



The Portland Committee on Community Engaged Policing (PCCEP)

September 22, 2020 Full Board Meeting Transcript

Marcia Perez:

Hey, good evening everyone. Marcia Perez. I'm the chair of the racial equity subcommittee.

Elliot:

Yolanda.

Yolonda Salguiero:

Hi, good evening. I'm Yolonda Salguiero. I'm co-chair of the youth subcommittee.

Elliot:

Britt.

Britt:

Good evening everyone. I am a co-chair with Yolonda of the subcommittee.

Participant 1:

We're saying, I was like, "Did that, did that, did that."

Participant 2:

Did you find it?

Elliot:

And Amy.

Amy Anderson:

Hi, I'm Amy Anderson with the chair of the behavioral house subcommittee. Welcome everyone.

Elliot:

And I think that's it besides Lakayana. Unless I'm missing someone, so I'll turn it over to Lakayana and then maybe Theo-

Trebbie:

[crosstalk 00:10:45].



Elliot:

... and Claudia and [inaudible 00:10:44] can introduce themselves. But Lakayana.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah, Lakayana, coach here of PCCEP. Theo and Claudia, any announcements or introductions.

Theo Latta:

My name's Theo Latta. I'm a PCCEP staff member. Thank you all for coming. Just a couple of housekeeping things, when you are not speaking, please press mute on your microphone if possible. Also press the video off so we can focus on the PCCEP members, so they have the screen, and if you have any questions, please direct them to me and Claudia and Judith, if you have comments that you would like read aloud... Says I'm really quiet. I also have a quiet voice. I apologize. Can you all hear me? I'll try to speak up a little bit more. Okay. If you have questions for the PCCEP members, please-

Tracey:

[inaudible 00:11:44].

Theo Latta:

... either myself, Theo Latta, Claudia Claudio, or Judith Mowry. And if you'd like us to read one, then we can read them to the PCCEP members, but we're going to try to keep the questions out of the chat box so that the PCCEP members can focus on the conversation, and there'll be ample time for public comments. If you need to have a comment or have a question, but the point is, I guess I'm trying to make is, we're going to try to leave the chat box for just emergency situations or something like that, we're not going to ask questions in the chat box. So Claudia, go ahead.

Claudia Claudio:

Hi Theo. Sorry, can you please let me know what you'd like me to do? My computer was acting a little funny with the sound, so I had to restart it, so I'm actually on my phone right now.

Theo Latta:

Understood. We're just introducing ourselves, myself, you, and then next will be Judith.

Claudia Claudio:

Okay. Hi everyone, my name is Claudia. Hi. My name is Claudia Claudio, and I am the PCCEP assistant for PCCEP, sorry I'm a little discombobulated right now, my computer is messing up a little bit, so I'm trying to get it fixed, but I am talking from my phone, but hi everyone, and welcome to the PCCEP September full board meeting.

Judith Mowry:

Hi everybody. My name is Judith, and Judith Mallory, and I work for the office of equity and human rights, and I spend part of my time supporting the PCCEP as a part of the staff with Theo and Claudia.



Participant 3:

And I noticed Vadim is here. Vadim?

Vadim Mozyrsky:

Hi everybody. Vadim Mozyrsky. PCCEP member. Thank you all for coming.

Lakayana Drury:

Cool. That's back to me. Welcome to the September PCCEP meeting. Really excited to have everybody here. We're starting early because we have such an agenda, there is a lot of things on the table that we wanted to get covered this meeting, so we're going to be going from five to eight, which is closer to it, it's the three hours that we usually would have when we're in person, and I just think it speaks to the work that the committee's been doing, and really wanting to make sure that a lot of time-sensitive things got discussed.

Lakayana Drury:

As such, we are not going to do subcommittee reports other than the Steering Committee and the Portland Police Bureau will have an opportunity to report back as well, so I'll just get right into those. As far as the Steering Committee, we've been doing a number of things since August.

Lakayana Drury:

At our meeting last week, we talked about codification. We talked about our PCCEP retreat, which I can briefly, we also talked about having more in-depth updates from the Portland police Bureau on recommendations that we had passed. There was still, we were wanting to see updates, not only on recommendations that were passed, but also ones that were along in the process, and updates on what that was looking like, and so we'll be getting an update from the Bureau on that.

Lakayana Drury:

PCCEP also had a number of closed-door meetings, a couple of them, one being our PCCEP retreat which is quarterly, and discussed our codification process which we will go through tonight, and also just general wellbeing of the committee. It was a really good session, and then last Monday, we met with the mayor, and that also was a closed-door session so that we can have time to discuss the codification process, the ongoing protests, and some other initiatives that PCCEP was working on, and that's an important time for us, I know that there were some comments on making that public, but we fail to be able to have a more candid conversation that once in a while, we do have to have those closed-door meetings.

Lakayana Drury:

So those were what we did. We also met, Steering Committee met with the Training Advisory Council. I want to say it's "Council," and the Citizen Review Committee. We met with them on Monday and some staff from the mayor's office, and we will be meeting again tomorrow, and those are part of PCCEP's effort to have more communication around initiatives that we're doing, and have more coordination between the oversight and advisory bodies that exist within the city, and we're very happy with how the



mayor's office has engaged with us on that process, PPB has engaged with us on that process, and that's it from the Steering Committee. Elliot, I don't know if there's anything else you want to add to that.

Elliot:

Just that, coming up on next week on the 29th, PCCEP will be hosting a budget office summit about the bump, the fall bump when budgets get re-allocated, and that will be an opportunity to respond to Ann Brayfield's question about what's happening with Portland's street response, and the police budget, and I don't know, but I'm interested in finding out, so I would encourage you to come to that meeting next week. We're also going to be posting on our website, information without the budget, so you could come into that meeting prepared. All of the city council members will be at that meeting. We want to hear from the public, but it's also an opportunity for them to respond directly to your questions about the police budget, so we hope to see you there next week.

Lakayana Drury:

Cool. Thank you Elliot for that. Next, we're going to turn it over to the Portland Police Bureau, to give their update. I'm forgetting his rank, but Mr. From will be giving that update, apologies for that. PPB, you are up.

Mike Frome:

Hey everybody, Mike Frome, I'm the assistant chief for services branch, so Mr. Drury, you're going to have to clue me in what report I'm supposed to be giving, because I was told to attend and be prepared to speak in general terms about what the Bureau was doing. It sounds like we were given homework before that was not related to me.

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. So yes, we can have updates on that to, and we also wanted updates, maybe this is Mary Claire on this part then, our recommendations and any updates on them. If you want to speak, go first, Chief, to just updates on the Bureau and things that's going on, and then we can hear from Mary Claire on any PCCEP-related updates on recommendations.

Mike Frome:

I'm happy to just speak in general terms right now. I mean, the Police Bureau at the moment, for the last two weeks is primarily concerned with preparing for some large public events that are going to be held on Saturday. We've got a Proud Boy gathering, apparently in Delta Park, and then probably a counter-protest gathering somewhere in North Portland, most likely Peninsula Park, so a lot of our planning time is going into trying to figure out a safety plan for the city for that.

Mike Frome:

And then second, closer to what I do, because I'm on the services side of things, we are also preparing for the fall budget monitoring process, the bump, and we are getting prepared to go in front of council and other groups to discuss where the Portland Police Bureau is with its budget, and the initial view of the budget appears to be that we have some holes in it, and we are going to need to make some serious



adjustments in order to cut costs. I'll leave that. Outside of that, I would take any just general questions if people have. Again, when it comes to specific things, dealing with operations, investigations, that's not my main bailiwick, So my responses may be fairly minimal.

Lakayana Drury:

We will take two community member questions on this section, and if PCCEP folks have questions, they can chat offline about it, since we have much more access, but in the interest of time, I want to make sure we keep things moving. Is there any community comment you can either raise your hand or just unmute and ask your question. Okay. Elliot, did look like you had a question, so why don't you ask yours since we do have time.

Elliot:

Yeah, so thank you for joining our meeting today, Mr. From. I wanted to know, given this upcoming protests and counter-protest this weekend, there's has been a perception among some members of the public that the police are favoring one side, the fascist side, the right wing side, over the counter-protestors, and I'm wondering if you know if there's any plan to redress that perception in terms of tactical, how the tactics for engaging both with these groups.

Mike Frome:

We don't publicly discuss individual tactics ahead of an event because that's counterproductive to having a successful outcome most of the time, but what I will say is, is that the goal is to prevent either group from being able to interact with each other.

Elliot:

Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

I'm on mute. Any other questions? Okay. I'm going to turn it over. Thank you, Chief Frome. I'm going to turn it over to Mary Claire for any updates on PCCEP recommendations. Mary Claire, are you there? Okay. We are going to keep them moving. Hopefully we will come back and get some updates on the recommendations, as one of the things you've just discussed is having more updates and keeping track. To that point, another thing we didn't discuss, we didn't mention but we did discuss was we, Theo, our staff member Theo, is going to be putting together a list of all the recommendations. That'll be color coded by status of them being completed, so we'll be in a much better position.

Participant 4:

When?

Lakayana Drury:

I think it should be together very shortly. We took a look at a draft last week, it looks really nice. Theo, I don't know if you want to speak to that?



Theo Latta:

Yeah, thanks. I sent it over to our folks who help out with accessibility, so I need to try to collaborate with them, so it's accessible for everyone, and it should be shortly, I showed the draft to PCCEP members, but it'll still be a constant work in progress. Because they all-

Participant 4:

When?

Participant 4:

... [Crosstalk 00:23:50] updating.

Participant 4:

When?

Theo Latta:

... updating.

Participant 4:

When? Give us a date.

Theo Latta:

I can't control when it gets through the accessibility folk.

Participant 4:

So you're two months late, you know that?

Theo Latta:

Apologies. I certainly never meant to be two months late or any time late at all. It is a lot of information, but I've been working as quickly as I could, but I do apologize for being late.

Mary Claire Buckley:

Lakayana? Sorry.

Lakayana Drury:

It's fine.

Mary Claire Buckley:

I was having some computer issues, but I'm back if you want to quickly go through... I did look over the recommendations that PCCEP has forwarded to the Bureau thus far, I believe we have responded to all of those except the most recent one that you sent last week that never, you thought had gone to the



Bureau, but went to the Mayor's office, so we'll be looking at that. That was on munitions in crowd control, I believe, recommendations from PCCEP about the use of those.

Mary Claire Buckley:

As for updates, I did look and we had provided PCCEP with a draft of the procedural justice, somebody asked about this in one of the subcommittees, we had provided a draft of the procedural justice policy to PCCEP on the 15th of July, and looking at my information, I don't think that we've received anything back from either the subcommittee that's going to handle it, or from the full committee.

Lakayana Drury:

What recommendation was that?

Mary Claire Buckley:

That was on developing a procedural justice policy or directive, and so that has been forwarded to you guys in July, and we're awaiting PCCEP's response, and then we'll go from there in terms of posting it for universal review and going through our usual process.

Participant 3:

Was that, excuse me. Hi, Mary Claire, was that sent to all of PCCEP? I don't remember that one.

Mary Claire Buckley:

I would have to check with Judith because it went to the office and it gets sent to Judith. We were prepared to talk about it at a subcommittee meeting in July, and I don't recall if we ever got very far in that, and then it was to go out to, I don't know if Judith, if you remember, if the staff remembers whether it got sent out to the full committee or just to the sub committee.

Judith Mowry:

I'm sorry, I'll have to look through the email to confirm that.

Mary Claire Buckley:

Okay.

Lakayana Drury:

Thanks for that update.

Mary Claire Buckley:

Okay.

Lakayana Drury:

See, we have, Patrick has a hand up.



Patrick:

Sorry. I have a couple questions, actually. First of all, the Mayor's meeting. You mentioned that it was held in private again. Has there been a Mayor's meeting that wasn't in private? And secondly, for Mary Claire, the SPMI put forward several recommendations, and I was wondering if you had any sort of documentation on those?

Lakayana Drury:

Mary Claire, you can go first.

Mary Claire Buckley:

Okay. Patrick, I would have to look, you don't recall what those specific ones were, do you?

Patrick:

Not off the top of my head, no.

Mary Claire Buckley:

Okay. I don't either off the top of my head, but I will look into that and get back to you and to the committee.

Patrick:

Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

To your question, the last time we had the mayor at a public meeting, I can't remember. I don't know if someone else has-

Elliot:

I think it was the listening session, one of the listening sessions around George Floyd, he was present, although not necessarily responding, but I think in terms of the meetings, maybe Patrick is referring to those smaller meetings, I don't, since my time on PCCEP, I've not, never been public.

Britt:

Yeah, and just to note, he was also one of the youth subcommittee meetings, related to our recommendation around restorative justice, but that was also a public meeting. That was attended by other people too.

Patrick:

So there's been no notes from those or any sort of public input, as far as those meetings [crosstalk 00:28:41].

Britt:



No, we shared about the meeting beforehand, people did attend, and we talked about it afterwards, and we incorporated it into our recommendation.

Patrick:

Yeah. You meant the youth subcommittee meeting. I'm, speaking about the ones that the Steering Committee goes to with the Mayor.

Britt:

Understand, okay.

Patrick:

Thank you, Britt.

Lakayana Drury:

No, we don't have anything up, but we will get something up.

Elliot:

Maybe we could provide or Lakayana, you could provide a summary of what we talked about at that meeting.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah, we went over three things. We discussed the protests and answered PCCEP questions on it, got the Mayor's take on various pieces of it, and then we talked about codification and where the mayor stands on it and our ideas for it to help craft the recommendation that we'll be looking at tonight, and then the final piece was on the truth and reconciliation committee that the Housing and Settlement Agreement subcommittee is working on.

Patrick:

Thank you.

Elliot:

And one of the issues that came up was around all these listening sessions which we're holding, and I think it was Marcia who brought up the point that we can't continue to hold these listening sessions if we're not seeing on the other side responses and action from the city, and in particular, we talked about the five recommendations that have been made since the end of May that we've not received official response from, even though the 60 day timeline has elapsed on those, so the Mayor was unaware that they were behind on that and said that we would get an answer to those. I don't think we've yet received an answer to those.

