



The Portland Committee on Community Engaged Policing (PCCEP)

August 25, 2020 Full Board Public Meeting Transcript

Theo Latta:

The August general PCCEP meeting. It's an honor to be with you all and share this space. PCCEP, if it's your first time here, stands for the Portland Committee on Community-Engaged Policing. If you're hearing my voice right now, that's great, if you need some assistance in that endeavor, and if you would like to use the sign language interpreters, Heather Duval, is the video to pin. She's going to be taking care of that as well as AJ, it looks like. Okay, AJ, it looks like. We have a full agenda, so I'm not going to take too much of your time. I just wanted to discuss the mission statement a little bit, and the group values. That's the mission right there. One of the primary functions of PCCEP is to elevate the voice of the community. So thank you all, community members for being here and allowing PCCEP to elevate your voice. Thank you.

Theo Latta:

Want to talk a little bit about the PCCEP group values, those are the same values that we try to utilize in these conversations in these types of meetings. It's really important in all of the the communications here is to understand that people are different. People have different lenses. People view things through their own eyes. They can always see things through one set of eyes, so it's important to be cognizant of that, mindful, and give each other some grace. So one of the values here is assume positive intent, so it's important that we always assume positive intent.

Theo Latta:

Could you keep your sound off unless you're speaking? PCCEP, the co-chairs Elliot and Lakayana, they will give ample time for community comments. If you'd like to make a community comment, then you can go ahead and unmute yourself. When you're called upon, you can unmute yourself, turn your video on, and we'll make sure that we give you space to speak. In case of a Zoom bombing, which is when folks try to take control of the call, or try to just yell ridiculous things, we're going to mute them and get them off the call as quickly as possible. Obviously as PCCEP we aren't going to tolerate any white supremacy, we're not going to tolerate any hate speech. So that'll be immediately eliminated.

Theo Latta:

This meeting is going to be recorded and posted on YouTube by tomorrow. Please understand that. If you'd like your name changed, I'd be happy to do that, just personal message me that in the chat box. Last thing is please keep the chat box clear of questions. Save your questions for the community comment portion. It often becomes too much for folks to track when we see just tons and tons of questions in the chat box, and we really want that to be an open conversation with community and PCCEP members. So please wait to ask your question until the co-chairs allow space for that. Thank you. My name is Theo Latta. I'm PCCEP staff, so if you need anything, there's my email right there, my contact phone number, and yeah, I'm here to help. Again, I thank you very much. Take it away co-chairs.



Lakayana:

Thank you Theo, and thank everyone again for being here for our August, 2020 meeting. This is the Portland Committee on Community-Engaged Policing, where we are tasked with helping to oversee the settlement agreement as well as, and as equally as important to build those bridges between the community and law enforcement, and create spaces for dialogue, for recommendations and for change.

Lakayana:

Just some thoughts as we come into the meeting today, this is the three month anniversary since George Floyd was murdered in Minneapolis, which sparked nationwide protests. But it also goes back a lot further than that, for the struggle for black people to be free in this country, and to have safety in public and in private. And we've seen time and time again, it's not been upheld. Just this weekend with the shooting of Jacob Blake in my home state of Wisconsin, that that continues to be a problem. Especially here in Portland, the dominant narrative continues to be protests rather than the issues that the protests are about, which is black lives. So just wanted to open the meeting by framing that as a centerpiece, as we dialogue, and as we do our work to remember part of why we are here, and the voices that can't speak, and the bodies that continue to be killed.

Speaker 1:

[inaudible 00:12:16].

Lakayana:

I just want to open with a moment of silence, and then we will go around and do some introductions. So just a moment of silence for the family of Jacob Blake, who is actually still alive, and to remember George Floyd and many countless others.

Lakayana:

Thank you for that. So we're going to get this meeting started and I just want to encourage our representatives of Portland Police Bureau to continue to center black lives in your, y'all's as an organization's response to what's happening and to work with the community, work with PCCEP and the other groups in this city to address those issues, and not let the sole focus just be on protests. And when you are dealing with protesters, who I just like to refer to as community members, to use deescalation, to seek to understand first, and to use as little violence as possible. I'm going to turn it over and just call on folks to introduce themselves. Elliot.

Elliot Young:

Yeah, sorry. I had to find the unmute button. My name is Elliot Young. I'm the co-chair of PCCEP. Welcome everyone.

Lakayana:

Anne.

Anne Campbell:



Hi, I'm Anne Campbell. I'm an alternate co-chair of PCCEP, and I wanted to thank Lakayana for those words, sorry. I'm really concerned at this time in our world, in our society and in Portland, our community. Thank you.

Lakayana:

Amy.

Amy Anderson:

Good evening everyone. My name is Amy Anderson. I am the chair of the Behavioral Health Subcommittee. Welcome.

Lakayana:

Taji.

Taji Chesimet:

Hello everyone, Taji Chesimet. I am a member of the Youth Subcommittee. Thank you everyone for being here tonight and I really echo the sentiments that Lakayana expressed around the focuses of the protests and why they're occurring. So thank you so much everyone for being here.

Lakayana:

Vadim.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Hi everybody, Vadim Mozyrsky. I'm glad you all are here. Thank you for coming.

Lakayana:

Yolanda, are you here?

Yolanda Salguiero:

Yeah, I'm here. Thank you. My name is Yolanda Salguiero, I'm co-chair for the Youth Subcommittee. Thank you for being here.

Lakayana:

Britt.

Britt:

Yes. Good evening, everyone. Thanks for being here. And for those of you who are coming to our subcommittees, we see you there. And I'm Britt and I'm a member of the Youth Subcommittee.

Lakayana:



Marcia.

Marcia Perez:

Hey, everyone, Marcia Perez. I'm the chair of the Racial Equity Subcommittee. Thank you all for being here tonight.

Lakayana:

Do we have any other members that I missed? I'm trying to make sure I hit everybody. Cool. Any alternates that are here? I think it's always important to recognize them, especially as we get ready to vote. Any alternates? Okay. We are going to move on to our subcommittee reports. Let's start with the Youth Subcommittee.

Britt:

Sure. So we had our official meeting earlier this month, and have also been moving some things forward offline. In reference to the restorative justice recommendation, which we had passed a couple months ago, we are currently working on a brief to update the mayor and his office with, to look at next steps there and to get some type of public commitment of support, which they have tangentially agreed to doing. So we're working on that. We also met with, or had the opportunity to speak with Brian, who's on the call right now, a community member, around his idea for some proposals around identification for officers, and that is also something that's come up from other community members.

Britt:

So we're actually going to put together a recommendation for the PCCEP and hope to present that at our next general body meeting. So that's something we'll be working on. We also, as a Youth Subcommittee are looking to hold a town hall, or community forum for young people. I'm trying to coordinate some of the various youth activists movements and events and programs going on right now. So we'll have more on that at our next meeting as well.

Lakayana:

Thank you, Britt. Let's send it over to Marcia, and the Racial Equity Subcommittee.

Marcia Perez:

Yeah. Thank you. We met last Thursday, we held a special forum as in Say Her Name. And so we heard from the mother of Kendra James, Shirley Isadore, who shared her story, which was really, really impactful. We had a great turnout. We had a dialogue about what community safety looks like for black women, and really explored how to humanize the experiences of those who've been impacted by police violence. It was really very powerful. Shirley is going to the DC March tomorrow, and I actually will be meeting with her later this evening to get her her shirts that PCCEP covered, which I'm really excited for. She was really grateful to be back and doing community work with us. Thank you all for attending that event and I hope that we can continue that dialogue.

Lakayana:



Yeah. Awesome event. Awesome, awesome event. Let's go with the Behavioral Health Subcommittee.

Amy Anderson:

Yeah, good evening everyone. Last month for the Behavioral Health Subcommittee, we gave over our time to talk about the [inaudible 00:18:47] report, which is due once a quarter. So we had a chance for people to hear what was going on and give any input. Our next Behavioral Health Meeting will be September 1st, and we will be hearing from Lieutenant Casey on more about the Behavioral Health Unit. And we will also be discussing some recommendations from previous meetings. So hopefully we will see you there. We start at 6:30 and we go to 8:00.

Lakayana:

Thank you, Amy. I'm going to turn over to Vadim for the Policy and Settlement Subcommittee.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Thank you. We had a really good meeting last time, a good attendance, and good input on the Truth and Reconciliation Model. We discussed what that model will look like, what the literature out there has been, and what the recommendations are about what the Truth and Reconciliation Model would be, and also the next steps, which will entail gathering together for a Truth and Reconciliation Committee working with PPB in order to move that forward. So we're going to reach out to PPB, or have reached out and we'll reach out to PPB to keep that moving forward. Please attend our meetings. There's going to be a lot done in the next few months, and we're looking for as much help and input as possible.

Lakayana:

Awesome, thanks Vadim. So Steering Committee met, I want to say a couple of weeks ago. We discussed a number of things. There was a set of metrics that was produced by the Mental Health Alliance and the Albina Ministerial Alliance Coalition for Justice. I think I said that right. They came up with a whole bunch of metrics that they feel that if PCCEP hit these metrics would show that we are being a successful committee. We talked about those metrics, which ones felt logical and how we can collaborate with both of these organizations on those metrics. We planned out this evening's meeting and talked about the directives.

Lakayana:

Also, there was some comments about having more support for the Behavioral Health Subcommittee. I felt that's also important to note and that we heard those comments and want to continue to raise the voices of those on the committee, and the work that they're doing and make sure that they get the support that they need from PCCEP. So, yeah. Make sure that we are helping as much as we can with them. Yeah. So I personally definitely heard that loud and clear. Anything else I missed from that meeting Eliot that you wanted to add in on?

