



CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON



Bureau of Police

Ted Wheeler, Mayor

Danielle M. Outlaw, Chief of Police

1111 S.W. 2nd Avenue • Portland, OR 97204 • Phone: 503-823-0000

Integrity • Compassion • Accountability • Respect • Excellence • Service

Directive 1110.00, Personal Appearance Standards (formerly, “Appearance Standards”) Executive Summary

Introduction

The Portland Police Bureau last reviewed Directive 1110.00, Personal Appearance Standards, in 2007. The Bureau’s primary objective in revising the policy was to align Bureau guidelines and requirements with modern industry best practice standards.

Public Comments

The Bureau received several comments over the course of both universal review and public comment periods. Several commenters recommended the removal of gender-specific language, while the vast majority of responders commented on the existing grooming and physical appearance standards, which they deemed outdated and seemingly arbitrary in nature. More specifically, many commenters expressed concern about the prohibition of ponytails, which was included in the revised directive and posted for second universal review and public comment.

Gender-Neutral Language

During the first universal review and comment period, at which point stakeholders have an opportunity to provide feedback on the Bureau’s active policy, a few commenters emphasized the Bureau’s use of gender-specific language in the “Professional Appearance Standards” section of the directive. The Bureau recognized that the existing language not only established disparate standards for male- and female-identifying sworn members, but it was also out of alignment with city and county practices of using gender-neutral language. The Bureau incorporated gender-neutral language to address both of these issues and to reflect the Bureau’s current practice of using gender-neutral pronouns.

Grooming and Physical Appearance Standards

Several commenters noted that the previous iteration of the policy included gender-specific grooming standards and perceived antiquated policies for body art and facial hair. More specifically, commenters expressed concern that the Bureau’s restrictive policies on these issues prevented members from being representative of the community they serve. The Bureau reworked the policy to allow for some flexibility in this regard. The revised policy also establishes grooming standards that account for member safety and professionalism.

We thank every individual who took the time to provide feedback on this directive. All comments received during both review periods are attached at the end of this document. We have removed all personal information to protect the privacy of commenters.

The Bureau’s Revised Policy

The updated directive contains more inclusive language with regard to the Bureau’s grooming and appearance requirements and includes shifts in Bureau practices that both align the organization with

modern industry practices and create a space where Bureau members' appearance reflect the community they serve. Additionally, the revised directive no longer includes references to outdated uniform requirements, as all uniform standards are outlined in the Bureau's Uniform and Clothing Guide.

While the Bureau believes the revised policy provides more clarity and enhanced guidance to its members, any suggestions to further improve this directive are welcome during its next review.

This directive will become effective on October 1, 2019.

Published on 10/1/19

Community Policing: Making the Difference Together
An Equal Opportunity Employer

City Information Line: 503-823-4000, TTY (for hearing and speech impaired): 503-823-6868 Website: www.portlandpolice.com

1110.00, Personal Appearance Standards

Refer:

- DIR 210.90, Recognition and Awards
- DIR 317.40, Authorized Use of Bureau Resources
- DIR 1120.05, Clothing Allowance for Plainclothes Assignments
- DIR 1200.00, Inspections, Maintenance, Responsibility and Authority
- Uniform and Clothing Guide (Uniform Committee – Intranet)

Definitions:

- **Body Art:** Modification of the body's appearance for the purpose of creating a design, form, figure or art. Body art includes, but is not limited to, branding, piercing, scarification, and tattoos.

Policy:

1. This directive establishes grooming, dress code, and other general appearance standards for all Bureau members. Sworn members shall refer to the Uniform and Clothing Guide for specific guidance on uniform standards.
2. Members will wear the appropriate clothing or uniform, be properly equipped, well-groomed and exhibit a professional appearance while performing their official duties. Professional appearance projects the image of an alert, responsive agency that takes pride in its work. Clothing and grooming will be appropriate for a business environment. Clothing, uniforms, and equipment will be selected and authorized taking into consideration safety, versatility, durability, compatibility, appearance, and tradition. Only authorized uniforms and equipment will be worn.

Procedure:

1. Authorized Off-Duty Use.
 - 1.1. Off duty members will not wear a Bureau uniform, complete or in part, without prior consent of their RU manager. If authorized, the entire uniform of the day will be worn. However, the uniform may be worn to and from work if the route is direct and the member will not be involved in conducting personal business. If worn to and from work, it is permissible to wear a civilian jacket or raincoat in lieu of the uniform coat.
2. General Grooming Standards.
 - 2.1. Hair.
 - 2.1.1. Members shall keep their hair clean, neatly groomed and styled in a manner that does not interfere with their assigned duties.
 - 2.1.2. Dyeing or highlighting hair is permitted, but members' hair color must be consistent with a naturally occurring color range and must be professional in appearance. Members are prohibited from dyeing patterns or prints.
 - 2.1.3. Sworn member specifications while on duty.

- 2.1.3.1. Sworn members shall style their hair in a manner that does not interfere with uniform headgear or any specialized equipment and will not interfere with the member's safety and effectiveness.
 - 2.1.3.2. Sworn members' hair length shall not extend beyond the top edge of their uniform collar while on duty. Sworn members hair that exceeds collar length shall pull back, pin, or otherwise fasten their hair in such a way so as not to interfere with their uniform or equipment or pose a risk to the member's safety and effectiveness.
 - 2.2. Facial Hair.
 - 2.2.1. Members shall keep all facial hair clean and neatly trimmed.
 - 2.2.2. Sworn member specifications.
 - 2.2.2.1. Sworn members are permitted to wear mustaches, goatees, and/or beards, with the following conditions:
 - 2.2.2.1.1. Mustaches should follow the natural arch of the mouth and should not exceed the upper border of the lip or extend more than a quarter-inch horizontally beyond the corners of the mouth;
 - 2.2.2.1.2. Goatees should not extend more than a quarter-inch below the bottom of the chin; and
 - 2.2.2.1.3. Beards must be well-kempt and should not extend beyond a half-inch from the face.
 - 2.2.2.2. A sworn member's sideburns should not exceed a quarter-inch below the bottom of the earlobe and should be trimmed with a clean horizontal line along the base, unless attached to a beard.
 - 2.2.2.3. Members with facial hair shall have shaving equipment readily available at work should an emergency situation dictate immediate removal or trimming of facial hair (e.g., the need to don a gas mask during a crowd control event).
 - 2.3. The Bureau shall consider accommodations to these grooming standards on a case-by-case basis. Such accommodations may be appropriate only in cases where the member demonstrates a religious or medical need for accommodation. In such instances, the member shall submit a request for an accommodation through their chain of command to the Chief.
 - 2.4. Sworn members in plainclothes or undercover assignments shall be excused from conforming to the grooming standards set forth in this directive.
3. Dress Standards.
 - 3.1. Responsibility Unit (RU) Managers shall have the discretion to establish attire guidelines for professional staff in their units. All members shall wear professional attire that is appropriate for a work environment.
 - 3.2. Sworn members in uniform assignments shall act in accordance with the Bureau "Uniform and Clothing Guide" with regard to uniform, equipment, or other clothing requirements.

4. Jewelry.

- 4.1. Members are permitted to wear jewelry that is professional in appearance, inoffensive and does not interfere with their assigned duties or pose a risk to the safety of others.
- 4.2. Sworn member specifications while on duty.
 - 4.2.1. Sworn members working in a patrol capacity/field operations in a uniform capacity shall not wear more than two rings total.
 - 4.2.1.1. Rings should be worn in such a way so as not to interfere with the use of equipment or hinder the member's ability to use their hands or fingers.
 - 4.2.2. Sworn members may wear one watch, bracelet, and a necklace that is not visible.
 - 4.2.3. Sworn members may wear studs or other earrings that fit closely against the ear and do not extend below or around the earlobe. Only one earring stud per natural earlobe is allowed while on duty.
 - 4.2.3.1. Ear gauges and ear stretching plugs are prohibited.
 - 4.2.4. RU Managers or a designee may grant exceptions to the required jewelry standards when necessary for a specific assignment.

5. Body Art.

- 5.1. Members may have or display body art, however, they are prohibited from displaying body art on the face or neck that cannot be easily concealed (i.e., behind the ear or the base of the neck), except for reasonable cosmetic or medical purposes.
 - 5.1.1. Members are prohibited from displaying body art on their hands with the exception of a single finger tattoo/body art or body art that extends from the arm to the hand. The size of the body art may not exceed the length of the space between the member's lowest knuckle and hand.
- 5.2. Members are prohibited from displaying body art that is obscene, offensive, or biased toward a legally-protected class, or otherwise discriminatory in nature.
 - 5.2.1. Members may submit a memo through channels to their Branch Assistant Chief to appeal a Bureau decision that forbids the member from displaying their body art. The Branch Assistant Chief shall make a final determination on the permissibility of the member's body art.
- 5.3. Sworn members are prohibited from displaying visible body piercings other than the authorized earrings.

6. Court Appearance.

- 6.1. Members shall wear professional business attire or a full uniform when appearing in court.
 - 6.1.1. Members shall adjust their court attire if a reasonable request is made by the attorney handling the case (i.e., a City Attorney or District Attorney).

7. Command Staff and RU Manager Responsibilities.

- 7.1. May exempt a member from wearing the uniform for the duration of a specific assignment if civilian clothing would be more appropriate. RU managers and

supervisors will ensure their members conform to the uniform and equipment requirements.

- 7.2. Inspect members to ensure all uniforms and equipment are serviceable, authorized, and that the body armor is less than five years old.
 - 7.3. In situations where duty assignments require deviations from this directive, RU managers may authorize variances.
8. Assistant Chief of Services Responsibilities.
- 8.1. The Assistant Chief of Services shall:
 - 8.1.1. Recommend approval of specialty uniforms and equipment after review by the uniform committee and Chief of Police.
 - 8.1.2. Review the uniform and equipment procurement system.
 - 8.1.3. Review proposals from the Uniform Committee and forward with a recommendation to the Chief of Police.
9. Personnel Division Manager Responsibilities.
- 9.1. When notified that a member will be separating from the Bureau, the Personnel Division Manager or designee shall provide the member with a separation checklist and instruct the member to complete a notice of separation.
 - 9.1.1. The Personnel Division Manager or designee shall notify the Assistant Chief of Services if the member fails to complete the necessary checkout form(s).
 - 9.2. The Personnel Division Captain or designee shall coordinate with the Fiscal Services Division to ensure appropriate badges are available.
10. Training Division Captain Responsibilities.
- 10.1. The Training Division Captain or designee shall:
 - 10.1.1. Coordinate with the Personnel Division for the initial issue of uniforms and equipment when sworn members are newly hired.
 - 10.1.2. Verify the return of specified uniforms and equipment when a member separates from the Bureau.
 - 10.1.3. Recommend equipment to be worn or carried by sworn members. Any disagreements regarding equipment should be referred to the Assistant Chief of Services.

