

TRAINING ADVISORY COUNCIL
September 12, 2018
PPB Training Complex
6:30 -8:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Shawn Campbell, Chair
Edward Hershey
Danielle Droppers
Robert Fischer
Judy Low
Sylvia Zingeser
Sarah Suniga
Tyler Hall
Anne Parmeter
Kezia Wanner
Venn Wilde

MEMBERS ABSENT

Sushanah Boston
McKay Fenske
David Coates
Gary Marschke
Dave Hoffman
Jeffrey Klatke

TRAINING STAFF PRESENT

Lt. Jacob Clark
Liesbeth Gerritsen
Jody Halia

PPB STAFF PRESENT

Mary Claire Buckley
Kate Bonn
Robert Day
Jeff Bell
Raven Graham

GUESTS PRESENT

Dan Handleman
Megan Mohler

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

CITY OF PORTLAND
Training Advisory Council
Training Division

Date: 09-12-2018

Recording starts here

FEMALE: Recording device is running so just a reminder that this gets recorded and transcribed in its entirety and that's how we have record of this and it's a public document.

CAMPBELL: So, please, if you speak, please say your name beforehand just so the poor soul who transcribes this has an easier time of it. All right as Chair I would like to open this meeting and welcome everybody for coming today. It's a little easier today since it's raining as opposed to July when it was sunny which is good. Let's open with our usual somebody reading the Mission Statement. Do we have a volunteer?

ANN: The mission of the TAC is to provide ongoing advice to the Chief of Police and the Training Division in order to continuously improve training standards, practices, and outcomes through the examination of training philosophy, content, delivery, tactics, policy, equipment and facilities. The mission of the Portland Police Bureau is to reduce crime and the fear of crime by working with all citizens to preserve life, maintain human rights, protect property and promote individual responsibility and community commitment.

CAMPBELL: Thank you, Ann. All right, a few announcements before we get started. We have a few changes to the schedule. Of course, Lieutenant Dobson isn't able to make it tonight because of some personal issues, but we do have Kate Vaughn from his group here who will speak to us both about the use of force as well as our official request. As far as the stuff about demonstrations and protests the training dealing with that, I believe, Lieutenant Clark you are going to speak a little bit to that just not as in depth because it was kind of a last-minute thing, so.

CLARK: Yeah, correct.

CAMPBELL: All right. All right, to start out do we have a motion to approve the prior meeting transcripts?

FEMALE: I didn't finish reading them.

CAMPBELL: We need someone to-

BOB: I move we approve the prior meeting transcript.

CAMPBELL: Moved by Bob. Do we have a second?

JUDY: I'll second it.

CAMPBELL: Thank you. Second is by Judy. Please, affirmative vote, all in favor say aye.

GROUP: Aye.

CAMPBELL: All opposed? Motion passes. All right, to start up today let's do a couple of new business announcements. The first one is the - does anyone have an interest in doing police ride alongs? We suggest that you contact Jody. I will - I sent it out earlier this year about how to go about doing that, I'll send it out again after this meeting. As a reminder once we pass by bylaws at -

53 hopefully at this meeting, every member is required to do a police
54 ride along once a year. I believe Bob, you just completed yours and
55 you had a heck of a good time and learned a lot in doing it.
56 **BOB:** Very busy. Do it on the East side.
57 **TANYA:** I have a - this is Tanya - I have a ride along scheduled
58 next week.
59 **BOB:** Oh. Eastside?
60 **TANYA:** No, out at Central. Yeah.
61 **MALE:** I also have a ride along scheduled next week with Central
62 Precinct.
63 **MALE:** I hope you guys don't run into each other where they get a
64 lot of officers in one place.
65 **CAMPBELL:** All right, moving on from that. The second item for new
66 business is update on current membership and recruiting. As you can
67 tell by the current amount of people in this room, we are a little
68 low on members. In fact, we currently have a total of 16 members
69 intact, which is lower than we should and so we are going to start
70 the recruiting drive. The steering committee has talked about it
71 and Bob has volunteered to be the head of the task force for
72 recruiting. Mostly what we need is just some volunteers to help him
73 with that task. Judy is that you saying you'd be interested in
74 doing it?
75 **JUDY:** I - as I mentioned in the steering committee meeting, I
76 volunteer to help Bob.
77 **BOB:** Yeah, let me say (inaudible)-
78 **CAMPBELL:** Oh, yes sir.
79 **BOB:** A few things about what - what's going to be the - I think our
80 goal and what's going to be required to get to our goal. We have
81 some more people leaving, do we not, at the end of the year-
82 **CAMPBELL:** Yes.
83 **BOB:** So, the object is to get some people on because we're right
84 down to the minimum - on bare minimum right now. So, if ideally we
85 could recruit ten people so we could get to the - the workings of
86 the number - say we can work that - and we should do that by the end
87 of the year. The way the timetables work on getting stuff - getting
88 stuff printed and - and announced and processed and so on, it - it
89 pretty well means we should have the application form and
90 application process in - started or given at least to the Portland
91 Police Bureau by the end of this month. Which means between now and
92 the end of this month I think the task force will have to meet at
93 least one time to go over the application forms and make sure that
94 this reflects what - what kind of - well, what kind of outreach we
95 want in - in the application. So, both - and then - then I think
96 we'll be okay until the end of Oct - of Oct - November, or - or end
97 of October/November where we will have to then review the
98 applications. It is anticipated in past is any - is indicative of -
99 an indication of what the future will be, it - we probably will have
100 something like 20 applications. That's kind of a rounded figure

101 that - that has been the past experience and I've kind of whittled
102 that down to 10. So the end of October and into November we'll be
103 having to read applications and then have them picked out together
104 and - and evaluate them. So, if - for those that want to
105 participate, I think I'd like to meet you after this - this session
106 and try to identify a time later this month when we can get together
107 and look at the application forms. I can send them - what the past
108 application form was out to you. I've already looked at it and -
109 and looked at - at some of the other applications that - that are
110 done in other of the police - what do you call them kind of
111 programs, these - well, other of the police community organizations
112 - community involvement, community councils and so on. And so I've
113 kind of made some suggestions, which I'd - which I'd like to share
114 with you all on how to maybe describe a little bit more of what this
115 - the - TAC is, a little bit more about what - what they're actually
116 going to be evaluated on, the kind of persons we're looking for,
117 which has - were - were pretty skimpy on the old applications. So,
118 those who would like to - to work on this subcommittee - or, this
119 task force, let's get together briefly after this meeting and kind
120 of talk about how to - how to organize and get those sometime this
121 month, okay?

122 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you, Bob. Okay. So, Judy are you still in after
123 all that? (inaudible) Glen?

124 **GLEN:** Yes.

125 **CAMPBELL:** Would anybody else like to be part of the recruitment
126 task force?

127 **ANN:** Yeah.

128 **CAMPBELL:** Ann, thank you.

129 **FEMALE:** How many people do you need?

130 **BOB:** That's probably pretty good right there, we got-

131 **FEMALE:** Okay.

132 **FEMALE:** We need as many people as possible-

133 **CAMPBELL:** Yeah.

134 **FEMALE:** Because we need to outreach to as many people as possible.

135 **CAMPBELL:** Yeah. That being said, even if you're not part of the
136 committee for the task force, if you know anybody who you think
137 would be a good fit for TAC or you know of any groups that you think
138 should be more involved in TAC, I encourage you to talk with the
139 task force and also reach out yourself.

140 **BOB:** Yeah, we'll - we'll send out materials to you all when it's -
141 when it's finally out in the field and try to get new recruits. We
142 won't be the only recruiters, but we're trying to get the process
143 organized for the recruitment, okay?

144 **CAMPBELL:** Yep. Just to make everything official, do we have an
145 official motion to create a recruitment task force with Bob as chair
146 and Judy, Ann, and Ben as members?

147 **BEN:** So moved.

