

Police Accountability Commission
Full Commission Meeting
03-31-2022
Meeting Report

Contents

1. Attendance
2. Agenda
3. Reference Documents
4. Notes
5. Zoom Chat
6. Zoom Q&A
7. Advance Public Comment
8. Meeting Webpage and Recording

Attendance

| Commission Members | | | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|
| Name | Present | Absent | Name | Present | Absent |
| Alvin | X | | Katherine | X | |
| Angie | | X | Lovisa | X | |
| Charlie | X | | May | X | |
| Connie | X | | Monica | X | |
| Dan | X | | Nicole | | X |
| Debbie | X | | Seemab | X | |
| Eric | X | | Sophia | X | |
| Eva | X | | Tirsa | X | |
| Faythe | X | | Winta | X | |
| Jason | X | | Zoe | | X |

| Support Staff | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Name | Name |
| Ayomide Nikzi (Facilitator) | Sameer Kanal |
| Victoria Lara (Facilitator) | |

Agenda

1. Call to Order
 - A. Logistical Announcements
 - B. Summary of PAC timeline
2. Guidelines for Today's Meeting
 - A. Reminder of Community Standards
 - B. Co-chairs' review of today's meeting purpose
3. Draft Bylaws
 - A. Discussion of remainder of document (beginning with Section VII)
 - B. Public Comment
 - C. Potential Agreement: Approve PAC draft bylaws
4. Draft Agenda and Scope
 - A. Discussion of draft document
 - B. Public Comment
 - C. Potential Agreement: Approve PAC draft agenda and scope
5. Draft Community Engagement Framework (30 minutes)
 - A. Discussion of draft document
 - B. Public Comment
 - C. Potential Agreement: Approve PAC draft community engagement framework
6. Conclusion
 - A. Parking Lot Recap
 - B. Update on April scheduling
 - C. Thank you and adjournment

Reference Documents

[PAC 03-31-2022 Meeting Agenda](#)

[PAC 03-31-2022 Meeting Slides](#)

[PAC 03-31-2022 Draft Bylaws](#)

[PAC 03-31-2022 Draft Agenda and Scope](#)

[PAC 03-31-2022 Draft Community Engagement Framework](#)

[PAC 03-31-2022 Potential Agreements](#)

[PAC Values and Goals \(03-24-2022\)](#)

[PAC 03-31-2022 Draft Bylaws Summary](#)

Notes

Draft Bylaws ([timestamp 15:01](#))

- Commissioners will use methodology stated in the bylaws which is modified consensus making.
- Commissioners provide summary for each section and ask the commission to provide edits if necessary

Discussion of remainder of document ([timestamp 19:17](#))

- Commissioners proposed no edits to the final bylaws sections. ([timestamp 35:32](#))
- Commissioner discussed potentially setting the terms of the commission's duration, as stated by city council in a resolution earlier today should be incorporated into the Bylaws. Commissioners noted that the term was defined as "after the Commission has met for 18 months" in the Bylaws.

Public Comment on the PAC Draft Bylaws ([timestamp 38:47](#))

- No public comment was given.

Potential Agreement: Approve PAC draft bylaws ([timestamp 40:04](#))

- Commissioners come to a consensus to approve the PAC Bylaws.

Draft Agenda and Scope ([timestamp 43:52](#))

Discussion of draft document

- Facilitators led the Commission through reviewing the document, section by section, to accept any proposed edits from the commission.
- Introductory Paragraph:
 - Commissioners discussed the addition of a new introductory paragraph, added by co-chairs at the commission's request since the last full-PAC discussion of the draft document. There was a proposal to remove "to meet the needs, concerns, and desires of the communities

most impacted by policing, overpolicing, and police misconduct”. This was flagged to circle back to later in this meeting.