Elliot Young:

Yeah. Well, the one thing which we're going to be discussing later in the agenda was this idea for a town hall, which we briefly discussed. We'll talk about that later. The other thing I just wanted to inform the



community about is that the co-chairs, Lakayana and myself, are meeting with the CRC, the Community Review Committee, and the TAC, Training Advisory Committee, with the mayor's office, and these are going to be ongoing meetings now with the different commissioners' assistants, or some staff people on a every third week basis to just give updates. Vadim was also present there as the vice chair of CRC. But as we get more information from those meetings, we will pass that along. But essentially the last meeting was just more of a organizing meeting.

Lakayana:

Yeah. And those meetings came about as we were looking for more communication between the different, the RR3 committees, the CRC, TAC, and PCCEP, wanted to collaborate more, and we also wanted more connection with the mayor's office and other elected officials. So appreciate them for being a part of that.

Elliot Young:

Just one other thing I forgot about the [Amica 00:23:04]. We have this document that the Amica produced, and they have extended the opportunity for us as PCCEP to edit it into a document that we would agree with. So we're going to be working on that, and hopefully bringing that to our next board meeting in September to actually vote on.

Lakayana:

Cool. Thank you. Our first item up on the agenda tonight is about codifying PCCEP. Currently, what that means is that currently PCCEP is not written into city code. We only exist within the settlement agreement between the city, the Police Bureau and the Department of Justice. One of the things that Mayor Wheeler has said, and that PCCEP has echoed is the desire to be written into city code so that our body is permanent and our work is preserved and ongoing, beyond any one elected official. As part of that process, a number of things have happened. We're going to discuss that tonight and get some community input, and PCCEP input on what we would like to see. This has come up at a number of different meetings and in various stages, and as things evolve and processes happen, we want to keep this afloat and really get this done in a organized fashion that also, like I said earlier, preserves our work.

Lakayana:

Right after George Floyd was murdered, the mayor's office reached out to me and said that they want to codify PCCEP. They put it in this 19-point action plan, and they were asking about what sorts of things that we would like to see in it. So I'm going to just copy and paste those recommendations that I provided, which starts to serve as an outline. It's not by any means a substantial list, or a finished list. It's just something that we can work on.

Lakayana:

Here's what I put in there. It was nine pieces that I put in there. PCCEP selects its own members. PCCEP has a role in engaging community members to review new cohorts of officers. PCCEP has a role in hiring all top-level command staff, including the police chief, assistant and deputy chiefs.



Lakayana:

PCCEP have a spot at the negotiating table as a community representative during contract negotiations with the Portland Police Association. PCCEP is embedded into the universal review process for all PPB recommendations that impact the community. We're going to look at, actually, couple of those later tonight. Clarifying strengthened language around the Portland Police Bureau's responsibility to consider our recommendations. So that basically means currently when we make a recommendation, it's not really clear what the Portland Police Bureau's responsibility is in actually taking these recommendations other than that they look at them. So just being more clear on what's their responsibility in that. Compelling officer testimony, which we can talk about a little bit later, but that's kind of shifted a little bit. PCCEP has the power in disciplining officers and increasing the PCCEP stipend to \$500.

Lakayana:

Those were the recommendations that I laid out. What's happened since then, a couple of things. There's a ballot initiative that passed City Council that would overhaul the accountability system and get rid of the Independent Police Review, and I think the Citizen Review Committee. Basically that would shift the landscaping of oversight. As that landscape shifts, then PCCEP also has to consider what is our role in a future that is undetermined, because that ballot measure passed City Council but has to go before voters, so it's unclear if it passes, what happens, what happens in the interim, and where does PCCEP really fit in with all of that? So that's a question that we have to consider with this.

Lakayana:

Then on August 10th, PCCEP met with Nicole Grant of the mayor's office. She wanted to talk about the updates since the mayor's plan, that 19-point action plan was released in June, and just updates, seeing as how, like I said, the ballot measure passed and just where are things at, and a couple of things that she had outlined that, that the mayor's office would like to see. It's just us clarifying the purpose as PCCEP moves into a more permanent body, where do we see as our space in the landscape of police accountability and community engagement, and community relations? Looking at the timeline of how this process goes about, so we don't rush it, but then it's also not so dragged out that it takes forever. Also reviewing the different things that I had suggested, and are there other things that we would want to add in there or change?

Lakayana:

I think things like the compelling officer testimony and having discipline power with are number seven and eight are things that have really shifted considering, like I just mentioned the new police accountability system that they're trying to institute. Also just keeping in mind, too, PCCEP's role as a volunteer body, right, and what we can really do.

Lakayana:

I think the thing that PCCEP has done really well, if you look at the three listening sessions we had in the beginning of June through early July, or even the black women's discussion that we had last week, is our ability to really bring together community members and create a space where discussions can be had. And also to have some space where community members are leading topics around police engagement



and things of that nature. While the mayor appoints us, this is a completely a community run by a community members. That's where things stand. What we would like to use this time to do right now is to hear input from PCCEP members, as far as what they would like to see with us being codified, where we feel PCCEP's purpose is in the realm of community engagement and police oversight and things of that nature? And equally as important, hear from community members on what they would like to see. And things are up on a table, right? We can put new things that maybe PCCEP hasn't done before. We can say here's things that we didn't like that we feel could be different.

Lakayana:

Like I said, number one, having PCCEP select its own members. The Mayor's done a great job every time we've suggested somebody to him, he's taken that recommendation. But to be truly independent, I think it would be great if our body could select its own members. What does that look like? Do we get input from other community organizations? What kind of apparatuses would we want to put in place with that? So I want to open the floor up first to PCCEP members on their thoughts on codification? What does the timeline look like? What purpose would you like to see us serve? What powers and responsibilities would you like to see in our jurisdiction? And then open that same thing up to the community.

Elliot Young:

If no one else is going, I have some thoughts. One, I agree with Lakayana that I think the compelling officer testimony and PCCEP having power to discipline officers seems to be more in the wheelhouse of what's currently being done by IPR and CRC, and would be done in the case that we have this new police oversight body. So in terms of trying to establish lanes, I would see PCCEP being more community engagement and not involved in direct discipline of police officers. In terms of thinking about how to make PCCEP more independent, I think we have to think about where it's housed in the city bureaucracy. Currently, it's under the mayor's office and the budget comes out of the mayor's office, from what I understand. So we might think about having PCCEP actually function, maybe under the auditor's office, or under the whole City Council.

Elliot Young:

I'm not sure of where it should be, but it seems if it's directly under the mayor, if the mayor's appointing us, then that creates a little bit of a, not conflict of interest, but definitely more control over this than we would want if we wanted to be independent. Then, I think that that's related also to funding for this endeavor. If we wanted to take on more functions to sit at the negotiating table, to be involved in hiring top-level command staff, and to continue to do community outreach and organizing, then we're going to have to think about how much funding we have and maybe increasing that funding. Currently, most of the funding that's given over to the settlement agreement goes to the [COCOL 00:32:54] people who do those reports. But as that goes away, we can think about maybe there's more funding, but I think if we're going to establish this thinking about a stable funding source for PCCEP would be important. Otherwise, I think the suggestions you make are great.

Lakayana:

Thank you Elliot.



Amy Anderson:

Yeah, Lakayana, I was wondering if you had a chance to hear back from the city attorney on those questions I asked you about what do we have to do as far as getting codified, and what would be the next steps for us moving into that position?

Lakayana:

I haven't talked to the city attorney about that, but from what Nicole had said in the mayor's office, what they would like to see is just the two pieces I said, creating a timeline that makes sense for all parties involved and really defining out what PCCEP's purposes is. As far as-

PART 1 OF 4 ENDS [00:34:04]

Lakayana:

... PCCEP's purposes, as far as where do we see ourselves fitting in this landscape of all the different bodies and committees and groups that are out there that do similar work?

Amy:

Would that be inside or outside the settlement agreement?

Lakayana:

I think it would be outside of it, because we would have to look at long-term right? The settlement agreement won't go on forever and so by being codified within city code, we would then exist outside the settlement agreement.

Amy:

Right. Which is [crosstalk 00:34:38] February, right?

Lakayana:

Say it again?

Amy:

The relationship ends this February if the judge approves it, then the one year is over. Right?

Lakayana:

I think the one year's up in January, and our next review is in February, but I could be-

Amy:

Okay. Okay.

Elliot Young:



That's another thing to mention about. At that meeting there was some concern that the mayor's office wanted us to hold back, until we see what happens with this oversight committee. But given that Commissioner Hardesty's understanding of the new oversight committee, as being in a separate lane from what PCCEP is doing, that allayed the concerns of the mayor's office in terms of moving ahead. In other words, PCCEP can move ahead with codification, regardless of what happens with that vote on the oversight committee.

Amy:

Okay. Do we have to bring it before a lawyer, or just city council? What are the next steps, after we create our document?

Elliot Young:

I think that what happens, is we suggest what our mission is. What we want to do. And then the mayor's office would talk to the lawyers, come up with the legislative language to actually codify it, and then it would go to the city council.

Amy:

Okay. One more question, then I'm done. Theo, do you have a copy of our budget that we can see offline? Not here. But do you have a copy of the PCCEP's budget that we can review?

Theo Latta:

I do have the budget. Yeah. And we can do that. We have to just schedule a time where we can all sit down together and look at it together. But since I'm already speaking, I'm just going to take just [inaudible 00:02:32]. Elliot, to your earlier point. This is the mayor's committee for sure, but the office and PCCEP, is also run through the Office of Equity and Human Rights, just to be clear. So even though it's the mayor's committee, you all are as autonomous as a committee's going to be within the city parameters. We also have the city attorney, Tracy Reed, who's on the call. Or we also have Amanda Watson on the call, from the mayor's office, who can certainly speak. But from what I understand, and I think it's the accurate interpretation of the mayor's office concerns, is if PCCEP is to be codified... I don't know if it's codified or codified, I'm going to go with codified because I like it how it sounds.

