



CITIZEN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

Community Oversight of Portland Police Bureau

City of Portland / City Auditor
Independent Police Review (IPR)
Citizen Review Committee (CRC)

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, June 5, 2019 (meetings are typically held the first Wednesday of each month)

Time: 5:00 pm * *Please Note: agenda times are approximate*

Location: **Lovejoy Room, Portland City Hall**. 1221 SW 4th Ave. Portland, OR 97204

Present: Kristin Malone, Julie Falk, Hillary Houck, Daniel Schwartz, Amanda Lamb, Irene Konev, Dan Handelman, Debbie Aiona, Regina Hannon, Phillip Wolfe,

On the phone: Neil Simon

AGENDA

5:30 pm—5:35 pm Introductions and Welcome (CRC Chair Kristin Malone)
(Approval of April 3, 2019 meeting minutes)

5:35 pm – 5:40 pm Director's Report (IPR Interim Director Amanda Lamb)

- Interim Director Amanda Lamb provided a summary of her background. She started her career as a performance auditor and did criminal research at the county. She started her career with the City Auditor's Office as an Analyst with IPR and then she was appointed as a Chief Deputy Auditor. With the departure of Director Severe and 2 Assistant Directors, she was appointed as an interim IPR Director.
- DOJ is in town for meetings. IPR, PPB, and DOJ had a discussion on what driving the overages of 180 days timeline.
- Chair Malone asked Interim Director Lamb to go over some of the drivers that caused the cases to go over 180 days.
 - We've pulled cases that went over 180 days and look at the data point on figure out which stage they went over in. Once we figured out the stage, we looked into what is driving that stage's overage.
 - The strategy we are using to address the drivers that we have control is making sure people are assigned a certain number of cases.
- IPR Director search:
 - Before launching the recruitment, the Auditor's Officer tried to engage internal and external candidates as much as possible to help build a job profile.
 - The interview process is currently ongoing and there will be 2 rounds of interviews. There will be 3 interview panels:
 - IPR staff panel
 - Police Bureau and Mayor's staff
 - Community member panel: PCCEP, CRC and a past IPR complainant.
- Chair Malone asked Interim Director Lamb how IPR is managing the workloads?
 - I am fully in the role as an IPR Director and reviewing cases. The Auditor also appointed the City Ombudsman, and the General Counsel as Acting Assistant Directors to help review cases.
- Ms. Falk asked Interim Director Lamb who from the CRC did she meet with regarding to the IPR Director's recruitment?
 - It was Chair Malone

5:40 pm – 5:45 pm Chair's Report (CRC Chair Kristin Malone)

1) Discussion of IPR annual report

- The purpose of the annual report is to highlight what IPR did last year. It is not intended to talk about the criminal justice system as a whole or what PPB did. It is also intended to be more approachable to the general public and can be easily digested.
- The online dashboard on IPR website is where the public can drill down into the data and answer specific questions that they might have.
- One highlights from this year is that IPR received more complaints from community and bureau members. There were also 7 use of deadly force incidents.
- There were couple changes to the accountability system:
 - Supervisory Investigation: This is where officers allegedly committing a minor rule violation. This started July of 2018 so there's not enough data to say what the results were. This will change at the next annual report
 - IPR and IA investigators are now being able to recommend findings which goes to the officer's supervisor for review.
 - Internally IPR was able to hire an additional staff and continuing with the outreach effort.
- Regarding to the increase in community member complaint, IPR staff did some digging and found that the Bureau's generated complaints came from smaller units that have not typically file complaints in the past.
- IPR is looking into strategies to obtain complainant demographics since people don't provide that data. Currently about 35% of the complainants don't provide demographic data.
- Chair Malone made a comment it has been several years since the CRC hears an appeal from an African American complainant.
- Interim Director Lamb made a comment in the online allegation dashboard, people can drill down by complainant demographic to see what kind of allegations different communities tend to complain.
- Mr. Schwartz asked Interim Director Lamb to provide more clarification on page 10 of the annual report, community members filed complaints against 376 officers, just over half of those 376 were named in one complaint
 - The first half of officers had one complaint against them, the other half had more than one complaint. I also want to point it out that on tab 5 of the online allegation dashboard, you can look at the closure rate by allegation type.
- The most common allegations were procedure and conduct. There has been a decrease in use of force allegations in the past 2 years. There's a lot of stability in disparate treatment.
- IPR completed 25 independent investigations in 2018 most of them related to disparate treatment.
- IPR referred about 20% community cases to Internal Affairs for review. They also opened cases themselves and opened a total of 133 community member complaints. They investigated 68% of those complaints and sent another 22% of cases to Service Improvement Opportunity (SIO).

