training
evaluation results: So, from officers perspectives, how prepared do they feel, and how much do they feel that they learned and obtained in skills gains. And then also from an instructor’s point of view, what are their observations from the skills training, and where do they think that more training is needed and stuff like that.

Literature research: So, we – some of our officers are able to – they’re very busy, but the oftentimes will make some time to review literature research, and then the analyst team also reviews literature research. And so, sometimes what we do, which we currently have in progress for firearms, is we’ll create lit reviews for them to give them a brief overview of the main findings of a research study, and then we meet with them to discuss is this something that is already implemented in training; should there be any adjustments to how it’s implement; if it’s not implemented, thoughts regarding whether or not it would be beneficial to implement; and things like that. And then they attend specialty firearms training to get more information regarding national trends and methodology and things like that and bring that back to the Training Division, and then discussions with training management and lead instructors. And then, so this is an example of the use-of-force trends for pointing of a firearm, and in this – so, we don’t always know – like the force inspector mentioned, there can be increases or decreases due to, you know, changes in the crime rates or things like that. And so, when we’re looking at this, we’re not particularly necessarily looking for an exact amount, but we’re looking for the overall trend, and does anything stick out that should alarm us of, like, oh, why is that happening, and let’s get more information and see if there is anything related to training or not. It may or may not be, but it just gives us some indications. This trendline here – I don’t know how visible or clear it is, but that – so, overall, the bureau’s use of force over the years has decreased substantially, and use of force for pointing of a firearm is similar to that. And so – and it has about a similar trend. And so, this trendline is just saying if this is all kind of the same, like, what would be anticipate that continued trendline to go with – for those years, and that – it would be up here. So, we had, like, more of a dramatic drop starting in 2018, and that correlates with some training efforts and policy changes that happened. So, we had the pursuit policy that substantially reduced pursuits. And in those, oftentimes there can be a high-risk vehicle stop and so – which included pointing of a firearm, and so there was that. There was the greater use of the sul position. So, when an officer needs to get somewhat prepared for utilizing a firearm but doesn’t need to be at the point of pointing a firearm at someone, there’s another positioning for that. And so – and the research actually supports this positioning when it can be utilized. This is just preliminary research right now, so I’m a little cautious, but so far it looks
promising that that can actually help with outcomes. And then we had
colors in the new high-risk vehicle stop procedures themselves, so
changing the use of firearms in those procedures. And then we had a
new firearm technique introduced into our firearms training and new
qualification system. So, we see that trend, and we’re like, oh,
okay. That correlates with, you know, what we would anticipate with
those changes. And then we also – I already talked about the
officer-involved shootings. If there’s time, I’m can talk about that
more, but I don’t know if there will be. And then for firearms
retention rates, this is only a partial list, but we have a list of
all the core training - yeah, core competency areas for firearm -
and then we work on building an estimated time frame for training.
And this can be difficult because when people – there’s a lot of
variation on people, and so capturing that. There’s a little
research on it, though we do utilize the research available. But
it’s important and valuable because if we can track and target our
training at the right intervals, then the idea is, you know, to have
a proactive training approach that then reduces the need for
reactive training. And so, we have these estimates based on research
that is available. Then we get feedback from our lead instructors
who specialize in firearms training. We get feedback from the
firearms program from other external firearms folks as well. So,
down at DPSST and Clackamas, there are people who specialize in
firearms training. And then feedback from members. So, sometimes in
the surveys, we’ve asked them, “How often do you believe you need to
receive firearms training involving the following skills in order to
be prepared for using the skills effectively on the job, and then
we’ll have a scale from, like, 2-3 times a year, once a year, every
other year, and every three years. So, and then we look at the
variation and estimate, you know, on average what that would be. And
we anticipate that these may change over time. There’s actually some
studies that we’ve had – we haven’t had the capacity to run, but
we’ve been interested in running at PPB too to help us finetune our
retention rate information, but this is where we’re at right now
with that. And then – I’m actually going to skip this one. I’m
worried about time. I want to make sure you guys have questions.
This is just an example of survey questions we ask, and basically,
we’re hoping to have an increase in confidence over time as we work
on our firearms training program and to help make sure they’re at
the level of proficiency needed for the officer-involved shooting
situations. And then some of our main findings are basically more
training time is needed for gaining proficiency needed for the high-
stress situations, focus on close proximity encounters, training
incorporating more realism. This area is very, very well supported
by the research, although, again limited out there but very strong
findings that that is a critical component for firearms training:
Positional shooting, moving and shooting, and the like conditions
which they’re working on now. Any quick questions on the firearms – yeah?

SCHURR: Could you – you said it’s really important and shows up well that literature about the realism. Can you explain what that is?

