

Behavioral Health Unit Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

December 6, 2017

Committee Members

Lt. Chris Wheelwright BHU; PPB, ***Sgt. Todd Tackett** PPB; ***Sgt. Casey Hettman** PPB; ***Ofc. Jason Jones**, PPB CIT; **Emily Rochon**, PPB SCT; **Shannon Pullen**, National Alliance on Mental Illness; ***Bill Osborne**, Multnomah County Behavioral Health; **Cristina Nieves**, Commissioner Fritz's Office; ***Maggie Bennington-Davis**, Health Share of OR; ***Felesia Otis**, Volunteers of America; **Jan Friedman**, Disability Rights Oregon; ***Kathleen Roy**, Central City Concern; ***Beth Epps**, Cascadia; **Katie Burgard** Multnomah County Sherriff's Office; ***Mike Morris**, Oregon Health Authority Addictions & Mental Health Division; **Melanie Payne**, Bureau Of Emergency Communications, **Janie Marsh**, Mental Health America of Oregon, **Alex Bassos**, Metropolitan Public Defender's Office; **Leticia Sainz**, Multnomah County Mental Health & Addiction Services; ***Wyndham McNair**, Case Manager CCC

[* Indicates Committee Member was absent]

October Minutes & Report

Katie Burgard moved to approve the October minutes and Leticia Sainz seconded the motion, with Jan Friedman abstaining. The motion passed. **M/S/P**

Katie Burgard moved to approve the October Report. Melanie Payne seconded the motion with Jan Friedman abstaining. The motion passed. **M/S/P**

Directive 850.25 Police Response to Mental Health Facilities

The group reviewed the Definitions, Policy and Procedure of Directive 850.22. This Directive helps define PPB's response to mental health facilities and to ensure that police officers and facilities staff understand each other's roles when police are requested to respond to a mental health facility. The definitions are intended to define different types of mental health facilities and provide clarification.

The committee discussed the use of flags and how those flags are used to determine which level of police response. The committee discussed the facilities response to the Directive. BHU leadership explained the policy helps facilities staff to know what the police will do and what to expect, for example the Police Officers will not help administer medications. With staff turnover, there is a continual need to educate and communicate with facilities staff to ensure the best possible outcomes.

The committee discussed (2.1.3) the CIT coordinator, whose role is to follow up with facilities when issues arise or an incident takes place in order to facilitate communication and understanding between facilities staff and police. There is a significant need for ongoing training with facilities staff.

The committee asked for further clarification about the Definitions section and how these definitions affect the scope of the policy. Does this policy only apply to secure and non-secure residential mental health facilities only or does it apply to other types of not licensed mental health facilities? Portland

Behavioral Health Unit Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

December 6, 2017

Police Bureau determines the flags that go into the BOEC system. Multnomah County has a list of facilities that are considered for flags.

There was confusion over “designated” and “residential” – 2nd bullet point in the definitions. The rest of the policy does not use the term “designated residential.” The committee would like to see clarification and consistency of terms used throughout the Directive, including the title.

Members wanted to know if this Directive applies to local hospitals. Is this the State definition? What facilities does the Portland Police want this response to include? The ORS broadly defines “facilities”. Does BOEC have flags on all mental health facilities? Directive tells PPB how to respond to subset of mental health facilities but not the rest of the mental health facilities. The committee suggested either change the title to include “designated residential facilities” or define how PPB responds to other mental health facilities.

The committee discussed the four officer police response. BHU Leadership explained it gives discretion to the Sergeant who has knowledge of the facility and situation to change the number responding. Flags are a cue and a great starting point. There was a discussion about priority calls and how they are dispatched and how the knowledge of the facility gives the Sergeant the ability to lower the priority as more information comes in.

The committee agreed to make an official recommendation the definitions and type of mental health facilities impacted by this Directive. Definitions should also be defined to include juveniles. Leticia Sainz voted to include this in the motion, Katie Burgard seconded it. The motion passed **M/P/S**

Due to the timeline of the review period, the BHUAC Chair agreed to type up recommendations for change in language and send to the BHUAC to vote via email. See the December 2017 report for the full recommendations submitted by the BHUAC.

Directive 850.22 Police Response to Mental Health Director’s Holds & Elopement

The Committee discussed how Directive 850.22 works. Committee members asked how officers use timing or delaying custody to avoid force when dealing with 1.1.2.1 which says: “Determine if taking civil custody of the person named on the Director’s Custody Report may be achieved in a safe manner. Delaying custody is a tactic that may be used if the member determines that taking the person into custody under present circumstances may result in an undue safety risk to members, the involved person, and/or others. If delaying custody, members shall notify a supervisor and then develop a plan to determine a safe time and method to take the person into civil custody. An appropriate police report shall be completed documenting the details of this decision.” How does this work with ORS statute? The Director writes a hold and the Portland Police Bureau is expected to take the person into custody. There is confusion at some facilities/clinics because of the delay. The City Attorney is taking a look at the statute.

Behavioral Health Unit Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

December 6, 2017

How does the community track the outcomes of disengagements? BOEC does not track that. Delaying custody isn't the same as disengagement. It would be nice to know where people go and what happens to them once the Police Bureau disengages. Statute does say that the Portland Police Bureau will take into custody when dealing with holds, disengagement is an effective tool to deescalate a volatile situation. Is it effective? A delay is a delay, but policy says there is an imminent hold. This situation happens rarely. When it does happen, Portland Police will consult with others and make a plan. There is always a follow up plan in either hold situations or disengagements.

It was suggested that an education component to managers and better communication from the Portland Police Bureau about this could help.

The committee recommended the Directive should define "Directors Designee" and work Multnomah County to define clearly who can write a directors hold.

Alex Bassos moved to adopt the above language and Christina Nieves seconded the motion. The motion passed. **M/S/P**

It was recommended to add "a person" to the front of "custody" in section #3 under Policy to read "A member's ability to manage a person in custody in a safe, constructive, and humane a manner as possible.

Jan Friedman moves to adopt the language and Alex Bassos seconded the motion. The motion passed. **M/S/P**

Due to the timeline of the review period, the BHUAC Chair agreed to type up recommendations for change in language and send to the BHUAC to vote via email. See the December 2017 report for the full recommendations submitted by the BHUAC.

The next BHUAC meeting will be on January 24, 2018 at 2:00 PM at the Portland Police Bureau's Central Precinct, 11th floor BHU Meeting Room.