Patrick:



Also Officer Frome, I had a question for you. From my understanding, you're in charge of logistics for the Police Bureau? And if so, do you see, from the outside I look at it and I see it very similar to the Lunch Counter Strikes in the South during the freedom movement there where-

PART 1 OF 6 ENDS [00:31:04]

Patrick:

...the freedom movement there, where if the police were doing something that was not [inaudible 00:31:08], that they would fill the jails and slowly whittled the police budget down to the point where they couldn't afford overtime anymore. And I was wondering if you could speak to that, that maybe this is a tactic where it should call for some other actions other than just, well, "We need more money" because that'd be great.

Mike Frome:

[inaudible 00:31:33] It certainly could be [inaudible 00:31:37] but I can tell you that I don't believe the police Bureau is going into the fall bump asking for any more money at this point.

Patrick:

Thank you. I misunderstood you earlier then, sorry.

Mike Frome:

No, I mean the fall bump we have to account for how spending is going and talk about our strategies for closing holes in our budget, but that can be done in other ways than by getting more money. So for example, we can extend the lifespan of vehicles, we can make selective cuts to programs, we can reduce the amount of product that we might be buying in one category or another. So those are all things internal within our budget that we can do to try to close gaps.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you for that. We are going to move on to our next section. Yeah, just real quick. I see Rochelle had a question. So a number of different initiatives, each subcommittee kind of works on a different population. The racial equity subcommittee just held a event called Say Her Name in August, which was around engaging black women. So that's just one example. I'm sure there's some others can provide some others. And I would be interested in some of the other subcommittees wanting to drop some things in the chat just when we're done. I know that we had said we didn't want stuff in the chat, but I kind of think it's can be helpful, but that's just my thought.

Lakayana Drury:

We're going to keep it moving. We have three seats to fill for PCCEP, and this has been a long overdue process. I want to thank the staff and the members who sat on the interview committee for helping get this together. We have five very qualified candidates. We have three seats available right now. So we have five candidates. We'll be voting on three of them. I will read their names and then they will introduce themselves and can speak as to why they want to be on the committee. If they've participated



in anything on the committee too so far, like attended meetings and stuff that could also be helpful and relevant information for us as we are deciding this. And then we will pause real quick and hear from Theo because he's got something to say.

Theo Latta:

Sorry, I just wanted to mention if we do have other seats open up in the near future, then any of these candidates will be available as alternates to fill those seats. So just for the candidates who are giving a presentation today, I would encourage you just, if you are selected great, if you're not selected, then I would encourage you to stay involved because seats may open up. And yeah, I just wanted to mention that.

Lakayana Drury:

Cool. So what we will do is we will hear from the five candidates and then you will privately message Theo PCCEP members, your recommendations. So, you'll put your three and the three candidates who get the most votes will be selected. I'm going to just go down and read off your name and if you could just introduce yourself, apologies in advance.

Speaker 1:

Sorry I was late.

Lakayana Drury:

[inaudible 00:35:11] You're all good. So we're going to start with Coco Chanel Clay. Are you on the line?

Britton:

I don't think she's here. No.

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. Alex Rodriguez.

Speaker 2:

Hey, quick question though to you. How long should this take?

Lakayana Drury:

30 seconds to a minute.

Speaker 3:

...just trying to get out of here, dude.

Speaker 2:

Hey, I'm Alex Rodriguez. I am a Portland resident out here, him, he, him pronouns. I've had [little 00:35:49] experience on the streets and I was homeless during when COVID hit and during all the events



that kind of followed. And I have a passion for advocating for those I see in the street who aren't usually heard. And yeah that's my 2 cents.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you Alex, appreciate it. Next we are going to go to Alana Nayak. I know I mispronounced your name from knowing you as long as I have. Sorry about that.

Britt:

Hi, I am Alanna Nayak. I use she/ [her 00:36:26] pronouns I'm 17 and I go to St. Mary's. I really want to be on PCCEP because I've been involved in working with Raising Justice, formerly known as Youth Educating Police. And I specifically am the policy director focused on kind of pushing forward some of the policies relating to alternatives to detention and, removing SRS from schools and a variety of things. And I have also helped write the restorative justice recommendation that was recently passed with the mayor. I have been involved in MYC and have worked with [inaudible 00:37:06] before on basically gathering young people together to talk about their police perceptions. And we have presented that out to multiple public safety committees surrounding young people's perceptions of police. And I would just love to be on this committee so that I can further push forward policies that are going to reform our public safety system. So thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Thanks Alana. Next we're going to go to Kia Myers Dougan.

Kia:

Hi everyone. My name is Kia Myers Dougan, and I am obviously, I'm a Portland resident. I am a professional coach and I am really excited to join PCCEP because this is work that I feel extremely passionate about, especially in this moment, but I do have a history of doing this work. While I haven't served on a committee of this nature. I have extensive experience in working with the Los Angeles police departments, community relationship division. We put together a series of listening sessions with the youth, primarily black and brown youth, where they had an opportunity to sit down and have very real often very uncomfortable conversations with police to ask them questions about treatment and tactics and what they can do to mend fences, because we're in a moment then just as we are now of people talking past each other and very firmly rooted on one side or the other.

Kia:

And we develop these listening series, we call them days of dialogue, which the LAPD still continues these today. But these series were established for the exact reason that we were using them; to build communications, build relationships, build trust, establish connections with the community. And so I have an ongoing relationship with many of the senior lead officers that put that forth along with me. And I really want to bring that experience, those ideas, that knowledge to what we are doing with PCCEP it's vitally important.

Kia:



And I'm also excited to use the skills that I have from coaching, which include deep listening and creating safe space for individuals, which I know is one, a PCCEP's values to be vulnerable and be honest, and to build trust. And I want to bring those skills along with my project management skills of follow up, follow through being detail oriented, to get things done, to put plans of action in place that meet the needs of the community that we are answering to. So that's why I'm very, very excited to be a part of this and to contribute to the goals of the committee and building trust and building relations with the community and with the police department. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Appreciate it, Kia. Thank you. And then our final candidate is Zaneb [Fouk 00:40:31]. Is Zaneb here? Let's [inaudible 00:40:41] participants.

Judith:

I don't see her... [crosstalk 00:40:45]

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. So let's open it up to, so we have three candidates here, but I would love to open it up to any public or PCCEP questions for candidates based on what they've heard. If you just want to raise your hand, that would be helpful. Okay, so we're going to go with Vadim then Susan.

Vadim:

I just wanted to say that I have noticed that Zaneb has been at a lot of our meetings and provided input. I'm not sure why she's not here today, but from my experience, she's had a lot of very important input and brings up good experience here. So I hope everybody has either heard of that or will take that into consideration when voting today. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah. That's always a challenge. Appreciate that input though, Susan.

Susan:

Yeah. This is actually something I thought about when I was looking over the charter and it sounds like you can have people, family members of police officers on this team, and I'm thinking that you shouldn't, and I'm curious whether any of those people are family members of law enforcement.

Lakayana Drury:

That's a good point because it's not a prerequisite. I don't feel like that should be something they have to answer if someone wants to, I'll be opening to that. But since it's not something I think I would leave it up to them to answer or not.

Britt:

Hi, I don't have any relationship to police in any regard. So yeah.



Kia:

I do not have family members that are police officers.

Speaker 2:

And the same goes for me too. I have no family members who are police officers either.

Lakayana Drury:

Cool. Next we're going to go with Elliot and then Patrick and maybe one or two more questions. I see Amy's got her hand up. So Elliott, Patrick then Amy. Yeah.

Elliot:

Mine's more of a process question. Do we have a specific spot we're doing for youth or is this just open we vote for...

Lakayana Drury:

[crosstalk 00:43:12] we've past our youth, the minimum youth seats are two reserved [crosstalk 00:43:17] three, but there's no limit to what we can have, so.

Elliot:

Okay, Cool. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

I consider myself youth too. Patrick You're up.

Patrick:

Sorry. Needed to unmute. I had two questions and one of them, I don't think needs to be answered by the members themselves, but would somebody feel comfortable with saying whether anyone of one of the people being interviewed right now have a history with mental illness or alcohol or drug addiction.

Lakayana Drury:

Can I ask, is that staff protocol around those questions? I know we've had that come up in the past and I know that there might be some rules around having to explain that. And it's also a thing of when you put it out there and it's almost like people have to answer. So I don't know if there's any kind of...

Patrick:

I'm not asking them, I'm asking the people that did the interviewing. I'm not asking for individual information.

Lakayana Drury:



Yeah. So I guess I'm going to turn it back over to Theo. I don't think they can say that, especially when I'm asking them, but I don't know Theo what's your thought on that.

Theo Latta:

I think it's up to the person if they want to say that they have lived experience in anything, then they can, but that's not something that we're ever going to ask.

Patrick:

Okay. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

But I hear that though. And I think that there does need to be some way to, and we've had this challenge in the past of being able to make sure that, that community is represented in finding a way that's somehow able to do it, so.

Patrick:

It actually helps either way.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah, Amy.

Vadim:

I'm sorry. I forgot to mention something before Amy speaks to though. I do want to point out that Barb is on this meeting and she should really have the opportunity to be voted on with respect to being on PCCEP. I think she's contributed greatly and has a background that is sorely lacking in this organization to provide input on some of the community work that we are entrusted to do. So I just want to say Barb, thank you for attending a lot of these meetings.

Lakayana Drury:

Amy you have the last question.

Speaker 4:

Turn on the microphone.

Amy:

It is.

Speaker 4:

Hey [inaudible 00:45:48]

Amy:



Yeah. My question is really around. What do folks know about the settlement agreement, because that is why we're here. And I think being part of PCCEP, I don't want to get lost in all the stuff we got going on. I want to kind of stay to Patrick's thought process. This whole theme is because someone with mental illness got shot, killed. So I'm just curious do either one of the two applicants have understanding of why we're here or have you read any of the settlement agreement to know what we're talking about?

Lakayana Drury:

There's three candidates here.

Amy:

Oh, okay.

Lakayana Drury:

Kia, Alana and Alex. [crosstalk 00:46:28]

Amy:

Sorry, yeah.

Lakayana Drury:

Four [inaudible 00:46:32]

Britt:

To answer that question. I haven't directly read the settlement agreement, but I've heard about it from some of my colleagues at Raising Justice. It was basically surrounding, there was excessive use of force within the police bureau. And so the DOJ got involved and now we're here and that basically created PCCEP as it is today. So yeah.

Kia:

Amy, I also like Alana, I have not read the full settlement agreement, but I'm very aware that, that was the inspiration for building this committee, and it's also something that I have very special interest in because while I'm not a therapist, I am a coach and I deal a lot with therapists and understand the importance of the other "ism" that happens often between law enforcement and people that are having a mental health emergency. And recently within the last several months, since learning of this committee and applying to join the committee, I witnessed someone having a mental health emergency. And when I frantically did research to see what can I say when I call, if I were to call, what can I say to disarm that situation? So and I did find a resource and I use that word or that wording specifically because of how aware I am of this matter.

Amy:

Thank you. And Alex, how about you?



Speaker 2:

I have not read the settlement. I am also aware though that I was informed when I first heard about PCCEP of that incident. And I have a lot of personal experience here on the streets. I personally know a lot of the folks out there who do have mental health issues constantly. And up through, a lot of times they've had the police called on them and I do a lot of peer support and also advocate for them to make sure that they're able to communicate the best they can of what their issue is. And also I do a lot of de-escalation too, just on living out, when I [live 00:00:48:45] down the streets through as well to calm people down and then to avoid conflicts.

Amy:

Well, definitely thank you all, because it sounds like you all have robust lived experience, which is what we're really after, and that's important to me. So thank you. Yeah, no, I haven't read the whole settlement agreement. I was just curious if you were aware of the reasons for it. So yeah, we're good. Portland plan, PCCEP plan is a shorter version, which is what we're kind of trying to rewrite. So thanks all for applying.

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. For the sake of time, we're going to get to our vote. Go ahead Theo.

Theo Latta:

I wanted to mention that you do have an alternate name for Biddy Lewis, who is also an alternate who can be voted on today. I invited him to come, but he's not on the call right now. So as it stands, you have six candidates that you can vote for, for the three spots, Kia, Zaneb, Coco Chanel, Alex, Alana, and the Biddy.

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. Also seeing something about Barb but I didn't know that Barb was running or was an alternate. I know that [inaudible 00:50:04] had mentioned something, but...

Theo Latta:

Yeah.

Amy:

[inaudible 00:50:09] on it. If you guys just give us a minute. The whole concept is Jason Reno when we had our conversation mentioned, that there was a chunk of the budget reserved for peer support position for any member who might need it. And I was not aware that that bucket even existed, I don't know anything about it. But Barb is really assisting me with my behavior, with my challenges visually and cognitively. And so Jason kind of thought that maybe there was a program that she would fit into under a different category, but we don't need to talk about that tonight, but that is something that we want to discuss going forward, is what is that position Jason was talking about in the contract?

Lakayana Drury:



Yeah. We had it before and I think it would be a good candidate for us so...

Judith:

[crosstalk 00:51:05]can it just for, I want everyone to know it's not a position or it's what we always do, making accommodations. So I just want to make that clear that other people who feel they need an accommodation, please speak to us. We've had peer support before for members. So I'm happy to keep looking at that. I thought that's kind of where we had landed with Barb's role as well Amy.

Amy:

You turn that.

Judith:

That is what I understand. That's why part of why Vadim, she wasn't interviewed in the interviews. So that's why [inaudible 00:51:39] it's not out in front of the group right now.

Speaker 5:

Judith, I need to talk to you about it later.

Judith:

Okay.

Speaker 5:

Jason Made a special call to me, to let me know that I couldn't be peer support and a member of the public. So I was going to check back with you when you came back and with Theo and deal with that all then.

Judith:

Okay, that sounds great. I'm back, we can talk this week. Thank you so much.

Vadim:

And thanks for clarifying that, Judith. I didn't realize that there was conflict like that.

Judith:

Yeah, absolutely. Thank you. We'll work it out.

Amy:

It shouldn't be a conflict.

Lakayana Drury:



So I need PCCEP members to privately message Theo. Make sure it's private, otherwise your vote will be public. We have six representatives. We've got Kia, Alana, Alex, Zaneb, the Biddy and Coco. I don't know if it's an official or not, but we've strongly encouraged people to vote for folks that are here, especially folks that have just went through public interview from PCCEP and community members. But you are free to, I guess, vote for folks that are not here. Is that correct Theo?