- Organizational Phase section:
 - Co-chairs read the text into the record. There were no comments.
- Fact-Finding Phase section:
 - Co-Chairs read the text into the record. Commissioners discussed minor word changes and clarifications, including “identifying how police are not being accountable” as part of defining the barriers the PAC needed to identify.
 - Commissioners discussed adding (to the section committing to receiving a briefing from the PPA), a briefing from PPB leadership. There was also a proposal to remove the item altogether (to no longer commit to receiving briefings from either PPA or PPB). The mandated duties of the Commission from City Council included talking to all parties to the *USDOJ v. City of Portland* Settlement Agreement (including PPA), so it is required. Concern was raised that the language empowered PPA (and PPB)’s voice, with relation to the briefing being “about how they’d like to see our new system work”. Discussed possible change to “meet with” and “to discuss the design of the new system”
 - Commissioners discussed adding a briefing from the City Council, in particular the Commissioner-in-Charge of the Police Bureau.
 - Commissioners discussed if it would be awkward to develop Charter Amendments in the Fact-Finding Phase before the framework development that the PAC would conduct in future phases of work. Proposed move for this optional task from Fact-Finding Phase section of this document to Ongoing Tasks section.
 - Commissioners discussed genericizing enumerated briefings to “listening to all stakeholders”
 - Commissioners discussed proposal to add “Investigate forms of governance to give the board the credibility of independence.”
- Ongoing tasks:
 - Co-Chairs read the text into the record.

- Commissioners discussed moving “Ongoing Tasks” segment from bottom of document to where they start (between Organizational and Fact-Finding Phase’s sections) (timestamp 1:10:10)
- After proposed move, commissioners discussed this section’s content (timestamp 1:19:55)
- Commissioners discussed replacing the word “testimony” with “engagement”
- Powers and Duties Phase (timestamp 1:22:33)
 - Co-Chairs read the text into the record.
 - Commissioners gave a general comment that this is the “function” of the new oversight system, to be distinguished from the “form” of it (next phase). There was a question as to if a section on public access and transparency existed, which is in the next section as well (“Structure and Details”)
 - Commissioners asked what the outcome documents would be, and staff responded that the examples from the Charter Commission might be helpful – conceptual agreements in sentence form, possibly with paragraph justification, but not (yet) code language.
- Structure and Details phase (timestamp 1:28:10)
 - Co-Chairs read the text into the record. Commissioners discussed minor word changes and clarifications, or sub-headings (e.g. moving the requirements of reports/meetings’ openness to public to its own section and not from a City Council section).
 - Commissioners suggested adding onboarding process
 - Commissioners noted that much of this language is derived directly from mandated details of the oversight board, including mandates from the City Council to the PAC to figure out
 - Commissioners suggested including under the staffing structure, the idea of the oversight board employing full time attorneys
- Transition Plan and Final Details phase (timestamp 1:38:44)
 - Co-Chairs read the text into the record. Commissioners discussed minor word changes and clarifications.

- Commissioners asked about the City’s submission of a transition plan, required as part of the settlement agreement, and discussed possibly adding to the Fact-Finding Phase determining what the current transition plan in place is. Deputy City Attorney Sarah Ames clarified that there are two transition plans – the City submitted one to the Court to keep IPR functioning, and to maintain IPR’s work, whereas the PAC is responsible for proposing to City Council a transition plan related to ongoing cases, employee transitions, etc.
- Concluding Phase(s) (timestamp 1:46:22)
 - Commissioners discussed that sharing information and giving feedback is an important part of the work plan, and asked if it should be in Ongoing Tasks. Reviewed that it is already in Ongoing Tasks, and discussed possible removal from Concluding Phases if “take public testimony” implies *only* during this phase.
- Commissioners, having previously flagged items and proposed possible changes, began reviewing the document a second time and working through those proposals (timestamp 1:51:33)
 - Commission gave consensus to keeping draft introductory paragraph included in full (timestamp 1:53:40)
 - No proposed changes to “Organizational Phase” section
 - Under “Ongoing Tasks”, Commission gave consensus to removing “testimony from” and “engagement with” from enumerated individuals and adding it to the header “Take Testimony and Engagement” (timestamp 1:56:55)
 - Under “Ongoing Tasks”, Commission discussed adding enumerated DOJ stakeholders in a parenthetical, as well as possibly adding “and others” or leaving it as just adding the five named parties to reflect the specific list of parties to the *USDOJ v. City of Portland* Settlement Agreement. Commission gave consensus to adding only the five parties, and also changing header to say “Ongoing Tasks (Phases 2-6)” (timestamp 2:06:45)
 - Under “Fact-Finding Phase”, Commissioners discussed adding back in “how police are not being held accountable” in required Outcomes