COVELLI: Yeah. Yeah. It’s really interesting. So, oftentimes firearms training will have more of, like, a static shooting, and they’ll be at the range, and it will be focused on (inaudible) of, you know, shooting a target or something like that. And then they’ll test them in more of a realistic scenario and see how they perform in that. And there is a tremendous amount –

SCHURR: Is it like a video of a person (inaudible) or –

COVELLI: Oh. They have – it would be like more of a – have you seen our scenario training? It will –

MALE: (Inaudible) it’s been a day.

COVELLI: Oh, okay. So, they do –

MALE: They do exactly that here.

SCHURR: Okay.

MALE: Because there are scenarios back here that are extremely realistic, and I was in them. Oh, yeah. Not the police. I could not get my gun out fast enough. So, the scenarios they run here are really very good. They have a whole set of urban – yeah, city and suburban scenes and day and night and alleys and streets, et cetera, et cetera. And so, the officers are out there, and they don’t know what’s going to happen.

SCHURR: Okay.

MALE: I didn’t know either. It was great. I recommend everyone do that if you can.

SCHURR: Thank you.

MALE: Does that help?

COVELLI: Yeah. They have – so, the performance, they’ll find changes substantially in those situations where it induces more realistic stress. And then they also – sometimes there is some research that has information regarding real encounters too, and they see similarly that the skill sets go down. So, it’s really important to have the training that incorporates that realism so that they can work through that, and you can actually get more of an accurate assessment of the skills too. Yeah?

KAHAN: I have a question regarding that particular training. Does it have rewind features if needed?

COVELLI: I wish.

KAHAN: (Inaudible) in a scenario, something goes wrong, and you say, “Whoops! Can we do a do over on that?”

COVELLI: They do, actually. So, they have some situations – they don’t always have the training time, but they do have situations where they’ll go through the scenarios, and depending on the
outcome, they can put the people through it again, and it’s, yeah, really important.

**FEMALE:** One questions. When you were talking about shooting at the range, is there different types of range where they purposely target (inaudible). We’re talking about shooting with different scenario building (inaudible).

**MALE:** Yes. They do both.

**COVELLI:** Yeah.

**MALE:** They’re two different things. And to add to your comment, so what happened is that a scenario would happen, and then there would be a discussion about how it was dealt with and what was good about it, what was bad about it. They don’t necessarily redo that same scenario, but they would redo a similar scenario or something like that, and then it was talked about again and how did that work? What didn’t work. I thought it was pretty darn effective. Scared the hell out of me.

**SCHOENING:** So, this is Franz Schoening. So, like Emma said, traditional firearms training is using live firearms. You’re standing in a line of officers shooting at targets, paper targets, and that’s traditionally how we’ve trained firearms for proficiency. But to Emma’s point, it’s easy to stand on a line and practice on your skills when nobody else is shooting back you and there’s no threat coming in. So, we tried to transition to more scenario – live roleplay or scenarios where you have simulated firearms. They firearm ink projectiles or blanks. And so, having that interaction with a live person who is moving who is firing rounds at you. The physiologic response is just entirely different. You’re looking to move somewhere else where you’re not being shot at, or you’re trying to send rounds back at that person. There’s a lot more decision making involved. It just changes the dynamic totally, and that’s where we see the real training value is in these live force-on-force encounters.

**FEMALE:** I guess my question (inaudible) range doesn’t have a (inaudible) type of shootings, and so (inaudible).

**SCHOENING:** We do have some targets that move, but again, it’s – just shooting at a moving target is not interactive –

(Inaudible)

**SCHOENING:** There is some value, but it’s not a true representation (inaudible) live situation.

**KAHAN:** Now, does the police forces have access to what the Army uses which is (inaudible) training the weapons fires lasers and you can tell who is being touched and who is not being touched, and it’s all the (inaudible). Is there any police agency that has (inaudible)? It’s highly effective (inaudible).

**SCHOENING:** I have heard of agencies that have tried that training equipment. We don’t use it here. I think we have looked at it, and
we decided the simulation (inaudible) work better for us in this environment.

SCHURR: Actually, now I have to bring my work to the situation that I’m imagining that one of the important parts of this training would also be things like times you don’t want to shoot somebody like if there is a playground nearby or some little old lady crossing the street while there happens to be this thing going on, and do you have scenarios of how to not shoot the wrong people, and do you have police chaplains nearby if they do? It’s not a joke? It’s a thing, you know, because it - there is (inaudible) injury when you accidentally shoot the wrong the people. It’s a thing. This is what I do.