History:

- Originating Directive Date: 09/06/01
- Last Revision Signed: 10/01/19
 - Effective Date: 10/31/19
- Next Review Date: 10/31/21

1110.00, -Personal Appearance StandardsAPPEARANCE STANDARDS

~~Index: Title; Grooming; Uniform and Equipment— Issuance and Replacement~~

Refer:

- DIR 210.90, -Recognition and Awards
- DIR 317.40, -Authorized Use of Bureau EquipmentResources
- DIR 1120.05, - Clothing Allowance for Plainclothes Assignments
- DIR 1200.00, Inspections, Maintenance, Responsibility and Authority
- Uniform and Clothing Guide (Uniform Committee – Intranet)

POLICY (1110.00)

Definitions:

- Body Art: Modification of the body’s appearance for the purpose of creating a design, form, figure or art. Body art includes, but is not limited to, branding, piercing, scarification, and tattoos.

Policy:

1. This directive establishes grooming, dress code, and other general appearance standards for all Bureau members. Sworn members shall refer to the Uniform and Clothing Guide for specific guidance on uniform standards.

~~2.~~Members will wear the appropriate clothing or uniform, be properly equipped, well-groomed and exhibit a professional appearance while performing their official duties. Professional appearance projects the image of an alert, responsive agency that takes pride in its work. Clothing and grooming will be appropriate for a business environment. Clothing, uniforms, and equipment will be selected and authorized taking into consideration safety, versatility, durability, compatibility, appearance, and tradition. Only authorized uniforms and equipment will be worn.

PROCEDURE (1110.00)

Directive Specific Definitions

~~Body art: Procedures used to alter the body’s appearance including, but not limited to, branding, scarification and tattoos.~~

~~Branding: The act of burning the skin for the purpose of creating a design, form, figure or art.~~

~~Piercing: The act of creating a hole in any part of the body for the purpose of inserting an object, jewelry or ornamentation.~~

~~Scarification: The act of cutting the skin for the purpose of creating a design, form, figure or art.~~

~~Tattoo: The act of marking the skin with indelible designs, forms, figures, art, etc. by puncturing the skin and inserting pigment.~~

General Guidelines—Wearing of the Uniform (1110.00)

~~All members will wear and use only the uniforms, clothing and equipment issued by the Bureau and/or approved by the Chief of Police as described in this directive so as to support the policy described above. The uniform will be clean, neatly pressed, of proper fit and in good repair.~~

~~This directive addresses uniforms used Bureau wide by members. All members will refer to the Portland Police Bureau Uniform and Clothing guide, updated by the Uniform Committee, for specific descriptions of uniforms, equipment and instructions. Clothing, uniform, and equipment requirements for some specialty units and divisions are not addressed in this Directive. Members will wear the prescribed uniform or civilian clothing as directed by their RU manager in division or unit SOP.~~

~~During official or special functions including, but not limited to parades, graduations, funerals, award ceremonies, formal balls and other events, the appropriate RU manager, Branch chief or Chief of Police will determine the specific uniform of the day.~~

~~Members in a uniform assignment through the rank of lieutenant will wear the full uniform unless otherwise authorized by their supervisor. Members above the rank of lieutenant in a uniform assignment are encouraged to wear the uniform.~~

~~1. Authorized Off Duty Use (1110.00):~~

~~Off duty members will not wear a Bureau uniform, complete or in part, without prior consent of their RU manager. If authorized, the entire uniform of the day will be worn. However, the uniform may be worn to and from work if the route is direct and the member will not be involved in conducting personal business. If worn to and from work, it is permissible to wear a civilian jacket or raincoat in lieu of the uniform coat.~~

~~Authorized Uniform/Equipment Repair, Replacement and Return (1110.00)~~

~~Any unserviceable uniforms or equipment will be replaced. Only RU managers or their designee may authorize replacement of uniforms or equipment. The item to be replaced must be inspected by the person so designated by the RU manager in order to receive a purchase authorization. A purchase authorization (PPB Uniform Order form) is required from members for new uniform and equipment items. The purchase authorization must be presented to the vendor within seven days (in person, by FAX, or electronically) after it is issued. Members will sign for only those items they receive from the vendor.~~

~~Complaints about vendor service, material availability or defective items should be made by memorandum through channels to the Operations Branch chief with a copy to the Services Branch chief. The date, time and names of the affected employees, along with the recommended solutions, will be included in the memorandum.~~

~~Fitting (1110.00)~~

- ~~a. All weather jackets and dress jackets will be fitted with the member wearing the body armor and full duty belt.~~

- ~~b. Neck and sleeve length are to be correct for body proportions while wearing body armor. Shirt side tapering will only be altered at city expense when the body is of such proportion that excessive material causes the shirt to fit poorly. Any other tapering will be at the officer's expense.~~
- ~~c. Sworn female members may choose between male or female patterns. If there are tailoring problems that the uniform distributor cannot resolve, the RU manager or designee may approve additional alterations.~~
- ~~d. Sworn members will not accept items from a uniform vendor until all items have been tried on for condition, proper size, fit and tailoring.~~

Body Armor (1110.00)

~~Members through the rank of Lieutenant wearing a uniform in a uniform patrol assignment (i.e., precincts including SROs, Traffic, Transit, TOD) will wear body armor, unless authorized by an RU manager. Body armor is not required when members are wearing the Formal Uniform, a version of the Commanding Officers Uniform, or when authorized by the RU manager.~~

~~Supervisors are responsible for designating when members in a non-uniform assignment will wear body armor. Some examples to be considered are:~~

- ~~a. Operations deemed hazardous by a supervisor, (i.e., DVD raid, high risk arrest, investigations at major crime scenes when a threat exists, etc.).~~
- ~~b. Directed by a supervisor to wear body armor.~~
- ~~c. Required by written directive (i.e., the range).~~

~~The Bureau recognizes that some sworn members may have physical conditions restricting their ability to wear body armor. Any member claiming a medical restriction will obtain a detailed written justification from a medical doctor that describes the physical condition and how that condition prevents the wearing of body armor. The justification will be forwarded, through channels, to the Services Branch chief for final determination. The Bureau retains the right to require an independent medical evaluation (at Bureau expense) to verify the determination that body armor cannot be worn. Such medical information will be maintained in a separate, confidential file.~~

~~The Bureau may attempt to provide an alternative assignment on a temporary basis to members with a bona fide medical restriction by giving that member an assignment that does not require wearing body armor. The Bureau will consider purchasing alternative body armor in order to address bona fide medical restrictions on a case by case basis.~~

~~Because body armor has a limited manufacturer's warranty, body armor shall be inspected for fit and wear each year and replaced every five years. The serial number will be added to the member's individual personnel information.~~

~~Body armor beyond the manufacturer's warranty will be turned in to a designated member within the division/precinct for final disposition or disposal.~~

~~Issuance/Return of Badges (1110.00)~~

~~Only sworn members, honorably retired sworn members and persons designated by the Chief of Police or designee will be issued, allowed to purchase, or given a Bureau badge. Badges issued to members will be returned upon promotion, demotion, retirement, resignation, termination or at the request of a designated representative of the Chief of Police.~~

~~The Personnel Division (Personnel) will maintain an inventory that will be exchanged or loaned to members when their badges are being repaired.~~

~~Personnel will distribute one set of badges (uniform and cap) to sworn members upon employment, promotion or demotion. They will collect any issued badges from members on retirement, suspension, termination, resignation or other separation from City employment and forward to Fiscal.~~

~~Sworn members may purchase one additional badge set for the rank or position they currently hold or have held during their employment.~~

~~Cap and uniform badges issued to members will be titled with the member's rank. Retirement badges will be inscribed on the back with the member's dates of service and promotion(s), if applicable.~~

~~Presentation of badges to law enforcement dignitaries, ordering special badges for acrylic embedment, and other special situations will require the approval of the Chief of Police or designee.~~

~~Pins (1110.00)~~

~~Members are encouraged to display pins that are designed for wear with the uniform.~~

~~Authorized pins are:~~

- ~~a. American flag.~~
- ~~b. TriMet Pin (for duration of assignment to Transit Police Division).~~
- ~~c. City of Portland Years of Service.~~
- ~~d. Portland Police Association (PPA).~~
- ~~e. Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT).~~
- ~~f. Crisis Intervention Team (CIT).~~
- ~~g. Field Training Officer (FTO).~~
- ~~h. Motorcycle Pin.~~
- ~~i. Police Memorial Pin.~~
- ~~j. Special Emergency Reaction Team (SERT) Pin.~~

~~Authorized pins will be worn on the right pocket flap of the shirt.~~

~~The Rose Festival Pin is authorized the week preceding and the week of Rose Festival.~~

Members attending special community events are authorized to wear pins, buttons, or ribbons denoting that event. These items may not be for a political candidate or ballot measure.

Mourning Bands (1110.00)

Members are authorized to wear black mourning bands in honor of Bureau members or law enforcement personnel who have died in the line of duty. Mourning bands may also be authorized during Law Enforcement Memorial week. The Chief of Police will authorize the period they can be worn.

Patches (1110.00)

Only authorized patches are to be worn by members. Generally, only Bureau patches are worn on the shoulders of the uniform items. Exceptions must be approved by the Chief of Police.

Awards (1110.00)

Members are encouraged to display ribbons and medals (full size and miniature) designed for wear with the uniform in recognition of acts of valor, outstanding service, or unit recognition.

Refer to the Uniform and Clothing Guide for details.

The Uniform Committee will determine (on an individual basis) where members will wear awards that they have received from outside agencies.