148 **CAMPBELL:** So moved by Ben. Do we have a second? So seconded by
149 Ed. Please say aye if you agree.
150 **GROUP:** Aye.
151 **CAMPBELL:** All opposed? Motion passes. Thank you very much for the
152 recruitment task force and again, please meet with Bob after the
153 meeting just to schedule a day this month to meet. All right,
154 moving on. The next item on the agenda is the formal acceptance of
155 the TAC Bylaws, something that many have been waiting for a long
156 time on. Just for a little bit of background, this updated Bylaws
157 were started, I don't know - Ed, you might know how many years ago?
158 **ED:** (inaudible).
159 **CAMPBELL:** It's been a moving target.
160 **FEMALE:** Yes, it has been, yeah.
161 **CAMPBELL:** It's been under review by the City Attorney for about two
162 years, I know, and we finally got through that process and to an
163 actual document. At this time I would like to suggest we either
164 vote the Bylaws up or down. I would prefer not to make small
165 changes at this time as opposed to just let's pass the Bylaws and
166 then if we need to make some small changes, we can do that because
167 that's an easier process than trying to move the whole thing back
168 and forth between us and the City Attorney again. Are there any
169 discussions or would you like to make a motion (inaudible).
170 **BEN:** Yes, Shawn - this is Ben - I move to adopt the Bylaws as
171 written.
172 **DANIELLE:** I second.
173 **CAMPBELL:** We have a second from Danielle. Is there any discussion?
174 All right, seeing none, all in favor, please say aye.
175 **GROUP:** Aye.
176 **CAMPBELL:** All opposed? Motion passes. We have Bylaws.
177 **MALE:** We're 15 minutes ahead of schedule. That's an all-time
178 record.
179 **CAMPBELL:** I know. All right, moving on. Next we have the Use of
180 Force Report presentation. The presentation will be given by Gate
181 Bonn - all right - Kate Bonn - that's embarrassing for me - Analyst
182 from the Professional Standards Division. Thank you, Kate.
183 **KATE:** All right. Well, thank you all for being here tonight.
184 Those of you that were here, I last presented in October of 2017.
185 So, if you were a member of the TAC at that time - if you were at
186 that meeting - you might recognize a little bit of this presentation
187 and I apologize if any of it is redundant. But after I was talking
188 with Jody, it seems like you guys have quite a few new members and
189 so we wanted to kind of start from the ground up and give you guys a
190 good picture of how the Portland Police Bureau analyzes force and
191 the process that we go through for all of that. So, feel free to
192 interrupt me as I go through if I - if you have any questions or -
193 or if I am unclear about anything. So who are we? The Force Audit
194 Team of the Police Bureau - the - a three-person team - myself,
195 Shannon Smith, and Heidi Busche. We are supervised by Lieutenant

196 Craig Dobson who you all know - and he does apologize that he's not
197 here. He had a family medical emergency that happened earlier
198 today, so he won't be here, but if you guys have any questions I am
199 happy to pass those along to him. We are assigned to the
200 Professional Standards Division of the Police Bureau and as I was
201 writing this slide from last year's presentation I realized that I
202 need to make some edits to it. And the first edit is that I need to
203 cross myself off that list because as of today I am actually an
204 analyst at the Training Division. I am now going to be helping the
205 Curriculum Development Unit doing evaluation of our ECIT and
206 Advanced Academy Training so, I will no longer be on the Audit Team
207 but I will be helping out just for the time being while we work to
208 hire some new analysts and potentially expand our audit
209 capabilities. Auditing is becoming more and more common in law
210 enforcement all across the country. I just got back from a
211 conference of - in law enforcement inspections and auditors, really
212 something that the bureau does want to expand into in the very near
213 future. So, what we do currently is we audit Use of Force Reports
214 for compliance with the Settlement Agreement, specifically
215 Paragraphs 74 through 77. If you have not read the Settlement
216 Agreement, I suggest that you do so. It is a very - it's a - it's a
217 dense document, but it really guides the policies, the practices,
218 the directives, how the Portland Police Bureau operates. It was
219 passed in 2012 and it's a constant process for the bureau to do
220 everything we need to do to be in compliance with that, and it's
221 going to make - make us a better agency. Specifically Paragraphs 74
222 through 77 relates to officer reporting of force as well as the
223 supervisor investigation of force incidents and the chain of command
224 review that comes after the facts. After the Settlement Agreement,
225 officers have - they now have a whole host of requirements of
226 components that they need to include in their Use of Force Reports.
227 So that's not only a detailed description of the force that they
228 use, the different applications of force - each one as they go
229 through the event - but also their attempts to contact witnesses at
230 the scene, their perception of the mental health status of the
231 subject. All of these things that - that we really want so that we
232 have a complete understanding of the force incident as it happened.
233 The sergeant also has a whole host of requirements that he has to do
234 during his investigations - sorry, he or she - and then also
235 includes various investigative components in their after-action
236 documents that they produce that then goes all the way through the
237 chain of command, ultimately comes across our desk to be audited.
238 We read through every single one of these documents. We read
239 through every single report, every after-action - we look at all the
240 photos, we look at all the videos. We take in this entire force
241 incident and see what happened and we make sure that everybody was
242 in policy and that they were abiding by the Settlement Agreement as
243 it happened. Because of how close we are with all of these various

244 documents, we decided to start coding force data. It's actually not
245 a requirement of the Settlement Agreement. It does say we have to
246 audit use of force, but specific analysis of force data - there's
247 one - there's one little line that discusses it - but the coding and
248 analysis of force data that we do, if you guys have all seen the
249 force data summary reports that we put out, they're very extensive.
250 We take all of this data and we compile it and we analyze it in
251 every which way that we can think of. So, that is something that we
252 have worked very hard on and - and I can't say having been involved
253 with - or, that interacted and networked with a lot of law
254 enforcement agencies recently, PPB is really on the forefront of
255 their force analysis. So, the Settlement Agreement, what does it
256 mean for use of force? Obviously, we have enhanced reporting
257 requirements for all the officers as active after-action - or, as
258 they go through the after-action process, we audit that for
259 completeness. And it also expanded the definition of force. So,
260 last year on August 19, of 2017, which is a date that's permanently
261 engrained in my memory because it does not fall in any logical form
262 on - on - it's not a quarterly basis, it's not on a month-end and
263 yet we decided to change right in the middle of the quarter. Which,
264 for an analyst, it - it throws off your data quite a bit. So,
265 August 19 of 2017 we passed a new Use of Force policy, Policy 1010 -
266 I'm going to refer to it several times throughout this presentation.
267 But what that does is officer actions that previously would not have
268 been counted as force, such as resisted handcuffing or control
269 against resistance, we now count those as force, officers are
270 required to complete a Use of Force Report, a sergeant is required
271 to investigate, it goes as far up the chain of command as it needs
272 to go depending on the category of force. Now, I'm going to get the
273 categories here in a second. Bob, I believe you sent us a handful
274 of questions in an email not too long ago and so I'm going to talk a
275 little bit about categories. But what does all this produce? We
276 have our Force Audit Results which is quite literally reporting on
277 reporting. It's very dry, it's very dull, but they are produced for
278 the DOJ, they're produced for the Settlement Agreement, and they're
279 also produced for the precincts so that Lieutenant Dobson can go
280 back to the precincts and can discuss how well the officers are
281 doing in terms of abiding by the components of the Settlement
282 Agreement and all these different requirements. Force Summary
283 Reports, which you all have seen, they're not required by the
284 Settlement Agreement, but we do produce them on a quarterly and
285 annual basis and we try and incorporate as many analyses as we can
286 so we do appreciate when you guys give us input on the kinds of
287 things that you want to see. And we have all of this data at our
288 disposal. We do love receiving feedback. We have a little link at
289 the end of each one of our Force Report - of our Force Reports that
290 you can go and you can fill out a survey and you can give us
291 feedback. Nobody ever does, but we would love it if somebody did.