COVELLI: So, yes. We actually do. That’s emphasized a lot during the active threat training, and then they incorporate sometimes in other training scenarios, and it reinforces a pretty important component to our current firearms instructors. So, there’s areas where they will incorporate that too. In fact, last I hear they had - I think it was last – anyways. One of the recent trainings, they had a scenario setup where it had various people - it was a display one, but they had to go through this mini scenario and make decision making and stuff like that. And I don’t know the question about the chaplain though, but that is actually a good question.

SCHURR: You probably know.

MALE: The answer would be no. We’ve never had chaplains (inaudible) scenarios, but (inaudible).

KAHAN: Do you ever have scenarios in which the situation where the decision has to be made whether or not to shoot followed by if you have to shoot, how are you going to shoot making an entire scenario that builds from coming in, seeing the situation, making decisions, the results of those decisions are fed back to the officer. The situation evolves, and you can say, “If you had intervened here, maybe you wouldn’t have to shoot, but you still have to,” and then when you make the decision, the way in which you shoot is set?

COVELLI: They do. And they’re working on incorporating the latter part more. So, our patrol procedures program does a lot of the decision making part of it though it’s incorporated into firearms as well. And they are working on – they’re running into staffing capacity challenges with it, but they’re working on the other main disciplines that have a specialty in that area that’s going to be a part of that to be there as well to provide a more thorough debrief regarding, like, the actual application and stuff like that. I’m not sure who –

MALE: Go right ahead.

MALE: Does the training involve (inaudible)?

COVELLI: It does. Yeah. That’s a very important part of their training, and they - I sat and watched several of the debriefs
actually, and they’re pretty thorough, so yeah. We can definitely
talk more about that. Yeah.

**LEVINSON:** Phil Levinson. In response to the question about whether
to shoot and not to shoot, I was here for a training and went into
an area where there was some video that was shown, and basically,
the decisions were made based on what was going on on the video if I
remember it correctly. And then there was a critique following it,
so that – you know, there was potential for shooting somebody that
shouldn’t have been shot versus the subject, and I thought that was
well done and well rehearsed and well discussed afterward. And is
that pretty consistent with what goes on?

**MALE:** Yes.

**LEVINSON:** Okay.

**CASTLE:** If you want to interject because we are running very short
on time. I will just also sell and pitch there are many
opportunities for TAC members to observe training throughout the
year. I have participated in some of these trainings and have seen
some of the members have, and they have really good feedback and
insight into how the training works. Next time you see that
opportunity, think hard about it. It’s a lot of fun. I can
personally attest to that. And I’ll give you a few more minutes to
wrap up.

**MALE:** And it’s really enlightening to go through the actual
training and actually go with a partner on the scene and actually
deal with that scene because you really get of sense of what that
officer goes through in those circumstances.

**COVELLI:** I’m just going to end with I was asked regarding how TAC
can assist more with the analyst team, and one of the things is
we’re working on developing more comprehensive review and reporting
of how we evaluate and the results for our main discipline programs.
And so, we’re happy to present that information to a subgroup or to
the entire committee and obtain feedback regarding either the
reporting or the methodology and provide advice regarding furthering
community communications of results. So, we’re working on – and one
of the recent COCL recommendations has been, like, “Oh, my gosh. You
guys are doing a lot of work. I don’t think anybody’s aware of
this.” You know, like you (inaudible) work on your reporting and get
this out to the community whether it’s through paper reports or
presentations or, you know, whatever that best methodology is. So,
you know, we appreciate advice regarding that as we develop the
capacity for that. And then we have, you know, a subset of research
projects sometimes that TAC has assisted us with, and we’re always
grateful for that help as well, so. And I’ll just thank you for your
time, and please feel free to send us questions, and hopefully we’ll
present again at some other time.

**CASTLE:** Thank you, Emma, and thank you for your flexibility with
the schedule. All right.
SCHURR: (Inaudible).

CASTLE: So, this brings us to the end of our agenda. Obviously, we ran a little bit long today, so we’re technically over time, but I do want to take the next five minutes for public comment. Hopefully, we can get to this, and thanks to the member of the public for your patience. I know Seemab had a question that he was saving for public comments, so Seemab if you want to go. And I suspect we have a phone call who is going to want to give public comment as well. Seemab? And if you’re speaking, we can’t hear you.

HUSSAINI: Hello, can you hear me now? Hello? Hello?

CASTLE: All right. We can hear you.