Theo Latta:

If PCCEP is to be codified, the mayor's office wants a tangible PCCEP on the same page. The lane that PCCEP is going to operate within after the settlement agreement, because the settlement agreement, it's just basically the maintenance here. Right? And Jared's on the call as well, so he can correct me if I'm wrong, but that ends January 10th. And then we go and meet with Judge Simon in February. Is it not? Mary Claire's shaking her head. So I apologize if that's wrong, please feel free to correct me.

Mary Claire:

All I'm saying is, there is no guarantee at this point-

Theo Latta:



Right.

Mary Claire:

... what will come next.

Theo Latta:

Fair enough. That's a fair point and I didn't mean to put you on the spot, Mary Claire. Fair enough, we don't know what's going to go on and even tomorrow, right? We're in a pandemic, strange times, strange times in the city, but I think it's important for PCCEP to be really direct and very clear about where they want to go now. Right? So the mayor's office, I believe said, that if PCCEP wants the settlement agreement just to continue the way it is, then they would codify that. Right? If PCCEP wants to steer in a different direction, then they want that on paper and PCCEP consensus about that. So I'll stop... Amanda Watson, did you have any [inaudible 00:39:00] for me?

Amanda:

Oh, okay. Oh, sure. Yeah, no. Thanks Theo. You pretty much hit it on the head, is that really, the mayor is very supportive and he's really excited about PCCEP codification. And we really just want to make sure that the codification is following PCCEP's vision for what you want to look like going forward. So that's exactly it, having an agreed upon idea of what the group will look like post-settlement agreement. And then in terms of next steps, to your question Amy, we move from that vision into drafting the code language for what that would look like. So we work with the city attorney on that. It should be a pretty straightforward process.

Amanda:

And so in a sense, really this will be dictated in good part to PCCEP's own timeline, to having this conversation in the amount of time you need to have the conversation. I think we would like to have it done by December, end of the year at the latest, just given the tentative timeline Marie Claire just mentioned, but it's an important conversation to have. And so I'm here to listen tonight and to learn. I'm excited to hear what PCCEP's vision is for going forward, and to support you in getting that codified and made permanent.

Lakayana:

Can we just hear if the city attorney, Tracy, if you want to just add anything on there, as far as what you've heard from feedback, from what your role might be in this or any of that?

Tracy:

Yeah. Can you hear me? I just would also urge that you guys focus on the substance of what you would like to see PCCEP doing post-settlement agreement. When PCCEP was recreated after COAB, it was with the intent then that it would exist beyond the life of the settlement agreement. But now that beyond the life of the settlement agreement, isn't necessarily far off, it would be great to have that outline. And then we can certainly... You guys don't need to worry about drafting the actual code language, we will



take the salient points and turn that into appropriate code language and obviously have a back and forth dialogue about that.

Lakayana:

Thank you, Tracy. Ann, go ahead.

Ann:

Thank you. Yeah. In that meeting I understood, with the city, the mayor's office, that they wanted us to focus on our mission and I appreciate the piece you put together. Lakayana, I had a couple of questions. I'm just wondering, in a time that we are in with pandemic and the economy, if asking for \$500, our stipend to be increased. I'm just wondering where that money would come from. And then, now our role is not to be involved in the hiring of top level command staff. There's some additional things added and I'm not super clear about that, as it relates to the mission.

Lakayana:

Of PCCEP? You just said, why we would be on that? Yeah. I think-

Ann:

I agree with it, but I was just wondering how that would work.

Lakayana:

Yeah. Right. When I see PCCEP, I see us as, we are the community, engagement PCCEP. Our job is to make sure that community voice is being heard and that community representation is at different spots. Right?

Ann:

Right.

Lakayana:

And so if there's, let's say spots at... There should be community input in the hiring of those positions. So PCCEP, being a community body, we could either assign one of our members to be on it, or we could draft a community member to do that. I think that could be a little cumbersome. I think, as representatives of the community, we could be on those things. There was a number of decisions, top level, within PPB that happened in the last two months where community voice was not heard. One of the top level command staff left for Idaho, I believe and they replaced that person with another white sergeant. I don't know what the position was, but it made the entire command staff all white in this, there's no color in it.

Lakayana:

So that's a place where community voice could have been. And even the replacement of the newest police chief, there was no community input on that as well. So I think that there should be community



voice in those decisions. And so that's why I had said that that's where I see PCCEP's role being. And I think in a larger conversation you need to have, I think we should have a special meeting, and I had suggested this before, where we hammer out what we see is the vision and the mission of PCCEP. And from my vision, it is that community voice is put into top level decisions like that. And when we have negotiations with the police union, those should not be closed door meetings to everybody. There should be some community representatives on there. So that's just my thinking on that.

Ann:

So just a follow up question to what you just said. Are you envisioning a town hall, or a listening session, to get the information that the community wants in terms of those hires? Or how-

Lakayana:

No. I wouldn't see it like that. I would see it like, okay, PPB says, "We're hiring a new police chief." No matter if it's two days, or we got 10 weeks, or 24 hours, that there is a community voice on there. And so they would say, "Okay, let's have one of the PCCEP members be in on this meeting as part of that decision, maybe one or two." And when we go through contract negotiations with the Portland Police Association, with that negotiation and new union contract, two PCCEP members are sitting on there representing. Maybe those members then come back to the community and have a town hall and say, "Hey, what feedback do you want us to give when we're sitting in on this meeting?" So that when people are applying for PCCEP, then that's one of the things that they can like, "Oh, I want to be on PCCEP, because they have say in those things." And that really then puts the onus on the various associations [inaudible 00:00:46:07] the Portland Police Association, that they will have community feedback.

Ann:

Okay. Thanks. I think Vadim [inaudible 00:46:14] has a question.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Yep.

Lakayana:

Sorry. We'll go with Vadim and then I also see Yolonda has a question. And then Marcia also has a statement.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Yeah, just a few comments. One, I think we should report to all of city council, not just to the mayor. That will make us a public body in the real sense. So right now we have public meetings, because our bylaws dictate that, which can be changed at any point in time. But if we report to all of city council that, one, gives us independence, two, will result in us actually needing to present to city council what we're doing and making our requests to the council. And I think that'll help with a lot of things, including funding, including getting people on board with what we're doing, including the visibility of PCCEP. So



reporting to all city council, and as was pointed out right now, we're within OEHR as far as the staffing, and perhaps even the whole budget now comes from OEHR. I'm not sure how that's portioned

Vadim Mozyrsky:

I think that's an interesting discussion right there, which bureau best suits the kind of mission that PCCEP has. Certainly Office of Equity and Human rights, seems to fit that bill, but they already have their Human Rights Commission. They technically have the Disability Commission, which is defunct right now, but maybe will come back at some point in time. So for the amount of staffing they have, they're dealing with a lot of high-level commissions. So, that's something that we do need to address at some point in time. But not weighing on that one and the other.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Now with respect to the negotiations for the police contract, I'm a union member and I've worked on these things in the past. These are very laborious and very time consuming, and also very knowledge based conversations. The people that are working on these things, it entails labor laws, union laws. The information is generally supposed to remain within the bargaining room for various reasons. And I wonder what the difference is, between us being able to provide community input on contracts by having listening sessions and providing those things, versus asking somebody from PCCEP, or two people from PCCEP, to donate what will be hundreds of hours to sitting in a negotiation table and providing... You really have to have a background in labor law in order to be able to understand how the stuff unfolds and I'm not sure what that input could be, as opposed to providing recommendations that we can already provide from public input. And that's all the comments I have.

Lakayana:

Thanks Vadim. Thank you. Who did I have next? Yolonda and then Marcia.

Yolonda:

Thanks Lakayana. You provided these items quite a while ago. So I remember giving some feedback months ago, but looking over them again today, it looks like number three, four, and eight, would all require more training for PCCEP members. And so to piggy back off what Vadim was expressing, is that we definitely would need more training and more hours to understand in order to be efficient in these roles as PCCEP members. And from what I remember when I worked in Portland Police personnel, they had a civilian spot during police officer interviews. And that would be a good opportunity for PCCEP members, to be involved in the hiring process. But I think...

Yolonda:

I'm just looking at my notes. Like I said before a few months ago, I think PPB would accommodate us in this ask. And then just basically, are PCCEP folks willing to spend more personal time being trained? So I'm one of the folks who've been there from the beginning. And when we initially signed on, we didn't realize that there were going to be subcommittees. And so hopefully everybody understands now that there's subcommittee commitments, but these roles would require more work. I just want to be transparent about that, so that everybody knows what we're getting into. So that's about it.



Lakayana:

I just want to make sure, you said I think PPB would accommodate the ask for us sitting on hiring panels, for who again?

Yolonda:

They used to have, I'm not familiar with the current processes, but they'd have a civilian sit on oral boards for part of the hiring process.

Lakayana:

Okay.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Right. And I think they still do it. It's actually a two week commitment, where you participate in the testing of officers and also the interview process, and anybody can apply for it. Any member of the community can apply to sit on that panel.

Lakayana:

Cool. And just so we know, number seven and eight are basically off the table right now. We feel like those aren't in our wheelhouse right now. Nothing's really on the table, it was all just... We're just taking feedback. That's why I'm not going to respond to any of the thoughts that people are just saying. I just want to take it all down. And like I said, I think we should have a special session, which I had suggested maybe last month or something like that. But I think we should have a special session in September where we hammer and knock out all of these things and then move from there. Yeah. So I'm going to hand it over to Marcia and then we'll start moving into public comment because I see there was a couple of thoughts on there as well.

Marcia Perez:

Thank you. I think just based off of the event that we had last week, I'm curious what role PCCEP can play for families who've lost loved ones to police violence. And it's part of the reason why were we even exist in the first place. And we talked a lot about how families are unable to really grieve and process and heal. And I just wonder if there's an opportunity for PCCEP to exist in a way that's a little bit more meaningful. I think PPB's always mitigating risk and the city's mitigating risk, and so there's not a lot of empathy in the process in going through all of that. And I'm curious what your thoughts are.

Lakayana:

Could you state what the question was and all that? Like, how do we be more...