292 We also have a Summar - Use of Force Dashboard and an OIF Dashboard,
293 which I believe if you were here at the last meeting, Shannan Smith
294 downloaded our Force Dashboard. It's - it's had a facelift since
295 then so I do encourage you guys to go back and explore it. We went
296 back through - some different analysts - we made it a little bit
297 more versatile, it's more interactive, it's very fun to play around
298 with. And we also have the separate OIF Dashboard. And the key
299 distinction between these two - and when I talk about Force
300 Categories - officer involved shootings, they are a use of deadly
301 force and they are investigated as a Category 1 use of force so,
302 they do not come to our audit team. We analyze and we audit
303 Categories 2, 3, and 4 uses of force. Category 1, any use of deadly
304 force is investigated by Internal Affairs, by detectives, by a whole
305 host of people throughout the bureau. But it's not specifically the
306 audit team, that's why we have to keep those things separate.
307 That's why on our Force Reports where it says does not include OIF
308 or - or use of deadly force on there, that's just because it's
309 investigated in different capacity so we don't have that data mixed
310 in with our own. Categories - now I'm finally getting to it -
311 broadly speaking, these are the different force types that fall into
312 the various Category 2 and 3, and Category 4. Again, any use of
313 deadly force is considered a Category 1. Bob, in your questions you
314 are asking for a little bit of clarification around some language in
315 terms of Impact Weapons and Less Lethal. And I want to thank you
316 for that because both of these highlighted things that - yeah, we're
317 in this data all day long, sometimes we overlook things, but impact
318 weapons we were not clearly defining it. That is actually a baton
319 strike, it's a very, very rare use of force. It happens may - I
320 think maybe once or twice in the past couple quarters - not a common
321 - not a common use of force by any means - but, it's a little bit
322 inconsistent with how we say impact weapons versus we have Category
323 4 Baton - Nonstrike over there, so. We have that and then Less
324 Lethal now refers to our 40mm launcher which I believe Officer
325 Hertzler gave you guys a - a demonstration and discussed a little
326 bit with you, but used to be our bean bag shotgun, is now our 40mm
327 launcher. We're also going to clarify the language around that in
328 next quarter's report. So, the Force Categories, how does this
329 work? Again, this is a - a very broad list. This is a good
330 starting place when you're thinking about how we categorize force.
331 Force is categorized this way based on the likelihood of it
332 resulting in injury. That's as defined by the Oregon Revised
333 Statutes physical injury, impairment of physical condition or
334 substantial pain, but this really is a rough framework that we start
335 from. Categorizing force can get very complex because there is a
336 lot of other factors that come into it. If you have a subject
337 sustaining some sort of injury or the age of the subject or if the
338 subject is pregnant, any one of these things can elevate it to a
339 serious use of force. We audit one hundred percent of serious use

340 of force incidents, automatically bump something from whatever
341 category it was up - up the chain so that it is reviewed by a higher
342 level of command. And then it's also the discretion of the
343 supervisor. If there's anything that happens in this incident, if
344 they for any reason believes that this needs to go up higher they
345 have the discretion to do so. So, again, this is our starting
346 point. If - if one of these uses of - if one of these types of
347 force is used that's kind of where it starts out, but depending on a
348 whole host of circumstances it can take - be elevated. Different
349 force types are used in response to the threat level that's
350 perceived by the officer when they arrive on scene. And that's
351 important to note because Portland Police does not have a force
352 spectrum, which is a pretty common thing in law enforcement, but we
353 deviated away from that a little bit. Each one of these force types
354 is used individually, based on the - the levels of aggression and
355 the circumstances of the - of the scene as the officer arrives, the
356 threat level that they are perceiving based on the subject's
357 actions. So, for example, pointing of a firearm, which Bob asked
358 about in some of his questions, used in a response to an unknown
359 threat. So, that would a high risk traffic stop or the end of a
360 pursuit. Oftentimes individuals in a stolen vehicle are armed. You
361 don't know their threat level when you're arriving on the scene and
362 you have an automatic disadvantage from that. Therefore pointing of
363 a firearm is often used so that the officer can maintain some
364 distance as they understand a little bit more about what's going on,
365 on scene. Methodology - so - first of all, does anyone have any
366 questions about categories?

367 **MALE:** Which is 2 and which is 3 in (inaudible)?

368 **KATE:** Category 2 and 3. So, that every - so, these are actually
369 mixed together and, again, that's dependent on the circumstances
370 that I were talk - that I was talking about. These are not fixed in
371 a - in one Category 2 or one Category 3. It's dependent on - on the
372 - the-

373 **MALE:** On - on the - in what - what the officer perceives as a
374 threat.

375 **KATE:** Yeah, well - well, yes. That's what the - force type is
376 dependent on the perceived threat. The category is when the
377 sergeant arrives on scene and the sergeant - after the use of force
378 happens and the sergeant's investigating that is when the category
379 is determined. Yes?

380 **BEN:** This is Ben. A question about Baton Nonstrike. It seems to
381 me just from my - my mental model of a baton, that anytime a baton
382 would be interacting with my body it would have to come in contact
383 with my body at some point and of course (inaudible) interaction so,
384 what - what's it look like for someone to use a baton on me and not
385 strike me?

386 **KATE:** Specifically, it's both. If you-

387 **MALE:** So, if bad guy's on the ground, laying on the ground, hands
388 are underneath him and you can't get their arms up to handcuff them,
389 one of the things that we teach to - you can use the baton just as
390 leverage. You stick it in their arm-
391 **BEN:** I see, to pull their hand out, yeah.
392 **MALE:** Kind of pull on it, yeah, that lever helps get their arm out
393 from underneath. So, you're not hitting them with anything, you're
394 not hurting them. It's just leverage to get their arm up.
395 **MALE:** I think you were hurting them by pushing that - pushing the
396 arm - by putting it by the wrist so that they had to get their arm
397 up. Is that-
398 **MALE:** You could hurt them. You're not striking them with it-
399 **MALE:** Right.
400 **MALE:** You're not intending to hurt them with it, you're using it as
401 leverage.
402 **BEN:** Thank you. I've a second question, does this - I'm - I have
403 the idea that someone has covered this before, but just verify for
404 me again, the Use of Force Reports and Summaries, do they include
405 the use of force during large scale public gatherings?
406 **KATE:** So, for crowd controlment?
407 **BEN:** Yeah.
408 **KATE:** Officers do, but it - it's audited under a different - it -
409 it's separate - it's audited separately. But, yes, they complete
410 (inaudible).
411 **BEN:** Is it included in the Summary?
412 **KATE:** In the for - is it a separate? We now report, I believe it
413 was in the Annual Report of last year we had a specific page of the
414 Annual Report that's for crowd control events. That's just because
415 there are - it's a different set of force types. Yes?
416 **FEMALE:** I'd like to know what the PIT stands for?
417 **KATE:** Pursuit Intervention Technique.
418 **FEMALE:** What?
419 **KATE:** Pursuit Intervention Technique.
420 **FEMALE:** Okay.
421 **KATE:** Where the car bumps the other.
422 **FEMALE:** Okay. All right.
423 **KATE:** Yeah. Yes?
424 **SARAH:** This is Sarah. I have a question about how - you said that
425 depending on other contextual factors, pregnancy, age, these things
426 might then be elevated or coded differently. How does that - how's
427 that reflected in the report?
428 **KATE:** Yeah, so those will be what's called a serious use of force.
429 So, again, regardless of the force type. So, say you have one
430 officer and one subject with only resisted handcuffing so based on
431 that it's only going to fall under a Category 4, but it has one of
432 those - one of those factors present. Automatically makes it a
433 serious use of force, it's investigated as a Category 2, goes all
434 the way up the chain of command and it's audited in full. So, it's

435 really a procedural thing for us. It just makes sure it goes
436 through every step of the investigation because of - specifically
437 because of those contextual factors.

438 **SARAH:** And just a follow-up question. And so, would that be
439 evident? Like, would I - where would I look for that to see if that
440 happened?

441 **KATE:** We don't typically - we don't have that included anywhere in
442 our reports how many - the number of serious uses of force what we
443 have, but it's something we could - we could potentially include.
444 It's separate - we code that data.

445 **SARAH:** Okay.

446 **MALE:** This might address an issue then of your pay grade, but I
447 take it we're considering - I understand why deadly force is not
448 included in this report. But it does, as a number of people
449 including my friend Ben Handleman point out, over - over time - it's
450 anomaly to me. It said - the thing says Use of Force and then the
451 most important use of force is not in the Use of Force Report. So,
452 I'm wondering if down the road somebody might consider renaming this
453 Use of Nondeadly Force.

454 **FEMALE:** Yeah, that makes sense.

455 **CAMPBELL:** This is Shawn. I would just like to point out, in the
456 Quarter 2 report that I just looked through today, it did have the
457 fatal shooting listed.

458 **KATE:** Yes, yeah. So, we-

459 **CAMPBELL:** It does not give details, but it is in there now.

460 **MALE:** Okay.

461 **KATE:** Yeah. That - that - that is a change that we made since the
462 Annual Report. Same with the crowd control. At the end of the 2017
463 Annual Report we started including additional pages for officer
464 involved shootings and all that and I believe, yes, at the end of
465 Quarter 2 we decided to just go ahead and attach that onto the end
466 of it and call it good.