section related to barriers to police accountability, as well as adding in “listen to all people interested in this issue.” Commissioners discussed whether enumerated list was possibly limiting, and added in text to say the Commission would listen to any interested party during this phase. Commissioners came to consensus to add new proposed text and all proposals from earlier in this meeting to change “Fact-Finding Phase” text. (timestamp 2:14:15)

- No proposed changes to “Powers and Duties Phase” section, and commissioners gave consensus to move on without further discussion to next section (timestamp 2:16:25)
- Co-chairs reviewed changes proposed earlier in this meeting to “Structure and Details Phase” section, which included adding staff attorney discussion, adding a section on onboarding process, and clarifications/word choice changes. Commissioners gave consensus to approve all previously proposed changes from earlier in the meeting (timestamp 2:17:30) excluding the changes related to public access and transparency.
- Commissioners gave consensus to moving reports / meetings / investigations transparency level to their own category, and adding in “transparency” to required outcome documents for “Structure and Details” phase (timestamp 2:18:30)
- Commissioners then moved to discuss “Transition Plan and Final Details” section, which had no previously-proposed changes. Commissioners came to consensus to move on without further discussion to next section (timestamp 2:19:17)
- Co-chairs reviewed one proposed change to “Concluding Phase(s)” section, which was to remove “take public testimony” since it was already listed under “Ongoing Tasks (Phases 2-6)”. Commissioners discussed alternative, which is to clarify that public testimony is on the final draft, by changing the item this references to say “share final draft proposal” rather than simply “share information” before asking for public testimony, and then keeping “take public testimony.”

Commission gave consensus to this change and therefore to full sixth section (timestamp 2:21:20)

Public Comment (timestamp 2:22:30)

- Compliance Officer / Community Liaison (COCL) staff wishes the commission well and congratulates the PAC on their current work.

Potential Agreement: Approve PAC draft agenda and scope (timestamp 2:26:00)

- Commission comes to a consensus to approve draft of the agenda and scope, as revised today, as the PAC Agenda and Scope (timestamp 2:27:17)

Draft Community Engagement Framework (timestamp 2:28:34)

Discussion of draft document

- Co-Chairs walk through document as previously discussed, noting no new proposed edits were received via email. (timestamp 2:29:10)
- Co-chairs noted there were two parts of the text which were referred without recommendation by the Sub-Committee on Community Engagement Framework.
- Commissioners came to consensus on “Purpose” section and “Vision” section (other than one highlighted section under Vision) (timestamp 2:31:30)
- Commissioners came to consensus on “Values and Guiding Principles” as written (timestamp 2:33:08)
- Commissioners came to consensus on “Objectives” section as written, other than a highlighted section (2nd part referred without recommendation) (timestamp 2:34:50)
- Commissioners come to consensus on “Methodology” section as written, with a formatting change (timestamp 2:36:16).
- The Commission then moved into discussing the two highlighted items, referred without recommendation by the Sub-Committee on Community Engagement Framework.
 - The Commission discussed a possible Part 4 on harm reduction and healing under “Our Vision”. Commissioners discussed whether or not this was the task of the PAC – building relationships may be another

entity's responsibility, not PAC's. Proposal to change it to "creating a system" that does this work, rather than the PAC doing it directly through its community engagement, did not achieve consensus due to strong opposition (timestamp 2:42:04)