- For Bureau initiated cases there were 77 complaints. 65 of those were investigated 55 by IA and the rest by IPR. 49% of those allegations were sustained
- Mr. Schwartz asked Interim Director Lamb if the B cases were all officers?
 - We don't differentiate between sworn and non-sworn employees.
- For CRC appeals, the current version incorrectly referenced a case twice and also did not mention a case. IPR will make the corrections.
- Out 39 officers with sustained allegations, 20 officers received command counseling, one was terminated.
- Ms. Falk, Chair Malone, and Mr. Schwartz asked Interim Director Lamb if she had any idea on why the CRC have not receive any appeals lately?
 - I don't have any information on that right now. I will have to look into this.
- Ms. Aiona made a comment IPR used to do a satisfaction survey. She would like IPR to put more efforts into gathering feedbacks from the people who use the system
- Chair Malone made a suggestion to Interim Director Lamb that IPR should think about different ways to connect with people who are using the system aside from just mailing out letters. IPR investigator could give people a call to make sure they've received the correspondence.
 - This is something that IPR had included in our strategic plan. We would like to do a better job on communicating with the people who use our system.
- Mr. Wolfe made a comment he is wondering why both community and bureau-initiated complaints are increasing?
 - With respect to the community-initiated complaints it increased from 396 to 415. That is not a substantial increase while Bureau initiated complaints doubled. This is why our analysts dived down on the Bureau initiated cases found that we are getting complaints from units that don't typically file complaints.
- Mr. Handelman made several comments:
 - This is the second year in a row that IPR had made mistake on the number of appeals.
 - He is wondering if IPR and CRC are willing to support the idea of printing out the data table instead of constantly update the online interactive dashboard. Two years ago, IPR published the data table as an appendix.
- Mr. Schwartz asked Interim Director Lamb if he goes on the dashboard and limit the data to 2018, will it matches the data in the annual report?
 - They are mostly match. We use the online dashboard as an opportunity to improve the quality of our data. When we find mistakes on the data, we update it on the dashboard. We update the dashboard quarterly.
- Mr. Schwartz asked Mr. Handelman if he would rather have the data constantly being updated?
 - No because it is very confusing since it doesn't match the report since the dashboard is being updated. It would be better to have a snapshot of the data at the time the report was written.