467 **CAMPBELL:** And this is Shawn again real quick. I would just like to
468 say that that was part of our 2017 recommendations, and I think you
469 and the whole staff are already stepping forward on that.

470 **KATE:** Of course.

471 **MALE:** You know, let me - let me give it another spin on this
472 pointing of firearm thing if I may. My understanding is is that
473 within the criminal justice system, you're going to have, say a
474 robbery and someone - and someone just comes up and he says I want
475 your money and I'm going to threaten you with my fists or something
476 like that and they - you - you rob. It says it's a lower class or
477 robbery. Someone comes up and rips something out of your arm,
478 knocks you down, and robs you, it's a higher level of - of robbery.
479 Someone comes up and points a gun at you, it's a really high level
480 of robbery. And yet you guys seem to - the police department seems
481 to say well, if you point a gun at the person, well that's a lower
482 level of - of - of force. I - I mean, you - I heard it said - I was

483 passing one of the - officer that I was riding on - in a ride along
484 about - about pointing a gun and he said well, it - you know, it's
485 really a compliance device and something that we - we can
486 immediately get - get compliance with the people. You gave a
487 slightly different, you know, spin on it.
488 **MALE:** (inaudible) not accurate.
489 **MALE:** That's not accurate?
490 **MALE:** It is not a compliance.
491 **MALE:** Well, that's - okay, that may have been - that may have been
492 a mistake on that idea. But - but I don't know how - I mean, the -
493 the criminal justice system and the public in general think wait a
494 minute, when you're pointing a gun at somebody, that is a real
495 extension of force. I mean, it - it's a psychological force, it's
496 not - it's a minor thing? It's down with resisting handcuffing? It
497 doesn't make sense to me. Is that - is that standard across police
498 departments that this - one of those standards of practice or
499 standards - I - I'm sorry to be a little worked up about this, but
500 it just seems if he's pointing a gun it's - that's a minor thing.
501 **MALE:** It's not that it's a minor thing, it's-
502 **MALE:** The most minor category you have.
503 **MALE:** It's not that it's a minor thing. It is a minor use of force
504 because you're not actually using force. If you utilize that-
505 **MALE:** So, that means you're - if you're pulling the trigger it's
506 the littlest of force-
507 **MALE:** On the trigger (inaudible)-
508 **MALE:** And that goes all the way to 1.
509 **MALE:** Exactly.
510 **BELL:** So - so - so, I - I have to say, I didn't, you know, neither
511 of us - and, I'm sorry, I'm Jeff Bell, I'm the Captain of
512 Professional Standards Division so I want to apologize for, you
513 know, again for Lieutenant Dobson not being here. He truly did have
514 a last-minute emergency. One of the things I - and I - and I
515 totally hear what you're saying and I think the Training Division
516 has definitely gone away from - we don't point firearms or we don't
517 train people to point firearms in nearly as many situations as we
518 used to. The way these are laid out for the most part is based on
519 the actual harm to the individual in terms of physical harm. So, I
520 - I - again, I'm not saying that there's not room to - to take a
521 look at that in a different way, but I'm just letting you know
522 that's - that's kind of how these were looked at. So, Category 4
523 cases where there is essentially little or the minimest, no harm to
524 the person. Category 2 would be - or, I'm sorry - Category 3 would
525 be where there is very minor kind of temporary physical injury.
526 Category 3 - or, I'm sorry - Category 2 - they're really backwards
527 from what I think they should be - is - is, you know, when the
528 officer causes - when the use of force causes serious physical
529 injury. And then Category 1 would be a little bit different because
530 we still investigate any use of deadly force as a use of deadly

531 force regardless of whether or not there is injury. But that was
532 kind of the - the thought process of how those four categories were
533 done. I - I absolutely hear what you're saying in terms of, you
534 know, in - in terms of if someone forcibly put my hand behind my
535 back versus someone pointing a gun at me there is a significant
536 difference there in the - in the probably the emotional impact on
537 me, but in terms of the way these are looked at, it's based on the -
538 the actual physical harm to the community member.

539 **FEMALE:** You know, if I could follow that up with - when we were
540 looking at the policies many jurisdictions do not even count
541 pointing a firearm as a use of force. So, a lot of police bureaus
542 don't even consider it a use of force.

543 **MALE:** It's the gateway to Category 1.

544 **CAMPBELL:** This is Shawn. I think for me where it comes into it
545 isn't the fact that the pointing of the gun itself is actually harms
546 anybody beyond emotional harm. It's the fact that if someone
547 doesn't comply with the pointing of the gun you're really left with
548 two options. You either shoot the gun or you let them go. And that
549 seems like a much higher beyond just the actual physical harm as
550 much as maybe it should be considered the possible physical harm.

551 **MALE:** Oh, we - we train transitioning, too, so - and I've done it
552 myself on the job where you, yes, you have somebody at gunpoint and
553 they then charge at you but there's nothing in their hands, no
554 weapon. You can't use deadly force in that circumstance so you
555 hostile your gun and you go to other tools.

556 **MALE:** Why'd you have you gun out in the first place?

557 **MALE:** Well, in my specific example-

558 **MALE:** I - I mean, I - I was-

559 **MALE:** There's a guy running from a stolen car after-pursuit and I
560 fought with him a couple times and he had run to the front door of
561 somebody's home and was trying to kick the door in. So, I was - I
562 had him at gunpoint. He charged at me - he didn't have anything in
563 his hands - so, I re-holstered, we fought, he got away from me, and
564 then he shot three cops. So, it - so, we train-

565 **MALE:** Yeah, I (inaudible).

566 **MALE:** But you have to react to exactly what you have right in front
567 of you in that moment. We train to transition to different tools if
568 they're not a danger - a deadly threat anymore. The fact is they
569 can obviously become a deadly threat shortly thereafter again, but
570 that's how we train.

571 **CAMPBELL:** As a reminder, please say your name before-

572 **MALE:** I didn't know that, I'm sorry.

573 **CAMPBELL:** That's all right. Well, just so the transcription can be
574 more easily made. Ed, do you have something?

575 **ED:** This is Edward. This - this conversation should be elucidating
576 reaffirms for me that context counts.

577 **MALE:** Absolutely

578 **MALE:** And that therefore it is very difficult to apply a data set
579 to this subject to begin with and when you look at individual
580 incidents. You do it and it's a good thing you're doing it, but any
581 individual - for instance, I'm sitting here thinking of myself
582 before he stopped breathing, what would James Chasse be? Would it'd
583 been a 4 because he resisted handcuffing? Did he - was there a
584 takedown or was he down on the ground before the cops - the police
585 showed up? So that, you know, very - a 4 can become a 1-
586 **MALE:** Even a 4 can become a 1 pretty quickly, all right?
587 **MALE:** But at - when you talked about using the - the baton as a -
588 as a way to convince somebody to be handcuffed.
589 **KATE:** And that's why I think it's - it's very interest - very
590 important to understand that again, this is the - this is the
591 baseline, this is where things start. So, in terms of our data
592 collection purposes, in terms of our - literally tracking documents,
593 this is where things start. But any incident can be elevated to a
594 higher level based on what - what happens on scene, based on what
595 happens throughout the incident, based on what the sergeant
596 determines during an investigation. So, again, a (inaudible)
597 starting place, but everything doesn't have to be kept in these - in
598 these singular boxes throughout the entire time. But, I will say
599 that your - you give me a perfect transition there into the
600 complexity of all this that we are dealing with. So, this is our
601 methodology and this is where if you were here during October of
602 last year, you - you've seen this before, but just don't give away
603 the ending. But I want you all to imagine - just a hypothetical for
604 a second - that these two parents take their three children to go
605 get ice cream. Now, you are charged with auditing this case, with
606 collecting data on this. What would you collect? Go ahead and
607 shout your answers out.
608 **MALE:** What were we - what?
609 **KATE:** You - you are - you are the analyst.
610 **MALE:** Yeah.
611 **KATE:** And you are collecting data on this event.
612 **MALE:** What's the question?
613 **KATE:** The - any question you want. What kinds of data do you want
614 to collect?
615 **MALE:** Oh, I didn't know.
616 **MALE:** Was it in a cone, bowl-
617 **KATE:** Mm-hm.
618 **FEMALE:** Boy, girl.
619 **KATE:** Mm-hm.
620 **FEMALE:** Servings.
621 **KATE:** Yes.
622 **MALE:** Age.
623 **KATE:** Yeah. So, there's any name of diff - there's no right answer
624 because there's no right or wrong answers.
625 **MALE:** Nobody else could think of money?