HUSSAINI: All right. Welcome everybody. Thank you for having me, Seemab Hussaini. My question actually harkens back to when we were talking about facial recognition technology, and I also have something to frame up for the training as well, but I’ll wait in line for that. But regarding the facial recognition technology, I know it was mentioned that, you know, the intrusive development in facial recognition technology for AI in order to be able to gain speech and facial recognition as a tool to help in police accountability when it comes to data that was extrapolated as an example from, I believe, San Francisco or Oakland it was mentioned earlier? It was a while ago it was mentioned, and I didn’t note everything down. But – and that they had a disparity report of some sort saying that their body cams or BWC tech allowed them to basically understand how – what the data yield was regarding – sorry, I’m putting this together in a rush while making dinner. It was along – the findings were about how they were able to verify what negative contact was to communities of color and how disproportionate that was. And so, I had – that was interesting to me because I know that one of the most imperative issues when it comes to communities of color is police surveillance and data and facial recognition and how it actually affects them negatively. So, I’m wondering if this has actually also been explored as an understanding as well as a possible negative when it comes to enjoining AI with BWC tech.

CASTLE: Normally, I don’t like to address public comments specifically, but I just want to clear up something. I’m pretty sure, and I don’t know – I think the people who brought it up originally aren’t here. But my understand (inaudible) discussion mentioned that it was specifically audio, not video analysis for the FBI stuff. And then the other thing I’ll just mention is I’m pretty sure City Council a few years ago already banned use of facial recognition technology with some carve outs, but they wouldn’t apply to police use. So, this issue may already be solved, and I recommend doing some research into that because it might be interesting. Oh, Phil?
HUSSAINI: Yeah. And I appreciate that because, yes, the City Council did ban it; however, it was still mentioned, and facial recognition – I’m not sure if you guys go back into recordings or what not, but it was mentioned – most of it was about speech recognition and whatnot, but then it was almost mentioned facial how that is a beneficial tool and asset, and my hope was to be able to bring awareness for – and I did not keep up with who was speaking on that particular subject, but, you know, they seemed to have lacked awareness about that being a negative, particularly for the City of Portland as well as communities of color.

CASTLE: Thank you. And I see a phone number raising their hand. I suspect it’s Dan. Okay, Dan? And I blocked their microphone. Sorry about that, Dan. Do you want to start speaking again? All right. Try again.

HANDELMAN: Can you hear me now?

CASTLE: Yes.

HANDELMAN: Oh, great. Yeah. That phone told me I wasn’t allowed to unmute. The rules. Hi, this is Dan Handelman. I use he/him pronouns. I’m with the group Portland Cop Watch. Thank you for your discussions tonight. So, I was troubled by two things I heard tonight. One is that the Force Science Institute was allowed to train Portland police despite community concerns about their junk science. I will just call it that because that’s what other people have called it. And secondly that the new force inspector is saying that they can’t change what’s in the force reports that you are given, but I don’t think that’s true at all. I think that if you talk to a compliance officer and the DOJ and say, “Then in addition to the stuff that you asked for, we would like this to also be presented with these extra pieces of data,” I think they would be very open to that, especially because that’s what your job is to recommend changes to the Training Division for the community. So, I do hope that that gets thought out. The – also, the mention of the body-worn cameras, it said that the two primary reasons for body-worn cameras were to use for prosecutions and to protect officers when there is a complaint about them. We were told that the primary use was to prove whether or not an officer violated policy. So, it’s not necessarily a protection for an officer. It’s to clarify whether or not there was misconduct, but I still don’t trust them anyway. The demographic data is something that fluctuated. There was three quarters where the percentage of black people subjected to force was between 19-22%, and it went back up to what it was before which is between 25-30%. And I mentioned in the chat that you all did not see the quarter two data at one of your meetings yet. That came out in August, so I’m hoping that comes up in the next meeting. The question about whether officers use deadly force not being part of the force inspector’s purview is very disturbing because what if an officer who uses a lot of force also uses deadly force because I
think it would be very telling if there’s an officer who is prone to using force who is also one of the ones that used deadly force, so I’m hoping that there’s some connection made there. The group that’s working on the crowd stuff, I hope you saw the Independent Monitor LLC Report that came out about that last month. It was part of the DOJ agreement. It talked about crowd control, the problems with training, the problems with the way it was enacted on the streets. I hope that you all saw that. And my last comment for the night is Portland Cop Watch’s 90th issue of our newsletter, our 30th anniversary issue, came out a couple weeks ago. It’s up online on our website, portlandcopwatch.org, and I’ll hope you’ll check it out. There’s an article, as usual, about the Training Advisory Council in there. Thank you very much.

CASTLE: Thank you, Dan. And I will just note for the record that the Q2 force report was sent out to TAC members via email. It has not been formally presented though, so that’s a good clarification. We are now 9 minutes over time for the meeting. Does anyone object to ending this meeting immediately?

CASTLE: All right. This meeting is now officially over. Thank you, everyone, and have a great rest of your evening.