Procedure:

2.1. Authorized Off-Duty Use.

- 2.1.1.1. Off duty members will not wear a Bureau uniform, complete or in part, without prior consent of their RU manager. If authorized, the entire uniform of the day will be worn. However, the uniform may be worn to and from work if the route is direct and the member will not be involved in conducting personal business. If worn to and from work, it is permissible to wear a civilian jacket or raincoat in lieu of the uniform coat.

3.2. Professional Appearance Standards (1110.00) Sworn Hairstyle and General Grooming Standards.

2.1. Hair.

- 2.1.1. Members shall keep their hair clean, neatly groomed and styled in a manner that does not interfere with their assigned duties.
- 2.1.2. Dyeing or highlighting hair is permitted, but members' hair color must be consistent with a naturally occurring color range and must be professional in appearance. Members are prohibited from dyeing patterns or prints.
- 2.1.3. Sworn member specifications while on duty.
- a. All sworn members will keep their hair clean, neatly trimmed and combed.
 - b. Dyed, tinted or bleached hair must be within a naturally occurring color range and must be professional in appearance. For purposes of this order, naturally occurring color range does not include unique hair colors such as pink, blue, purple or green.
 - c. Hair must be styled in such a manner so that it does not interfere with uniform headgear or any specialized equipment and will not interfere with officer safety and effectiveness.

- d. ~~Non-uniform, sworn members may be temporarily excused from these hair and grooming regulations while on undercover assignment. However, such members will again comply with these regulations once the special assignment is completed or whenever wearing the official uniform.~~

Specific Sworn Male Standards (1110.00) ~~Facial hair may not be more than ¼ inch in length, and must not interfere with the natural seal of the issued gas mask.~~

2.1.3.1. Sworn members shall style their hair in a manner that does not interfere with uniform headgear or any specialized equipment and will not interfere with the member's safety and effectiveness.

2.1.3.2. Sworn members' hair length shall not extend beyond the top edge of their uniform collar while on duty. Sworn members hair that exceeds collar length shall pull back, pin, or otherwise fasten their hair in such a way so as not to interfere with their uniform or equipment or pose a risk to the member's safety and effectiveness. ~~Ponytails are prohibited.~~

2.2. Facial Hair.

2.2.1. Members shall keep all facial hair clean and neatly trimmed.

2.2.2. Sworn member specifications.

2.2.2.1. Sworn members are permitted to wear mustaches, goatees, and/or beards, with the following conditions:

2.2.2.1.1. Mustaches should follow the natural arch of the mouth and should not exceed the upper border of the lip or extend more than a quarter-inch horizontally beyond the corners of the mouth;

2.2.2.1.2. Goatees should not extend more than a quarter-inch below the bottom of the chin; and

2.2.2.1.3. Beards must be well-kempt and should not extend beyond a half-inch from the face.

~~Mustaches and goatees are allowed. Beards are not allowed. Mustaches must be kept neatly trimmed and will not exceed the upper border of the lip or extend more than 1/4 inch horizontally beyond the corners of the mouth.~~

~~Goatees may not extend more than ¼ inch below the bottom of the chin.~~

3.1.1.1.2.2.2. Sideburns may not extend below lower opening of the ear and must end with a clean horizontal line, not flared out at the bottom. A sworn member's sideburns should not exceed a quarter-inch below the bottom of the earlobe and should be trimmed with a clean horizontal line along the base, unless attached to a beard.

~~a. A man's hair will be cut so as not to extend below the lower edge of the collar. Additionally, a man's hair will not extend over the top of the ears.~~

2.2.2.3. Members with facial hair shall have shaving equipment readily available at work should an emergency situation dictate immediate removal or trimming of facial hair (e.g., the need to don a gas mask during a crowd control event).

~~2.3.~~ The Bureau ~~will~~shall consider ~~and may approve~~ accommodations to ~~this standard~~these grooming standards on a ~~case--by-~~ case basis. Such accommodations may be appropriate only in cases where the member demonstrates a religious or medical need for accommodation. In such instances, the member ~~should bring the need~~shall submit a request for an accommodation ~~to the Bureau's attention~~ through ~~the~~their chain of command to the Chief ~~of Police~~.

2.4. Sworn members in plainclothes or undercover assignments shall be excused from conforming to the grooming standards set forth in this directive.

Specific Sworn Female Standards (1110.00)

~~4.~~ Hair will be neatly trimmed, shaped and in a style that permits wearing of the ~~uniform cap or hat or other department emergency equipment.~~

~~a.~~ Members are permitted to wear jewelry that ~~if hair is longer than collar length, it must be pulled back and cannot extend below the top of the shoulder blades.~~

~~c.~~ The Bureau will consider and may approve accommodations to this standard on a case by case basis. Such accommodations may be appropriate only in cases where the member demonstrates a religious or medical need for accommodation. In such instances, the member should bring the need for accommodation to the Bureau's attention through the chain of command to the Chief of Police.

Non-Sworn, Male and Female Hairstyle and Grooming Standards (1110.00)

~~4.1.~~ All non-sworn members will keep their hair clean, neatly trimmed and combed. Hair must be styled in such a manner as to not interfere with the duties ~~their assigned within their respective division. Final determination will be at the discretion of the RU manager.~~

~~4.2.~~

~~4.3.~~ b. Dyed, tinted or bleached hair must be within a naturally occurring color range, and be professional on appearance. For purposes of this order, naturally occurring color range does not include unique hair colors such as pink, blue, purple or green.

~~c.~~ Hair must be styled in such a manner so that it does not interfere with any specialized equipment and will not interfere with member safety and effectiveness.

~~d.~~ Mustaches and beards are allowed. They must be kept neatly trimmed.

Non-Sworn Male and Female Clothing Standards (1110.00)

Bureau approved uniforms are permitted as outlined by the assigned RU manager.

Jewelry (1110.00)

All members may wear jewelry that is clean, neat and of a style that presents a professional appearance, is not offensive to others, and is consistent with the type of assignment and duty performed.

— Standards for wearing jewelry:

~~4.3.1. No ring will be worn so that it interferes with the use of equipment or hinders the use of the hand and their hands or fingers.~~

~~4.3.2. Sworn members, while in uniform, may wear one watch, one bracelet, and a necklace that is not visible.~~

~~a. No more than two rings may be worn.~~

~~4.3.3. One Sworn members may wear studs or other earrings that fit closely against the ear and do not extend below or around the earlobe. Only one earring stud per natural earlobe is allowed. Plugs (used to enlarge piercing holes in the ear lobes) while on duty.~~

~~4.3.4. Ear gauges and ear stretching plugs are prohibited.~~

~~b. No tongue studs or visible body piercing (other than the listed earring stud), will be worn.~~

~~5. RU managers Managers or a designee may grant an exception to members where deviation from this policy is appropriate exceptions to the required jewelry standards when necessary for a specific assignment.~~

3. Dress Standards.

3.1. Responsibility Unit (RU) Managers shall have the discretion to establish attire guidelines for professional staff in their units. All members shall wear professional attire that is appropriate for a work environment.

3.2. Sworn members in uniform assignments shall act in accordance with the Bureau "Uniform and Clothing Guide" with regard to uniform, equipment, or other clothing requirements.

4. Jewelry.

4.1. Members are permitted to wear jewelry that is professional in appearance, inoffensive and does not interfere with their assigned duties or pose a risk to the safety of others.

4.2. Sworn member specifications while on duty.

4.2.1. Sworn members working in a patrol capacity/field operations in a uniform capacity shall not wear more than ~~one~~two rings total.

4.2.1.1. Rings should be worn in such a way so as not to interfere with the use of equipment or hinder the member's ability to use their hands or fingers.

4.2.2. Sworn members may wear one watch, bracelet, and a necklace that is not visible.

4.2.3. Sworn members may wear studs or other earrings that fit closely against the ear and do not extend below or around the earlobe. Only one earring stud per natural earlobe is allowed while on duty.

4.2.3.1. Ear gauges and ear stretching plugs are prohibited.

4.2.4. RU Managers or a designee may grant exceptions to the required jewelry standards when necessary for a specific assignment.

6.5. Body Art (1110.00)

5.1. Members may have or display tattoos/body art, however, they are prohibited from displaying visible body art on the face and neck is prohibited, or neck that cannot be easily concealed (i.e., behind the ear or the base of the neck), except for reasonable cosmetic or medical purposes.

5.1.1. Members with visible are prohibited from having displaying tattoos/body art prior to August 1, 2000 are exempt from this provision, on their hands with the exception of a single finger tattoo/body art or body art that extends from the arm to the hand. The size of the tattoo/body art may not exceed the length of the space between the member's lowest knuckle and hand.

5.2. Members will not expose any are prohibited from having or displaying body art that the Bureau deems is obscene, offensive forms of body art while on duty. Offensive forms of body art include images which are sexually explicit, racially and/or sexually, or biased or could be viewed as toward a legally-protected class, or otherwise discriminatory in nature.

5.2.1. Members may submit a memo through channels to their Branch Assistant Chief to appeal a Bureau decision that forbids the member from displaying their body art. The Branch Assistant Chief shall make a final determination on the permissibility of the member's body art.