626 **FEMALE:** Mom and dad.

627 **KATE:** (inaudible) different ice creams, like these kids - these
628 kids splurged when they went to the ice cream shop. But what you
629 all highlight here is that based on what question you ask - based on
630 what data you want to collect, any one of those could be the right
631 answer. So, in this - in this instance right here we have one
632 event, we have five people that are involved - there's two parents,
633 there's three children, and honestly if we want to get it complex
634 there's got to be somebody serving the ice cream in all this
635 process, right? They order three ice creams, but between the three
636 of them there's nine scoops of ice cream and there's four different
637 flavors. And just to get a little bit - just to throw a little ring
638 into the mix, what happens if on the way out to the car one of the
639 kiddos drops their ice cream cone? Sad kiddo, right? So, one of
640 the parents decides okay, we're going to do the nice thing and go
641 back into the shop and get the kiddo another ice cream cone. Does
642 that mean we now have two events? Those two separate trips into the
643 ice cream shop, depending on the question that you're asking, either
644 one of those could be correct. But now if you were here last
645 October you understand this event transfers right over into a force
646 incident. We've got one event but we have five people, two officers
647 and three subjects. They produce three force reports, there's nine
648 different applications, four different types of force between them.
649 And then what happens if somebody tries to deploy their Taser and it
650 fails? For whatever reason the probes don't make contact and the -
651 the - the suspect - subject, excuse me, never receives a current.
652 Does that still count as a use of force? Based on our methodology,
653 yes it would. We count any and all applications. If an officer
654 either attempts to drive-stun or have a probe deployment on their
655 Taser - whether it's accidental or intentional - we count it and it
656 goes through this entire data collection process and it is factored
657 into our Force Data Reports. So, all of this really just speaks to
658 how complex this process is. Depending on the questions that you're
659 asking, any - any - any of these factors can be relevant. But for -
660 for what we do, we read every single report, we read every single
661 after-actions, we look through the sergeant's investigation, we look
662 through the entire chain of command review. We review any and all
663 information we can about the force incident to make sure that we are
664 capturing the most valid data possible. And the reason I put this
665 graphic over here on the right - this is actually a graphic from our
666 new Force Data Dashboard so, I encourage all of you to go and check
667 that out. But this is a good - a good way of thinking, when you are
668 reading our Force Reports, think about what the denominator is of
669 the section that you're looking at. Think about what subset of data
670 might've contributed to that. So, if you're looking at subject
671 demographics you're going to be looking at subject level data. That
672 is data that has been cleaned so if we have multiple contacts with a
673 subject throughout the quarter we only represent them once - if more

674 than one officer uses force on a subject, still only counted once.
675 But what if we want to understand which precinct officers are from
676 that they're using force? Well, then we need to - we need to look
677 at officer level data for that. And and officer uses force in more
678 than one incident, they're still only counted once because they are
679 a single officer. What if you want to know the total number of
680 force events? Well, then you're going to be looking at the whole
681 thing. You want to know specific number of the - the applications
682 of a Taser. That's going to be there. The number of applications
683 of resisted handcuffing - maybe you only have one subject, but you
684 have two officers both of whom - subject fights with both of the
685 officers. That's two applications of resisted handcuffing even
686 though it's only one force type. It's very complex, but I've really
687 only put up here to - to illustrate that as you're looking through
688 this data it's important to be mindful. We're very mindful as we're
689 compiling it, we're trying to make sure that this is the most - the
690 most robust analysis that - that we can put out there. At the end
691 of the day the three of, we're just data nerds. We - we love data,
692 we love this kind of stuff, and we're going to try and - try and
693 compile these reports in - in the best, most analytically
694 methodologically rigorous way that we can. Obviously everything is
695 audited for all the Settlement Agreement points throughout this
696 process and we collect all the data on it. All of this culminates
697 into this. Everything is so complex that we had to color code it.
698 Even our data sets, when we turn things over to the DOJ and the
699 COCL. Are you asking for red data or are you asking for blue data?
700 Are you asking for force data or audit data? These are all very
701 different things that, depending on the question that you're asking,
702 any one of them might be accurate. So, if we start up here at the
703 top - Force Occurs. An FDCR is produced for each officer-subject
704 dyad. So, if you have two officers and two subjects and both
705 officers use force against both subjects, you have four FDCR
706 reports. Everything increases exponentially. As you increase
707 subjects and you increase officers, yes - everything increases from
708 there. That after-action is then completed by the sergeant, goes
709 all the way through lieutenant, RU manager, chief's office, however
710 high it needs to go based on the category, based on the
711 circumstances of the event. And eventually it arrives at our team,
712 we compile all - we will get - we code all of the force that occurs.
713 We audit 20 percent of the cases that we see and we do that just
714 because of how many cases we - we have to look at each - every
715 quarter, twenty percent are randomly selected. We also perform a
716 full audit on all CEW's, all Taser cases, and all serious uses of
717 force. Over here the inspector conducts an additional Phase 2 on
718 all of the cases that we audit. So, that is because, like I said,
719 we're data nerds, we're analysts, we're not cops. We have not gone
720 through the training that the officers have gone through so, when it
721 comes to tactical and training considerations, we're not in the best

722 position to try and say the officer should or should not have done
723 something different. I've read thousands of force reports, but I
724 still don't know what it's like to be fighting with a subject on the
725 ground. So, I'm not going to try and assume that the officer should
726 or should not have done something different. Instead, Lieutenant
727 Dobson reads through each one of those cases and he has his own
728 methodology that he goes through for basically a qualitative
729 assessment of the officer's skills and decision point analysis when
730 they arrived on scene. We will also collect data for our EIS, which
731 is our Employee - Early Intervention System. That is also with -
732 within PSD but it's not within our team. I have mostly included
733 that in here just to say that any force event, no matter how simple
734 - it's one officer, one subject, one application of resisted
735 handcuffing, but most basic police - police arrest action that you
736 can have is still going to go through this entire process, every
737 single one. We analyze force every which way that we can possibly
738 think of and we do so on a very extensive and rigorous way and we
739 take a lot of pride in doing that. So, here's what I was actually
740 here to talk about. I think this is what's on the agenda and that's
741 a review of our Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 force data. And we realize
742 that because you guys did not receive the briefing on Quarter 1 data
743 at the last meeting, it might be helpful for me to go over that as
744 well as catch you up onto Quarter 2. And it's actually kind of a
745 benefit because looking at one quarter's worth of data doesn't tell
746 you all that much. You can't determine a lot in terms of trend from
747 one quarter's worth. You really only have - it's - it's small data.
748 Small data problems are - are the worst problems that any analyst
749 can have. So, if we look all the way back to - I - I put everything
750 in back to a year so this is Quarter 3, 2017. And this is when that
751 new force policy was enacted, our new 1010 policy. It was on August
752 19th. We had about two weeks left of Quarter 3 for - for that to -
753 to fall into effect that has all of those resisted handcuffing,
754 control against resistance, all those actions that previously
755 would've been in the officer's report but now all of a sudden we
756 have data that we need to compile about that. So, between Quarter 3
757 and Quarter 4 we had a noticeable jump here, and we knew that was
758 going to happen. That's literally just from having more data, not
759 from force going up, not from any real - real patterns or - or
760 trends or anything like that other than data. So, into Q1 we saw a
761 noticeable jump again. We were fully anticipating that. That is
762 officers, sergeants, everybody becoming more clear on the
763 requirements of the new 1010. And now, into Quarter 2 we started to
764 see it come down just slightly. And what we're expecting is that
765 we're - we're trying to - we're sort of finding a baseline here. I
766 - I want to see our Quarter 3 numbers before I say if we've hit a
767 baseline or - or if it's still going to continue to go up or down
768 or, you know, who knows that's going to happen. We'll know here in
769 just about a month for the Quarter 3 numbers, but in terms of

770 Quarter 2 there really aren't any noticeable trends or changes or
771 any big - big blips that I can report to you guys today other than
772 to say we are seeing what we expected to see after this new use of
773 force policy was enacted. Yes.

774 **BEN:** This is Ben. I'm curious on these numbers, I hear you saying
775 we're seeing the kinds of shifts you expected.

776 **KATE:** Mm-hm.