Theo Latta:

Yeah, it's a thing that is really up to the discretion of you all and that was really implemented because folks would not show up to any of the meetings and then still not show up to be voted on. It's a little bit different maybe in all your minds it can be different for having somebody show up to a lot of subcommittee meetings, a lot of meetings, and then for whatever reason, not be able to make one meeting. We want to create an equitable space where if life happens, then we don't want that to be something that inhibits somebody for not being able to be voted on. But it's really up to you all, whoever you all think would be the best fit to join this committee than vote for them. And you're voting for three people. So it's not just one person, you're voting for three people and then yeah. And you all should have their applications, correct?

Judith:

Yeah. I'm sorry to make this complicated, but I just need clarification Theo. I thought we had three spots for adults and two spots for youth.

Theo Latta:

We have three spots in general. So the spots can be anybody because the PCCEP plan says that two spots are reserved for youth, right? But it can be seven youth, right? It's just two spots are reserved specifically for youth. There needs to be at least two youth, but it can be as many youth as the committee feels is worth...

Lakayana Drury:

And we currently have three on the committee [crosstalk 00:54:36] under the youth category. So we will do the vote. And then, yeah, we'll let Theo come back after codification. So send in your stuff, we're going to move onto codification recommendations. So send your things over and then we'll get a update after that.

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. So our next agenda item is codification of PCCEP. This has been a process. So currently PCCEP exists only within the settlement agreement of between this city PPB and the department of justice. And we are working to get our committee written into city code, which would then make us a permanent city body. The mayor has publicly stated his support for this several times in our meeting last week. He also reiterated that support, we talked through kind of what that timeline looks like, hoping to have it written into code sometime in October.

Lakayana Drury:



And what the mayor asked was that we come up with kind of a mission statement for PCCEP, the scope of our work and any definition of powers that we wanted to have, whether they are current or ones that we would want added. And so I drafted a recommendation of powers that we would like to have. And then post that last week I drafted basically, I just call it a codification plan, but it took the framework of the PCCEP plan, and I'm posting it right here. Took the framework of the PCCEP plan and added the updates that we would like to see. And so what I'm going to do, as I'm going to go through some of these updates, I thought that this document was the best way to kind of lay out what PCCEP wanted, but it's not necessarily what, when it gets written into code, what it will actually look like, but it answers the questions that need to be answered about what goes on. So long story long, that's what that is.

Lakayana Drury:

So basically there's a couple parts to it. So the first page of this document that I just dropped in the chat, it kind of gives an overview of everything. Because I realized that people looking through it, you'd have to like jump around and figure out what are all the changes. So I'll go through the changes and then I might go into some detail on them. So basically there's about nine changes to the PCCEP plan, 10 changes that would work for codification.

Lakayana Drury:

The first one would be changing the mission statement. [inaudible 00:57:49] Mission statement is, if I can pull it up here, the mission of Portland Committee on Community Engaged Policing, is to work with the mayor / police commissioner, Portland's Police Bureau, and the Portland's diverse constituencies to solicit and exchange information between the community and the Portland police Bureau to achieve a desired outcomes of equitable policing which exceeds constitutional requirements and meaningful community engagement with and trust in PPB. The updated mission statement I put down was to convene and amplify the voices of the communities of Portland as they pertain to community safety, accountability, and equitable practices and culture of the Portland Police Bureau.

Lakayana Drury:

The second year change to the plan was, update the goals, incorporating elements that were outlined in the PCCEP charter. So some of the things that were mentioned in the PCCEP charter, which is a separate document, that's also linked in there. It said; increase collaboration between the communities, implement policies and practices that decrease stop searches and incidents of use of force, increase transparency and accountability within and to support and assess the equitable and just outcomes of the Portland Police Bureau for all of Portland's diverse communities.

Lakayana Drury:

That was put in this charter document and I felt like adding those elements to the PCCEP goals which strengthen what we're trying to do. Revision of our scope of work. So some of those include, and I'm going to have to pull this up here, having PCCEP selecting its own members, which when we spoke to the mayor last week, he said he was on board with that, provided that we provide an outline of how we would select those members. Like; what are the criteria? Because that's the biggest thing is; How are we judging who could be on PCCEP? And so in this revised codification plan, it outlines what those would be.



Lakayana Drury:

Just to run through that real quick. Recruit and appoint its own members of the committee, following a standardized framework of criteria of desirable member members, including diversity of racial background, sexual orientation, lived experience with mental health, those impacted by police violence, member of different abilities, ages, genders, and underserved communities. PCCEP would have a role in hiring all top level command staff, and this would also include writing job descriptions for these positions. There's the commission based out of San Francisco that has this ability, that they write with community feedback, the job descriptions of what they're looking for from candidates for the police Bureau, especially in these top positions. So that was something that was not put this original document that I added after, that was brought to my attention.

Lakayana Drury:

PCCEP have a spot at the negotiation table for PPA contracts, the Portland Police Association, be embedded in the universal review process. So that's when any new directors come up that PCCEP would automatically get to have one of those review process pieces, like a public input session for it.

Lakayana Drury:

Clarify and strengthened language around PCCEP's responsibility to consider recommendations. So hopping back into this, I added a section it's called a PCCEP [actually 01:01:22], Portland Police Bureau's responsibilities. And that was something that's not in the original PCCEP plan it, the PBB responsibilities are lumped in with the city's. But I think that PPB being such a key partner that their responsibilities had to be outlined. So that includes things that already exist, like the PPB chief or someone he delegates, attends all the PCCEP meetings. PPB meaningfully consider the recommendations that PCCEP produces. So that's within 60 days, which they've been doing. But again, it goes to this whole thing of; what does that really mean to a meaningfully consider them...

PART 2 OF 6 ENDS [01:02:04]

Lakayana Drury:

You know, what does that really mean to meaningfully consider them? PCCEP should have liaison present a report of the progress of our activities like we did at the beginning of this meeting. PPB will update its offers quarterly on PCCEP of activities. So this is, again, something that wasn't in there, but I'm envisioning, at their roll calls when officers are going out to do their work at a quarterly time, there would be updates so that they know that we exist and know the work that we're working on.

Lakayana Drury:

All PCCEP recommendations shall be sent to the police commissioner and police chief. This would also alleviate the ... some recommendations. We have to manually send them, the staff does, to these different people based off of who they are, whether it's the police commissioner slash mayor or the PBB chief. And going forward, it would be ... they would get all of them whether it ... no matter who it was going towards, so that they're informed, and there's never that lack of communication or missing pieces.



Lakayana Drury:

All recommendations ... okay, so we got that. The Portland Police Association shall engage with PCCEP when needed. I felt that it was important to put that provision in there. The PPA president or an appointed representative shall participate in one PCCEP meeting annually, so that they're engaged in that process as well, and knowing what PCCEP's working on. And then this is a final provision that I added that I thought was really important: if at any time PCCEP does not feel its recommendations are being fully considered by PPB, it may appeal to the police commissioner for a review of a working relationship with PBB. The police commissioner, police chief, and PCCEP steering committee will then meet to review the work.

Lakayana Drury:

So that I feel like is a medium between when PCCEP's making recommendations and trying to feel like their recommendations are being taken seriously, and if the PCCEP feels any point like, "Hey, we don't feel like they are", that we can have a sit down meeting and be like, "This is what we're feeling," and kind of talk ... talk through those things.

Lakayana Drury:

Let me get back up to the top here and see where I'm at. And then deliverable product is the last one I put on there. And I had stuck in there ... let me find it here ... a final deliverable product was that we would host a yearly town hall with the police commissioner and the police chief. And we currently have quarterly meetings with the compliance officer, which again, those will go away once the settlement agreement finishes.

Lakayana Drury:

And so PCCEP and the police commissioner and the police chief would have a yearly public town hall where they would hear from the community. And then at the end of that PCCEP would produce what I'm calling a scorecard, which ... there's various groups around the country that have made these, and it would score the police bureau in four categories: use of force, transparency, accountability, and community engagement. And so that would be another product that PCCEP would deliver, and post this town hall, so PCCEP ... or excuse me ... so the police bureau could have an idea of where the community's feeling. It's not in here directly from them. And I know that we've hosted listening sessions right now based off of the feedback and the current climate that we're in. But by embedding that as a yearly process, there would always be ... and people have suggested this. Sometimes PCCEP members are like, "Hey, we should have the mayor come and sit down and have a town hall with us." This would embed it into our yearly process, and doesn't prevent us from having other meetings.

Lakayana Drury:

And then just to wrap this all up, there's number 10, just revisions throughout the document that just basically revise the authority of the mayor, where it says, "the mayor would select members" or, "mayor would do this." It now says that PCCEP would do it through the steering committee.

Lakayana Drury:



And that's the basic framework. This is a draft. This is not what the codification would look like, but I felt that this would ... this would be the closest way to lay out what PCCEP is asking for, and what PCCEP would look like when it's codified. Now, this also runs in tandem with the settlement agreement, which is at this point scheduled to expire in January. But again, that's not a guarantee. So, it's like codification would happen ... codification would happen, and then the settlement agreement, and both those would kind of work out until the settlement agreement fully completed.

Lakayana Drury:

So, that's basically it. I know that's a lot of stuff in there. I tried to make this first page help condense what things were made. And then I also highlighted through the document where the changes were. So I will open it up to public ... excuse me, no PCCEP comment first on suggestions, changes, clarifications, any of that we will start with. I also do, if I forget, remind me, want to hear from PPB, if there's any comments that they have on how they feel that this would either help, hinder, or suggest other ideas of what they would like to do. Yeah. So I'm going to open up the participant list and PCCEP questions. Looks like we got Vadim first. And actually, can we ... no, it's fine. Go ahead Vadim.

Vadim:

Oh, I just want to say, thanks everybody for putting this together. There's some really good points on there. I only wanted to discuss one of the points there, which is the self-selection. I've heard before when we discussed these matters as well as from personal experience that when you have a group that self-selects itself, you get a group that is a bunch of friends or people that work together or participate in nonprofit. And it becomes an organization that's hard to have diversity because people self-select and because they choose the people that they already know from their circle of friends or circle of business partners, that's a concern I have. And I don't know whether you'd like to address it, or if there's any safeguards to keep that from happening.

Lakayana Drury:

They're not laid out in here. And I think that can either be done through this plan or through bylaws. The kind of outline I put in here is a rough one, but I think it needs ... it would need to be fully fleshed out to prevent that. And I think there is ways. And I think, I think the question like that is kind of ... would be something that the codification team, when they take this over to like, get it to the final form, could kind of flesh out. Some kind of provisions would need to be put in place to prevent that.

Elliot:

I guess I would ask Vadim in relation to that question: given that essentially the PCCEP has been voting and choosing its own members, the mayor from my understanding has always approved all of our recommendations. Do you think it's been a problem thus far in terms of insularity, not diversity on the committee?

Vadim:

Well, as I understand it, we actually have a group of individuals, including the AMA about a ministerial alliance, as well as a MHA that provides input on the application list and actually forwards those people



to the PCCEP to be voted on. And the selection process is still appointed by the mayor. So even if all of our recommendations are taken wholesale by the mayor, if anything that says that the system is working right now, in that there is a safeguards in there, not only in the recommendation process, but also that the word of PCCEP right now is being accepted by the mayor, at least up until now. So it seems like there's protections in place right now. And I'm just wondering what the protections will be down the road. So we don't have 13 individuals that all know each other, you know, reappointing one another, if that makes sense.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah, no, there's also will be a PCCEP staff on the interview committee. So there will be at least that there, and again, I think the ... I think that's a detailed piece of it that can just be worked out to prevent that from happening.

Elliot:

So is it your understanding [Lockana [inaudible 01:10:29]] that this would mean the AMAC and the MHA would go ... that their roles would go away? Because I think in the selection process ...

Lakayana Drury:

Theo's got a ...

Theo Latta:

To be clear, the AMAC and MHA are invited to participate, but they don't ... individual members from those groups are invited to participate, but they don't always participate, just to be clear. But we have had community members involved in that process as well, outside of the AMA and MHA when they can't come. Just so there's community input.

Elliot:

I guess how I read the ... Locakna, your draft would not preclude that from continuing.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah, I think it could be a possibility. Like, maybe there's a provision in there where you invite community groups to be a part of that selection process, or something of that nature. Again, I think that's a technical detail, though, of it.

Amy:

Luckana real quick, sometimes organizations have nomination committees or nominating committees that work strictly on processing applications, like all the time. Like all year round, they look at people coming in, "Will they fit? Do they meet criteria?" And then they bring their response back to the general board. You know, so there's ways that you can prevent the friend of friend of friend thing is by having a really good nominations committee to work on bringing people on board all the time. You know, [crosstalk 01:12:09] department has one, and it worked out really well. About three or four people typically, and they just continue to review applications, you know?



Lakayana Drury:

So this is what it says in here. What I ... if you look under section four, codified selection process, it says, "Applicant submissions to initial screening of applicants," as you just kind of laid out, "by an interview committee, convened by the steering committee with supportive PCCEP staff that shall include at least one PCCEP staff and at least two PCCEP members. Candidate interviews with the interview committee steering committee appointment." Then, "Recommendations for alternatives by the interview committee to the steering committee." And then ... this is going to be a little complicated, "The steering committee appointment." And then ... so basically the steering committee would appoint the alternates based off of the interview committee's recommendations, and then the full PCCEP would vote on them the way we did tonight. Something along those lines.

Lakayana Drury:

So I agree with you on the interview committee piece. Other questions, suggestions, changes? Okay. Yeah. I'm going to open it up to public comment, looks like we already got a few. So we'll go with Susan and then we'll go with Patrick. Okay.

Susan:

Yeah, when I look at this document and the mission it makes tons of sense to me. Convene and amplify the voices of the community, that's bottom line what you got going. Now, when you go to the goals, the first one, "increase collaboration with communities." Get that. But then now you say, "implement policies and practices that decrease stops," just generically decreased stops, "searches, and incidents of use of force." I mean, I don't see that you have any control over whether they implement or practice anything. And my basic concern is that you got two things going on at once. One is amplifying the voices and the other is to get PPB to communicate with the community, I guess.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah. Yeah. That's a good point. Wouldn't be opposed to pointing that out. That came from the PCCEP charter. It's linked in the document there, and it says, "Goal number two is implement policies and practices that decrease incidents of use of force." And so I had expanded it to include searches, stops and otherwise, but I think ... so we don't implement policies, but we do recommend them. So maybe that's the change, right? That would recommend policies and practices that decrease stops. That is part of our charge, but definitely open to changing that, would be curious to hear other people's thoughts, and also yours based off of that feedback.