5.3. Sworn members are prohibited from displaying visible body piercings other than the authorized earrings.

~~For the purposes of this directive, body art is defined as procedures used to alter the body's appearance including, but not limited to, branding, scarification and tattoos.~~

~~Non-Sworn and Sworn, Non-Uniformed Assignment, Dress Code (1110.00)~~

~~Refer to the Uniform and Clothing Guide posted to the Intranet.~~

~~Court Attire (1110.00)~~

~~For all court appearances, including Traffic Court, Circuit Court, Federal Court, Grand Jury, preliminary hearings, depositions and any other appearance in a judicial setting, members will, without exception, appear in one of the attires listed below:~~

~~a. Uniform of the day or Class A uniform.~~

~~b. Professional business attire (generally duty weapons should remain concealed).~~

~~RESPONSIBILITY, ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONTROL (1110.00)~~

~~Uniform Committee~~

~~The Uniform Committee will continually review the clothing, uniform and equipment requirements of the Police Bureau. This will be done by making recommendations on uniforms and equipment, overseeing uniform/equipment contracts, resolving member complaints, ensuring process quality control and coordinating with the Safety Committee on mutual issues.~~

~~The Uniform Committee will be comprised of members from the Chief of Police's Office and from Operations, Investigations, and Services Branches. This should include a representative from each precinct, Transit Police, Traffic Division, TOD, School Police, Detective Division and the Training Division. The committee will include at least one non-sworn member. The committee will normally meet on a monthly basis. Items for committee consideration can be sent directly to any committee member.~~

~~The aide to the Operations Branch chief will serve as the liaison to the uniform committee.~~

~~Bureau Members (1110.00)~~

~~Bureau members will:~~

- ~~a. Sworn members will maintain at least one complete serviceable Class C, Class B and class A uniform. Non-sworn members, if issued uniforms, will maintain at least two complete serviceable sets of uniforms.~~
- ~~b. Be responsible for their uniforms and equipment (refer to DIR 317.40 for specifics). They are also responsible for keeping their uniforms and equipment clean and in good repair. This would include minor repairs, including buttons, small tears, etc.~~
- ~~c. Not sign for any uniform or equipment unless it has been delivered to the member.~~
- ~~d. Inform their supervisor when a uniform is defective or worn out or equipment items need replacement or repair.~~
- ~~e. Return uniforms and equipment in good condition within the specified time frame or as required by the Bureau or supervisor's instructions.~~
- ~~f. Return all Bureau uniforms and equipment upon separation from the Bureau.~~
- ~~g. Refer any recommendation for uniforms or equipment to the uniform committee.~~
- ~~h. Upon status change, turn in unneeded uniforms and equipment and ensure they are issued appropriate uniforms and equipment for their new status.~~
- ~~i. Detectives and Criminalists will maintain at least one complete and serviceable Class C Uniform.~~
- ~~j. Commanding officers will maintain at least one complete serviceable Class C, Class B, Class B Commanding Officer Summer Uniform, Class A, Commanding Officer Summer Dress Uniform, and Commanding Officer Dress Uniform.~~

6. Court Appearance.

- 6.1. Members shall wear professional business attire or a full uniform when appearing in court.

6.1.1. Members shall adjust their court attire if a reasonable request is made by the attorney handling the case (i.e., a City Attorney or District Attorney).

~~Members shall adhere to the court appearance standard established by the attorney on the case.~~

7. Command Staff and RU Manager Responsibilities. Supervisors (1110.00)

7.1. May exempt a member from wearing the uniform for the duration of a specific assignment if civilian clothing would be more appropriate. RU managers and supervisors will ensure their members conform to the uniform and equipment requirements.

~~7.2. Will maintain a requisition and tracking mechanism, including payment to vendors. Requests for replacement of worn or unserviceable uniforms or equipment will be made to the RU manager or designee. Copies of the uniform order form will be retained pending verification of the order. Careful inspection will be made for negligence or intentional misuse.~~

~~7.3.7.2. Inspect members to ensure all uniforms and equipment are serviceable and authorized, and that the body armor is less than five years old.~~

~~7.4. Publish division Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) that defines what their members will routinely wear in the workplace.~~

~~7.5.7.3. In situations where duty assignments require deviations from this directive, RU managers may authorize variances. The approval of such variances will be kept to a minimum.~~

~~7.6. f. RU managers or their designees have the responsibility to recommend to the Chief of Police uniforms and equipment appropriate for their specific assignment and mission.~~

Branch Chiefs (1110.00)

8. Assistant Chief of Services Responsibilities.

8.1. The Assistant Chief of Services shall:

~~7.6.1.8.1.1. Recommend approval of specialty uniforms and equipment after review by the uniform committee and Chief of Police.~~

~~7.6.2.8.1.2. Review the uniform and equipment procurement system.~~

~~7.6.3.8.1.3. e. Review proposals from the Uniform Committee and forward with a recommendation to the Chief of Police.~~

8.9. Personnel Division (1110.00) Manager Responsibilities.

~~9.1. When notified that a member will be leaving/separating from the Bureau, the Personnel will have the member complete a notice of separation and will Division Manager or~~

designee shall provide the member with a separation checklist; and instruct the member to complete a notice of separation.

~~8.1.1.9.1.1.~~ The Personnel Division Manager or designee shall notify the Assistant Chief of Services Branch chief if the member fails to complete the necessary checkout; form(s).

~~8.2.9.2.~~ b. Coordinate with Fiscal ~~The Personnel Division Captain or designee shall~~ coordinate with the Fiscal Services Division to ensure appropriate badges are available.

~~9. Fiscal Services Division (1110.00);~~

~~— Maintain status and assignment records to ensure policy compliance and be responsible for the destruction, maintenance, ;~~

~~9.1. Manage the ordering, inventory, distribution, sales, maintenance, and ordering; destruction of badges.~~

~~9.2. b. Process payments to vendors.~~

10. Training Division Captain Responsibilities. (1110.00)

10.1. The Training Division Captain or designee shall:

10.1.1. Coordinate with the Personnel Division for the initial issue of uniforms and equipment when ~~new~~ sworn members are newly hired.

10.1.2. Verify the turn-in/return of specified uniforms and equipment when a member ~~leaves City employment~~ separates from the Bureau.

10.1.3. e. — Recommend equipment to be worn / or carried by sworn members. Any disagreements regarding equipment should be referred to the Assistant Chief of Services Branch chief.

From:
To:
Subject: Comments Regarding the Review of Directive 1110.00
Date: Sunday, November 04, 2018 12:53:36 AM

To whom it may concern,

I am providing feedback in regards to the section of directive 1110.00 titled "Specific Sworn Male Standards".

I believe that sworn officers should be allowed to wear beards while on duty. In the past, the Portland Police Bureau has allowed beards to be worn by sworn officers. There are numerous agencies throughout the United States that allow their law enforcement professionals to wear beards. There are also several surrounding agencies that allow their members to wear beards. Beards are incredibly popular in the City of Portland and are seen throughout it's population. It is a common belief that police officers should represent the population they serve. While this may seem trivial in regards to other factors such as racial makeup, beards are very important to many citizens in this city and many members of the Portland Police Bureau. The way facial hair is worn (or not worn) by a person can be deeply personal.

The opposing arguments for beards that I have heard include the usage of gas masks, whether or not they appear professional, and an obscure OSHA rule that I have not been able to locate. I believe that there is a happy medium that can be obtained in regards to all of these opposing points.

I can personally attest to donning a gas mask during the recent election protests that took place in the middle of No Shave November. During these protests, I was in the middle of at least two gas deployments and obtained a seal throughout the entirety of these incidents and had no issues whatsoever. I have numerous co-workers who can also attest to first hand experience with this, many of which are members of the Rapid Response Team.

I believe that beards can be worn and remain groomed and professional in nature. My comments on the review of this directive are not aimed to obtain scraggly or absurdly long beards, but well-groomed and neatly trimmed beards that would still adequately portray the professionalism of the Portland Police Bureau.

I have attempted to locate the OSHA rule regarding facial hair and the usage of gas masks but have been unsuccessful. I know that numerous other agencies within the state allow beards to be worn despite this and believe that a reasonable policy change could be adapted to accommodate those who frequently use gas masks in the performance of their duties (such as RRT, SERT, etc...). Something simple along the lines of requiring members who wear beards to have the means to shave readily available would suffice.

Once last point that I would like to bring up may not seem like a priority to some but I believe it to be important. Simple things such as the policy change that I am suggesting can have massive effects in regards to morale among the members of the Portland Police Bureau. It seems these days that everything about our job is constricting around us and this has been having a negative effect Bureau-wide for some time now. It may not mean much to some, but small little victories and changes can mean the world to many.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

From:
To:
Subject: Directive 1110.00 Feedback
Date: Thursday, November 01, 2018 7:59:14 AM

Hey there,

Here is my feedback for Directive 1110.00.

I don't think we have or are issued all three classes of uniform anymore?, so that section needs to be updated. And, detectives may or may not have class C. And, not sure why that is pointed out again after saying all sworn need to have all three (A, B, and C) anyway?

Also, a tangent from this but, as there has been talk regarding the detective division and appropriate attire, I would like to put an idea in the suggestion box. I would like it if the few people who are not dressing appropriately would be addressed about it, rather than the "coming down on" everyone, which is what we have been hearing is going to happen. So, better to have a sergeant say, "John", you need to wear collared shirts and nice dark jeans or slacks with no holes in them," than to make strict rules for all of us about exact slacks and ties and jackets and such. I'm sure we all need a reminder at times to keep things modern day business-like with attire, still, I would rather it be from the local level (sergeants actually saying something to folks wearing t-shirts and sweat pants and the like) rather than making all the rest of us, who generally follow appropriate attire in the workplace, court, etc. have to change things when we are actually doing it very well to start with. Especially as a female, it is difficult to find appropriate clothing that works for the amount of belt loop structure and pockets that I need to carry equipment. That's why I like dark jeans and nice button down shirts, sweaters, and jackets (court gets an upgrade to a suit). There was also talk about wearing something like khaki's and a police bureau polo, but I don't think that would be a good idea for detectives because of the obvious "police officer" look such that, folks that I need to talk to (and who often don't want to talk to police) wouldn't be as receptive to just sitting down and chatting with me in a relaxed manner. Anyway, just thoughts. :)

Thank you and enjoy the day,

#1

1st Universal Review: 11/1/18 - 11/16/19

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, November 01, 2018 6:25:10 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 01, 2018 6:27:58 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:48
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Directive mentions Class A, B and C uniforms. Are these currently issued? Seems like only the B is currently issued to sworn members. Hat badges, we give those to sworn members? If we don't have a class A uniform or a dress cap to wear, why does it mention a cap badge?

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, November 01, 2018 6:32:01 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 01, 2018 6:35:03 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:01
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

In a day and age where even officers can have full sleeves and legs of tattoos visible, where skin is no longer the color of, well, skin, I think it is ridiculous that one cannot dye their hair a color other than "natural." I am hopeful that the day were a thin blue line of colored hair is as acceptable as the disgusting tattoo "art" that doesn't make anyone bat an eyelash.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, November 01, 2018 6:35:24 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 01, 2018 6:38:48 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:24
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

The Explosive Disposal Unit has worn a pin for about fifteen/seventeen years. It was approved back when I was on the uniform committee. Is there a way to get the EDU pin added to the Directive during this process?