Marcia Perez:

Yeah. Can we play a role and what would the role be, if in the event that there's an officer involved shooting and we have a family that's been impacted? Does PCCEP help elevate the voice of that family? Do they reach out? Do they do some type of outreach and advocacy? One person suggested in the chat



last week, doing a volunteer response program or something. So I'm just curious, if there's a more meaningful role we can play when people are victimized by a system that doesn't see them as victims.

Lakayana:

Can you just type that somewhere for me? Thank you.

Elliot Young:

Let me just respond, Marcia, a bit. I think we did that when Koben Henriksen was killed. There was a statement which included a condolence to the family. And I don't think we have that as part of our regular process. And maybe that's what you're asking, because I know we've asked that the city issue condolences when someone is killed. But maybe that could be something that we also do as a regular part of our work. And reaching out to the families, because I was struck, at the meeting you mentioned, how the family, the mother, was not contacted at all by the city after the killing had happened.

Marcia Perez:

Yeah. And I think that that's pretty common. And then it probably depends on the leadership that's in place. Portland's had a lot of different leaders in tact. And so I think that if we could create that, in codifying and creating a process of this is always how we respond. So there's consistency, because it is an equitable for one family to be outreached to and supported in some way and not another. And so I think that if we could develop some type of a process of regular practice, that honors families, or at least acknowledges them, because oftentimes once the investigation starts, there's not a lot of communication mostly for the investigation. And so that's really damaging for folks. And then you heard that mother speak, it's been 17 years and she's not heard really from PPB.

Taji:

[inaudible 00:55:40] No, sorry.

Marcia Perez:

I saw Amy had her hand up.

Taji:

I also had my hand up before-

Marcia Perez:

Oh, good. Sorry. Sorry.

Lakayana:

Go ahead Amy.

Amy:



What I was going to say Lakayana is, one of the things I do in my community profession is, I'm a Peer Wellness Specialist. So we lean towards having those tougher conversations with people and allowing them to communicate in grief. And the other thing I do on a regular basis is I'm a jail chaplain. Okay? And that's some of the things we do, is we console families. We talk to the loved ones, we interact with the kids. That's just something we're cross-trained to do. And I got to tell you, yesterday I was downtown and an officer stepped out of a car, and on the back it said chaplain. So it reminded me of the role that the chaplains play when situations like this come up, that we could very well say, as part of our future, that we'll have some chaplaincy type program or response program that grieving families can reach out to at no cost. Meet them where they're at.

Amy:

I'm just saying, that's what I do, but I'm sure there's a lot of people out there who can also do what I do. And maybe that's part of something we add into PCCEP, is that we have a group that specializes in grieving or grief counseling, not counseling, but support type stuff. And get them plugged into the community. So that's something that I hold dear to my heart, as a resource individual, is everybody on this committee probably know somebody. And we can raise that awareness, that we have that capability. That's all I want to say. Thank you.

Lakayana:

So thank you for sharing that. I'm thinking of a couple of things, I'm thinking like, man, we might need some time to really hash this out, like a half day session. We do have a retreat coming up, so I think we could do some of it there. I think we could do some of it in a public special session with the community and through both of those, take all these ideas and put them in together or something. I know Taji has a comment and then I want to open it up to public comment before we move on to the next session. So go ahead Taji.

Taji:

Yeah. I'll try to keep them succinct. It's just three main points. So the first one being, the recommendations and making sure that similar to, I think multiple people mentioned this, but ensuring that not only can we just present a recommendation and the mayor sees it and has to respond in 60 days, but we have some sort of actionable steps moving forward that isn't tangential and it's more direct. It's something I was expressing earlier to Jared as well around it. It's just, how do we ensure that this mandate of aggregating the voices of the community, from those special sessions, or from anything, and bring that to action and then have that action have some follow through?

Taji:

And I think that relates to the second point, which is on the conversation that myself, Yolonda, Elliott and Ann had with some of the members of the [Meeki 00:24:57], I believe last week, I'm losing days. And I'm 18, so that says something about this work. I think it was really interesting and helpful to talk about and break down some of those things. And I really think that if we are going to be representing the community, I think Rochelle mentioned this in the comments, we need to be more intentional around outreach. And so that we don't have the same groups of folks, not only responding, but participating in some of the conversations.



Taji:

I'm really excited to see some new individuals like Brian and [Zeynab 00:59:24], who've been more engaging in some of the conversations, but I think we can and must go farther. And that should be part of the codification as well. It should be something that could be funded, like an actual position, if Theo and Claudia are unable to do that from their capacity, that it could be expanded to have another person, whether part-time or full-time. And that it should be something that we can direct funds from after [Coco 00:59:50] leaves.

Taji:

I think the last part I was going to mention is where we're housed. And since it's this dual thing with OEHR and the mayor's office, I think it would be appropriate to decide one of the two, and just have the appropriate and necessary funds to be able to do the operations of PCCEP, which could include these new things Amy's mentioning, along with a coordinator for community engagement on a part-time or whatever basis. I think all of those things really are important to codifying and ensuring we're doing it intentionally. Yeah. That was my thoughts. Love to hear what the community thinks.

Lakayana:

Excellent. I took a bunch of notes on this last two pages on it. So I'm going to send those over to Claudia. If we can get this section when this all gets, what is that, transcribed? If we could get the section pulled out, that would be really helpful, just so we can use this for our basis for the next part, as we continue this conversation. Because I know Yolonda had mentioned that she had made some points, while we've all had this conversation about a couple of times. Community members. We'll take about four or five comments from community members, on what they think as far as vision, mission of PCCEP, what powers they would like to see. Comments they have from what they've heard so far from PCCEP members. Please raise your hand, if you can with the "Raise your hand" feature, or just physically raise your hand. And I see we have Susan up first.

Susan:

Hi, this is Susan Cotter. Can you hear me?

Lakayana:

Yes ma'am, go ahead.

Susan:

Excellent. Thank you. I got to say that I have been frustrated with all of the different groups that provide recommendations to the police. And then it feels like a black hole and I know that PCCEP has been working to get a consolidated list. And I think that there's a role of somebody, and I don't know if it's PCCEP, but to get all of that information together, because really we provide the input and we don't know what response and there's a huge amount of data available to it. What aren't they doing? What needs to be educated, both the city council and the public while they're listening to the city council? And then we then have the data, in terms of holding them accountable. Right now it just feels like, it's going



out there and yeah, I've seen a couple of responses, "Oh, we don't have the budget for that." I'd like to know what response we're actually getting from the police.

Lakayana:

Yeah. Spotty at best to be a hundred percent honest. I think that's what we laid out in one of our things as well, as we would like more, and Taji just said it perfectly as well, more of a response, more action, other than just taking it. So I appreciate those comments Susan.

Susan:

But it's also documented, because if it's not documented, if it's not put together in a readable place, like the page you guys have.... It's out there yeah, but it's really hard to digest. And until it's digestible by the majority, nothing's going to happen, because if we're not holding them accountable... They don't have to, all they have to do is attend the meetings and say, "Thank you very much for your input." And move right along.

Lakayana:

I agree. Thank you for that. Let's go to Dan next. I see his hand up.

Dan:

Yeah. Hi, Dan Handelman with Portland Copwatch. I appreciate you having this discussion. I'm having some flashbacks, because some of what you're describing are things that the Community Oversight Advisory Board did before you. They answered to the entire city council and were nominated and appointed by the entire city council. And then as your group was being designed, it was a deliberate decision to make it so that you only answered to the mayor. So I think it's a good idea to run your interaction with city council, to all of them, because everybody is responsible for what the police are doing in the city, regardless of our siloed, bureaucratic structure in the city.

Dan:

One of the things that I haven't heard anybody talk about, is that the PCCEP should really be reviewing data. When you codify it, you shouldn't necessarily be too specific about it, or else it'll either narrow you too much or make it too broad. But you started looking at the data around traffic stops a couple of months ago. And you said you went to look also to force data, even though Training Advisory Council does that too. Once the COAB has gone, nobody's going to be looking at the data they're looking at. So we have been urging the city to hire an analyst to support you all, and to have you... You don't have to look at every last bit of what's in the settlement agreement, but some of the major things that they're looking at now, I think somebody in the community needs to look at that.

Dan:

My understanding and I'm sure Mary Claire Buckley can expound on this, that the Bureau has created a spreadsheet of all the recommendations that they've gotten over the last several years. I don't know what happened to that, or why it's not a public document. It should be up on the Bureau's website tracking what the progress is of dealing with them. I understand there's a document like that. In terms



of your ideas about reaching out to people who've been affected by police violence, you have to remember that you are part of the same legal entity as the police. It's not your fault that that's the way structure is, but the city of Portland pays money out of a general risk management fund, that all the city's departments and bureaus pay money out of. Including if something happened that PCCEP owed money, it came out of there too. So the city attorney's role, is to defend the city against lawsuits, which means that there's a conflict for you all to do what you're doing. I don't think it's a bad thing, but remember that you are community members, but you're also city officials at this point.

Dan:

So there are community groups that are working on the same things you're talking about, supporting families. I think it would be great to have you all reach out to them. And then send letters, like Mr. Young was reminding you about, like went to the family of Koben Henricksen, to show your support and to show that you're concerned about the use of police violence. There may be some legal problems. And the last thing, just in terms of a flashback and structures in the city, the Human Rights Commission used to have a Community Police Relations Committee, which may sound very similar to what you do. They specifically had the focus on police traffic stop data among other things. And as soon as the settlement agreement went to effect, they pretty much fell apart. And they originally were envisioned as being the group that was going to take the role, what the COAB did and what you're doing. So I think it may be worthwhile looking at yourselves as being a permanent fixture in the Office of Equity and Human Rights, but as a standalone group, not part of the Human Rights Commission. Thank you.

Lakayana:

What was the name of that committee, Dan?