777 **BEN:** And I - sorry I didn't get this question to you sooner because
778 you could've prepared for it with a slide, but I'm wondering if you
779 have a way to look at what the data would be if you were using the
780 old (inaudible)

781 **KATE:** Ah. So yes.

782 **BEN:** And contract that through because if - if what you're saying
783 is correct-

784 **KATE:** Mm-hm.

785 **BEN:** Use of force levels aren't really changing, I would expect
786 those numbers to be fairly stable.

787 **KATE:** We can get very close. The issue, and I'm going to - forgive
788 me as I go back a whole bunch of slides here - you guys get to see
789 some cutesy (inaudible), but if I can go back to this category. So,
790 because we have Takedown over here and Controlled Takedown over
791 here, previously-

792 **MALE:** That was split.

793 **KATE:** Previously those would've been lumped into one. So, that
794 complicates things, but yes, we did try and do something very
795 similar looking only at the force types that we were collecting pre-
796 8/19 to those that we - comparing only those force types post- 8/19.
797 We were seeing things being fairly level as much as we can with that
798 - with that Takedown component. That's the one thing that throws it
799 off because previously those would've been lumped together, and they
800 were one of our biggest force types. So, it's fallen off just a
801 little bit, but now that they're split into two it messes with the
802 data just a little bit.

803 **MALE:** Okay, thank you.

804 **CAMPBELL:** Shawn, real quick. With the Takedown and Controlled
805 Takedown can there be instances where you have both a Takedown and
806 Controlled Takedown in the same instance?

807 **KATE:** Yes - yeah, for sure. Yeah, it might as a Controlled
808 Takedown and then subject gets back up and it turns into a dynamic
809 takedown or vice versa. Yes?

810 **CAMPBELL:** I - I think Tyler was next, sorry.

811 **TYLER:** Tyler. Going back to your - the - the different quarters
812 with the statistic (inaudible)-

813 **KATE:** Mm-hm.

814 **TYLER:** I was noticing in this - in one of the slides prior it
815 mentioned that the officer-subject dyad was reported together-

816 **KATE:** Mm-hm.

817 **TYLER:** But then I'm noticing that there's a split in the numbers so
818 if an officer uses force on a subject wouldn't those numbers be the
819 same?
820 **KATE:** Not necessarily because there might be multiple officers--
821 **TYLER:** Okay.
822 **KATE:** And there - or there might be multiple subjects.
823 **TYLER:** Okay.
824 **KATE:** If an officer arrives on scene and there's two subjects and
825 he doesn't have cover, they don't have cover with them the - that -
826 that throws it off. Like usually they move in conjunction with each
827 other--
828 **TYLER:** Mm-hm.
829 **KATE:** But there's always a little bit of a difference between the
830 two.
831 **TYLER:** Okay.
832 **KATE:** Yeah. Yes?
833 **ANN:** This is Ann. How do you know how accurate the self-reported
834 data is or is there - is there some gray area if something is, like
835 oh, we're not really sure if that was resisted, it was kind of
836 resisted.
837 **KATE:** Speaking as an analyst as much as - as much as I can say I,
838 you know, I'm not out there on the street, but I know that
839 Lieutenant Dobson fields calls day in and day out of questions, of
840 yeah, we don't know - this is how it played out. Do I need to fill
841 out as - as Category 2 or a Category 4? Is this resisted
842 handcuffing? What we have a lot of confusion of - and what we call
843 a lot of confusion especially between 2/4 and 2/1, is the
844 distinction between resisted handcuffing and control against
845 resistance because it's very often that those occur in conjunction
846 with each - with each other. So Lieutenant Dobson did a lot of work
847 to clarify, okay - this is what we mean by resisted handcuffing and
848 it's only that. This is what we mean by control against resistance
849 and it's only that. Now, that's not to say that those don't occur,
850 you know, maybe an individual taken into custody and they resist
851 handcuffing and then after they get them up and they're taking them
852 to the patrol vehicle this person is still fighting, thrashing
853 around, that is considered control against resistance at that point.
854 But what we were seeing is that officers in one motion of the
855 resisted handcuffing were also counting it as control against
856 resistance, understandably so because it was a new force type and
857 they're trying to - they're trying to understand it for themselves.
858 So Lieutenant Dobson did a lot of work, we put out a lot of what we
859 call Tips and Techniques Bulletins just trying to clarify, okay -
860 this is what this refers to. Distinguishing between controlled
861 takedown and a dynamic takedown, of what kinds of movement are you
862 seeing from the - from the subject that - or what kinds of actions
863 are the officers performing that make it a controlled versus a
864 dynamic, took a lot of clarification on that. We do - we also do a

865 fair amount of data cleaning in terms of if we see - I mean,
866 officers may check off errors. They may mark dynamic takedown, but
867 in their write-up of - of the event it's clear that this was
868 controlled - it was - they were completely controlled the entire way
869 down to the ground. We're going to code that as a controlled
870 takedown because that - that was like what actually occurred. And
871 that's - that's part of what we do in the auditing process is we're
872 there to notice checkbox errors. We're there to notice disparities
873 between what they're saying. So, we try and correct it for - in
874 whichever direction it needs to go.

875 **CAMPBELL:** This is Shawn. Just to add into that, the last couple
876 quarters' reports as well included out of compliance, when people
877 were out of compliance-

878 **KATE:** Mm-hm.

879 **CAMPBELL:** With the - I don't want to say the wrong word, but the
880 standard-

881 **KATE:** Out of policy?

882 **CAMPBELL:** Policy, thank you - and some of those are improper
883 reporting.

884 **KATE:** Mm-hm.

885 **BEN:** Ben. I suppose most of them were on (inaudible) Quarter 1.

886 **KATE:** Mm-hm. So, and oftentimes that - that will relate to it's -
887 you know, there's a lot of things going on, it's a very volatile
888 scene, and - and maybe there's - there's largely no force that's
889 used, but one single officer at one point points their firearm in
890 the middle of the incident and then, you know, holsters their
891 firearm, goes about, takes - takes - and no other force occurs. And
892 then as they're driving away from the scene realizes okay, I need to
893 contact a sergeant. And it's that action of you need to remain on
894 scene and contact your sergeant so that sergeant can come and
895 investigate and that's now found out of policy, and that's
896 investigated as such. Executive findings - so, this is still -
897 we're still on the Q1, Q2's, this is still reflecting some of this
898 data over here. But these are just some of the bullet points that
899 we have in the first couple pages of our report. Q1 we had 26,000
900 officer-initiated calls for service, Q2 very slight drop to 24,000.
901 Also saw a very slight drop in the force that was used, .28 to .24
902 percent. In the citizen-initiated calls we have 61,000 and we
903 actually rose by about 5,000 in citizen-initiated calls in Q2 and
904 yet we still saw a very slight drop in force. So, that's something
905 to take note of. Not anything that we're going to call a trend,
906 it's not anything that we're going to call a pattern, but does make
907 us wonder what Q3 is going to look like. Are we going to - are we
908 going to continue on that pattern of more calls for service and a
909 lower level of force? Yes?

910 **BOB:** Yeah, this is Bob here. What - I know this is not in the
911 Force Report, but is there analysis given to what happened in the -
912 in the areas where there was not a report. In other words, 61,000

913 citizen calls, there was not force used - what was used? What
914 happened? What were those calls about?

915 **KATE:** We are actually - we're - as soon as our - as soon as our
916 team has the bandwidth for it, I mentioned we're trying to hire an
917 additional analyst right now - we intend to do a study on non-force
918 incidents so, as an analyst, that - it - it's kind of a step-back of
919 our data. When we analyze data we only have force data in front of
920 us. We don't have a good idea of what's going on in the non-force
921 events so, what we want to find out is we want to do an analysis.
922 We want to collect a lot of the circumstantial factors that we have
923 in terms of any aggression displayed by the subject, any de-
924 escalation techniques that are utilized by the officers. We want to
925 perform an analysis on that and it's on our list of things to do, we
926 just need more analysts to do it.

927 **BOB:** Part of the reason I'm asking - this is Bob again - part of
928 the reason I'm asking is that I was astounded by the number of
929 mental health cases that were being dealt with in - on the ride
930 along that I did. And - and there was, like no report done by the
931 officer except to say it was alcohol or mental health or I think he
932 had a little box that he checked.

933 **KATE:** He has a mental health template that they fill out and ask
934 him.