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name
Email Address
Phone Number

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, November 01, 2018 6:44:12 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 01, 2018 6:50:49 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:37
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

The grooming standard for hair for women does not differentiate between uniform and non-uniform assignments. It does not address pony tails for men or women which have been allowed for at least a decade. They were allowed for men because someone decided it reflected the community. (Tom Mack was the initiator of this issue.) Business attire for court is not defined and it probably should be, especially for Grand Jury. Members are appearing for GJ in t-shirts, jeans, and tennis shoes. I cannot tell the difference between them and suspects some of the time.

I am not certain that anyone actually read this directive before sending it out for review....

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#5

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, November 01, 2018 7:03:43 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 01, 2018 7:04:21 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:37
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Authorized PINS should include the Rapid Response Team (RRT) Pin

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, November 01, 2018 8:27:27 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 01, 2018 8:27:53 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:25
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Looks good to me

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, November 01, 2018 8:24:16 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 01, 2018 8:52:14 AM
Time Spent: 00:27:58
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Directive 1110.00 Feedback

"Bureau Members (1110.00)

Bureau members will:

a. Sworn members will maintain at least one complete serviceable Class C, Class B and class A uniform. Non sworn members, if issued uniforms, will maintain at least two complete serviceable sets of uniforms."

"i. Detectives and Criminalists will maintain at least one complete and serviceable Class C Uniform."

"j. Commanding officers will maintain at least one complete serviceable Class C, Class B, Class B Commanding Officer Summer Uniform, Class A, Commanding Officer Summer Dress Uniform, and Commanding Officer Dress Uniform. "

"Court Attire (1110.00)

a. Uniform of the day or Class A uniform."

It should be noted that for the rank of Officer, Sergeant, Detective, Criminalist and Lt, we are issued only class B uniforms.

There are no more class A or C uniforms.

Only Captains and above are issued our old class A uniforms.

Talk to the Quartermaster. She has all of the details about how it currently works.

"Issuance/Return of Badges (1110.00)

Personnel will distribute one set of badges (uniform and cap) to sworn members upon employment"

We have not issued "cap badges" in probably 6 years or so.

It is one of my pet peeves when male officers are not freshly shaved prior to the beginning of their shift. There is only generalized language in the Directive, and can be the source of unnecessary debate over the meaning of what "well groomed" looks like.

The directive goes into great detail about the length of the goatee hair, no flared sideburns and a prohibition on handle bar mustaches...

But the member who decides to start growing some facial hair over the weekend, or the guy who was too lazy to shave for a couple of days in a row look somewhat shabby.

Two points: the addition of facial hair needs to be start one (or two) weeks prior to displaying it in uniform. (This was the old rule 20 some years ago.)

Point two: 'Male members shall be clean shaven in all facial areas, except where otherwise permitted facial hair is allowed by this directive, prior to the beginning of their shift or court appearance.'

Just my Thoughts,
Matt

PS: Did Versaterm design this feedback form? It lacks ease of use and is rudimentary and unnecessarily clunky.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#8

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, November 01, 2018 9:36:27 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 01, 2018 9:46:18 AM
Time Spent: 00:09:50
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Pins and award pin placement need to be re-evaluated for the external vest. The vest is very thick and there are few places that pins can pierce the external carrier that don't interfere with items in the pocket (risk for injuring officer's hands with the pointy end of the pin). For example my awards pins fit best to the side of my cloth badge between the badge and the central zipper. In this configuration they must be stacked and not in a horizontal line.

Tattoo requirements. Having a tattoo prior to 2000 is unrealistic. For example, as we are starting to hire people born in 1997, it is unlikely they got their tattoos when they were age three. Many recruits both men and women who served in the military have visible tattoos prior to employment. The prohibition of visible tattoos on arms and legs should be prohibited entirely as it narrows our recruitment field.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name
Email Address
Phone Number

#9

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, November 01, 2018 11:09:19 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 01, 2018 11:09:29 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:10
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

While the Police Bureau should not necessarily adapt to trends, certain aspects of the grooming standards seem outmoded.

- Beards are not allowed.
- A man's hair will be cut so as not to extend below the lower edge of the collar. Additionally, a man's hair will not extend over the top of the ears.

This prohibition is completely contrary to the lifestyle of thousands of Portlanders. If the bureau wants its department to reflect the community it serves, this beard prohibition should be thought through. Furthermore, many potential candidates for open police officer positions will simply not apply because of this and other rather arbitrary rules regarding the length of hair.

Among black men, especially of college age, it has become more than popular to wear dreadlocks. The bureau should allow men, or women, to wear dreadlocks beyond the length allowed by this draft directive.

Please reconsider this portion of the directive to allow men to wear beards as many police departments in the state do. It will help us recruit as well.

- If hair is longer than collar length, it must be pulled back and cannot extend below the top of the shoulder blades. This comes from the section covering female grooming standards. What difference does it make if hair is a little beyond shoulder blades? Please rethink this wording. Please consider the popularity of dreadlocks and other longer hairstyles worn by women today. Again, do we want officers to reflect the community they serve, or not?

- No more than two rings may be worn. What is the purpose of this? Please remove these kinds of arbitrary regulations.

- Professional business attire This needs to be more clearly defined. If the bureau wants men in ties it should say so here. "Business attire" is vague, especially in a rather casual city like this. The directive goes to great lengths above regarding hair color and length, the exact number of rings, length of hair to the quarter inch. Define "business attire" please, or we'll keep having officers confused with defendants at court.
-

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#10

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, November 01, 2018 9:30:24 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 01, 2018 9:31:26 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:01
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

this policy states the following: Bureau members will:

a. Sworn members will maintain at least one complete serviceable Class C, Class B and class A uniform. Non sworn members, if issued uniforms, will maintain at least two complete serviceable sets of uniforms.

....

we do not have class a, b and c uniforms now. we only have one uniform. this policy should reflect that

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#11

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, November 02, 2018 5:28:05 AM
Last Modified: Friday, November 02, 2018 5:30:54 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:48
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Regarding section:

"Body Art (1110.00)

Visible body art on the face and neck is prohibited, except for reasonable cosmetic purposes."

Please consider adding an additional exception to include tattooing for medical purposes rather than strictly cosmetic.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#12

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, November 02, 2018 10:09:19 AM
Last Modified: Friday, November 02, 2018 10:25:12 AM
Time Spent: 00:15:53
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

For non-sworn members working in non-public facing capacities (I cannot speak to other members), the directive seems overly far-reaching, outdated, and invites unnecessary micro-management of appearance. The City HR department's Dress & Appearance section states "A neat and professional appearance is a requirement. General cleanliness and personal hygiene are important in all work environments. It is expected that all employees will exercise good judgment and dress appropriately for their jobs. Different styles will be necessary depending on the degree of customer contact, the nature of the work, work location, and safety issues. Clothing that displays offensive slogans is prohibited." It seems like this description is more than suitable to allow flexibility but cover the variety of differing non-sworn capacities and interaction levels. If people are exercising good hygiene and dressed in an appropriate way for the interaction required that day (comparable to other bureaus' interactions e.g. work from home, primarily solo computer work, IT/manual equipment installations requiring being under desks, sitting in a meeting, meeting with higher level officials, etc.) then that should be suitable without overprescribing specific standards. If the interaction doesn't meet the level required for the day's activity (e.g. wearing jeans to a high-level Commissioners meeting where everyone else is dressed in formal business attire) then the RU manager should bring it up with the employee.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)**Respondent skipped this question**

#13

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, November 02, 2018 10:22:54 AM
Last Modified: Friday, November 02, 2018 10:33:46 AM
Time Spent: 00:10:51
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

This sentence is outdated and should be removed since a person's use of hair dye has no impact on their ability to perform their job:
- "Dyed, tinted or bleached hair must be within a naturally occurring color range and must be professional in appearance. For purposes of this order, naturally occurring color range does not include unique hair colors such as pink, blue, purple or green."

The decision to have specific sworn male and female standards should be revisited to become more aligned with the City's efforts to become more gender neutral. There should not be two separate standards for hair length.

The specific jewelry standards are excessive.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#14

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, November 03, 2018 1:00:45 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, November 03, 2018 1:10:03 AM
Time Spent: 00:09:17
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

This directive would require bureau members to maintain uniforms that haven't been issued for many years. Class B Uniforms have become the standard for training, daily assignments, and dress events. Most of us don't have Class C BDU's, let alone Class A Ike Jackets, Bus Driver Caps, Ties, Trousers, etc. In my opinion the Class B uniforms have sufficed quite well and, since we use the Class A and C uniforms so rarely, the money that might be used to purchase them would be better spent elsewhere.

"Bureau members will:

- a. Sworn members will maintain at least one complete serviceable Class C, Class B and class A uniform."
-

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#15

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, November 03, 2018 11:28:16 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, November 03, 2018 11:33:09 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:53
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Let the officers have groomed beards! I heard CCSO is going to change their rules and allow beards permanently after no shave November this year. PPB should be ahead of that curve bc they are progressive in all areas of law enforcement! This is a moral booster and a recruiting sell point for potential new hires(it's the little things that add up). It costs nothing and is a positive change that would have a lasting impact on moral.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#16

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, November 03, 2018 11:58:50 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, November 03, 2018 12:02:12 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:22
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

I think officers should be allowed to have beards. Most of the surrounding agencies allow officers to have beards. I think beards would make officers more approachable, thus making community engagement easier.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#17

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, November 03, 2018 1:48:19 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, November 03, 2018 1:52:19 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:00
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Beards are not unprofessional and allowing officers to grow them out would tie them with the city more. Portland is known for men having beards and its sill that the police aren't allowed to grow them.

As far as the gas mask policy, that is just unreasonable. How often do officers use the masks outside of protests? If officers were to respond to a situation where a gas mask was necessary, I'm sure there would be bigger issues to worry about.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#18

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, November 03, 2018 2:18:53 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, November 03, 2018 2:20:25 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:31
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

A nicely trimmed and groomed beard is just as professional as a goatee and should be allowed.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#19

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, November 03, 2018 11:04:42 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, November 03, 2018 11:51:13 PM
Time Spent: 00:46:30
IP Address:

Page 1

Directive 1110.00 Feedback

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

I am providing feedback in regards to the section of directive 1110.00 titled "Specific Sworn Male Standards".