Susan:

Yeah. I think that definitely improves it, but I still am a little concerned about decreasing stops. You know? I mean, I understand what the intent is, sort of stops that don't reflect parity of society or, sort of harassment stops or something like that. But to just say, we're decreasing the number of stops, maybe the stop is good, maybe the stop's bad. So to me it's a little vague.

Lakayana Drury:



Okay. No, really good feedback. I would add disproportionate in there then, but I also want to hear feedback once we get this public comment just from PCCEP again. So I'm adding that to either amending or changing, and I'll let you know, based on everybody else's feedback, what goes on. Patrick?

Patrick:

Yeah. There's a few of them in there, but I'll wait until another time to bring up most of them. But the one that comes to mind on the first go through is the removal section, section six. It sounds like a popularity contest with the steering committee. If you aren't pocketing with the steering committee, you can be removed that's ... you should just cut it to that if that's what you want.

Lakayana Drury:

Yes. So the steering committee after consultation with the council.

Patrick:

After consultation, yes. So they can either take their advice or not.

Lakayana Drury:

Yes and no. So someone has to be in charge of being able to remove somebody from that. Like, let's say you didn't make meetings, or the person was disruptive to the group. Like somebody has to have that discretion to do that. And I could only think of a steering committee being able ... it's not like they just get to pick somebody and say ... and maybe we need to clarify that. There has to be some reason or something, but it's not just like, "Oh, we don't like this person so we can just vote them off." But the power ... who has the power to take someone off the committee? It was in the hands of the mayor. But now that PCCEP would be selecting its own members, it has to be housed somewhere, and the best place I thought that that could go would be in the steering committee.

Patrick:

And also I agree with Amy, I'm not sure that everybody ... I'm not sure as far as PCCEP selecting their own members, if that's wise, if there isn't some sort of body that called the information and put forth members to be selected.

Lakayana Drury:

Say that again.

Patrick:

I agree with Amy. I think that there should be some sort of body that is responsible for finding people and bringing them forward to the committee itself. Otherwise, you end up with ... is the word nepotism?

Lakayana Drury:

Something like that, yeah. Okay. So your cosigning the interview committee piece. Okay. Appreciate that. And then we had the removal piece in there. Let's go to Dan. Then we got Susan back. Oh, I do



want to let ... if there's anybody else who hasn't spoken before Susan wants to go from the community, I do see Amy, your hand as well. So we will go back to PCCEP for final comments as well. Dan, you're up.

Dan Handleman:

Thank you. This is Dan Handelman with Portland Copwatch. I'm concerned that the mission statement doesn't actually do anything other than convene people and amplify their voices. The original mission statement that was posted here in the chat, there's something about achieving the desired outcomes. And I think that should be part of the mission still. The document that you posted, Mr. Chair, I'm having a hard time following, because there's some things that are added that are highlighted in yellow and some other things that aren't. So it's really hard for me to tell where the changes are. I agree with the people who are expressing concern about self-selecting and I don't think it's a technical issue to say, "Do you want other community members involved?" I think if it [inaudible 01:19:32] intention, if you have the intention of involving community members, it should be in the document that that is some part of what you want to do, because otherwise it will just be, "Well, we can do it because it's not prohibited." But if it's going to be intentional, it should be listed there.

Dan Handleman:

I'm not really sure ... you didn't really talk about what kind of training the new members are going to get post-settlement agreement. I think right now the settlement agreement is part of ... people are supposed to read that, as part of their training. Apparently that's not necessary, because Ms. Anderson admitted that she hadn't done that. But you know, I don't know how that's going to be done or what the vision is for that. And just to echo again about recruiting more ... remember that this isn't a club or a nonprofit, this is the advisory body that is very important, efficient and function for members of the public and for the police bureau. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

Okay. So training is in here. I want to make sure I got all of your pieces in here. So training is in here. I did modify it slightly. Where is it ... "prior to voting as a PCCEP member." So, "Learn about the history of Portland's diverse communities," that stayed on. "Participate in a ride along," there's two things in here. There was participating in a ride along, and then there was the PPB community academy.

Lakayana Drury:

I suggest that the PPB community academy be optional. I do think going on a ride along would be helpful for PCCEP members. I don't think going to the Academy is a make or break thing. And it was a really hard thing to schedule. Would be interested to hear from PBB's response on that. But also training includes reviewing ... it's all the same stuff we've done before. Reviewing mistakes from our lessons learned from COAB. Learn about the organizational structure of PPB, all of those pieces. It still has a pieces of AMAC in there. So there's no changes to any of the training that was onboarded before. I will say that. Dan, can you just remind me, was there something else you put in there? You had the community?

Dan Handleman:



No, no, no. I just ... I didn't have time to review this full document because it was not posted with the agenda on Friday. I only looked at it just before the meeting and while you're going through it. So I couldn't tell what had been changed or not. So thank you for clarifying that.

Lakayana Drury:

Yep. And so, just a little on the document ... so yeah, so I highlighted all of the sections and some had more highlighting than others, depending on just what it was. I guess, I should just universally highlighted it. But I did walk through just right now what they were. And apologies for not getting this up a little bit sooner within that 10 day threshold that we wanted. Susan, you're up.

Susan:

Yeah. The other thing that I find incongruent between the goals and the mission is this thing about relationships, and to build confidence and that's ... I don't see that ... that's a result we hope, but if you do your goal, I mean, if you do your mission, you hope to get that. But you're just ... I don't know, it just feels like you're taking on too much. You know, you're not responsible for developing the trust in PPB. It takes PPB to play, and they're not playing. And so any type of agreement that you're going to start bringing them in and try to convince them to play is ... you're going to lose. You're going to fail. I mean, we're hopefully going to get there, but at this point we're not there.

Lakayana Drury:

Where are you seeing the trust piece in there? Does that work?

Susan:

Yeah, so there's a component is on the last sentence of the first paragraph of goals. The last, the very last phrase, "to build confidence and provide just outcomes." This ... to build confidence, I think is not your ... I mean, to me, that takes on too much.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah.

Susan:

Because it depends on PPB playing. And if the community isn't confident in PPB, they're not ... it's not your fault.

Lakayana Drury:

Good point. Thank you. Any other thoughts on that? Okay. I'm going to turn it back over then to ... let me see there's ... yeah. We're going to turn it back over to PCCEP comments. I see Elliot has his hand up.

Elliot:

Yeah. So in response to Susan's point, I think the ... I think it's the revised mission statement. Is that the one Claudia that you put in or is that the original mission statement? The one in the chat.



Claudia:

Yeah so the one that I posted on the chat is the one that is currently up on the homepage of the PCCEP website.

Elliot:

Okay. So that's not the revised. So where is the revised one, Lockana?

Lakayana Drury:

It's in ... under section one mission.

Elliot:

Oh, just the ...

Amy:

The agenda.

Elliot:

One sentence?

Amy:

Yes. Yes.

Elliot:

Okay. So, okay. I guess I would agree with Dan's point that the mission ... I would like to talk ... say something about implementation. But I thought the trust was in ... is in the original mission statement, which people brought up in our ... in other meetings, a problem with that. And so I was agreeing with Susan, but I like, I like what you have here, but I would think adding something that implementation would be useful.

Lakayana Drury:

And implementing what specifically?

Elliot:

Implementing the things that we're trying to do, the accountability, equitable practices. Because right now, as it reads, we're just convening and amplifying the voices of the community. So it means people could be talking about these issues, but what we've had a problem with is not the voices of the community. We've had a problem with the implementation of the voices of the community. So I think we have to look towards outcomes and implementation, which of course we don't control, but I think that should be our mission, sort of our goal.

Lakayana Drury:



So could we change it to something simply as, "to convene and amplify the voices of the community to implement changes as they pertain to ..." and then the things that we ... ?

Elliot:

Sure, yeah. I'm wondering in terms of process, are we planning on voting on this now or are we just discussing it?

Lakayana Drury:

I want to vote on it, but what I think would be helpful is if we moved onto a different recommendation and then I can work on some of these changes, so I can have some time to look at it. But I also see some other hands up too.

Amy:

Yeah.

Lakayana Drury:

Yep. Yeah. Amy and ...

Amy:

Lockana real quick, take a look in chat and see what Patrick just posted. It's the first paragraph from the settlement agreement. And if you read some of it, that would make an awesome mission statement, is to actually follow what they exactly prescribed the goal of PCCEP was. So I'm going to put that out there. That's a really good statement, Patrick. Thank you.

Amy:

It talks about the actual goal of the settlement agreement. So right there is a perfect mission statement. The other thing is, is that a lot of stuff that y'all are putting in here belongs in the bylaws, okay? I'm a bylaws freak, and this stuff that you going back and forth with, with membership and removal, that belongs in your statement of bylaws. And then we can create a codification plan that talks about the things that PCCEP is supposed to do already, and what the city's supposed to do already. And then it won't be so hard to get it approved. That would be just my recommendation. This is too much to put on the table tonight because it's not clearly articulated in the various documents that will need to be done. And it was only posted two days ago or whatever. Like Friday. You can't do that to people. It's not right. I'm just [inaudible 01:29:07] out my opinion.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you for your input. Anne?

Anne:



Thanks, Lockana, for the work you did on this. I put in the chat to you, in terms of the mission, what if we added, "to work with the mayor slash police commissioner, comma Portland Police Bureau and Portland's diverse constituencies to convene and amplify?" I don't know, it's just an idea.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah. So I did stick the actions that Patrick had put in there. If we added that to the front it would almost put the mission statement back to exactly what it was. So, but that's also an option. Maybe we do want to keep it as it was. I felt it was convoluted, but I'm open to ideas.

Anne:

I didn't see what he read. Is it in the chat? Sorry.

Claudia:

So, what it says now is ...

Anne:

I know what it says now. Sorry.

Lakayana Drury:

Well, I meant with his addition to it, it says, "to convene and amplify the voices of the communities of Portland as they pertain to community safety, accountability, and equitable practices and culture. The Portland Police Bureau to achieve a desired outcomes of equitable policing, which exceeds constitutional requirements and meaningful community engagement."

Anne:

Okay.

Lakayana Drury:

I'll drop it in the chat. So you can take a look at it.

Anne:

Thanks.

Lakayana Drury:

Other PCCEP comment? Okay. I do want to open it up to PPB comment, and there was a specific request for PCCEP, I mean, for the PPB to respond to the idea of having PCCEP ... have PPB respond to PCCEP's idea of having a lead role in hiring top level police officers. Sorry, I'm reading and trying to type at the same time. So yeah, Mary, Claire, or Chief Frahm, If y'all could speak to that. Your thoughts just overall, but then also specifically to the PCCEP's role of hiring, or having a role in hiring folks.

Chief Frahm:



I'll speak to the PCCEP having a role. I mean, I think the police bureau would be open to having a lot more input in some hiring decisions. I mean, ultimately when the chief selects his deputy chief or the assistant chiefs, the chief is trying to assemble a team that that chief believes is going to provide them with the best service that they're able to get. I think it would be reasonable to develop something where the chief consults with a whole lot of other people. I mean, not just PCCEP, he has advisory councils that also have some very unique insights into what they would like to see in the assistant chiefs or the deputy chiefs. So I think that's an open conversation which ultimately rests with how the chief wants to do it. In terms of, PCCEP's role in hiring, I mean, the comment in the chat was hiring of PPB officers in general. Again, I think there's a lot of room for an increased amount of community input into what we're looking for in police officers, possibly what.

PART 3 OF 6 ENDS [01:33:04]

Chief Frahm:

Looking for [inaudible 01:33:01] police officers, possibly white roles people can play in various stages of the selection. I really doubt PCCEP wants to be the leading role in the actual physical mechanics of hiring them. If they do, I will give them that, because that's something that we do right now, and it's a whole lot of work. But I think what we're really talking about is meaningful input from the community, to try to have officers that reflect what we're looking for. We're open to that.

Lakayana Drury:

And what specifically about helping write job descriptions?

Chief Frahm:

Well, the job descriptions are written by the Bureau of Human Resources. So we would have to work with them.

Lakayana Drury:

Any other comments and overall. Any of the processes that we laid out, or simulations; also be curious about thoughts on ride alongs, and the Citizen's Academy. Chief Frome.

Chief Frahm:

I would say ride alongs can be very useful. Because you're going to get put in contact with an actual officer that takes calls and has the most contact with the community at a very raw and unfiltered level. So I always recommend those for people. As far as the Citizen's Academy, I think there might be ways to deliver the information to PCCEP members, that would be easier for them to take... Quite honestly, we're looking into expanding our online learning systems at the Portland Police Bureau, to help our officers be able to learn things through video, as opposed to having to sit in classrooms as much. I could see where we could probably present or put together learning modules for PCCEP members in a similar way so that they could watch it at their convenience.

Lakayana Drury:



Thank you. Any other comments right now? Okay, what we're going to do we'll table this one. I will edit it slightly based off this feedback, and then we will get it posted within the next couple of days. I like the suggestion of having it by next Monday, and then we will get a special session convened to vote on this sometime, either probably early October. Our timeline that we're looking to get PCCEP [codified 01:35:37] is by around November. So very good input from everybody on that. So stay tuned for that and some updates. I'm going to turn it over to Elliot for the next piece of the meeting.

Elliot:

Okay. So we're just going to plow on through, we're a little behind. But this next piece is about the metrics document. So the [AMAC 01:36:13], who are the A-M-A-C and the mental... Oh, by the Ministerial Alliance and the Mental Health Association or Alliance, I never know, are the AMAC to the settlement agreement. They developed a document which was essentially a community engagement checklist that they were negotiating with the city that would become essentially the standard by which the city would, and the court for now would measure whether we're doing enough community engagement. So I took their document and I edited it based on conversations we had in PCCEP, and left it open for other people to comment, and that is what you see under version one.

Elliot:

I will put it into the chat and then Amy took a stab at doing a different document. And what her document is... She could probably explain it, but what it seems is it's more broad about the mission and about, in general, the work of the PCCEP. So I was thinking that these are two very different documents and it seems that either we could vote on each of these, although it seems that Amy's document kind of overlaps with what Lakayana's codification documents do. So maybe Amy do you want to comment on how you want to reconcile these two pieces?