935 **BOB:** Yeah, and - and I - I know it's not force reporting - I'm
936 sorry to bring that up-

937 **KATE:** No, that's okay.

938 **BOB:** But I was kind of hoping that the police department is doing
939 something about documenting how much mental health problems they're
940 dealing with out there. I mean, it - it's - I mean, I know the
941 jails are saying we're - we're - we're mental health facilities
942 anymore. But-

943 **KATE:** So, we do have another analyst that - that does a mental
944 health audit that - that works with-

945 **BOB:** Okay.

946 **KATE:** Specifically some of that mental health data, BHU -
947 Behavioral Health Unit.

948 **BOB:** Is that data made public?

949 **KATE:** That I cannot speak to.

950 **FEMALE:** I don't think so.

951 **KATE:** Yes, it is? I don't know if they produce reports or not.

952 **BOB:** Okay.

953 **KATE:** But, yes - but to speak to what-

954 **MALE:** Yes, yes.

955 **KATE:** Yes, we do?

956 **MALE:** It is.

957 **KATE:** Okay. Sorry. I don't work with those reports myself, so.

958 **FEMALE:** Mental Health notes.

959 **MALE:** Okay.

960 **KATE:** Yeah. But, yes, we do - we - very strongly as analysts, we
961 want to put eyes - we want to have a comparative sample is what we
962 want. If we wanted to do a truly rigorous statistically analysis of
963 this data, then you can't only have an outcome - you can't only have
964 a yes outcome, you also need to have a no outcome so that you can
965 compare. Well, what - what was the difference between these two?
966 So, our goal eventually is - is to code an ent - a non-force data
967 set so that we can actually run some statistical models of what are
968 officers doing in force events versus what are they doing in non-
969 force events and what can we emphasize to try and - and lower our
970 levels of force even more? Yes.

971 **ED:** Edward. This is sort of piggy backing on Bob's question.
972 There was of a kerfuffle not long ago when the local newspaper
973 figured out that it was a very high rate of arrests of transients.
974 Some of us thought it made complete sense that there would be a high
975 rate of arrest of transients given the nature of what's happening in
976 the streets, but I'm wondering, is there a potential here for taking
977 a look at use of force based on the person that force was used on
978 and categorizing - I won't - I won't call them victims because they
979 probably aren't, they're - most of them are - they're virtually all
980 arrestees, they're subjects, but by sub - is there any potential or
981 benefits or - or ability to figure out by subject-

982 **KATE:** Mm-hm.

983 **ED:** What use of - how use of force is.

984 **KATE:** But that's the only variable that we code, and we do have a
985 page on all of our force reports right now that - one that does
986 mental health sub - mental - mental health crisis - specifically
987 mental health crisis, that's a key thing. They're individuals that
988 are actively - cannot take care of themselves, trying to harm
989 themselves or others, versus just a perceived mental health
990 influence - important data distinction. But we also have a page for
991 transient subjects and a page for subjects who are drug or alcohol
992 induced at that time - at the (inaudible).

993 **ED:** And racial minorities?

994 **KATE:** We report demographic data of those - of those populations.
995 Yeah. Yeah. And that would be an initial variable that we would
996 code in the non-force data set in, you know - hypothetically maybe
997 there's an officer out there who is really good at de-escalating
998 drunk people. Drunk people, we all know, they're hard to ration -
999 they're hard to rationalize with, but maybe there's somebody out
1000 there who knows the trick and we just need to review some of those
1001 data sets so that we can start training officers on - on what those
1002 are. It's really just a goal to collect enough data to say that
1003 we've - we're seeing a pattern here and we want to try and
1004 investigate it further.

1005 **BEN:** This is Ben.

1006 **KATE:** Mm-hm.

1007 **BEN:** Would your prospective non-force audit allow you to identify
1008 specific officers who might have more skill in certain area and then
1009 - this is maybe more a training division question - and then work
1010 with those officers to develop the training to share that
1011 information or the skills with other officers?
1012 **KATE:** It's a - I mean, if I can (inaudible) - it's a potential.
1013 Anything is a potential. When I talk about the non-force data set,
1014 I really say this is - this is an ambitious goal that the - that the
1015 analysts have and it it's given the bandwidth to do what we'd love
1016 to and that analysis could be designed in any way. So, it could be
1017 a design to track officers, it could be designed to be anonymous.
1018 None of it has actually taken shape yet. It's just something that
1019 we recognize. If we want to truly say there is a difference between
1020 force and non-force events, we need to collect a comparative data
1021 set to do it before we say anybody is good or bad at - on either
1022 side.
1023 **MALE:** And Ben, that's - we don't have the data necessarily backing
1024 that up, but that's what we do at training is reach out to the folks
1025 in the field that are the best at what they do and - and pick their
1026 brains, what're they doing different. We bring them in to train the
1027 rest of your own. We just don't have the specific statistics to
1028 show that this officer is better at this one thing. It's more just
1029 experience, more anecdotal.
1030 **BEN:** Thank you.
1031 **CAMPBELL:** Shawn real quick, and this is just more just a comment, I
1032 guess. Looking at this slide and being someone who also goes
1033 through this data-
1034 **KATE:** Mm-hm.
1035 **CAMPBELL:** From your reports more than I like to think about
1036 sometimes. One thing I'd be very interested in if you're thinking
1037 of another thing to add to your Dashboard, your online data-
1038 **KATE:** Mm-hm.
1039 **CAMPBELL:** Would being able to divide between the citizen initiated
1040 and the-
1041 **KATE:** Officer initiated?
1042 **CAMPBELL:** Police officer initiated calls?
1043 **KATE:** Yes, of course.
1044 **CAMPBELL:** I think that might be of interest, depending upon what
1045 comes out.
1046 **KATE:** Yes, definitely, and that's - I mean, yes, that's definitely
1047 something that we could filter for. All right, this last bit here
1048 is about custodies. So, Quarter 1 we had 6,100 custodies to 6,300 -
1049 not a huge difference there. Very small, you know, small reduction
1050 in force again, not one of those ones that we want to say is this a
1051 pattern but one that we want to keep our eyes on. But the reason
1052 that I wanted to put this custody information up here is because it
1053 relates really well to the demographic information to the census
1054 data discussion that we've been having. And I know that you guys

1055 sent your formal request and we responded. I believe that email was
1056 passed around to all of you, but I just wanted to discuss it a
1057 little bit more. And I'm going - and this is from the analytical
1058 perspective so, I'm an analyst, I'm a data nerd, and I'm interested
1059 in doing things in the most - in the most methodologically
1060 appropriate way that I can. So, these are extra (inaudible) Quarter
1061 2 reports - I apologize for the small text - but this - this first
1062 table up here, these are the subjects of the uses of force, the
1063 demographic information for those that - the subject reports for
1064 Quarter 2 and then these are the custodies that occurred in Quarter
1065 2. So, if we think about this broadly, all of these people up here
1066 are represented in this population and that is because this
1067 population down here - these custod - these individuals who were
1068 taken into custodies, by their very nature, were having an
1069 interaction with the police. And that - and that - I have no idea
1070 what that interaction was from, but they were quite literally in the
1071 physical presence of an officer enough to be taken into custody.
1072 When I talk about custodies I'm not only saying arrests, we - we
1073 could be talking about individuals who are taken on mental health
1074 holds or individuals who are taken to detox. However temporarily
1075 they are with the police, we do still count them as a custody so
1076 they would be reflected in that data set. What it looks like when
1077 we graph all of this is these are all of the custodies that we had,
1078 the people who were in contact with police, and this is the subset
1079 right here that had force used against them. So, if we were to put
1080 the entire population of Portland into this chunk of the pie, this
1081 small slice would be miniscule. From an analyst's perspective it
1082 would be largely meaningless. We're not going to be able to confirm
1083 that much from it. So, if we instead compare the individuals who
1084 had force used against them to the individuals who were taken into
1085 custody, you have an appropriate numerator and an appropriate
1086 denominator for the analysis. We go - we've got to go way back to
1087 elementary school, but that - that's what it all breaks down to at
1088 the end of the day is numerators and denominators. So,
1089 unfortunately, if we were try and use the census data here it's just
1090 not an appropriate comparison because the entire population of
1091 Portland is not in a position to have force used against them.
1092 That's because of the entire population of Portland a very small
1093 subset of them is coming into contact with the police on a quarterly
1094 basis or is even having to call 911 or - or make contact with an
1095 officer in any way, shape, or form. Whether they're the victim of a
1096 crime, whether they are involved in a crime, anything, you - you
1097 have to by your very nature be in contact with the police in order
1098 to potentially be the subject of a use of force. So, I was looking
1099 through the news the other day and this is actually - this isn't the
1100 only example of this kind of analysis - this was a study that was
1101 put out by Portland State University Criminal Justice Policy and
1102 Research Institute just a couple of months ago. And I myself, I