- Chair Malone made a comment the snapshot is only useful to catch IPR mistake since it is more accurate when the data is constantly being updated. People also would more likely to access the dashboard online.
- Mr. Handelman asked Interim Director Lamb if there's a reason that IPR does not want to publish the data tables? Is IPR going to present the report to Council?
 - The primary reason IPR is not doing that is because of workload. It is labor-intensive to put together all the tables that go into the report and publish it as a separate document. It is important to understand the difference between static document and dynamic data dashboard. The static document serves as a snapshot in time. Every snapshot report will contain some things that you wish you can go back and correct.
 - Regarding to the question about whether IPR is going to present the report to Council, we do not intend to present the report to Council. If they have questions or would like us to present the report, they can ask us.
- Mr. Simon asked Interim Director Lamb how many candidates have the Auditor's Office received for the Director position and whether the DOJ settlement agreement had any impact on the recruitment process?
 - We had more than 60 candidates who applied for the position. We are interviewing less than 10 candidates and hoping to 3-5 candidates going to the second round. Regarding to the question about the DOJ, no one contacting us and say we are not applying because of the DOJ settlement agreement.
- Mr. Schwartz asked Interim Director Lamb if the Auditor's Office is hiring the Assistant Director positions as well?
 - We are not right now. We want the Director to be able to hire the assistant directors.
- Chair Malone asked Interim Director Lamb if there's any analysis that been how the City is unable to recruit officers
 - It would be a pretty robust analysis to try and tie a particular contact to a complaints because people can complain about interactions with an officer that weren't contacts like when people complained about an officer parking in a wrong spot for example. We did do complaints per officer and we had it broken down on page 9 of the report. We broke it down by precinct. In the dashboard we can also look at complaints per officer.
- Mr. Schwartz asked Captain Bacigalupi if there are less police officers this year than last year?
 - I don't know the answer to that. We are currently down about 125-130 officers. The other thing that I don't know is whether the documented citizen contacts fell last year. Sometime even with less officers, that number doesn't necessarily go down. I can try and find out and get back to you.
- Mr. Schwartz made a comment it seems like the number an officer's working hours are changing based on the number of available officers so it might be a good idea to look into that data.
- Interim Director Lamb made a comment she had spent a great amount of time looking at the data to try and figure out the best comparators. IPR also have to request for the data from the Bureau. Regarding to the CRC appeals number that Mr. Handelman pointed out, IPR sees it as a weakness in the current data collection practices. IPR is working on getting a better data system to keep track of all CRC and PRB meeting decisions.

- 6:00 pm—6:20 pm Workgroup updates: Please provide the following information —
- 1) Brief summary of the goals and objectives of your workgroup
 - 2) Date of last meeting
 - 3) Brief summary of the work done at your last meeting
 - 4) Next scheduled meeting
 - 5) Main topic to be discussed/addressed at the next meeting
 - 6) Any assistance from IPR or CRC needed to achieve your goals

ACTIVE WORKGROUPS

1. Outreach Workgroup (5 min.)

MISSION STATEMENT: The Outreach Workgroup engages the community to raise awareness about the Citizen Review Committee (CRC), gather concerns about police services and accountability, and identify issues for the CRC to address. Following up with appellants and others community requests will supplement current work group tasks. Additionally, outreach committee members will serve as point for ongoing communications with IPR, the City, the Bureau, community members and/or act as the face of CRC.

Chair: Neil Simon / Members: Vadim Mozyrsky

IPR staff: Irene Konev, Community Outreach Coordinator

2. Recurring Audit (5 min.)

MISSION STATEMENT: The Recurring Audit Workgroup seeks to improve accountability of IPR and the Portland Police Bureau by reviewing closed cases to ensure procedures, policies and protocols are followed and will recommend improvements, if necessary.

Chair: Daniel Schwartz / Members: Hilary Houck, and Jihane Nami

3. Crowd Control Workgroup (5 min.)

MISSION STATEMENT: The Crowd Control Workgroup examines existing crowd control policies, training, and tactics of the Portland Police Bureau, reviews crowd control best practices, legal standards and other information, and makes appropriate recommendations.

Chair: Candace Avalos /Members: Andrea Chiller, and Kayla Wade

4. Use of Force Workgroup (5 min.)

MISSION STATEMENT: The Use of Force Workgroup examines Portland Police Bureau use of deadly force policies, directives, training and implementation in order to recommend and support any needed change in Portland Police Bureau use of force.

Chair: Kristin Malone / Members: Kayla Wade

6:20 pm —6:45 pm Public comment and wrap-up comments by CRC members

6:45 pm [Adjournment](#)

To better serve you, a request for an interpreter or assisted listening device for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made three (3) days prior to the meeting—please call the IPR main line 823-0146 (or TYY 503-823-6868).

Visit the website for more information regarding the Independent Police Review division, Citizen Review Committee, protocols, CRC meeting schedules, and approved minutes: www.portlandoregon.gov/ipr.

CRC Members:

- 1. If you know you will not be able to attend a CRC meeting or that you will be missing a significant amount of a meeting, please call or e-mail IPR in advance so that the CRC Chair may be made aware of your expected absence.*
- 2. After this meeting, please return your folder so IPR staff can use it for document distribution at the next CRC meeting.*

**Note: agenda item(s) as well as the meeting date, time, or location may be subject to change.*