Amy:

Sure. Given that line writing in English is not my specialty. I'm a Math person. After reading everybody else's, your documents and how it was laid out, it's much better. Mine was just merely to try to put together all the things that PCCEP is currently responsible to do, that a lot of folks didn't know, we haven't talked about. It was to really blend the, "What do we have to do still" kind of thing. But I didn't do a red line version, so it's not going to be easy for people to read.

Amy:

So the version that you did with the red lining and showing the paragraph, I'm just going to pull mine and call it good as practice because I didn't lay it out in a way that's easy for people to read. I just laid it out for ideas, not for actual referencing one over the other, over the other. So I really liked the one you put out. So I'm just going to pull mine as practice. Like I said, I'm good. [crosstalk 01:39:00] I just didn't do it the way it should have been done, that's easy to read. I'll know better next time. It was a great learning experience.

Elliot:



No, and I think it's really for me reading through it, I think it's really helpful document to get precisely at that question of what we're doing. So thank you for working [crosstalk 01:39:21] on that. And I think as an internal document, it could be really helpful for us. [crosstalk 01:39:25] So thanks. So let's turn to the version one, which is the first link I put in there. 766385. And I made very minimal changes because I think in general, in our conversations with Jason Reno that I had, and that other PCCEP members had, the things that they would come up with are things that, in general, we agree that we would like to do. Some of these are more aspirational than actual mandates that will be held to. But I'll just talk about the changes, then Public Access under Public Access.

Elliot:

This is the second after that long list. Second big item, point three. It says "Public testimony taken before every PCCEP vote and opportunity for subcommittees to consider modifying each proposal, after receiving public testimony, before PCCEP votes." So this came up around an issue that happened over a year ago, where a subcommittee brought something up, and then it was being amended in a way that the subcommittee was not happy with. And so they wanted to take it back. And in general, I think it's a good idea for PCCEP, the full committee, to respect the work of the subcommittees and to work with them. But I also feel like, if there is a recommendation that has some urgency, that because it takes a whole other month to go back to that committee and come back to the general body, that we allow ourselves the possibility to amend and vote on a recommendation, even if the subcommittee disagrees with it.

Elliot:

Moving on to member retention. Point five of that says, "Retain at least 50% of PCCEP members for a full year." So we certainly will strive for that. But I think we also believe that in cases where members move out of the city for unrelated reasons, we sort of can't control that, or shouldn't be held responsible for that. So in general, we want to retain our members for more than a year for the full term. And if lots of members are resigning out of frustration, that is a clear signal to us that we need to revise how we're doing our work and make sure people aren't frustrated.

Elliot:

Point six is about maintaining at least two persons with lived experience of mental illness in the pool, and no less than one person with lived experience of mental illness at all times. And of course, this is something that, as we found out today, is a little difficult to adjudicate in public unless people are willing to come forth and say that they fit into that category. But I think the staff and PCCEP, who has access to this privileged information, can make sure that actually happens.

Elliot:

I changed something from three weeks to two weeks, because I thought that was a reasonable amount of time to give, distribute notices to the public that I believe also other city agencies use two weeks. And point three under Monitoring PCCEP, "Maintain active list of available trained alternates, so that full membership is reached." And then point four is, I wanted to add this point which Theo is diligently working on; PCCEP should maintain a card list of recommendations indicating which ones were adopted, which ones rejected and the status of the city's response. And I think the community has made it clear



those of us on PCCEP have made it clear that we need this and the city needs us to be able to track our own work. So that is going to happen imminently.

Elliot:

Point six, after the settlement agreement, PCCEP should continue to do annual reviews as stated above. So just to make it clear that once the settlement agreement goes away, we'll continue to do the things that are stated as part of the settlement agreement. So essentially this is a very detailed document with a lot of wonky stuff about what they want us to do. So I'm happy to take for some piece of comment, although PCCEP has seen this list and gone over it, but if there are things that you feel should be changed or comments you want to make, I'm happy to hear them. And then we'll open it up to the public. All right. Well, you can... Lakayana.

Lakayana Drury:

Just to be clear, and I might have missed this in here, but what is our responsibility to follow this post-settlement. I think I just heard you mention that, like how? Like all of these are things we want to be able to do. Where does this document fit? What is... Yeah.

Elliot:

So, since the central role of PCCEP should be community engagement, I think after the settlement agreement, PCCEP could be held accountable by the City Council for following through and doing these things. I don't think I wasn't imagining it as a legal contract, where they say, "Oh, you missed your announcement by one week on that particular date, and then we're all fired." But rather these are metrics guiding our work. We, the staff knows, PCCEP members know that we're trying to achieve these and that we're measured by this, and that if we're falling short on any particular items, members of the public could point that out, the City Council could point that out, people who are paying attention could point that out. We will no longer have a judge to oversee us, to tell us whether we're doing our jobs or not. But I think the City Council would then take on that role.

Lakayana Drury:

Thank you.

Elliot:

Amy?

Amy:

Yeah, in our last meeting, if you guys remember Mary Claire asked us if we had this document finished and ready to go. I need to ask her what's the relevancy of all of this. Like, I have a feeling there's more to this than I'm not aware of. So are you in the room, Mary Claire? Because I would like to know the answer to that one. No. Because she had asked us at the last meeting, had we completed the metrics document yet? And I'm thinking well, what's the urgency. I thought it was something we could just [crosstalk 00:01:47:07]..



Amanda:

Yes, if- is Tracy still on here?

Elliot:

Yeah.

Amanda:

I would defer to Tracy, but we've been having meetings, if she's not here. I can just tell you, we've been meeting with AMAC and actually Dan can probably speak to this too, and we were going, we wanted some response before our next meeting with them as to what PCCEP's position was on. These were developed by the mickey. And so we wanted the PCCEP to have an opportunity to weigh in on the expectations that the group was creating for them.

Elliot:

Eli, I see your hand.

Theo Latta:

Yeah. I won't speak for anybody else, obviously. I was just wondering, it seems that these documents, the codification process and the metrics set by the community, have enhanced status in the court. They don't necessarily need to run parallel. I think there's some intersections in there that could be part of the codification process, right? So if a piece of that would be useful in this sense to elevate the voice of the community, by elevating the recommendations of MHA and AMAC, I think it would do a few things. One, not least of which elevating the voice of AMEC and MHA, who've been doing this work for decades, and who PCCEP, you all have indicated that an AMAC and MHA, have indicated that they want a more collaborative working relationship. So I think it could go a long way in that endeavor. That was just my thoughts since you all brought it up.

Amy:

Okay. The other thing I want to mention is, on number five on that document references to us meeting in various locations. I think there needs to be an addendum in there about COVID, because COVID is changing the way we communicate. And I want this document, I told Jason we need to make reflections on the issues that COVID has changed, since they created this document. That's all I was... The reason I created the document I did was for the reason of pulling out things that I thought was irrelevant because of COVID, and pulling out the stuff that the city supposed to do, because I really saw that this group wanted to focus on what we want, we're going to do. So that's why I created my document. The way I did was to eliminate all the other language that would bring in the operational piece of it, instead of the aspirational piece.

Amy:

The things that were spelled out for PCCEP to accomplish, don't seem to have any direct resolution of what happens if we don't do it. Everything seems to have a lot of "We're going to do this and we're going to do that." But there's no timelines of completion. There's no set outcomes of what to expect.



And I think if we're going to change our future, we need to change the way we're doing business. And that is to reflect on outcomes or outputs. Remember we heard from Rosenbalm that outcomes were not part of the settlement agreement. And I think that was a huge revelation that made me, "We need to do that. We need to have simpler rules with define outcomes, over a period of time. They're called SMART goals. S-M-A-R-T. Specific, measurable... Because I don't see that in anything in there. They're all just kind of pie in the sky requests, but no time of accomplishments.

Elliot:

Yeah. So I totally agree with you, that PCCEP should have these goals that are accomplishable and measurable. We're simply trying to work, or I was trying to work with what MHA and AMAC have come up with in terms of the community engagement piece with which is only part of it. And they wanted our feedback, and this was a way to give them some feedback. And I think, they want to work collaboratively with us.

Elliot:

Someone asked, "Who is MHA?" Mental Health Alliance is one of the groups that was... That brought the original, or that was part of the settlement agreement from the beginning. So this is not the end of what PCCEP does, but I do think it's helpful for us to have goals for community engagement, since that is a big part of what we do. I also agree with you Amy, that we should have measurable outcomes. But that's not in this document that they've come up with. And I think we come up with those goals ourselves. I do want to open it up for public comment. So anyone from the public. Tracy are you there? Lakayana, is that your hand from before, or?

Tracy:

I'm here.

Elliot:

Oh, Tracy. Okay.

Tracy:

Yeah, I'm here.

Elliot:

Did you hear the previous conversation? We were wondering if you could clarify the process for this particular document and where it goes from here.

Tracy:

You mean the document for the codification, or the metrics document? [crosstalk 00:01:52:48].

Elliot:

Metrics.



Tracy:

Well, we've been waiting. The Mayor's office and our office, of course, felt that it was really important that PCCEP have an integral part in these metrics because- in the development of the metrics, PCCEP was really set up to have a lot of self-determination and determine the areas where it wanted to work. So we have been waiting for PCCEP to undertake this process. And I know PCCEP has been engaged with this and obviously as you've noted it, so lengthy document that touches on a number of areas. And I think it will be really helpful to get PCCEP's feedback, so that then the city can aggregate that with sort of the feedback we need to give on things that have big budgetary impacts and that sort of thing.

Tracy:

The goal was to have the PCCEP response either go with, or be incorporated into, or the city could see PCCEP's response, and then areas that weren't covered, the city could respond to. So I think whatever form PCCEP develops, we will then work to respond to any areas that aren't responded to, if that makes sense.

Elliot:

Sure. Okay, thank you for that clarification. Amanda Marshall, you're up next.

Amanda:

Thank you. Good evening. I'm Amanda G. Marshall. I was a former member associated with PCCEP, and I'm here today. I'm representing myself as a person with lived experience with the mental health system in Portland, Oregon. And also as a member of the Mental Health Alliance. The things that I am going to say are things that we have a group have, have discussed. I don't want to exclude any of the other members of our group from making their own comments, but hopefully this will be summary for folks that aren't as familiar, this metrics document came about as a result of a judicial order given by Judge Michael Simon in February, 2020. The AMAC and MHA met and wrote this metrics document together. We believe with additional resources that they are modest and achievable. The AMAC and the MHA met with the city twice, to discuss these metrics. The AMAC and the MHA met and discussed the metrics with all the members of PCCEP who were willing to meet.

Amanda:

There were two members who didn't respond to our invitations for, for whatever reason that was, which we're Lakayana Drury and Vadim Mozyrsky. Otherwise, I think that our group talked to everyone else. The MHA we're open to minor amendments to the metrics by the PCCEP such as the ones that are put forth today, we support those. We'd also like to note that Theo and Elliot both made good recommendations about not needing to review or measure exits of folks who move out of town. That doesn't seem necessary. The AMAC and the MHA will return to testify to Judge Simon in February, 2021 on his order to develop some sort of way to measure progress or the lack thereof.

Amanda:

And in conclusion, if the PCCEP wants the support of the community and its effort to exist beyond the settlement agreement, he said, "Should be able to show measurable progress in community



engagement in scale with the size of the city." Meaning in the 1000s and not the dozens. And the Mental Health Alliance has not seen PCCEP move in that direction yet, or any met actions moving toward that goal. But I think that this would be a fantastic way to do that. Thank you.

Lakayana Drury:

[crosstalk 01:56:40] Can I just clarify, Amanda, when you're saying PCCEP hasn't taken measurable steps toward these goals, can you clarify what you meant by that?

Amanda:

Particularly in community engagement, the entire beginning of this metrics document talks about all the different organizations to reach out to in particular. We were concerned that PCCEP maybe was reaching out to the organizations themselves, and not to the people that are part of those organizations, or use the services of those organizations. And that I don't think is sufficient.

Elliot:

Okay. So Amanda, are you done?

Amanda:

I am done.

Elliot:

Okay, thank you. Fair comment and Campbell's next.

Anne:

Thank you. I know that I was part of a meeting with them on this document, and I understand the history of it and the changes that we have put forth with Elliot. And I do believe that there are some measurable pieces in this, and we at PCCEP can move forward to create even more measurable pieces in, with this as kind of part of our framework. So I appreciate this document and I appreciate the work of all of the people that have worked on this for a number of years. Thank you.

Elliot:

Thanks. Dan Handelman?

Dan Handleman:

I, Dan Handleman, a Portland Cop watch again. I really appreciate Mr. Young, the way that you frame this, that this is not something where if the committee slips up on one of these things that you're all going to get kicked out of your seats." That's not the intention of it at all. It could be a very helpful thing. If you're going to be doing an annual assessment of your own work to go through and say, Oh wow, here are the things that we did do. And here are the things we didn't do that are on this list. And maybe some outside entities could go through that too, but it'd be helpful for you as an exercise to see how you're



doing. There are two slight suggestions I have for the amendments that you are proposing. And this is just coming from me having read it.

Dan Handleman:

Now, the ANA Coalition has not had a chance to go over this, but the one about input before a vote, I think that needs to be split into two sentences because right now, the part that you're proposing to add would modify both the first and last part of the sentence. And it means that the committee could override the idea of having public input instead of overriding idea of sending it back to a subcommittee, which I think is the intent. So I think you should break that into two sentences. And the other one that says about having at least two people with a lived experience of mental health in the pool. They should also say with at least one person on the committee, so that you're being clear on the second half of the sentence, what the differences between the two halves of the sentence.

Dan Handleman:

And I also posted in the chat, the language that is directly from the transcript of what Judge Simon said in terms of ordering this, maybe I see- to the Attorney Reeve has put in the chat that she doesn't think it was an order. I think that's true, but he asked the groups to do this so that he had something to use to determine whether or not the city is in full compliance. And PCCEP is in full compliance with the settlement agreement. So maybe not technically legally, it may not be an order, but we need to get these metrics to the judge so that he has something to decide, whether or not to finalize this agreement in January or February, really. Thank you.