- After further discussion, co-chairs asked if there was strong opposition to removing the section completely. Commission arrived to consensus and section was removed (timestamp 2:45:28)
- Commissioners discuss highlighted section (possible Part 4 under "Objectives") that discusses correcting past harms with police. Co-chairs noted that it's a sentiment the sub-committee shared and agreed with generally, but also that the sub-committee questioned whether it fit into the Community Engagement Framework, and therefore wanted a full commission decision on it. The discussion included definition of "past harms" – original proposal was to discuss past harms not as specific misconduct allegations, but broader concepts like reconciliation and reparations.
- Commissioners discussed moving this to "Vision" in same document, or whether or not it was better addressed in the Commission's separate Values and Goals document. Staff reviewed Values and Goals document with commission, approved last week by full commission. Proposal to change text to reflect the community engagement portion of this work. Several different versions of text were combined into a draft, moved up to "Our Vision" section. Commission gave consensus to adapted/combined/moved text (timestamp 3:06:05).

Public Comment on Draft Community Engagement Framework (timestamp 3:07:00)

- No public comment given

Potential Agreement: Approve PAC draft community engagement framework

- Commission comes to consensus to approve draft (timestamp 3:07:55)

Parking Lot Recap (timestamp 3:08:53)

- Define what trauma is
- How does commission vote?
- What is commissions timeline?
- City council quarterly report
- process clarification and community engagement framework
- Draft letters to council
- Quorum requirements
- Define gross violation of operation procedures
- Procedure for trauma informed board member
- How we create a system that promotes restoration, justice, and reconciliation for both current and past harms.

Zoom Chat

18:34:48 From Katherine McDowell (she/her) : Welcome Alvin! So glad you have joined us.

18:38:43 From CSD Support Staff : As of 6:38 PM there are 12 members of the Commission present, as well as 4 members of the public in the audience.

18:39:09 From dan handelman he/him : ^^ Two community members and two city staff

18:39:12 From CSD Support Staff to Hosts and panelists : Additionally, two members of the Commission have indicated to me they are arriving late today.

18:41:56 From dan handelman he/him : Not present right now:
Commissioners Faythe Aiken, Monica Arce, Nicole Cole, Seemab Hussaini, Charlie Michelle-Westley, May Saechao, Zoe Sigman, Angie Tomlinson.

18:42:32 From CSD Support Staff : As of 6:41 PM there are 13 members of the Commission present, as well as 5 audience members, of which 2 are City employees.

18:44:43 From Seemab (he/him) to Hosts and panelists : Let's no longer add roll to the chats and leave it to our coordinator, Sameer. Maybe put this to a vote?

18:45:04 From CSD Support Staff to Hosts and panelists : That won't be voted on today, but it is in the parking lot. Thank you Seemab!

18:56:49 From CSD Support Staff : As of 6:56 PM, there are 14 members of the Commission present, and six people in the audience, of which 3 are City employees/contractors

19:07:12 From dan handelmann he/him : public comment first?

19:07:21 From CSD Support Staff to Hosts and panelists : Yes.

19:08:16 From CSD Support Staff to Hosts and panelists : FYI May is present at the meeting but on her phone so she won't show up as a panelist, but she is here and is able to speak

19:10:08 From CSD Support Staff : As of 7:08 PM, there are 15 members of the Commission present and 5 people in the audience, including 3 City employees/contractors

19:13:31 From Seemab (he/him) to Hosts and panelists : Approve

19:14:00 From Debbie Aiona : Thank you Lovisa and Jason for leading the bylaws subcommittee!

19:14:17 From Seemab (he/him) to Hosts and panelists : Chat if limited audio/video

19:14:41 From CSD Support Staff to Hosts and panelists : She's calling in on her phone, she can neither read nor type in the chat

19:16:12 From Monica Arce (she/her) : such good work!