I believe that sworn officers should be allowed to wear beards while on duty. In the past, the Portland Police Bureau has allowed beards to be worn by sworn officers. There are numerous agencies throughout the United States that allow their law enforcement professionals to wear beards. There are also several surrounding agencies that allow their members to wear beards. Beards are incredibly popular in the City of Portland and are seen throughout it's population. It is a common belief that police officers should represent the population they serve. While this may seem trivial in regards to other factors such as racial makeup, beards are very important to many citizens in this city and many members of the Portland Police Bureau. The way facial hair is worn (or not worn) by a person can be deeply personal.

The opposing arguments for beards that I have heard include the usage of gas masks, whether or not they appear professional, and an obscure OSHA rule that I have not been able to locate. I believe that there is a happy medium that can be obtained in regards to all of these opposing points.

I can personally attest to donning a gas mask during the recent election protests that took place in the middle of No Shave November. During these protests, I was in the middle of at least two gas deployments and obtained a seal throughout the entirety of these incidents and had no issues whatsoever. I have numerous co-workers who can also attest to first hand experience with this, many of which are members of the Rapid Response Team.

I believe that beards can be worn and remain groomed and professional in nature. My comments on the review of this directive are not aimed to obtain scraggly or absurdly long beards, but well-groomed and neatly trimmed beards that would still adequately portray the professionalism of the Portland Police Bureau.

I have attempted to locate the OSHA rule regarding facial hair and the usage of gas masks but have been unsuccessful. I know that numerous other agencies within the state allow beards to be worn despite this and believe that a reasonable policy change could be adapted to accommodate those who frequently use gas masks in the performance of their duties (such as RRT, SERT, etc...). Something simple along the lines of requiring members who wear beards to have the means to shave readily available would suffice.

Once last point that I would like to bring up may not seem like a priority to some but I believe it to be important. Simple things such as the policy change that I am suggesting can have massive effects in regards to morale among the members of the Portland Police Bureau. It seems these days that everything about our job is constricting around us and this has been having a negative effect Bureau-wide for some time now. It may not mean much to some, but small little victories and changes can mean the world to many.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#20

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, November 04, 2018 2:31:02 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, November 04, 2018 2:32:17 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:15
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

1110.00 Male grooming standards should allow sworn male officers the ability to have a beard.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#21

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, November 06, 2018 4:56:44 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, November 06, 2018 4:58:27 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:42
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Please allow officers to have beards. In a place like Portland this should be allowed.

Also officers should be able to wear thin blue line flags on their uniforms. Officers are killed all the time and this is a way to show solidarity among all law enforcement officers.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#22

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, November 07, 2018 6:14:11 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, November 07, 2018 6:19:30 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:18
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

The guidelines regarding unnatural hair color, more that one piercing in ear lobe, no facial piercings, and no visible tattoos may need to be updated. Some are allowed and apparent on a few PPB personnel currently or historically. Also these sections may need to be more up-to-date according to societal fashion trends in 2018 moving forward.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#23

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, November 08, 2018 5:03:54 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 08, 2018 5:04:39 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:45
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

I would like to address the topic of beards in this policy.

Portland is the bearded city. Beards are accepted in a clean and neat professional appearance within our city. Facial hair and hairstyles are important cultural keystones. We have quite a few women in the bureau who wear cultural hairstyles (braids, dreadlocks, etc) and even the military has recently loosened restrictions on these. I think there is room for improving our relationship with the community through beards. I've worn a beard for several years during No Shave November events. I've never even been questioned about it by a member of the community.

Our Police Bureau is an outlier on this issue within the region. Every agency within the metro that I can think of allows their officers to wear beards. Our current policy is excessively restrictive. We lack internal legitimacy on this issue, which makes it difficult for supervisors to enforce the policy. A policy more in line with the values of the Police Bureau's members would be more procedurally just than the policy as written at present.

The Police Bureau has a significant quantity of officers who have received exemptions to this policy based on religion or discomfort caused by shaving. I have heard discussion by people in the bureau regarding the legitimacy of these notes and criticizing those who seek these exemptions. I can't help but wonder how many people avoid applying for such exemptions because of hearing the negative attitude toward those who apply for exemptions. How many people are living in serious discomfort or compromising their religious beliefs just to avoid a hostile work environment?

The biggest usage of gas masks by bureau members that I know of was by RRT in the days following President Trump's election. That event occurred toward the end of No Shave November and many members of RRT were participating in the event. I have sought out reports from persons present and affected that day. All reports I have heard indicate that gas masks still provided protection from the chemical agents deployed. Furthermore most events with the possibility of a need to use a gas mask are events with enough time for resources to assemble. If members were required to carry equipment to shave to be prepared for such an event I think that would be reasonable.

I think that allowing members to grow well-trimmed beards would be an enormous and immediate boost to morale. I know myself and many of my cohorts would appreciate any consideration you could give to this matter. Thanks for your time.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#24

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, November 11, 2018 8:57:43 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, November 11, 2018 8:59:37 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:53
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

I don't understand why your officers can't grow facial hair. It is a growing trend in Oregon and the Portland area to have beards. Is it too much to ask to allow the officers to have facial hair?

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#25

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, November 16, 2018 7:49:14 AM
Last Modified: Friday, November 16, 2018 7:50:14 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:00
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Allow beards for the members in uniform. Most other local agencies allow them now.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#26

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, November 16, 2018 3:14:31 PM
Last Modified: Friday, November 16, 2018 3:15:05 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:34
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Comments on Appearance Standards (Grooming) Directive, November 2018

To Chief Outlaw, Capt. Bell, Lieutenant Morgan, PPB Policy Analysts, Compliance Officer/Community Liaison Team, Community Oversight Advisory Board staff, US Dept. of Justice, Independent Police Review, Citizen Review Committee and the Portland Police Bureau:

These are comments from Portland Copwatch (PCW) on Directive 1110.00 on "Appearance Standards," which is colloquially known as the grooming policy. The policy appears to not have been changed much since Chief Kroeker instituted strict regulations in the year 2000; the policy can be found at <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/police/article/701811> .

Since this Directive does not yet have the Bureau's modern-day numbering scheme, this is a good opportunity for the Bureau to start instituting the sectional designation changes PCW keeps advocating: a) add letters to the Definitions, Policy, Procedure and other Sections to avoid having multiple areas with the same numbers, and b) return to the Bureau's earlier practice of numbering each Definition.

We do not have many comments on the substance of this Directive. It does seem that most of these guidelines could be moved to a (publicly available) Standard Operating Procedure, as we hope officers would not be severely disciplined for some of the violations under this policy. On the other hand, the rule about not wearing full or partial uniforms off duty is very important and, as we know from the most recent Police Review Board Report,* was invoked within the last year.

The issue of body art and tattoos is important for a few reasons: first, that community standards have changed greatly in the last two decades, and second, to screen out officers engaging in discriminatory associations (gangs, cliques, etc.). In 2000, it was discovered that Multnomah County Deputies involved in beating inmates sported "Brotherhood of the Strong" tattoos. Such markings can be indicative of violence-prone, white-supremacist and other inappropriate police behavior. The section on body art (which of course is not numbered yet) says officers should not "expose any offensive forms of body art while on duty" defining those as "images which are sexually explicit, racially and/or sexually biased or could be viewed as discriminatory in nature." This leads to the important question of why anyone with such body art would be allowed to be an officer in the first place. Perhaps a prohibition on such tattoos should be added, including a requirement that officers inform the Bureau if they have received any new tattoos after being hired.

Much of the Directive's guidelines on clothing and hairstyles have outdated gender-based instructions which do not seem to reflect the state's recognition of gender identities other than male and female. There are likely experts both within and outside the Bureau that can give guidance on this matter.

Just as another point of historical context, this Directive was one flashpoint for Chief Kroeker, as he asked men to cut off their pony tails and shave their beards (so they could put on gas masks). While there is an exemption for religious purposes, again, differentiating hairstyles for men and women is regressive at this point in history. The guidelines about gas masks give us deep concerns since it raises images of the police indiscriminately releasing chemical weapons on protestors; however, recognizing that police sometimes

Directive 1110.00 Feedback

enter hazardous areas not of their own making we are not at this time going to suggest changing those standards. We hope, however, that there is an emphasis on the rare need for gas masks.

Finally, we urge the Bureau to include more situations in which rank and file members do not have to wear full uniforms (including guns and other weapons) as "community engaged policing" is the buzz-phrase of the day. Going to community meetings, hanging out with young students, and other situations where police are supposed to be showing they are "just other community members"*** means they should not come armed to the hilt and looking ready for war.

CONCLUSION

There may be other parts of the Directive which need updating or correcting. These comments are being made in a short timeline as PCW has been busy trying to keep the Chief and Mayor from trying to curtail free speech and assembly in the name of trying to end street brawls.*** Later this month, the Portland Committee on Community Engaged Policing is scheduled to have its first meeting, but they will not yet be reviewing Bureau policies. We hope the PPB continues to reach out to people who may be affected by, or have particular insights into, various rules even after PCCEP begins its true work.

--dan handelman
portland copwatch

*-We note here that PRB reports are required by ordinance to be published twice a year, and only one report has come out in 2018 (in September). There are only about 6 weeks left to release the second report.

**-However, according to the Portland Mercury, only 18% of all officers actually live in Portland (9/27/18).

***-While it is good for the police to give feedback about what rules might be useful to guide their operations, PCW has long warned that when the police write the law, that means we are living in a police state.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

#1

2nd Universal Review: 8/1/19 - 8/31/19

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, August 01, 2019 11:48:45 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, August 01, 2019 11:49:26 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:40
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

2.1.3.2. Sworn members' hair length shall not extend beyond the top edge of their uniform collar while on duty. Sworn members with hair that exceeds collar length shall pull back, pin, or otherwise fasten their hair in such a way so as not to interfere with their uniform or equipment or pose a risk to the member's safety and effectiveness. Ponytails are prohibited.

This section will cause no end of problems with recruiting. We have about 120 openings. We wish to increase the number of women applicants. This will not help. I've heard the argument that hair length and ponytails somehow contribute to safety concerns. The external vest has become common gear and offers as many opportunities for grabbing as any longer hairstyle.