Dan:

That was the Community Police Relations Committee? I think their information is still up on the city's website and/or you can always look at the Copwatch website. We did a lot of reporting about what they were doing over the years they existed.

Lakayana:

Thank you. Any other community comments before we roll out to the next piece? [Zana 00:01:07:44], go ahead.

Zana:

Thank you. This is [Zana Falk 01:07:48] and I just wanted to say a couple of things, because it was just trying to be patient to listen and get all the information. I really appreciate Susan. I believe Dan of the Portland Copwatch. I really-

PART 2 OF 4 ENDS [01:08:04]

Zainab:



I really appreciate Susan. I believed in the Portland Copwatch. I really appreciate their comments cause I was thinking about the same and looking at the best practices, not just in the area, but elsewhere. I heard, was it Amy? No, I think it was Amy, who discussed about chaplains. And I actually have a friend who was in Baltimore city who did this training to be a chaplain. And then when I asked her, well, have you done any work? And then the funding wasn't available any longer. So when you look at programs, you have to look at the dollars and like I think Ann mentioned, how much is these things are going to cost because there is going to be a cost associated, especially with people's time, especially if we want people to be consistent in actually doing the work.

Zainab:

I appreciate here that you're planning on doing a retreat. So I think that at retreats, you can really do a lot more strategic planning around things rather than just throwing things out there, which is a great idea. But you can also sit back, collect information, as Dan mentioned about historical information that has existed and perhaps learning more about what the change to PCCEP, what was lost, basically. What wasn't handled or managed and what could be put in to the whole process of codifying, whatever you want to say, the process. And then looking at your special sessions to really focus on maybe one topic per say because I feel like there's so much happening in trying to... We have meetings. I think often in meetings, everyone's at meetings, but like I think Taji said, we need to look at action.

Zainab:

We need to really have some action from these meetings and actually putting it out there, so that the public and see, like Rochelle said, if the community doesn't really know about PCCEP, how can they learn about PCCEP and how can they learn that they can trust that this is a trusted space, not only a trusted space, there's trusted information in that PCCEP is really, like you said, autonomous when it comes to while reporting to the office of the mayor, you're still autonomous to the community and that they can trust that you're not just another gate. I guess I will say a gate, to keep them away or keep process from actually happening.

Zainab:

And then the last thing is consistency. One of the things that I feel like will be great if I could go to the website and just see information about since the inception, what has taken place, what has been really done and how has the Portland Police Bureau responded? Because I think if you actually make them or work with them to respond then you know that they're taking it in. And I think it's not just one sided. So that's just the things that actually wanted to share. Thank you.

Lakayana:

Great feedback. Really, really appreciate that. I just want to get on your final thought there. I think, yeah. What I envision going to your point about the special sessions and breaking down the work, I think I envisioned at least a couple of sessions, part of it being in the retreat and then doing maybe one that works on just the mission and the vision, and then a second one that can focus on what actual tasks, powers and roles would PCCEP have and break those out over September and early October to go along with the timeline that Amanda had suggested. So appreciate all the feedback on that, really, really



helpful. That's the last meeting you will hear from us and just overall things. And now we're going to really dive into the work. So be looking for the updates on there.

Lakayana:

I think also in there, and this has been said a number of times, is that website we got to figure out something that works for the community to really make that something that is accessible rather than it feels like just a huge stack of information that's not really well put out and doesn't do anybody any service. So yeah, we will work on that. I'm going to turn it over to Elliot, who's going to take over the second half of the meeting, starting with our directors.

Elliot Young:

Thanks a lot Lakayana. So the two other agenda items we have, one is to look at police directives and this is something that really is part of the charge to PCCEP that we should be looking at police directives. I don't think we've been doing a good job of it, at least in my time at PCCEP. So there are two, as I could tell, two pending police directives. And let me just explain for those of you who are not aware, police directives are essentially the policies that the PPB uses, the Portland Police Bureau uses to conduct their work. And every once in a while they review particular directives and open it up to public comment. And so these two directives are open to public comment and they're very lengthy and detailed, and so I'm a little bit afraid of how to conduct this conversation.

Elliot Young:

I know that we put the links up there, but why don't we start with the first one which is on the agenda. Theo, if you could put the links in the chat, that'd be great. Deadly force and in custody death reporting and investigation procedures. Thank you. So, Ann, I know raised this as one she wanted to talk about. So I don't know, Ann, do you want to have specific comments about this one?

Ann:

Thank you. As you said, it's very lengthy and looking through it, I just had a few questions or wondering about to raise with Portland Police Bureau, the guarantee warning which is further down, sorry. It is... if we were scrolling down, I don't know if that's what you wanted to do. Anyways. The guarantee warning is required... officers or people involved are required to answer questions asked by professional standards division investigators.

Ann:

My question is, it appears that they're the only ones that the officers involved have to answer questions to. Further on in the document, witness member, a Bureau member who has observed firsthand, it's similar that it seems that the professional standards division investigators are the ones that the officers speak to, rather than I know in the process, it appears that the homicide investigators take over at some point, but in the reading I did and in this, it looks like the officers, they can decide if they want to talk to the homicide officers. So there's a couple of things. I had some more things. It's a very lengthy document. I just want to put in this 2.2.5.1 those involved have 48 hours to provide a statement and it's voluntary. I'm wondering about that as well.



Elliot Young:

Yeah. Ann, I think you raised the things that stood out to me 2.2.1.2.2 states that any answers provided by the member after a Garrity warning cannot be used against the member in any criminal proceeding.

Ann:

Right.

Elliot Young:

So they're required to answer these questions, but then that is not allowed to be used. And it also seems to be this directive in conflict with the next directive we're going to be looking at, which is about providing exculpatory evidence to the DA, because if they get information that's exculpatory, but then they're not required to produce that information to the DA, that would seem to be in conflict. So I'm not sure how they square that circle.

Ann:

Right, right. Yeah, just to piggyback on that. Yes, there seems to be, in my mind in reading it, some confusion as to the process. And once again, and in both of them, it seems to... there's this objective reasonable, which to me I don't really understand the term reasonable they refer to, what's a reasonable officer? That sort of thing. So those are some questions I have. Right now they're in the review process. So it's my understanding that we can ask those questions.

Elliot Young:

Yeah. So that's great. The other thing I noticed is that when in some of the recent officer involved shootings, I hate to use that term, misnomer, but the public is actually put on... have been put on TriMet buses and held for questioning. And it seems that the police officers are given all of these opportunities to have lawyers present and to not answer questions, and it seems like the public is under a different set of rules. Other PCCEP members, did you get a chance to review this? Are there any questions you want to raise before we move on to public comment?

Speaker 2:

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Taji:

I think someone expressed in the comments that this section isn't deadly force, specifically the deadly force policy isn't under review. But in general, it's very interesting that the topics that are in review right now is similar to the ones being reviewed by the Sheriff's department. So they're both reviewing the use of force policies as of now, and both of them have a lot of ambiguity that has led to a lot of the reasons that acquittals of habit. I don't know if that's the right term, I'm not a lawyer. When officers aren't actually charged with murder or with criminal charges that it goes back to this point. And then it furthers the other thing that we previously mentioned in our recommendation back in June, I believe that I believe you Elliot put forward around qualified immunity.



Taji:

So it just gets more into the weeds. If we're talking specifically about the policy in this area, that would be my main issue that is across the board. And I think they do a better job of at least sharing data than the Sheriff's department does, but in the same way they have. They source Supreme Court cases like *Graham V Connor*, which allow for this ambiguity and discretionary policies because of the nuance of police tasks. I wonder if there's other cities that have use of force policies that are stronger than what Portland does or has available here. And I also really am interested in how previous under reviews or input time periods that occur on a yearly basis, how much that input that community gives actually affects the language that they change. Those are my main thoughts.

Elliot Young:

Thank you, Taji. Any other PCCEPS members before we move on to the community? Okay, great. Any public comment, people who want to make comments about this? I see that Dan wrote something in the chat, but anyone want to speak directly to this directive? Yes. Dan, you're up.

Dan:

Yeah. Hi again, Dan Handelman again from Portland Copwatch. What I wrote in the chat is that the question about the Garrity warning, the substance of the Garrity warning has to do with another Supreme Court case. But essentially if you compel an officer to testify and then use that in a criminal case, you're violating their fifth amendment rights that are guaranteed in the constitution of the United States. So that's why the Internal Affairs investigation is firewalled off from the criminal investigation. This has been a long discussion that we've been having for many, many years between the community and the Bureau. When the 48 hour rule went away in 2016, the Bureau tried to take the other... well, maybe it was this policy. Yeah. They tried to take this policy and insert into it that the officers would not be questioned until the grand jury was over, which sure that would really put a firewall between Internal Affairs and the District attorney's investigation.

Dan:

But it also means that you'd lose the immediate responses by the police. They have plenty of time to come up with new answers. So we pushed back on that and eventually that got put into the closet. Ann read that says they have to be interviewed within 48 hours. So that is a combination of getting rid of a prohibition that was in the police association contract and community input overcoming the previous DA's reluctance to allow internal investigations. So I think it's very important you all understand the difference between the administrative investigation, where the officer can get fired and the criminal one where they can get put in jail. Cause that has not only been one officer that we know of, and it was 52 years ago that was indicted and jailed for an on-duty use of force.

Dan:

A second officer was indicted for deadly force really. And the second officer happened a few years ago where he loaded a bean bag shotgun with a live round and he was indicted, but he was never tried because he committed suicide or took his own life before that could happen. So those are important things. And the last comment is doubling back to my first comment is, I understand that this directive



says it's under review. I think that the public comment period for this ended months and months ago, and that it means the Bureau has taken the public input and is still working on it. You should probably ask Mary Claire Buckley, and I believe there's a woman named Ashley that's on the call tonight, who's with the review team. Ask them what the status is and whether they'll take input from your group. But while this is still hasn't been revised, because I think it's great for you to put input into it, but it's not up for public review. The other one you're considering tonight is the only one that's listed right now. And thank you.