19:31:51 From CSD Support Staff : As of 7:31 PM, there are 15 members of the Commission present (one lost internet and when that member returns it'll be up to 16), and 6 people in the audience, including 5 City employees/contractors

19:44:37 From Lovisa Lloyd (she/her) to Hosts and panelists : Are we doing full discussion now, or still just suggesting edits?

19:45:38 From Katherine McDowell (she/her) : There is a Q/A relevant to Seemab's comment. Can we address this in our discussion?

19:46:15 From Eric Hunter to Hosts and panelists : Are we still making suggestions or debating the issues at this point?

19:48:05 From Faythe Aiken, she/her to Hosts and panelists : huzzah!

19:50:44 From dan handelmann he/him : DOJ stakeholders (City of Portland, Portland Police Association, US Dept of Justice, and amici Albina Ministerial Alliance Coalition for Justice and Police Reform, Mental Health Alliance)

19:55:44 From Faythe Aiken, she/her to Hosts and panelists : I like that, Debbie

19:56:04 From Monica Arce (she/her) : I like what Debbie just said too!

20:00:29 From dan handelman he/him : From Mandated Duties: The Commission is required to seek out testimony and input from all stakeholders in the Federal Department of Justice settlement agreement, as well as other interested parties, impacted communities, and concerned constituents, and may seek out expertise from those they identify as beneficial to the process both within and outside of Portland

20:12:38 From dan handelman he/him : <https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2021/rethink-police-accountability-commission-scope-of-work-final-draft-1.pdf>

20:23:15 From Jason Renaud to Hosts and panelists : It is a good time to schedule a briefing from the City Attorney on the proposed transition - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1YmpPoRkc7-Cov0ug9puAasw1Vuk-g_CzRmGzr75ANVE/edit?usp=sharing

20:26:29 From Jason Renaud to Hosts and panelists : Agreed! Make explicit.

20:26:54 From dan handelman he/him : It seems we have a lot to work through, if only this could be a full time job we could have the new board up and running by the end of the year...

20:39:37 From Faythe Aiken, she/her to Hosts and panelists : i'm good with removing engagement and testimony from the subpoints

20:41:08 From Monica Arce (she/her) : Im good with that

20:46:11 From Monica Arce (she/her) : that sounds good to me as a separate point

20:48:18 From Jason Renaud to Hosts and panelists : There are five and only five DOJ stakeholders.

20:48:32 From Monica Arce (she/her) : yes, got it

20:50:22 From Seemab (he/him) to Hosts and panelists : Yes

20:50:25 From Monica Arce (she/her) : I feel good about listing all five stakeholders if there is no question about who they are and we are not leaving anyone out.

20:50:38 From Eric Hunter : I think we list the five since they are spelled out

20:54:01 From Seemab (he/him) to Hosts and panelists : No challenge to as written now

20:54:33 From Faythe Aiken, she/her to Hosts and panelists : works for me

20:56:43 From Eva Vega : Perhaps “any entity or individual who has interest pertaining to this matter...”

20:57:17 From Ayomide Nikzi She/They to Sophia.Glenn and all panelists : Trying to move you now

20:58:44 From Monica Arce (she/her) : Im' good with that

20:59:01 From Seemab (he/him) to Hosts and panelists : Agree

21:01:04 From Seemab (he/him) to Hosts and panelists : Agree to move on

21:01:49 From CSD Support Staff : As of 9:01 PM there are 16 members of the Commission present. There are also 6 people in the audience, including 4 City employees/contractors.

21:02:14 From Seemab (he/him) to Hosts and panelists : Agree

21:02:17 From Eva Vega : I consent

21:03:20 From Eva Vega : No opposition. I consent.

21:03:52 From Eva Vega : I agree to move to section 6.