Offer training and advice about self-defense during control tactic class. Reinforce other officer safety techniques including distance and verbal control. Offer suggestions to reduce likelihood that a suspect can get in close to grab any extremity. But please do not impose this misogynistic directive on the bureau.

It has become popular for men and women to grow dreadlocks or to wear their hair in braids. Limiting length as is done here greatly reduces the potential for hiring college athletes (one among many groups). We have a candidate in process now who has dreadlocks slightly longer than this directive allows. He's a good candidate. It is unreasonable to impose such a superficial standard at all, much less at a critical time for hiring.

This section reminds me of times in our profession's history in which height, weight, gender, age, skin color and other superficial and unjust requirements existed. This is absolutely a step backward.

The directive should require clean and neat hair that does not interfere with an officer's professional equipment. That's it. Everything else is a matter of style not substance and takes us away from fulfilling some critical goals with regard to hiring.

This section will also have detrimental impact on morale, which is already very low. Sergeants and other supervisors will become hair police all of a sudden. Toward what end? Referring officers to IA for ponytails and hair length?

Please, please do not proceed as written.

2.2. Facial Hair.

2.2.1. Members shall keep all facial hair clean and neatly trimmed.

2.2.2. Sworn member specifications.

2.2.2.1. Sworn members are permitted to wear mustaches, goatees, and/or beards, with the following conditions:

2.2.2.1.1. Mustaches should follow the natural arch of the mouth and should not exceed the upper border of the lip or extend more than a quarter-inch horizontally beyond the corners of the mouth;

2.2.2.1.2. Goatees should not extend more than a quarter-inch below the bottom of the chin; and

2.2.2.1.3. Beards must be well-kempt and should not extend beyond a half-inch from the face.

Directive 1110.00 Feedback

The emphasis on length is arbitrary. Once again, this will hurt, not help, morale and recruiting. Beards in particular have become quite popular regionally. We are told to "mirror the community we serve." This does not help us achieve that goal.

There were times when superficial criteria such as skin color or height kept people from working here, now its hair.

This directive should not specify length. Neat and clean. Neat and clean and which does not interfere with equipment.

This section is another giant step backward at a time we can ill afford giant steps backward.

Please remove all mention of hair length from this directive. Allow reasonableness a chance to flourish in the place of superficiality.

2.4. Sworn members in plainclothes or undercover assignments shall be excused from conforming to the grooming standards set forth in this directive.

This section will engender a bit of class warfare among the troops. As I read this detectives/DVD/Personnel/Family Services may do what they wish. Sorry, but again this seems quite arbitrary. Good for them, bad for the rest including applicants.

Please reconsider these portions of the directive.

Dress Standards.

3.1. All members shall wear professional attire that is appropriate for a work environment.

Vague.

4.2. Sworn member specifications while on duty.

4.2.1. Sworn members working in a patrol capacity/field operations in a uniform capacity shall not wear more than one ring total.

Arbitrary.

4.2.2 Sworn members may wear one watch, bracelet, and a necklace that is not visible.

Arbitrary.

5.1.1. Members are prohibited from having tattoos on their hands with the exception of a single finger tattoo. The size of the tattoo may not exceed the length of the space between the member's lowest knuckle and hand.

A single finger. Second finger tattoo of same size need not apply. This doesn't make sense. Please let us apply reasonableness to this. Hand is not the face, where it does stand to reason that we set clear guidelines. We can have sleeves of tattoos but no gloves. Sorry, seems arbitrary.

6. Court Appearance.

6.1. Members shall adhere to the court appearance standard established by the attorney on the case.

Which attorney? Prosecution or defense? Please, let's set our own reasonable guidelines. Define professional attire somewhere in the directive. Define court attire somewhere in the directive.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Pashley

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 02, 2019 11:22:24 PM
Last Modified: Friday, August 02, 2019 11:35:00 PM
Time Spent: 00:12:35
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

As a female who has been in the military for six active years and a police officer for almost 22 years, I don't agree with the no pony tail policy. Putting my hair up for all those years in the Marine Corps did nothing but damage my hair. Having a bun on the tip top of the head is more ridiculous looking than a simple pony tail. It makes it literally impossible to wear a baseball hat. So now we're either cutting our hair short, not wearing hats or damaging our hair everyday. Allowing the men to grow beards and all the facial hair is more unprofessional than a pony tail. I can wear my gas mask with a pony tail, not a bun. Hair in a bun is coming out or the pins are falling out. So we're going backwards on women's appearances to the 50's but letting the men go scruff. Restricting us way more and giving them way more. Having a ponytail is way more comfortable to me than a bun. Not everyone knows how to properly put their hair up in a bun. A ponytail does not interfere with my gas mask or baseball hat. A bun does. I completely disagree with the ponytail restriction.

Also, why only one ring total. Maybe one ring per hand, so two total. Thanks!

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, August 03, 2019 8:52:17 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, August 03, 2019 9:11:42 PM
Time Spent: 00:19:24
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

The part of the directive that prohibits ponytails is unrealistic, unsafe and unprofessional. For women that have long hair, to constantly have hair in a tight bun can cause headaches and even migraines. Also, in situations where the officer has to wear the helmet (such as in protests or high risk calls) it is absolutely impossible to wear hair in a bun with the helmet. Furthermore, if someone grabs a tight bun, they have more control over the officer's head, putting the officer at risk of harm even more so than if they grab the end of a ponytail. In this scenario, it is easier to get out of a hold when the hair is loose in a ponytail than when it is in a bun. As someone who has been previously trained on how to get out of holds on my hair, I know that I am at a far greater risk of harm when my hair is tight and close to my head than when it is loose and there is room for me to maneuver my head in a way that releases the other person's hold on my hair. It will strongly increase the risk of harm to the officer in this situation to have their hair in a bun. Thirdly, wearing hair in a messy bun that constantly falls out (for those with longer hair) looks way more unprofessional than a neat ponytail.

I personally think that prohibiting ponytails is not just a question of looks or comfort. There are serious risks that come with expecting members to wear their hair in a tight bun; risks of both safety and personal harm (headaches/migraines). Also, it penalizes women while giving men more freedom with their grooming. Men are now allowed to have facial hair while women have to change their grooming habits and have the directive dictate how they must style their hair, ignoring their autonomy to make sound and safe decisions for themselves based on what works best for each woman.

I really hope this directive is reconsidered and changed.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, August 04, 2019 10:59:06 PM
Last Modified: Sunday, August 04, 2019 11:56:28 PM
Time Spent: 00:57:22
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Hello, This is in regards to the Grooming Standard Policy

I read that recently there was a change to the grooming standards saying "no pony tails." I would need a "pony tail" to be defined. I have chronic migraines and have been on daily medication for such for years now. I rarely wear my hair up on my days off and when I am working I tend to either wear a loose pony tail or I braid my hair to eliminate the tightness on my scalp. I have medium length hair and found that pony tails and braids tend to reduce the tension on my head; therefore declining the possibility of getting a migraine. When I do get a migraine, I have a hard time driving, seeing and hearing which takes me completely off the road and working. I feel that if I start wearing a bun on a regular basis, that will start inducing my migraines again and take me off the road. We are already so shorthanded and it will only hurt our shift more when we can prevent this. If I get a migraine, I am a liability to stay at work and will have to leave every single time. I have had one in the past where I couldn't even drive home and received approval for another officer to drop me off at home to avoid calling a cab.

Another issue that I see in the future is in regards to our uniform gear with fitting conflicts. When I do wear a pony tail or braids, I am able to put on my Bureau issued helmet in case of an emergency quickly and securely. If I were to be wearing a bun, I would have to take out the bun to get my helmet on due to my hair being so thick. If I do not get on my helmet in time and am having to do these extra tasks, I find it may be a liability in the future for the Bureau. Especially if I were hit with an object etc. while trying to take out my bun instead of just throwing the helmet over my pony tail/braids in a quick manner. At training, I've trained wearing a pony tail and braids and this is what I know in regards to habit during a situation.

One may say that a pony tail is easier to pull. I would say yes it is easy to pull but if the perp is going to pull something on an officer, it's going to be anything they can find quickly. A bun could give them more leverage to grasp their fingers around and pull in regards to controlling the officer's head. If someone were to pull my pony tail or braid, I could still move my head and manipulate out of it. A bun is close knit to your scalp and is a more solid handle to pull. I would rather someone pull my braid or pony tail any day rather than a bun. I did hear of a recent incident at EA where a female's officer bun was pulled during a physical altercation.

There have been studies done on women's hair styles in the work place online reflecting professionalism. Some state "A ponytail is perfectly professional, although a low ponytail general reads more professional than a high one. You can also experiment with buns, clips and braids." A low one would not fit for law enforcement because it would make the pony hang much lower than the collar line.

In Portland, we are considered unique, diverse and always looking for ways to change and adapt to the ever changing city. As a Bureau and leader to law enforcements everywhere, we should be promoting individualism. The new policy includes beards, face and possibly neck tattoos but takes away the individualism of a predominant female hairstyle? I for see that this will cause a negative moral reaction especially in females within the agency. There isn't a high number of females all together in law enforcement, and to restrict them more just because some may think "buns" look more professional shouldn't be a strong enough reason to change it all together. Just because gender phrases and titles were taken out of the policy doesn't mean there is an implied gender in regards to the new grooming standards. If I, as female now want to grow a beard, would the Bureau support this or would I be denied because it's out of the "norm"? If an identified male gender wanted to grow out their hair to have a bun or pony would the Bureau support this? What happens when this

Directive 1110.00 Feedback

becomes a cultural issue and someone has long hair for religious value. We were told that there would be "exceptions." But are there going to be all these "exceptions" for multiple people to the point that the majority are just wearing a pony tail like they are now? Will the uproot of this issue worth what may come as a huge conflict with employees in the future?

When looking at some of the surrounding areas to Portland and their policies, this is what I found:

1. Washington County: "if hair length extends below the bottom of the collar and interferes with the daily work or presents a safety issue, it must be pulled back away from the face, such as in a braid or ponytail, tied with bands and neutral in color.
2. Multnomah County: Pulled back away from your face, must not present a safety issue, can be in a braid, pony tail or bun as long as it doesn't hang lower than collar line.
3. Beaverton: Female sworn hair must not extend below the lower edge of the uniform collar.
4. Tigard: Female uniformed personnel may have longer hair, as long as it's secured tightly and neat and meets the general professional standards.