Elliot Young:

Thanks Dan. So Mary Claire, any thoughts on Dan's question?

Mary Claire:

Sure. I actually asked, my policy team didn't know that this was going to be an agenda item, but when I saw it asked the policy team to join the meeting tonight. So with you tonight is the head of the policy team, Ashley Lancaster and her associate officer Laurel Green Mitchell, who just joined the team and they can answer any questions about that piece. I also have, I believe Commander Parman is with us who can answer some of those questions about the process if you are looking for that information this evening, in terms of how, as Dan was talking about the difference between the criminal side and the administrative side and why all that is... I mean, I understand it seems confusing, but there obviously is a reason for the two.

Mary Claire:

So I guess I'd first let Ashley speak to where these stand and what the process will be in terms of receiving a comment. We, as you know, have talked to the subcommittees before about setting up a process where PCCEP would be involved in reviewing these on a structured basis. So we welcome the opportunity to have you provide input. So Ashley, do you want to give information on-

Ashley:

Yeah. Thank you, Mary Claire. So, hi, I'm Ashley Lancaster. Just a quick background for purposes of the community and the folks on PCCEP, I've been with the Bureau for nearly four years now working in a similar capacity. But as Mary Claire mentioned, I recently took over as lead on the policy development team. So just to answer the question about where we are in the review process with this directive, this is a DOJ directive, first of all. So we're required to review it initially on a six-month basis and then thereafter annually. We first initiated, excuse me, enacted the policy in September of 2017. And at that point, the DOJ approved the policy, City Council actually played a fairly significant role in drafting the version that you have on the screen as well, particularly around the area that Dan mentioned with the 48 hour rule, that section that pertains to that.

Ashley:

So six months from that timeframe, we initiated the required six month review pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreement. This unfortunately is one of those policies that has just been held up internally due to ongoing discussions with various stakeholders in this case, the union. So I think one of



your members briefly touched on this earlier in the discussion. That's a very complex process, the labor negotiations around revisions to these policies. And this is one that's just been tied up in that process.

Ashley:

So it technically is not open for public comment at this point, but I will say that pursuant to our directive 010, that policy or directive development and review process, anyone is permitted to comment on any policy at any time, whether or not it's officially open for public comment. And we do take those comments outside of the window, but there has to be some recognition that we might not be able to necessarily directly address those comments during that review period, depending on where we are in the process. So that is why it says currently under review at the header of that policy, because we are still working with our stakeholders, again specifically the unions on this policy.

Elliot Young:

Can I ask either Ashley or Mary Claire, the question about whether information that is gathered from a Garrity interview, if that provides exculpatory evidence, is that not turned over under this policy to the DA?

Ashley:

I would defer to either Bryan or Tracy for that.

Elliot Young:

Brian or Tracy, are you on the line?

Bryan Parman:

Okay, I'll start. This is Bryan Parman. I'm the Commander in Professional Standards. So as Internal Affairs conducts the administrative and the employment investigation into the incident, if we learn information, regardless of how we learned it, that would be exculpatory or would impeach the credibility of a witness in the case, we would consult with the City Attorney's Office and then consult with the District Attorney's Office. Ultimately, the decision on whether or not information falls under Brady or whether or not it's exculpatory or what the prosecution does with invested decision that the District Attorney's Office would make. But I think, generally speaking the comments made by those under and during compelled testimony can't be used against them. However, there is a carve out for that conversation if it relates directly to Brady material.

Elliot Young:

Okay, because as I read 2.2.5.4, it just says that no member may disclose any compelled statements. It doesn't, in this policy, carve out that exception as I see it.

Tracy:

Right. And I think that's because the lockbox has to be so secure for the criminal prosecution because the penalty, if you don't observe the keeping it completely separate from the criminal investigation and you're found to have violated the officer's fifth amendment rights, then he or she has immunity. And so



they're therefore immune from prosecution. And so the intent was to both promptly investigate as an employer and allow officers to be held criminally accountable as appropriate. But as Commander Parman said, the exculpatory Brady material would nonetheless be disclosed as appropriate. The timing on this, it's unlikely. The use immunity issue only goes through the grand jury. So once that decision is made, it would be a non-issue. So the likelihood of it being a problem within the timeframe is probably low, but it could happen.

Elliot Young:

Okay. Thank you. So it sounds like even though we're beyond the review date, we could submit these comments. So I encourage PCCEP members and other members of the community to submit whatever comments they have about this directive. Mary Claire, did you want to say anything else? No. Okay. So are there any more public comments about this one? Okay. Let's move on to the other one, which is actually under review and Theo, if you could bring that one up. This refers to the Brady violation or Brady rule. Essentially what the Brady rule says is that if there is exculpatory evidence, meaning if there's evidence that the police have, which could be used in the defense, that that should be turned over by the DA to the defense attorneys so that they could use it in the cases. And this is a 40 year old ruling, the Brady ruling, but this is a new directive that actually directs the department to do something about it. So open it up to PCCEP comments, anyone have specific comments on this one?

Elliot Young:

Okay. So I'm not hearing any, but I have one comment, which is if you could Theo go to 3.2, it says that the PSD commander and IA captain shall consult with the deputy chief AC of services and the CAO to determine if the allegations are substantial and credible enough to be considered potential exculpatory or impeachment material. If aforementioned group is unable to achieve a consensus, the chief shall make a final determination.

Elliot Young:

So I'm wondering why all allegations of that something might be exculpatory should not be turned over to the DA, because as I understand the Brady rule, isn't it only incumbent upon the DA to turn over that exculpatory material? So what this directive seems to do is set up a gate check before that where the police Bureau itself is determining what information should go to the DA to determine whether it's credible enough, which seems to be a possible conflict of interest, because I think it should be up to the DA who's under the rule of the Brady language to turn that over. But I'm not a lawyer and I might be reading that wrong, but that was my question about this particular directive. Other PCCEP members have any comments?

Speaker 3:

Elliot, that was my interpretation. So I'd be curious if others had thoughts on that.

Elliot Young:

Maybe we could, Tracy, since it's a legal question, ask you if you wouldn't mind answering that question.



Tracy:

I would like to punt that to Ashley, because I really have not been involved. I mean, I could pontificate, but I have not been involved in the work that's been ongoing. I mean, a lawyer on my team has, but it hasn't been me. But Ashley has been, and so she would be a better person to answer.

Elliot Young:

Ashley.

Ashley:

Yeah. So Elliot, I think you're correct. It is left to the discretion. First of all, it's important to characterize information prior to it arriving to a prosecutor as potential exculpatory or impeachment information because the prosecutor does have the discretion to determine whether or not it does qualify as exculpatory or impeachment information. One thing that I... I hope that what I'm about to say answers your question, but please let me know if I don't. One thing that we found in the now 20 or so days that this policy has been posted for public comment is that there's a fair amount of confusion around the purpose of the policy, what we're trying to achieve with it, and the process that you just described. So we are in the process of completely overhauling it, to be honest with you, to clarify the objective which is to... there are three primary objectives.

Ashley:

We want to provide clear guidance to members regarding compliance required as established by Brady v. Maryland and other court cases. We need to establish a procedure for reporting the information to this again, potential exculpatory or impeachment information to the prosecutor. And also we're aiming to establish a procedure for the handling of potential impeachment information, excuse me, that may be yielded from an internal investigation member misconduct. So for example, if we had an officer who violated our truthfulness policy, that has some potential Brady implications there. So we're trying to establish a procedure in that regard. I don't know that this draft achieves that or clearly articulates those objectives. And I think that the question that you raised is a very good one for that reason, and we're hoping to address that in the updated policy.

Elliot Young:

Great. So in other words, we should just send our comments to you because you're in the midst of this review process?

Ashley:

That's correct. It's currently open, but again... and I think we need to have a side conversation outside of this meeting to establish a more formal process by which we can create a feedback loop and work together in this regard in getting PCCEP's comments on our policies, but that's a separate conversation. But yes, this policy is open for public comment until September first, I believe that we always accept comments on policies. I just want to reiterate that even if it's not formerly open for public comment. You would have, again, another opportunity to weigh in publicly on the policy when we post it for



second public comment and universal review later on in the process, and hopefully that would clarify some of any other questions that your group has.

Elliot Young:

Great. Thank you. Well, let's open it up to public comment on this directive. Any people in the community, Zainab, I see your hand. So call on you.

Zainab:

I just had a question as I was listening to both the directives and just trying to understand the backstory or the reasons why it was brought to this meeting today, cause there wasn't anything on the agenda. Is there some type of... what are we trying to get from this? I'm just trying to understand more.

Elliot Young:

Yeah, so I think it was on the agenda. I'm not sure maybe it was added at a certain point, but at the steering committee meeting when we set up the agenda, one of the things that PCCP is charged with doing is reviewing these directives. And I think we are aware that we have fallen short of doing that. And so we thought, okay, here's at least one that is currently up for review that we should at least raise it, give the public a comment to talk about it. I think if there were strong sentiment about specific language, specific comment, then maybe it would be an issue that the full PCCP board could vote on. But I haven't heard that necessarily about these two issues, but I think that that's the idea is we need to be doing this as a regular course of our work in PCCP. Does that help answer that?

Zainab:

It does, but I would just suggest that you put an outline of what are you trying to get through this? So while you put it out here, I think we all see things differently or read things a little bit, interpret things differently. So perhaps having, I don't know, a sample of what we should be focusing on during the reading of these directives so that we recognize each time we're consistent, again, the consistency piece. Cause therefore I could pay attention to, oh, is this something that is a current problem within the system that needs to be changed? I wouldn't know.

Elliot Young:

Right.

Zainab:

Unless someone puts it out there that this has been violated or whatever. So those are just the things that I would just add to this conversation as the committee continues to review these directives. Thank you.