Elliot:

Dan, could you suggest some wording for those two suggestions you made in terms of breaking the sentences to clarify if you could do that, and put it in the chat. That might be helpful for us?

Dan Handleman:

Sure, sure.

Elliot:

Thanks. Patrick?

Patrick:

When you're speaking of measurable outcomes, are you speaking of great and drastic changes to the document?

Elliot:

I'm not sure what you're referring to. Are you referring to what Amy and I were talking about? Are you referring to the document?

Patrick:



Several people have mentioned that, that there should be more measurable outcomes.

Elliot:

Okay.

Patrick:

And I don't understand whether that is something that you guys will go off out alone and decide on your own, or if that's something that other people will be involved in?

Elliot:

Yeah. So, that's a great question. I think that's something that the community- that's a real major issue for what the role of the PCCEP should be. [inaudible 02:01:48] Rio, I'm in a meeting. Sorry. Thank you for your name. So the issue of coming out with what does the outcomes would be, I think the public should be involved in, and then of course we don't have control over whether those outcomes actually happen, but I think we should be cognisant and aware that we're not achieving our outcomes since the PCCEP exists for three years. And none of our recommendations are actually adopted, nothing changes in the city that would suggest that PCCEP is not actually effective, even if we're doing all our work. And I think that that kind of thing should be made... We should all know about. I see a thumbs up from Patrick. So we're on the same page. Do you have anything else, Patrick?

Patrick:

No, thank you. That was my question.

Elliot:

Okay, Susan?

Susan:

Yeah. I sent you guys a picture of what I think is being said a couple months ago, where it looks like what they're asking for is for PCCEP to be sort of a reciprocal. A place for everyone to funnel in their requests of PPB, their concerns. And that PCCEP is going to be that organization, that funnels... That tracks all the recommendations and what PPB's responses is. Am I sort of getting that correct? I have some questions associated with that, but is that correct? That's kind of what they're saying.

Elliot:

Well, I guess Amanda would be better placed to answer that. Amanda, do you want to take that?

Amanda:

I don't think that's what we're saying from the point of the Mental Health Alliance. Certainly we are concerned that PCCEP has gone away from the mental health aspect, and that has been a concern of ours. But we also recognize that there are a lot of...



PART 4 OF 6 ENDS [02:04:04]

Amanda:

Has been a concern of ours, but we also recognize that there are a lot of other groups, that are being disproportionately affected by Portland policing. And we also don't want to be exclusive of those groups. And so, I think, and this is me, I'm not speaking on behalf of MHA because I don't know what their views are. For me, I think this would be one way to do that. I don't think it would be the only way, to make recommendations to the police, but I think this would be one way that the community could do that.

Elliot:

Thank you.

Susan:

Okay. So, then the question I have, so, in associate, if that is though, if that is what's happening, that it's multifaceted, lots of communities have input PCCEP to great place. They're already giving recommendations. Hey, let's just, kind of get this train going and keep track of it. Then it sounds like, the first page is the groups. And then, it also talked about media lists and stuff. It sounds like, managing those groups and the media lists is going to be something that's going to be important in any such process.

Elliot:

Yes. As I understand it, this is going to involve a lot of community organizing work. And I think, embedded in this, without stating it is a role for hiring a community organizer, which is I think, what Tracy Reeve was referring to, in terms of the budget impact of this thing. So, this asks for us to do a lot of great community organizing work, which I think no one, everyone is in favor of, but we're going to need help to do that. So that, we'll require the city to fund someone to be doing that.

Susan:

Yeah. And I think, yeah, I agree. And then, the bottom line for what it sounds like they're looking for, is the tracking system. It's like, okay, we make recommendations. Where did they go? What did they say? Is this working?

Elliot:

Yeah. Not only what they, what we are looking for. Because frankly, those of us on PCCEP, haven't been able to track our own work. So, I think we're all wanting that to happen. So, thank you, Susan. Patrick, you have your hand up again. Oh, it's down. Okay. So, Dan has made. Lakayana has his hand up, yes.

Lakayana Drury:

I have some questions in times, but if Dan's going to go, I'll let Dan go.

Elliot:



No, Dan, he's not raised his hand. Go for it.

Lakayana Drury:

So, I'm still trying to figure how this document's going to be used. But here's just some things, there's a lot of stuff in this. And I think, PCCEP in this kind of, if the point of this document is, here are the things that PCCEP should work towards, I'm all in favor of it. But if this is going to be held up, because, this is a lot of stuff. This is a lot of stuff, for a committee that is volunteer. Right. And if this is a document like, Hey, these are the things that we want to strive for. Then I'm on, in favor of it. But, if this is going to be held up, like you didn't complete section five of this thing, then I have some real concerns about that. And I would hope that, the Amaechi groups, if you all can speak to that. How you want to use this document, because just like a little earlier, when it was said that PCCEP's not, Amanda you said something to the effect, that PCCEP's not working towards these goals currently.

Lakayana Drury:

And, I think that that's just, if that was what was being said. I don't know if it was something in particular here or overall. I think PCCEP is working very hard, towards community engagement. Okay. So, this now just said, okay, so I misinterpreted that, but that's how I would like to see this document used. If it's like, Hey, these are some things that we want to see you guys do, knowing that we're probably not going to hit all of these all the time. There's the rotating locations. I don't know if you have read on even those conducting surveys and focus groups, like PCCEP is supposed to conduct those.

Lakayana Drury:

Two-thirds of the, these are coming out of the community involvement. Two-thirds of the attendees are diverse populations that are attending PCCEP meetings. I think, that's really hard to do. I mean, I hope I would probably say this meeting is probably close to that, but again, it's hard to tell, and it just depends on how this document is upheld. Directives that we're supposed to look at, work product. It says directives, we're supposed to have three to four directives a year that we review. Each piece of subcommittee should make a certain number of recommendations.

Elliot:

Lakayana, I hear your concern. What I've heard from Jason, Dan Handelman, Amanda Marshall, is that, it's not going to, they're not thinking of this as a legalistic document, to whip us every time we commit an infraction, is as I understand it, and has been affirmed by the people who are involved in writing it. This aspirational was something to help us measure our own community engagement. So I was, my fear is we're alleviated or pleased. When I talked to Jason, I understood how the document was going to be used, and also to make it clear, that we recognize that this work cannot be done without additional funding and staff funding to do all of these things. So, let me continue to go down.

Lakayana Drury:

One more, one more point to this.

Elliot:



Yeah.

Lakayana Drury:

Can I add one more point to this? Just to finish my thoughts. I would like to see that language put in here, something about this being an aspirational document, and then also just some clarification on support for it, because how I felt sometimes in the past, it's like some things like said, about PCCEP, but it's like, we're not getting some of the support we need for it. So, just some clarification around that. Oh, and then the final, final thing is, for all of these organizations that are listed in the beginning, if they're acronyms that they could be listed out, what they are like either in parentheses or something else, so we can understand what they are.

Elliot:

Okay. So there are few people on the list. Tracy, did you have a direct response to Lakayana?

Tracy:

I just wanted to mention that, I think it's important that if, what PCCEP is regarding one section, say, as we agree that this is our aspiration, or we agree that this is what we will strive for, but if it is more of aspirational, this is our goals and objectives, rather than this is what we expect to be able to do. That it be stated that way. I certainly believe that all of the Amaechi are extremely well-intentioned, and aren't going to try to play got you later. But, this is a court proceeding. And, I do think it's important to have clarity if it's something, and we do think PCCEP own view of what it's agreeing to is very important. So, I would just urge that PCCEP, have clarity about whether something is a goal that PCCEP agrees should be the objective, or whether it is something that PCCEP actually feels it can achieve. And that can be measured.

Elliot:

Thank you. That's helpful, Patrick.

Patrick:

Yeah. I'm not a lawyer. Tracy is a lawyer. Tracy is your lawyer, probably. I think it's really important to recognize though, that I was there last year in February when we met before the judge, and shout out to everybody who's going to be there next year. I do think it's important to recognize, that last year, there was, at least in my view, there was a, Hey, you guys should probably go back and figure this out, moment. And, it's taken this long to get it, to the point where we're actually talking about figuring it out, what everybody wants. And, I would look at it as, if I was you. I would look at it as the Amaechi came and said, "Hey, since it's not coming up anywhere else, this is what we have in mind." And I think there seems to be a lot of issues around, whether something needs to be done or not be done. And I think, that maybe we're in a position where all of us need to work on that. And yeah, that's what I have to say.

Elliot:

Thank you, Patrick. I just tried to put some wording in the chat, to address this question. I think at the top of our version of this, it should be, it could state, "PCCEP views these goals as aspirational and



recognizes, that funding a staff organizer position would be necessary to accomplish these goals". I think that provides, if we're thinking of this as a contract, it provides an out, so to speak, so that we're not held to each one of these things. But I think what it suggests to us, is that we want to accomplish this and we want the city to help us to accomplish these goals. Vadim you're next.

Vadim:

Yeah. I want to chime in a little bit about, what's been said by Lakayana, and Tracy, and some other people. First, I want to acknowledge that the people on PCCEP right now, are doing a tremendous amount of work. And I think a lot of people that are not participating on a daily basis, are looking in from these meetings from the outside. Don't realize how many other meetings there are, how many other documents people are working on to present to elected officials, to request PPB input on things. It is a tremendous amount of work. And this document adds exponentially a lot more work to, as Lakayana said, volunteers, nothing wrong with that. I think all these points are worthwhile. I think they would certainly make the organization PCCEP better, if we were able to do it all.

Vadim:

But once again, it depends on who's doing the work. And so, my thought, and my question is, if these documents, if these items are only aspirational, and also if a lot of this is dependent on another staff position, that may or may not be coming under these tight fiscal times, why are we taking a vote on this? Why not just treat it as what it is? Our recommendation from the Amaechi as to what we should aspire to, and what we should try to do and work on it. And my thought is, if we take a vote, then we're accepting this is our own responsibility, which at, unless we have a whole lot more support staff and perhaps even a whole lot more members, it is honestly asking for failure. I mean, I'd like to tackle some of these, but there's a lot, a lot of work here. Thank you.

Elliot:

So Vadim, do you think the phrase I wrote, addresses that sufficiently? That these, we view these goals as aspirational and recognizes that we need a staff organizer to accomplish them?

Vadim:

I do. I do. But taking into account that, I mean, why vote on this? What's the benefit of taking a vote versus just trying to do these things as recommended by people?

Elliot:

Well, I think the initial goal of this was that they, the Amico wanted the input of PCCEP to say, "If these goals are goals for PCCEP, we should have a say over them." So, this was an effort for us to be able to weigh in, on what our own aspirational goals about community organizing should be, rather than, I think when we were presented this in May from an outside group, I think I wasn't at that meeting, but Lakayana expressed feeling like, why weren't we involved in coming up with these goals? And so, I think the Amico then integrated us into the process, met with all of us and solicited our feedback. And, and so I've felt like it was a collaboration, and the vote would just simply be a recognition by PCCEP that, yes, we see these as aspirational goals, rather than an outside body imposing this on us. But, I take your



point that we could not vote on it or vote against it and just say that's outside, and still take them as aspirational goals, Susan.

Susan:

Yeah. I think they are saying, that they want measurement and a feedback loop. That's all they're saying. They want measurement and a feedback loop. And all you, all PCCEP has to do is say, "What are your measurements? What are you going to commit to?" And in the absence of that, they've given you something, but give them, what you want to do. Just take this as, okay, this is what they want. Now, this is what we want.

Elliot:

Okay. Thank you, Amanda. And then Amy.

Amanda:

I'll keep my comments brief. But, I really did want to address this, just in light of the fact that I have a history with this group, if, for what it's worth, I'm not out to thwart you guys. The Mental Health Alliance is not out to thwart you guys. The Atlanta Ministry Alliance Coalition, is not out to thwart you guys. You folks are the ones that have the setup for the community outreach. You folks are doing the work, you folks are trying hard, we see that. We want to make you more successful. And these are suggestions for how you might be able to do that for accountability to the community.

Amanda:

I know for, from the Mental Health Alliance, we're not looking for you to strictly comply with every single sentence. That we're going to come try to ding you, if you miss one word in a sentence. We truly are trying to help each other, to help the community. And I don't know if that alleviates anyone's concerns or doesn't, but I did want to put that out there. Because, I do have a history with this group. And I know it's been contentious in the past, and that's not where I am coming from. And that's not where I believe the Amaechi are coming from either.

Elliot:

Thank you. Amy had her hand up. And then Vadim.

Amy:

Yes, something just came to my mind. If this group, Amaechi group, is going to report back to the judge in February, on PCCEP's progress, within the statements listed in these documents, I'm getting, I feel like I'm getting a two-sided conversation. What's going to happen with the judge in February. Are we going to get a good report? Are we going to get a bad report? And, why would you go back to the judge and kind of say, "We're not doing anything," when COVID has changed our entire reality? And a lot of these groups that are on that list, I, myself and others have participated with, and I have invited so many people to the table, and they all want to come. So, I'm looking at community organizing now, getting 200-300 people on a zoom call is amazing, given that I can never get that many people in a room to begin with.



Amy:

So, I'm just kind of concerned that the focus on getting community organizing, was pre COVID. And we really need to think about the fact, that people are not going to go to meetings. They're not going to go into community events, and we're not going to have the access that we used to to meeting people. So, I think a lot of this needs to be refined to reflect the COVID situation. And that's just kind of my take and been that way. The whole time I've read, it is like a lot of it will YouTube, and Zoom, and Facebook. Those are the words that need to be in the documents. If we're going to show that we're adapting to the current times, rather than before COVID. So, a lot of these organizations aren't even really practicing anymore, because they can't take in people publicly. So it's limited.

Amy:

Everything is limited. And then you have your technology, which further limits people's capabilities, of getting on calls. So there's a lot, I want to just go over and make sure folks understand, we're in a totally different era for community engagement. And if I'm going to ask anyone, I would put Marcia on the table and say, "Hey, you're really good at organized thing." But the real downside is, not a lot of people trust telling their story on Zoom. So, I really want everybody to think about that, when we're looking at these metrics. Do they reflect the current state of our community? I don't think so. I think they're out of it.

Elliot:

Okay. Thank you. And clearly COVID has changed the way we organize, and my understanding is that we all recognize that, but, let's, we're going to need to sort of put an end to this conversation and take a vote. And then we could move on, because we've got other items on the agenda. So, Susan, Vadim, Patrick, Lakayana, and then we're going to vote. So Susan.