21:05:49 From Eva Vega : I have no opposition

21:09:09 From Seemab (he/him) : Dennis! Great to hear from you!

21:11:50 From Eva Vega : I consent

21:15:23 From CSD Support Staff : There are two yellow-highlighted portions of text in this document. These were not recommended by the sub-committee on Community Engagement Framework, nor were they removed by the sub-committee. They were instead included because the sub-committee wanted to know the full commission's views on these two sections.

21:15:27 From Charlie (Char) She/Her : Losing battery, have to move to another room be right back.

21:15:52 From Seemab (he/him) : Yes

21:16:02 From Eva Vega : I'm good to move forward

21:17:34 From Eva Vega : I have no objection
21:17:41 From Eva Vega : I'm good to move forward
21:17:46 From Seemab (he/him) : No objection
21:19:14 From Eva Vega : I have no opposition
21:19:17 From Seemab (he/him) : Ready
21:19:23 From Eva Vega : I'm ready to move forward
21:20:43 From Eva Vega : I have no opposition. I'm ready to move forward.
21:20:46 From Seemab (he/him) : Happy
21:30:07 From Seemab (he/him) : Chuck it
21:30:18 From Monica Arce (she/her) : Yes, chuck it!
21:30:20 From Eva Vega : I'm ready to move forward
21:33:05 From Eva Vega : Perhaps "current & past grievances" in the place of harm?

"Restorative justice and reconciliation.."

21:34:43 From Jason Renaud : I agree with it as a vision, not as an outcome.
21:34:44 From Seemab (he/him) : Still not feeling it
21:34:57 From Seemab (he/him) : feeling it*
21:37:37 From Eva Vega : Outcome: "...to implement a system that promotes restoration, justice and reconciliation..."
21:37:57 From dan handelman he/him : *While engaging the community we will explain that by* design*ing* a system that will hold police accountable [not only for reducing the] for harms currently caused *we seek to recognize and repair past harms and prevent future harms. [but also for recognizing/ acknowledging/ repairing past harms and preventing future harms.]

Methodologies

21:39:27 From Eva Vega : Outcome: "...to implement a systematic policies and procedures that promote restoration, justice and reconciliation for both, current and past harms..."
21:39:35 From Seemab (he/him) : This sounds good
21:40:17 From Jason Renaud : CHange "that by" to "how"
21:41:14 From Alvin to Hosts and panelists : I have to do the daddy dues.
Will catch up with Sameer on what I miss here on the tail end
21:43:13 From Seemab (he/him) : "Will seek" makes it a vision

21:44:53 From CSD Support Staff : As of 9:42 PM, there are 15 members of the Commission present. There are also 5 people in the audience, including 3 City employees/contractors.

21:45:44 From Seemab (he/him) : We're getting really wordsmithy

21:47:27 From connie wohn (she/her) to Hosts and panelists : I will have to go at 10pm. I have a 6am call time tomorrow.

21:50:25 From Eva Vega : I agree Seemab

21:50:45 From Eva Vega : I'm ready to move forward

21:52:18 From Seemab (he/him) : APPROVE!

21:52:36 From Eva Vega : I approve!

21:53:54 From Seemab (he/him) : All good

21:54:31 From CSD Support Staff to Hosts and panelists : Some of the parking lot items have already been addressed, and a clean copy will be sent out to the group as part of concluding the organizational phase

Zoom Q&A and Responses

Philip Chachka (Guest) 07:41 PM

I think it will be helpful to consider the wants and desires of the PPA because it will be a major factor in getting the City Council to approve the changes. Might the wording for line J be changed to a conference with PPA with question and answer time?

This question has been answered live

Advance Public Comment

No advance public comment was received for this meeting.

Meeting Webpage and Recording

PAC Meeting Webpage: <https://www.portland.gov/police-accountability/events/2022/3/31/police-accountability-commission-meeting>

Video Link: <https://youtu.be/B6HA4m9SgqU>