Elliot Young:

That's a great point. And as I started looking at them, it was so wonky and policy specific that you seem you needed a lot of background information. So I think we should do that work of providing that



background information and raising the issues. But I see Dan has his hand up next and I'm sure he will provide all the background we need. Dan.

Dan:

Well, not all the background. This is Dan Handelman here from Portland Copwatch. In 2017, so three years ago, the IPR, independent police review put out a policy review about the Bureau and the Brady rule. I think they were partly prompted to do this because there was a Lieutenant named Larry Graham who turned over some exculpatory information to the DA and then ended up getting disciplined for doing so. So the Bureau's response to IPR's report was we will have a policy ready for you in 90 days. And that would have been three years ago last month. So we've been waiting for this policy to come out for quite a while, needless to say. Well, our comments, Portland Copwatch's comments on this are going to go out on Friday. So it's this whole timeline of you have 30 days to look at these really complex directives is something we've been worried about for a very long time.

Dan:

I'm glad the Bureau's going to work with you about how you can get input into them in a timely way. I'm not clear what your procedure is going to be like since you'll have to draw up your recommendations and vote on them tonight to get them in by September first. But just to give you a hint of what we're looking at, some of the words in this directive are not very well defined, including the question of the word timely. How quickly does the Bureau have to move to turn that information over to the DA?

PART 3 OF 4 ENDS [01:42:04]

Dan:

Does the Bureau have to move to turn that information over to the DA? It's very vague because it says timely. And also there's a question that says, it talks about the final sustained findings that the chief makes. Well, we've been involved in this oversight thing for a very long time. And from time to time, the chief will make our final finding. And then the officer will come into a mitigation hearing, what's called a mitigation hearing. And then the chief changes what the finding is. So we don't know whether this applies to the final finding that the chief made or the finding that the chief made after the mitigation hearing. So that should be made really clear too. So those are just some ideas. I don't know if you want to add those to any document you're going to create, but I'm happy to... We'll send you our comments when they're ready on Friday.

Elliot Young:

Thank you, Dan. And I think PCCEP relies on the expertise and the community like Portland Copwatch and others to provide the analysis that I think few of us have the time or knowledge to do. And so I think once we have that background information, we can share it with the community and perhaps come up with a PCCEP body recommendation about this particular directive. I don't think we're there yet, just because we haven't done that work, but are there any other public comments about this particular directive?

Elliot Young:



Okay. Seeing none where it's 7.11, which is perfect timing, we've got 19 minutes and the next topic on the agenda is the... So we can stop sharing the screen. Theo, thanks or Claudia. The next topic on the agenda is a town hall about policing protests. So at the steering committee meeting, I raised this issue, obviously, I think I just want to acknowledge what Lakayana said. I'm frustrated by the fact that all of the conversation in the local and national press focuses on the protest and not on the underlying reasons behind the protest. Yet we are at this impasse and everyone's focus seems to be on the protest. And so the idea that I had was to get people who were engaged in protest, protestors or community people together in a virtual room with police officers who are the ones doing the actual policing on the line.

Elliot Young:

So this wouldn't be the chief of police. This wouldn't be someone like Mary Claire Buckley, who comes to our meetings, but like actual on the line police to share their experiences of the protests with a mediator would be not anyone, a PCCEP member, but an outside mediator, someone who could mediate that conversation and to hopefully really listen to each other. I don't have any hope that this is going to resolve the tensions that exist. I also don't have hope that people who are lighting fires are going to participate in this conversation. But I do think that having the people who are out expressing their first amendment rights to be heard on the issue of police brutality and Black Lives Matter and are being subject to use of force by the Portland Police Bureau.

Elliot Young:

That would be helpful for them to explain how, what their experiences? And similarly, it would be helpful for the community to hear from officers who are charged with defending property and preventing fires for the public to hear how they're experiencing their position of being out after three months on the line. So that's the idea we thought would be really helpful to get... To fore board PCCEP input into whether this idea makes sense, how it should be structured and also to hear from the public about whether this is something that could be useful. Because PCCEP ultimately is charged with bringing together the community and the police to have a dialogue. So let me open it up to PCCEP members. Taji, I see you have your hand raised [inaudible 01:46:32].

Taji:

Yeah. From a lot of the different forums and spaces, and even in my own organizing a lot of expressed dis... No, a lot of them do not want to be having conversations with the direct officers who are indiscriminately using force or chemical weapons against them. I don't... I see the benefit in the theme or efforts of community dialogue, I guess. Like understanding the arduous nature of being a protest officer or peace officer, whatever you want to call the peace officer, whatever you want to call him in that situation. However, I doubt, in a lot of circumstances you're going to find at least black and brown people who want... I'm not trying to speak for all of them, but who find that the dialogue in this circumstance of a protest would be beneficial.

Taji:

If it's a larger conversation around discourse and larger tensions that existed over a longer period of time, I could see some of the benefit there. I just don't know if an officer who just used the baton on me last night wants to come sit down and talk about why he used the baton on me last night, if that makes



any sense. That's just my personal take and what I have heard from people who are very against cooperating in this course or dialogue [inaudible 01:48:02]. I think there's a lot more power in change as I continued to express than it is in... There's a reason the protests are happening as you've mentioned Elliot, as Deanna's mentioned. So addressing the reasons a.k.a. the imbalance of power of law enforcement, would be in much more benefit for the community feeling like there's justice and accountability. And then also, I don't know what we would be serving for the police officers in that sort of situation.

Taji:

I don't know if they want it to explicate the nuance of being an officer in a situation and why they may or may not have used force. I don't know if that's a platform PCCEP is trying to lift up. And if we want to hear that it may better exist in one of our meetings as we can talk about it then and try to be able to navigate that as we continue to push recommendations forward. But I don't know if that would just append and cause more harm to put those two groups together, even with a mediator. That's my take.

Elliot Young:

Yeah, good points. Just something to clarify. I would not want just to be narrowly focused on just protesting. In other words, I think part of protesters coming would be to explain why they're out there and why they're protesting [crosstalk 00:07:33].

Taji:

I think it is very clear and it's been-

Elliot Young:

No, it's not clear if you read the police bureau's press statements. It seems that there's this idea that the people protesting are not interested in Black Lives Matter and there's or are there multiple different interpretations out there. And that's what I see people sort of talking past each other but, Vadim you had your hand up.

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Yeah. As has been said before, I'm worried about who is going to attend this and how we capture the people that are instigating some of these actions on both sides. I wonder if the message is going to be lost. The Black Lives Matter, The Albina Ministerial Alliance, AIPAC, all these bodies that are working for change. And then you're hearing from the NAACP, you're hearing from The Oregonian, you're hearing from various people that are observing that the reaction that's being drawn from the police is by a very small minority of groups of protestors. How do we get that minority to show up to the table to say why these fires are being started? Why these lasers are being pointed at people's eyes? Why the destruction is happening and not have that wash out the larger question of Black Lives Matter and the changes that we need to happen?

Vadim Mozyrsky:



So how do we bring these people to the table? And if they do get to the table, which I think you've said is going to be very difficult and as Taji said is going to be very difficult. What is a constructive thing that we can do with that? Why not just focus on the people that are working for the change rather than the people that don't seem to want to participate in that change?

Elliot Young:

Thanks Vadim, Anne.

Ann:

Thank you. Yeah. I was in the steering committee meeting when we discussed this and I agree with dialogue and bringing people together and as Taji put it and Vadim. Who would we have? I think we'd have to be very careful and thoughtful about who we invited to this event. And then as I've said in the past, I think a mediator would be okay, but I think really a facilitator, someone who's very skilled in having these conversations and holding the space for everyone that is there. I think that that would be a very key piece in this endeavor. Thank you.

Elliot Young:

Okay. Are there any other PCCEP members have any comments? So-

Lakayana:

[inaudible 01:52:26] been said, yeah I'm not sure if it's worth our just time and energy to put that together. It seems like a very big thing. And also when you think about it, and we just said earlier, we're trying to focus on the actual issues at hand. I think it would be much more useful to talk to folks that are solution-based with people who are actually like these are issues are affecting black community residents. What do you all want to see from the police? Things of that nature. And I don't know if that's a public forum would even get a space for that. So just thinking of all the stuff we have to do and if this is the best use of our time.

Elliot Young:

Just in response to Vadim [inaudible 01:53:11] getting the people who are potentially lighting fires or doing these other things, I don't think that they would come. I'm talking about people who are actually protesting for Black Lives Matter and are doing so peacefully and our legal observers and our journalists and their experiences. But I think those same questions that the people have raised would still be pertinent to that.

Vadim Mozysky:

Right Elliot, but both you and I have been out there and you know how it goes. There's people that are protesting and the police are behind buildings and they're not doing anything. And then of a sudden the fires start and things get thrown and windows get broken and then they come out. I think that there needs to be, if we're having this dialogue about how to get beyond this, we need to understand the dynamics there, which is people get caught in the crossfire and I think that's a terrible thing.



Vadim Mozyrsky:

But how do you prevent that crossfire from happening to begin with? And that's what I'm trying to understand is how do we get resolution to what's going there? And we can talk to the people that are seeking change and I'm fully behind that, but that's not going to resolve the tension between the police and the people that seem intent on instigating things every night with the police. And unfortunately I think, putting people who are rightfully protesting out there in the midst of chaos. So, that's that's my concern.

Elliot Young:

Yeah, Marcia.

Marcia:

Yeah. I think that... I'm not sure how I feel about hosting an event like this either. I think protesters, whether they're causing damage in the city or not, have made their point clear and know what the underlying issues are related to The Black Lives Matter Movement. I think as a PCCEP body, it's our role to seek accountability for law enforcement. They just released a chart of all of the protests and when they've ended in riots. And I haven't heard anything about what have the protest resulted in. And I would be more inclined to hear from police as to what changes they have made based on the protest or the riots and the community action that there's been multiple forums that we've hosted. We've had listening sessions, there's been press conferences.