Susan:

Sorry, my name was up from before.

Elliot:

Okay, Patrick, is that from before?

Patrick:

I pushed down the list. I'm right in the middle of...

Elliot:

Yeah. Okay. Sure. Lakayana.

Patrick:

What needs to be said?

Lakayana Drury:



Yeah. So, I'm appreciating what Amanda said, appreciating what Amy said. So, couple of things. I just put in there and then it just got dropped down by a lot of other stuff too. An updated thing that could go at the beginning. Can't even find it now, but let me find it. Basically, it's an aspirational statement. Let me see where we go. PCCEP views the goals and metrics in this document as aspirational. PCCEP will work with MAC, MHA, the city and other community partners to achieve, or I wouldn't even say work towards these outcomes. I also, I'm wondering who are we reporting to with this? It said somewhere in this document, that we're reporting, but I didn't really, let me go to it. Monitoring PCCEP after the COCL is done. PCCEP presents reports on status of PCCEP goals and metrics, yada-yada-yada, for a view in policing, in a review of actual PPB reforms in city, I'm not sure who they were presenting it to.

Lakayana Drury:

I do also have concerns about the community organizer, as Amy said. And especially if we're going to be expected to do things, that we don't have the tools to do right now. Like we're, this is just a very big list. And, I think I'm more alleviated with my concerns if we're working towards an aspirational thing, but I don't, I wouldn't include a statement on, with the support of a community organizer. I'm mean again, we don't know if we're going to get that. And so I just think that that's something that should go in there. Yeah, so, and I, and to Vadim's point, I don't also know if we need to vote on this. I think we've provided our input on it and we can update it. And I think that would feel better to me than to vote on it. That's my thoughts.

Elliot:

Okay, Vadim.

Vadim:

Just quickly. I hope I recognize the well intentions of the MHA and the work they've done in the past. But I did attend the hearing last year. Well, judge Simon and Andrew stood up at that hearing and went through all the work that piece of members were doing, and with the PPB, with the community and the time commitment that was involved to show that PCCEP was a functional body. And then MHA who had previously, with Patrick, and once again, I appreciate all the work you all are doing, but I'm just trying to recount the facts.

Vadim:

Patrick and Amanda disbanded the mental health subcommittee at that point in time, and then stood up to judge Simon and pointed to that, their own disbanding of the subcommittee as evidence that PCCEP was not functional. So, I just don't want to put us in a situation where we're setting ourselves up for failure. I want to work on all these. I want more resources if possible, for sure. But at the same time, I don't know whether this is, whether all these things are something that we can accomplish, and accomplish by February. And what the result will be at the February's hearing, if these things are held up and people say, "Look, PCCEP has not accomplished section A, section B, section C, section D." That's my concern. Thank you.

Elliot:



Okay, Patrick.

Patrick:

With respect to Tracy and whether it was a demand, or an ask, or whatever, he did ask us all to work together. And, we took this to the city and the city was less than interested. And we've taken this now to the PCCEP, and this PCCEP seems less than interested. And, me personally, I will be happy to meet you guys in February, and we can talk about it then, but I think that all of us would be much happier to talk about it now, and can get something that we can all work, work together on. Right?

Elliot:

Yeah. I personally agree with that. I think, see this as collaborative, I see this as trying to support PCCEP's work. I think there are things we have not done. Like Dan, I think mentioned the quarterly reports. I think there are other things we haven't done, which we should be doing. And I think it's, the public should hold us accountable. And, it's helpful for us to know what we need to be doing. But, there has been the question raised about whether we want to vote on this. So, I think we should first vote on whether we want to vote on it. And if there's a majority who wants to vote on it, we will vote on it. If a majority of people don't think we should vote on it, then, I think that's how we go. Patrick, you have your hand raised again.

Patrick:

Yeah. If, I think if nobody wants to vote on it, you should not vote on it. That seems like a great idea.

Elliot:

Right? So let's take that vote. All in favor of. Theo.

Theo Latta:

Yeah. I just wanted to mention that, if you will decide not to vote on it, to be clear, it doesn't change anything. I don't want it to seem to the community, that it's disregarded, if there's not a vote on it. It's still a recommendation. It's still in conversation with the city and PCCEP. It doesn't change the fact that the Amaechi recommended these metrics, and PCCEP has them, and they can have further discussions around them. So, like a vote, not to vote on it. It doesn't necessarily change how the metrics are perceived.

Lakayana Drury:

Are you saying what I've been saying? Which is, if you vote not to vote on them, that it doesn't mean that PCCEP doesn't want to work towards these. Is that you're trying to say?

Theo Latta:

That is what I'm trying to say. You knocked the good words.

Elliot:



So, right.

Lakayana Drury:

Yes. I just want to put a clear point to. Yes, as. Yes, that. Yes.

Elliot:

Yeah. So we've engaged in a dialogue, they've, we've made some edits, recommendations, and Jason has suggested that he agrees with the ones that I have made, but let's decide whether we want to vote on this. So, all in favor of voting and I'll just go down the list and see, and.

Amy:

Elliot, Elliot, can I change the request, and make it that we accept this document, into the fold of the other working documents to be included in part of the codifications process? I think we're getting a little bit ahead of ourselves. This needs to be embedded in the work we're going to bring forward, as a collaborative. Otherwise, it's not collaborative. We need to use this document as part of the future of PCCEP, when we create the things, we are going to tell the city we're going to do, and maybe then it'll turn up as a really good, comprehensive, collaborative document. So I'm for, we incorporated it in.

Ann:

Can I just break in really quickly? I appreciate that Amy.

Amy:

I'm kind of like not done. Can you hold on?

Elliot:

Okay. Let's let Amy finish and then Ann. Yeah, go ahead.

Amy:

Okay. And that's all I'm saying is, I think it's really important that we show through our qualification paperwork, that we'll appreciate and incorporate what others are saying. So nobody feels left out. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

Elliot:

Thank you, Ann.

Ann:

I want to vote on it. I know that a number of us have read this have met with people and, I want to vote on it.

Elliot:



Okay. So let's take the vote on whether the majority want to vote on it. So, Ann says, yes, she wants to vote on it. Lakayana.

Lakayana Drury:

I would say, not vote on it, but I do think that PCCEP can work towards these things. I think that, there is some hesitation on PCCEP right now. And I think it's, we want to be able to get it right, rather than we're saying, we don't want to do these things. We just want to make sure it is done right. And I think by rushing through it, we're going to set ourselves up for a position that's not in our best interest.

Elliot:

Amy.Amy.

Amy:

I vote to not vote on it. Just accept them, as part of our future.

Elliot:

Okay. Vadim.

Vadim:

Pretty much the same. I vote not to vote on them, but I do think that they're good aspirational documents. I'd really love to meet with MHA as a group, on a monthly basis to go through these and our work toward them. So they understand that the work that we're doing, perhaps a little better and understand what their needs are, but not to take it as a part of our policies and guidance by voting on it. Thank you.

Elliot:

Yolonda.

Yolonda:

I echo the same thing Vadim just said.

Elliot:

Taji.

Taji:

I also agree that we shouldn't vote on it now, and can go back to it. Because we don't have the codification solidified right now.

Elliot:

And who else is on the call? Is Britt there?



Britt:

Yeah, but I would also vote, not to vote on it right now, for those reasons.

Elliot:

Okay. Do we have anyone else that I'm missing?

Marcia:

Elliot there is Marcia.

Elliot:

Oh, Marcia. Sorry.

Speaker 6:

Marcia and Jamari. I believe Jamari's still on the line.

Elliot:

Okay, Marcia.

Marcia:

I voted no.

Elliot:

Okay. And Jamari?

Jamari:

Yeah. Same. No.

Elliot:

Okay. Well, that, and I vote, yes. So, the noes have it. We will not vote on it, but I guess let the record reflect that, the piece that members were interested in, incorporating this document as we work forward towards codification. And, I think the sentiment is that this should not be looked at as a rejection of the things in this document, but rather that at this time, we don't want to sign on to all of the specifics of the stock and then as a committee. Okay.

Lakayana Drury:

So, just, can I add that, I like Vadim's suggestion of meeting with MHA. I think that, I think a final conversation about what to do next would be best. I would like to figure that out with Amanda and other folks, Jason, whoever that is, about how we continue this. It doesn't just end here, That's my thought.



Elliot:

Sure. Yeah. We will continue the conversation. So next up on our agenda and I'm not going to, because we only got half an hour, take a break, even though that's brutal and terrible practice. But if we're going to get through this stuff, I think we need to move ahead. So, let us move to a statement on violence in the community. And this is a statement that was drafted by Vadim. Would you like to share it in the chat and speak to it, Vadim?

Vadim:

Thank you. Let me copy and paste that into the chat.

Elliot:

It's, I think also do it on the shared screen.

Vadim:

Okay. So if it's on shared screen, so I'll read it out loud first, and then I have a brief statement to make. The statement is as follows, this summer, we witnessed Portlanders come together to seek racial justice in light of the many black and brown men and women who have been killed by police.

PART 5 OF 6 ENDS [02:35:04]

Vadim:

Any Black and Brown men and women who have been killed by police here and throughout the United States. These United voices have justifiably brought needed attention to past failures, to reform police practices. The Portland committee on community engaged policing honors, and commends these efforts to bring equality and safety to all community members. In keeping with PCCEP's mission of working with Portland's diverse constituencies to provide meaningful community engagement with the Portland Police Bureau, we call on all Portlanders and the city government to heed the message of these peaceful protests. But at the same time, not allow that message to be overshadowed by acts of violence. So that's a statement of [improving 03:03:07] and I'll try to be quick with the basis for the statement. It's the mission of PCCEP bring voice to Portland's diverse constituencies. It's been shown time and again, in our listening sessions, in the news and on the street that Portlanders overwhelmingly support the peaceful protest for racial justice and police accountability.

Vadim:

Yet, it's also clear that increasingly Portlanders are alarmed by the violence that occurs late at night. This violence is on all sides and can't be attributed to a single group or organization. A recent DHM survey shows that 56% of Oregonians are concerned about the violence. A different recent poll also by FM three shows that 67% of Portlanders support the protests, but that goes up to 92% if asked about non-violent protests. While polls shouldn't dictate how people should seek reform in racial justice, these polls do demonstrate that a lot of Portlanders are concerned about violence. But numbers hide the reality of people being hurt. We've all read about the individual that was killed in the vicinity of these protests and the other was hospitalized after being beaten into unconsciousness. Many bystanders and



protesters have been hurt by police response when this person crowds. On the other side, almost 200 police officers have been hurt, some seriously.

Vadim:

Each individual that has been hurt is part of our community. Each individual that has voiced their concerns and even their fears is part of our community. And to bring this to a personal level, I'd like to quote a recent newspaper article. And this is quote, "Terrance Moses was watching protesters against police brutality march down his quiet residential street one recent evening, when some of the group of a few hundred suddenly stopped and started yelling." And this is quoting from Mr. Moses, "It went from a peaceful march calling out the names to all of a sudden bang, how dare you fly the American flag?" And Mr. Moses who's Black and runs a nonprofit group in the Portland, Oregon area said, "They said, take it down. They wouldn't leave. They said, they're going to come back and burn the house down." And this is quoting from Mr. Moses again, "We don't go around terrorizing folks to try and force them to do something they don't want to do." Said Mr. Moses, who's non-profit group provides support for local homeless people. "I'm a veteran, I'm for these liberties."

Vadim:

This weekend more violence is expected in North Portland. Many community leaders have already spoken out against the violence that has been occurring, including Senator Lew Fredrick, House Speaker Tina Kotec, the Governor, the Mayor, and four current and future commissioners, Black American Chamber of Commerce, Oregon Commission on Black Affairs, Oregon Commission on Hispanic Affairs, Muslim Educational Trust, NAACP of Portland, Oasis Appraise International Ministries, Oregon Latin X Leadership Network, Unite Oregon, and many others. These people and the people that I represent are our community as well. We should elevate their voices. Personally I would not dictate morals to anyone, but it's my personal belief that speaking against violence, whatever it originates, wherever it originates and against whomever it is used as the moral and the right thing to do.

Vadim:

And it furthers PCCEP's mission of getting community involvement in police affairs and bringing the two sides together. So lastly, let me just quote three people that are I think very important to quote in general, Martin Luther King said, "Returning hate to hate multiplies hate. Adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of stars. Darkness cannot drive out darkness, only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate, only love can do that. Hate multiplies hate, violence multiplies violence, and toughness multiplies toughness in a descending spiral of destruction." Gandhi said, "I hope I object to violence because when it appears to do good, the good is only temporary. The evil it does is permanent." And president Obama most recently said, "So let's not excuse violence or rationalize it or participate in it. If we want our criminal justice system and American society at large to operate on a higher ethical code, then we have to model that code ourselves."

Vadim:

And so this is a very balanced statement. It's not about violence in any side, it is against the violence that everyone acknowledges is taking place. And more and more Portlanders are concerned about. Let's recognize those Portlanders and let's try to bridge the gap between the people that are seeking peace,



seeking reform, seeking racial justice, and those acts that a lot of people will feel are hurting that from all sides. Thank you very much.

Elliot:

Thank you, Vadim, for presenting that. I'll take piece of comment now, and then [crosstalk 02:40:42] everyone a chance for a comment afterwards.

Taji:

Ali, Can you hear me okay?

Elliot:

Taji, Yes.

Taji:

Okay, great. I voiced in multiple emails already, my stance on this, and I just want to close out by quoting, or not close out, but just synthesize what I'm saying in regards to my opinion and I mean, many community members and not those who are elected officials who are some war criminals. So I think it's interesting to quote someone who's in that community, and this was by a organizer named Lilith Sinclair, who said, "There's a vested interest in the State to be able to present which protest is good or bad because it's a way to attempt to keep people complicit. I don't believe that destroying the systems of oppression that we exist in is violent, considering the fact that none of these systems are in and of themselves alive." Sinclair said that protest is supposed to be disruptive. If the Mayor and police approve of a protest, then they think people need to rethink what it means to protest.

Taji:

And so I urge PCCEP members to understand what we're doing is denouncing some of the fight that it's going to take for us to have racial justice and have these reforms. It's all protests. So thank you so much.