When talking with some Officers from other neighboring agencies about this issue, the majority were the same. Hair styles were to be pulled back, neatly done and not extend the collar line or effect the safety of the officer. There is not been a large amount of documented incidents where officer's hair have been a safety hazard. In fact, when talking with other agencies, only 2 incidents I was told about came up and those female officers had hair extending almost to their waist line and they worked inside the jail, not on patrol.

In conclusion,

I do believe that this policy of the ponytail should be re-considered. There are so many other pressing issues that are more important to push rather than this one. I hope these comments are considered. Thank you.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#5

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, August 07, 2019 6:56:39 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, August 07, 2019 7:21:36 PM
Time Spent: 00:24:57
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

This largest issue seen with this update to directive 1110.0 is the new restriction on how members, predominately female members, are allowed to wear their hair. The sentence "ponytails are prohibited" seems to have been added in as an afterthought.

I see several issues with the restriction of the pony tail. One of the larges reasons begin it appears as though grooming standards were loosened significantly for men and are now more restrictive for women. Men are now allowed to grow beards and have longer hair if they want, however, this policy makes the allowed hair style for women pretty much restricted to a bun or having a short hair cut.

After speaking with hair industry professionals U gave learned the tighter, more pulled back bun is not a healthy option. It can actually be damaging causing breakage. Hair pulled back as such can be damaging to the scalp and be cause for headaches and migraines.

I also do not see the ponytail as a safety concern for the risk of it being grabbed. A bun is just as vulnerable to be grabbed and lets face it, if someone is going to pull hair, they are going to try to pull hair. Ponytail or no ponytail.

Officers who have to wear helmets and who have long hair also do not have much other choice than to wear a low pony tail A helmet wil not fit properly with hair worn higher. A bun will cause the back of the helmet to be pushed up, also causing an ill fitting helmet which is a significant safety issue. Officers should not have to worry about their hair style having an effect on how their safety equipment fits. And having to restyle hair every time a helmet is taken off and put back on is not practical.

The ponytail is still a professional looking hair style. It keeps hair out of officers' face and typically off of the back of the neck, keeping one cooler in hot weather. It is also an athletic hair style, which is also appropriate considering the physically demanding job that we perform day in and day out.

The type of ponytail is not defined in this directive. There is no real given reason for the ban of the ponytail that I see. If we want our officers to look like our community, then this is a giant step in the wrong direction. Restricting the hair styles worn mainly by women is going to make officers appear more militaristic, and from what I understand, that is the direction in appearance that management and the community has wanted us to go away from.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, August 10, 2019 7:26:14 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, August 10, 2019 7:30:19 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:05
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

I strongly believe that the ponytail prohibition should be removed. Ponytails do not pose any more of a safety hazard than external vests or anything else that a subject could grab onto. Wearing your hair in a bun forces your head forward against the headrest and is extremely uncomfortable and likely to cause damage over time. It also makes the gas mask and ballistic helmet difficult or impossible to put on without adjusting or taking out the bun. Buns are also militaristic, a quality the community has repeatedly expressed distaste for. As community police officers, ponytails allow us to reflect the community we represent and have a more accessible image. This new prohibition seems archaic and sexist. If ponytails do not interfere with one's job function then they should not be banned, particularly with the relaxation of men's grooming standards. The partially grown beards/stubble look unprofessional and sloppy.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, August 11, 2019 12:47:13 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, August 11, 2019 12:52:19 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:05
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

I feel this directive is unnecessarily restrictive for female officers. Wearing hair in a ponytail fashion does not hinder our ability to work safely. Other hairstyles (such as a bun) or even the issued uniforms and vests can be used against officers in a fight; this is not exclusive to ponytails. I feel that women should have the freedom to choose their professional hairstyles.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Respondent skipped this question

#8

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, August 12, 2019 2:58:27 AM
Last Modified: Monday, August 12, 2019 3:08:40 AM
Time Spent: 00:10:13
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

While there are some revisions to the directive that I feel are beneficial and appropriate, I feel that there are others that are unnecessary. Specifically, I do not feel that there should/ needs to be a restriction on ponytails for female officers. I am unaware of any local examples where a ponytail has created a safety issue of been a factor in a female officer being assaulted. In addition, if we as an agency are going for a professional appearance I feel that a ponytail looks far more professional than a bun or any other hair style where a female is attempting to place her hair up. In the event that a female needs to don a helmet or a gas mask they are still going to have to change their hair style in the moment to accommodate the special equipment. And lastly, if for no other reason, the ability to wear a ponytail for many females, specifically for those that work the street, is simply a morale boost which tells them that they are heard and that their opinion matters.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name
Email Address
Phone Number

#9

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 30, 2019 1:03:44 PM
Last Modified: Friday, August 30, 2019 1:04:19 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:34
IP Address:

Page 1

Q1 Please provide feedback for this directive

Comments on Personal Appearance Standards (Grooming) Directive, August 2019

To Chief Outlaw, Capt. Parman, Lieutenant Morgan, PPB Policy Analysts, Compliance Officer/Community Liaison Team, Community Oversight Advisory Board staff, US Dept. of Justice, Independent Police Review, Citizen Review Committee and the Portland Police Bureau:

Below are comments from Portland Copwatch (PCW) on Directive 1110.00 on "Personal Appearance Standards," which we still refer to as the grooming policy. It is the only Directive due for comments by August 31 and can be found at <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/police/article/738542> . The policy has been revised dramatically-- and has in some ways been made arbitrarily more restrictive.

As usual, we request that the Bureau assign lettering or other identifiers to the Definitions, Policy and Procedure sections for clarity. Since the Bureau is not taking the opportunity to do so, even though we pointed out this policy is being converted from the old numbering system, know that our comments apply to the Procedure section unless otherwise noted.

First we will thank the Bureau for following PCW's comments made in November 2018 to get rid of different standards based on people's gender.

That said, we find many troubling aspects and discover that we appear to be in agreement with many officers who wrote in with comments.

For example, the officers asked the Bureau to relax its prohibition on beards. While the Directive does allow people to grow beards with some restrictions, it requires officers to keep shaving equipment handy in case they need to shave before using a gas mask for crowd control (Section 2.2.2). Several officers wrote in saying they had put on gas masks at protest actions and not had any issues with chemicals affecting them.

This discussion raises a rather large concern on our part regarding the deployment of chemical weapons at civilians, which constitutes collective punishment (not allowed under international law) and raises the question of why police confiscate community members' gas masks when they seek to protect themselves from state-sponsored attacks. On the other hand, as we previously noted, sometimes officers go into situations where they are not the ones who create a caustic chemical atmosphere and were not recommending a change. Since officers seem to feel the masks work with beards, why won't management?

The officers also seem to think that surrounding agencies who allow beards are doing better at recruiting officers, since beards are rather ubiquitous in the Portland area.

Officers also objected to the old policy restricting them to wearing a maximum of two rings. Rather than lifting that restriction, the new policy says they can only wear one ring (Section 4.2). Unless the PPB allows officers who wear multiple rings to punch civilians using

Directive 1110.00 Feedback

those fingers, we do not understand why this would be an issue. Perhaps they can be ordered not to have sharp edges protruding on the outside of their hands.*-1 The restriction is particularly odd since many people in this country who are married wear two rings.

Officers also recalled the protests against forced cutting of pony tails from the early 2000s and asked for that hairstyle to be blessed in the new Directive. Instead, pony tails are again being expressly forbidden (Section 2.1.3.2), but confusingly also says long hair has to be pulled back, pinned or otherwise fastened to not interfere with equipment or safety (Section 2.1.3.1).

Lost in the discussion on both hair length and beards is the fact that some religious traditions-- including the spiritual guidance in some Native American cultures and branches of Islam and Judaism-- direct people to wear long hair and/or beards. While the Bureau says exceptions can be made, officer comments make applying for such an exception sound like an arduous task.

One other change that seems to be a step backward, not mentioned by officers, is that tattoos were previously banned from being "sexually explicit" but now allows the Bureau to decide if they are "obscene" (Section 5.2). Rather than rely on the old court chestnut of "I'll know it when I see it," the Bureau should have more specific rules such as the previous version's ban on body art that is "sexually explicit, racially and/or sexually biased," the latter part of which now allows the Bureau to determine if the artwork is "offensive or biased toward a legally-protected class, or otherwise discriminatory in nature." Since, for instance, houseless persons are not a legally protected class, the language should simply prohibit bias against (not toward, really) anyone.

The Bureau did not add, as we suggested, a ban on tattoos identifying a gang or clique within the ranks, which can lead to anti-civilian discrimination and force as happened in the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office in 2000 ("Brotherhood of the Strong"). We suggested a requirement that officers inform the Bureau if they have received any new tattoos after being hired.

We close with the same thought we used to end our November comments: "the Bureau [should] include more situations in which rank and file members do not have to wear full uniforms (including guns and other weapons) as 'community engaged policing' is the buzzphrase of the day. Going to community meetings, hanging out with young students, and other situations where police are supposed to be showing they are 'just other community members' means they should not come armed to the hilt and looking ready for war."*-2

CONCLUSION

When Portland Copwatch found itself in the position of agreeing with many of the rank and file officers in this particular Directive, it occurred to us that members of the Bureau may feel the same disrespect at having their concerns ignored as we do here in the community. We continue to encourage the Bureau to hold public meetings to discuss these policies, preferably in a safe space where officers and civilians can dialogue with one another to better understand the stated reasons for certain guidelines and work out whether there would in fact be any long term harm in making changes suggested during this process. We also believe leaving a longer time for Directives review would allow the community to have such discussions in public meetings with advisory bodies like the Portland Committee for Community Engaged Policing, which rarely has adequate time to make formal comments on PPB policies.

portland copwatch

*-1 The email version of these comments inadvertently left out this sentence: "Of course, another solution is to prohibit officers from punching people."

*-2-Here, we pointed out that about 82% of officers do not actually live in Portland.

Q2 Contact Information (optional)

Name

Email Address