Marcia:

And I haven't seen any police response that differs from anything different from when they started back in May. And so I would like to hear more specifically, is there something that we're missing that they're doing that we don't know about? Because, I don't know that we need... If the law enforcement doesn't know what the issues are related, why people are protesting, then and they're not willing to engage in a dialogue about it, that's telling in and of itself. And that's part of the reason why we're here. So I would be more inclined to be interested in what they're actually doing to achieve that.

Elliot Young:

Yeah. That sounds like a great idea and way to shift this into something that might be more action oriented. So let's open this up to the public. I think what's on the agenda is some kind of town hall discussion either with protestors and the police, or as Marcia's suggesting with the police leaders explaining what their plans are to respond to the protests in substantive ways. Does anyone from the public want to comment on those issues? Deanna.

Zainab:

Hi, great conversation you guys and discussion. The first thing I thought about when you said town hall, that means that you're trying to include people, everyone actually and you can't prevent others. And so there's not going to be a easy way to distinguish who can be invited and who's not. So I would recommend PCCEP not go in that direction when it comes to this process because it's not inclusive if



you're not going to invite them to the entire public. Second, I was trying to hear like, okay, what are we trying to get from this?

Zainab:

And I still didn't get that understanding of what is the purpose of this town hall. Facilitating a town hall like this I think has happened throughout time. And it's very difficult. I don't care what kind of skilled facilitator you have, there's a, there's a lot of pent up anger. I mean, what day is it on for Portland? Is it 92... Whatever day it is on right now, it's almost 100 days. And while there are those who believe that everything is being done on behalf of Black Lives Matter, there are those of us who recognize that it's not that. And so how do you distinguish that from what the Portland Police Bureau is trying to also share that we want to be able to be in the community to help support "lawlessness?" However, if you're part of the problem, how are you part of the solution? How can you be part of the solution?

Zainab:

So for me, and hearing this type of town hall meeting, I personally wouldn't want to attend only because I wouldn't feel safe in that environment lest you figure out the security. And if the security is the police that doesn't make you still feel safe. Second, you can't close it off when you talk about a town hall. So, what is different about PCCEP inviting people to the meetings to talk or to share? What's the difference between doing that? Having different groups have different time where they can just come and share their thoughts about what's happening?

Zainab:

Even the Portland Police Department. I'm not sure. I will say this. I've been to several meetings so far. And other than I think one meeting about the macing or tear gas, I really have not heard from the Portland Police Department. So perhaps, maybe that should be something that is added to the PCCEPs meetings so that people can provide a voice. But I would caution you in saying that this is an inclusive event if you're planning on selecting people because that's just not going to happen that way. Thank you.

Elliot Young:

Right. Deanne's have great points. All of our meetings are public, so we would not, we could not and would not be limiting who comes. I think like in our other town halls, the idea would be if we decided to go ahead with this to find a few people who are willing to speak, because as you say, people might not feel safe, even in a virtual room with police expressing the violence that they've been subject to. So I think that that is a real concern. Maybe this dialogue is just not possible at this moment. And that's something tough to hear. So I have a few people on the list, Jen, public dialogue, then Lakayana, then Susan see. So Jen, you're up.

Jen:

Hi, thank you. Thanks for inviting me to speak. I signed on with one of my facilitation organizations that I work with public dialogue consortium. I haven't done any work in Oregon and Portland. I'm in California mostly. So I'm really here as a concerned resident and really interested to hear what the committee is



doing and the intersection of getting familiar with all the organizations in Portland and unclear who is holding the space for this conversation. The conversation in the streets is very important, but there is a transition from what happens in the streets and what happens in the decision making bodies to make change. And anyways I'm an advocate for that. I hear what everyone's saying. I hear the issues about safety. I just know that these conversations can be designed so that they are inclusive and they are safe and they are productive and it is a really good and brave thing that a community can do together. So thank you.

Elliot Young:

Thank you, Jen. Lakayana.

Lakayana:

No I was going to say I'll let the community go first and I'll-

Elliot Young:

Sorry, Susan.

Susan:

I think I have to remember that the PPB is not actually interested in reform. I mean, even the settlement agreement, they refuse to agree that they were even... That there was even a problem. And so to have this meeting assumes that both people come together with some commitment to reform and we don't have that. And I think this group is solely responsible for accountability.

Elliot Young:

Okay. Thank you for your comment. Any other public comment? I know we're at 7.31, so we should probably close it out. But Brian Ministerial, you raised your hand.

Brian Betcone:

Well, I would just like to say in my experience, when I spoke and asked Chief Lovell about better identification, he was very resistant to that idea and that seemingly should be in my opinion, a very easy thing, especially considering how serious and unacceptable and long history we have with police brutality in black and brown communities. And the immediate resistance to that idea, it makes me feel like I'm not sure, I couldn't think of a more easy thing to ask of them. So I'm just not sure that they are, they want reform like the previous person said. Thank you for the opportunity.

Elliot Young:

Sure. Thank you, Brian for your comment. So let's a couple more comments from PCCEP members and then let's close it out to Lakayana and then Amy.

Lakayana:



Yeah, I was just going to say, I know PCCEP would be capable of hosting this, like logistically facilitating it. We've done tons of resources like this in the past, that's not my concern. It's just the concerns, the amount of energy to get it done right now with a lot of other stuff on our plate. And yeah, the return on investment doesn't seem like it will be very high.

Barb:

Yeah. For Thursday.

Elliot Young:

No, that's off the table, Amy. You're up next.

Barb:

Oh great. Because it's Barb.

Elliot Young:

Hi, Barb.

Barb:

I told you. So I have a couple of things on my piece of paper and the most important thing that I want to say is that at least twice, since we've all met the Portland PD and I would imagine in their enhanced crisis intervention team and some other teams helped a lot. Well, I actually succeeded in talking to people with knives down and deescalated them and got them the help that they will now know how to get. But the point is that the cops didn't shoot these people. And in the past that wouldn't have been something that would've happened probably midday at least. So the other stuff I have to say is really, really random. Actually, I'm not going to say it except for there's a difference between protestors and rioters. So I wish people would stop worrying about making that distinction. And my last comment is if you want to get a bunch of people together to do a big online thing, send them pizza or a coupon for a pizza or something like that. That's it.

Elliot Young:

Okay. Thanks Barb for your comments. What I'm hearing from both PCCEP members, as well as some community members is sort of doubt whether the return on investment on this idea is worth the energy invested. I will say that the motivation to propose this is that after three months of this, where the city just seems at an impasse and people who are out on the streets protesting are being brutalized and I'm not talking the rioter protests. The distinction is I guess, in the eye of the beholder. But I'm trying to think of some way out of that for the community will go to create safer spaces for the community to protest. I don't know when this is going to end. I don't think anyone knows when this is going to end. And so it is a hail Mary idea to just put people in a room together, but I'm hearing more concern than support.

Elliot Young:



I think we should not go ahead with it. And I think what we should do is maybe think along the lines of what Marcia's suggesting of a meeting where we could get in this could maybe have in our next board meeting. The PPB to just explain what they've done in response to the protests. And maybe at a different point, people will feel like more faith that something can come to this conversation. It's still a little disheartening, but also realistic the sense that the community doesn't believe their can be any dialogue. I, as someone who also distrust the police, always believed that even with your worst enemies dialogue is always possible and fruitful. Trevi, I see you've raised your hand, please go ahead.

Trevi:

Thank you. I want to suggest to anyone who doesn't go to the protest, I don't because of COVID, is to watch to stream them. There's plenty of streamers out there. You can watch the protest. And when you're watching the streamers, you overhear intimate conversations between the protesters, between the police. You learn a lot just from watching those and you really get a sense of, I watch them every night and you can see the pattern as what's happening. And you can judge, is this going to be a really bad night? And the videos of things that you see police officers do, shield yourself before you watch them. And the same for protesters, they don't get to hit people or do those things, but just some of the things they say and wanting to set things on fire, it's really a hard situation. And I really agree bringing all those people together right now. I think it would just create more harm than good.

Trevi:

And I am 100% advocate for people talking always, but I really think this has to, some of that has to dissipate. But I think by watching the protest and going to participate if you can, I would be down there if I wasn't worried about my health, will really help you understand what's being said, what's not being said. And I've seen things that I can't imagine how someone could live with themselves after what they did to somebody in the middle of the protest. And I've also saw a police officer last week, push somebody who's in the press and the guy hit a pole and the guy turned to the police officer and said, "Oh my gosh, you made me fall and hit that pole." And the cop stopped and said, "I'm sorry, I didn't see it. I apologize." And then went on pushing people. So you see those little moments for the potential for people to be human and to care about each other, and that fills me with hope.

Trevi:

So I also encourage people to watch it for those moments. But it's really scary. And I'm in my living room when I'm watching it and I'm scared. So I think it's just too much heat right now to bring people together. And even though... I mean, I was a therapist for 35 years and I've seen everything and wouldn't touch this. And even though someone can say, "Well, wait, I can organize this and we can make it safe." Why take the chance for greater hurt? I think we have to let this dissipate and then figure out how to get together and heal. And also I am so hopeful that the changes that are going to come out of this. I don't think we'll ever do this to ourselves again. I think we can't go back. We have to change as a country. We have to change. There's no going back. And because of that, I am grateful that everybody goes out there every night because I don't want us to go back. I want the change.

Elliot Young:



Thank you, Trevi for those hopeful comments at the end of this meeting. Thank all of the community participants. Please go on the PCCEP website to find the upcoming subcommittee meetings that are open to everybody. These meetings are also posted to our YouTube site. We will be putting up, hopefully soon, a full list of our recommendations and the work we've done over the last two years to make it accessible because I know the website does not make it accessible right now. And thank you to all the PCCEP members. Lakayana, do you have any parting words? Okay. Well, thanks all for staying a little bit longer and we'll see you all soon at a meeting upcoming. Take care. Stay safe. [crosstalk 02:13:36].

PART 4 OF 4 ENDS [02:14:07]