Elliot:

Thank you, Taji. Any other PCCEP members want to comment? Vadim, let's see if other people want to comment.

Vadim:

I just to answer Taji real quick, this is not about protests. I'm specifically not using that as a word. I'm for the protests, I'm for what they're trying to do. I'm obviously on PCCEP to try to further it and doing what I can in that part. I've been to the protest myself. I've witnessed what's going on. I'd been to the peaceful protest and I've also seen the eruption of violence. It's not about the protest. It's about people being afraid out there. And so yes, there are people that want the protests, but do people really want people being shot? Do people really want the police violence? And I'm not saying it's a protest violence. I'm not saying it's police violence. There's violence to go all around and it needs to stop. That's my point, thank you.



Elliot:

Okay. Anne.

Anne:

Thank you Vadim and Taji. I have a question Vadim. I read this statement and you read it to us today and I'm not totally understanding what you're asking for. You want us to say that we do not agree with the violence? But when you talked further about this, you specifically talked about violence. Well, with the flag that protestors were perpetrating on others, you didn't talk about the police violence and the many protestors that have sustained injuries at the hands of the police. So I'm a little unclear as to exactly, I don't really totally get it.

Vadim:

That's perfectly understandable. I did say, and I quote, "Many bystanders and protestors have been hurt by police response when dispersing crowds." I'm fully cognizant that like I said, there's not one side or one group that is causing the violence, but I think that there's a lot of Portlanders out there that are very concerned. You look at the polls, you talk to people out there and easily half the Portlanders, if not much higher are very concerned about violence happening on a daily basis, as a result of this violence by the police, violence by protestors, violence by other people. I don't really know who's causing all this violence. I wouldn't want attribute it to protestors because there could be people just coming by and joining in.

Vadim:

The media has covered it. It's hard to tell where this is all coming from, but until it stops, I feel it's really hard to move forward. And I'm asking for it to stop on behalf of the police, I'm asking you to stop on behalf of anybody else causing the violence down there. Otherwise, do we really believe that MLK, Gandhi, Obama and all these other people, do they have the best idea of what it means to cause change? These are the people that have caused great change. And if we were asking for that change, maybe we should also likewise respond to the people that are calling for peace.

Anne:

I appreciate that. However, I'm wondering about the violence that has happened over hundreds of years to the Black people in our community. And I-

Vadim:

I'm totally against that as well. Thank you.

Anne:

Yeah. And I just wonder about the narrowness of this. I agree with some of what you're saying, but I also know that there's a lot of people that are continuing to protest for racial justice, not just in Portland but around our country and around the world and I support them.

Vadim:



And I do as well.

Elliot:

Okay. Thank you, Vadim. So I'll speak and then I'm going to open up to the public. So as I read this statement, my understanding of reading it that last line, because it's talking about peaceful protest and then says, "Overshadowed by acts of violence." I read that as referring to the acts of violence by protestors. So it was not at all clear to me that this was including police violence in those. Furthermore, I think in this context, when we had a statement about condemning police violence, you voted against it. And so thinking in terms of consistency, if you are against police violence and also against protest for violence, I'm not sure why you would have voted against [crosstalk 00:12:00].

Vadim:

Which statement [inaudible 02:47:00] I vote against police violence?

Elliot:

We had a statement condemning police violence against protestors earlier in the summer. I could find that.

Vadim:

Yeah. If I could find that, I'd appreciate it.

Elliot:

So anyway, and the other thing, I'm okay, it's that a lot of other things. One of the things he said is the riot is the language of the unheard. So there's a sanitized version of MLK. That's all about peace and non-violence. And that certainly was part of his message... Central to his message. But I also think MLK understood that years and years of oppression, that Anne is speaking to, oftentimes does result in riots and aggressive of action and violence. And it's our job, I think to try to understand where that's coming from. It's violence in reaction to violence. And we do need to end the violence overall, but we can't just be pointing to the reaction to centuries of violence. So that's my own view on that [crosstalk 02:48:11].

Vadim:

And I appreciate that view. And I know that that's your view as well. I think, if you read the full speech by MLK where he says that riot is the language of the unheard, there's actually a speech against violence. That is a statement, but it's often taken out of context and I invite everybody to read the full speech, as many of his speeches are, it's beautiful. Thank you.

Elliot:

Thank you, Susan. You have your hand up.

Susan:



Yeah. We've had this discussion before, I continue to have the same problem, but I have to say it again. PCCEP can't get your act together to get your matrix and your processes together and your recommendations tracked and yet Vadim has time to condemn our community and it is bringing both sides together is not related to saying no violence. Telling your community that you shouldn't have violence. This is so outside of your goal, your mission. And it's [crosstalk 02:49:27] of alienating anyone that any of the community that we're actually supposed to be interacting with.

Elliot:

Thank you for your comment. Brett, you're up.

Britt:

Yeah. I was going to say something with a similar thrust. Vadim I think you're well intentioned here, but one of the problems is isn't we're seeing it as part of this conversation, is that not everyone agrees on what a statement like that means. We don't know what this violence type can quantify that or who's doing it. And so if there's any chance it's going to be inflammatory to people with our job being a welcoming body for community members that I just don't think it's worth it. I don't know what it achieves or what it's going to do, even if it were affected. But considering that there is ambiguity and that it could be harmful to people. I just I don't think it's something we want to do.

Elliot:

Okay, Patrick.

Lakayana Drury:

Hey guys.

Elliot:

Lockana, you can go after Patrick.

Patrick:

Oh, go ahead, Lockana. I want to hear this.

Lakayana Drury:

Yeah, I would just suggest that in the interest of time we just vote on it. I had suggested before with the video statement, we just take as is, and to get into the merits of whether it's what people feel. I would just rather vote on it.

Elliot:

Okay. But we have a process of listening to the public and I think we do need, in the interest of time to cut it short, but Patrick, you have your last hand up and then we will move to vote. Patrick.

Patrick:



Yeah. First of all, I was hoping that I could get a copy of this emailed to me as I would like to spread it around. It's entertaining. And then secondly, I was hoping to say that this is the first vote that you guys have had since I left, where I'm happy I don't get to vote. Because it would be embarrassing to have to vote no on this and say, "Yeah, I was associated with this."

Elliot:

Okay. Thank you. If you want the text, it's on the agenda. It's listed. There's a link to the text. So let's move on to the vote. And I'll just go down the list. This is a vote to adopt this statement on behalf of PCCEP, as written and drafted there. So Anne.

Anne:

No.

Elliot:

Lockana.

Lakayana Drury:

No.

Elliot:

Amy.

Amy:

No.

Elliot:

Vadim.

Vadim:

Yes. And my heart goes out to all the people that are experiencing violence and all the people that might experience violence. And I really hope that [inaudible 02:52:06] set up for them. Thank you.

Amy:

Wait a minute. [inaudible 02:52:08] first you guys. Okay. [inaudible 02:52:11] first Vadim.

Elliot:

Excuse me. Let's move on. Yolanda.

Yolanda:

Sorry. No. Sorry.



Amy:

Okay. Taji.

Britt:

I think Taji left.

Shamari:

Taji voted no.

Elliot:

Okay. Brett.

Britt:

No.

Elliot:

Marsia.

Marsia:

No.

Elliot:

Shamari.

Shamari:

No.

Elliot:

And I will vote no. So the motion does not pass and we will move on to our last subject. We don't have a lot of time, but I do want to present this, see how far we can get. This is the youth reconciliation.

Speaker 7:

Identification.

Elliot:

Oh, identification, sorry.

Speaker 7:

Go ahead.



Anne:

Can I ask a quick question. Can we extend by 15 minutes so that we could give them that time they requested for those?

Elliot:

I think that's a great idea and I apologize to everyone for indulging or to abusing your time. So let's move on quickly. Who? Taji, you or Brett?

Britt:

Yeah. Unfortunately, Taji had to go for a family dinner thing, but I'm here. And then as well as Brian [bet Cohn 00:02:53:38], I believe he's here on the call and he was also one of the draftees or people who drafted it. So yeah, it is linked so I'll just give a brief overview. Brian brought this issue to us a few needs ago, and he's also been generally involved in the PCCEP work and basically seeking a better way to uniformly identify officers. I know it's something that's come up a lot in protests, especially when it comes to holding officers accountable. For example, individuals came in members, aren't able to see who they interact with, who they might think they've been wronged by. So they can't report that way with the IPR, but then the Mayor himself, as well as the IPR director, both told us that they've had a problem in video evidence, identifying officers because protests are already chaotic and then if you can't see a large badge or if they've covered up the badge or obstructed in some other way, there's just no way to see who that is.

Britt:

And so there've been multiple instances where they haven't been able to hold officers accountable. At the same time when they are able to see the badge, the Mayor did share with us that he has been able to relieve a few officers from their duty in those instances. So it's definitely something that could work if the system were set up properly. So the director or our recommendation relates to the current PDD directive, 031250 reminiscing that language and RFU as to how it can be improved.

Britt:

And then we also connect this to the ongoing discussion with legislative concepts in the Oregon State Legislature. Right now it's moving forward, but that probably won't be going into effect until next year. So it's really Portland's chance here to get ahead of that and to say we stand for this right now. Specifically in terms of the change, it is making sure that there is a clear name on the front as well as on the helmet, or the numbers on the helmet, and then there's also the name on the back. Yeah. So those are the three change points right there. Hope that was effective.

Elliot:

Yeah. Thanks Brett, for that very effective and efficient presentation. So let's take a piece of comment quickly and then public comment and hopefully get to vote. Let me see if anyone has their hand raised. I don't see any hand raised. I'll just say that I think this is a really great recommendation and one that's very timely, one that lots of different actors in the city as you noted, are calling for. And I think there's



an urgency to pass this so that it could hopefully be implemented quickly and help at least redress some of the questions around police use of force. Okay. Any other piece of comment?

Lakayana Drury:

Anne has her hand up.

Elliot:

Oh, sorry. I was looking at the participants and not you.

Anne:

I think this is a really well done and I really appreciate the work that was put into it and totally support it. Thank you very much.

Elliot:

All right, so seeing no other hands from PCCEP community, public members have any feedback on this recommendation?

Brian:

My name is Brian. I just wanted to thank Taji and Brett for helping to make this happen and their work. And just add that one more thing is that it's my hope that this can also have a psychological effect, that if officers know that their identification is very large and very clear, that can help create better accountability, particularly to Black and Brown individuals in Portland. Thank you.

Elliot:

Thank you, Brian. Really important point. Any other community, public comment, Dan Handelman.

Dan Handleman:

Hi. And again, Dan Handelman with the Portland Copwatch. We have a long history with this directive. The fact that chief Resch wrote a overall memo, basically absolving officers of the need to put their name on their outermost garment, which is the way the directive is currently written, I never thought that the requirement to have the name on the outermost garment was something that was even applicable to the way that directive allows a commander to say an officer does not have to identify themselves if, for instance, there's a riotous situation going on. I didn't think that had to do with the name tags, I thought that had to do with, if you ask them for their business card or if you ask them what their name was, because they're going to be in the middle of doing things. So just even on the most basic level, if they don't make as many changes as you want it should never be that when there's a uniformed officer that they are relieved of needing to have their name on their outermost garment.

Dan Handleman:

I appreciate the idea of having on the back as well. I hope that they do agree to that, but they're going to say it's going to cost money. Thank you.



Elliot:

Thanks Dan. Any other public comment? Okay, well let's... Oh Susan. Yes.

Susan:

And that's why any time you tell them something that requests something that costs money, it's easy for them to say, "Sorry, it's not in the budget." But if you specifically say the requirement is that you can identify every officer in every circumstance, then that's something they can't say there's no budget.

Elliot:

Thank you, Susan. Brian, you have your hand up again? Yes.

Brian:

Taji and Brett did some really good research on this. And since the Oregon State Legislature has a very similar legislative concept, I think I heard them tell me that the ways and means committee in the Oregon State Legislature assessed how much this would cost to implement statewide. And it was not very much, it was in the thousands of dollars, which considering our large budget is really not a lot in the big picture.

Susan:

Well, and since the \$5 million that can't go to street response, they can take it out of that.

Elliot:

Okay. Thank you, Brian and Susan. Any more comment before we move on to vote? We might actually get out of here on time. Okay. Thank you all for your input on this recommendation, and thank the USF committee for proposing it. So I will run down the list. This is to vote to adopt the recommendation on police identification, as in the agenda. So Anne, how do you vote?

Anne:

Yes.

Elliot:

Lockana?

Lakayana Drury:

I vote yes. [inaudible 03:00:54] for their work done and for Brian and for stepping in as well. Awesome job you all.

Elliot:

Amy.

Amy:



I vote yes.

Elliot:

Vadim.

Vadim:

Yes.

Elliot:

Yolanda.

Yolanda:

Yes.

Elliot:

Taji. Oh, not here. Brett.

Britt:

Yes.

Elliot:

Garcia.

Garcia:

Yes.

Elliot:

Shamari.

Shamari:

Yes.

Elliot:

And I vote, yes. It's unanimous. That's a nice way to end today's meeting. Thank you to the youth subcommittee for an awesome recommendation, that is both practical and spiritual in its intent. I thank all of you for sticking with it, and today for our extra long meeting, we deliberate. Sometimes we don't agree, we had two votes that were very lopsided, but that's just how it goes. Everyone gets to say their piece.

Anne:



We're going to announce our new members?

Elliot:

Yes. Theo is going to announce our new members. Thank you.

Theo Latta:

Thank you for the work that you're all doing. That youth recommendation was a recommendation that came straight from the community at the youth subcommittee meeting, and I think it's powerful the work that you're all doing. So thank you and welcome to Kia, Alex and Alana, the new members of PCCEP. So thank you very much. I look forward to working with you. I'll follow up with you off tomorrow.

Amy:

They didn't vote for Zenab.

Elliot:

Amy, you're unmuted. Thank you and those of you who just joined PCCEP, I don't think you know how much work you signed up for. You may regret the decision, but we're glad to have you on board to share in the work. Thank all the PCCEP members, staff, all members of the public, the PVV, the city for joining us and really excited. We will see you next week at the meeting on the budget, the 29th, and then the rest of our meetings are listed on the PCCEP website. Thanks and have a good evening.

PART 6 OF 6 ENDS [03:03:47]