1103 have a Masters from Portland State in Criminology and Criminal
1104 Justice and this guy right here - Renauer, Dr. Brian Renauer, was my
1105 advisor while I was there. So, what he was doing here is he was
1106 doing a study that was looking at enforcement habits on TriMet so,
1107 looking at demographic information of individuals who are issues
1108 citations for not paying their fare or any number of different
1109 offenses that an individual can be cited for on TriMet. And he was
1110 asked a very similar question - well, can you compare the individual
1111 who received citations to the population of Portland? Well, it's
1112 not the appropriate analysis to do and that's because the entire
1113 population of Portland is not riding the bus or is not riding
1114 TriMet. They're not even in a position oftentimes to pay fare to
1115 TriMet so, therefore, they're not in a position to receive a
1116 citation from TriMet, if you understand. It's not an appropriate
1117 denominator to use for this analysis. Instead, if you wanted a -
1118 specifically, if you wanted to look at potential bias in the
1119 enforcement officers then you need to look at the individuals that
1120 they issued citations to, to the individuals who are riding the bus,
1121 the individuals who are in contact with those officers who could
1122 potentially receive a citation. That would be the appropriate
1123 numerator and the appropriate denominator. So, from an analytical
1124 perspective when we received your request, we of course understand
1125 the desire to use Census Bureau information, but it's instead much
1126 more appropriate analytically to use this custody information
1127 because these are the people who could potentially have force used
1128 against them.

1129 **MALE:** But you're missing the - I think - I'm sorry.

1130 **CAMPBELL:** Let's-

1131 **KATE:** Okay.

1132 **CAMPBELL:** Let's - let's recognize speakers on this one because I
1133 know it's going to be a little bit of a-

1134 **KATE:** Yes, I know it's going to be so-

1135 **CAMPBELL:** If it's okay, let's have Danielle because this is
1136 eventually her motion for the official request if she would like to
1137 speak.

1138 **DANIELLE:** So I think - I think the concern is the proportion. So,
1139 less about changing your denominator and your - your sample that
1140 you're pulling from to be the - to move from the people who come
1141 into contact with the police versus the population of Portland. I
1142 think it's more about looking at proportions of people who are
1143 coming into contact with the Police because if you just look up here
1144 - and I'm looking at the Quarter 1 data, you know, the - if you
1145 combine both male and female black African American folks, they're
1146 representing 31 percent this - the subjects that are of uses of
1147 force. They're representing 31 percent here, but they only make up
1148 6 percent of the population. So, it feels like there's some context
1149 that's missing from these reports and it - it feels a little bit
1150 misleading. And actually I have a formal statement that I want to

1151 read quickly if everyone could just bear with me for a second.
1152 Because I think it - this is actually a really important issue and
1153 I'm sorry, I'm fighting a cold so sorry for the cracking voice. But
1154 I just want to say that formally on the record that I'm disappointed
1155 with the response that Lieutenant Dobson provided and find the
1156 reasoning given for not including basic races in the city
1157 demographic data in the use of force reports insufficient. The
1158 inclusion of the data provides meaningful context to better
1159 understand if certain populations are overrepresented in use of
1160 force and provides necessary information for the Portland Police
1161 Bureau Training Advisory Committee to make better informed
1162 recommendations. In Lieutenant Dobson's response to the TAC's
1163 formal request to include basic city, race, and ethnicity
1164 demographic data for context he stated that census data is not the
1165 best representation of the population of subjects against whom force
1166 is used. Custody data is a much more appropriate comparison dataset
1167 because it identifies a population which is already in contact with
1168 the police. Now, according to the PPB's own 2016 Stops Data
1169 Collection Report, we know that black African American populations
1170 are stopped at disproportionate rates and they account for 20
1171 percent of pedestrians stopped even though these folks only
1172 represent about 6 percent of the population in the city. Traffic
1173 stops among the population have increased by nearly a full percent
1174 between 2012 and 2016 and we know that in 2017, 52 percent of
1175 arrests were of houseless folks. So, within that context, to say
1176 that custody data is a better comparison because it represents
1177 populations that are already in contact with the police and we know
1178 that certain populations are overrepresented feels like it's skewing
1179 the data. And Lieutenant Dobson's response to the request has also
1180 stated that since this data is outdated, which I agree with, but he
1181 also alludes to census estimates not being reliable data to use and
1182 nearly all government agencies rely on census data to inform
1183 budgets, policy, and programmatic efforts. And in fact the Portland
1184 Police Bureau's 2016 Stops Data Collection Report refers to and uses
1185 this very data within the introduction section of their report to
1186 rightfully provide appropriate context to the report. And thus it
1187 feels like resistance to transparency and at worst an attempt to
1188 present data in a misleading manner and frankly such as basic
1189 request being denied throw into question the potential efficacy of
1190 this committee if such a simple request and recommendation is denied
1191 and dismissed. And I became involved with this committee because I
1192 want to be part of the solution to work together to address issues
1193 so that all our community can live in a city where people feel
1194 appropriately served and protected by the police. Given - and given
1195 this important - the importance of this issue and the work that this
1196 committee has been charged with, I will ask again for the bureau to
1197 reconsider the decision to include in and of itself - just by itself

1198 - basic city demographic information for context for this data - for
1199 the use of force data. That's all I have to say.

1200 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you, Danielle.

1201 **ED:** I think the key word in Danielle's presentation which I most -
1202 most appreciate was the context. Now, we understand - I think you
1203 misread Professor Renauer. The job then is to go out and figure out
1204 what the demographic of the total ridership is and it shouldn't be
1205 too hard to do frankly. Similarly, in this instance we understand
1206 that it's simplistic to take the entire city and measure it against
1207 the arrested contact base because we know certain neighborhoods are
1208 different than other neighborhoods. When Bob said - advised the
1209 ride along people earlier in this meeting, pick the Eastside, there
1210 was a reason he did it, because that's where the action is. If you
1211 want to go on the Westside, be in Old Town on Friday nights, that's
1212 where the action is. So we understand that there are variables that
1213 happen to (inaudible). But it seems to me that it's disingenuous to
1214 dismiss that variable of total population. Will - will the
1215 disparity - what - what's it, 6 percent against 30 something percent
1216 - also reflect other hard facts about this city sociologically? In
1217 terms of poverty, housing, sure it will and it will be a service
1218 that'll be around to do that. To simply deny this request on the
1219 premise that it's - it's - it's simplistic or out of date, I think
1220 misses the point.

1221 **KATE:** If I can very briefly address it and I fully understand
1222 everything that you're saying - I do think that it's important to
1223 distinguish between force data and stops data which is - which is
1224 collected separately and stops data is compared to the entire city
1225 as a whole because the entire city is in a potential situation where
1226 they could be stopped by the police. So, yes, that is an
1227 appropriate comparison to make between those two. And that's really
1228 what we were trying to relay because this is the Force Data
1229 Collection Report because the - the focus of all of the amounts -
1230 these - all of the data that we collect is this top most stuff -
1231 section. It's not the total custodies so, yes, I - I - I absolutely
1232 believe that those kinds of analyses need to be performed. We were
1233 trying to distinguish here the difference between the subjects in
1234 uses of force versus custodies to compare - to include an analysis
1235 that directly compares subjects of uses of force to the larger
1236 population, which was what was implied here. Yes, to my - to my
1237 knowledge they did go out and find demographic information of
1238 ridership - yes, they did. But when they were specifically asked
1239 why didn't you compare it to the census data, this was the response.
1240 And this is where when we're trying to compare our subset of a
1241 subset, we want to make sure that it has the correct comparison
1242 there versus the entire population as a whole.

1243 **MALE:** So, if I could follow-up-

1244 **MALE:** Please remember that she's an analyst presenting our numbers,
1245 she's-

1246 **MALE:** Right.

1247 **MALE:** She's not a policy maker, she's not a decision maker.

1248 **MALE:** I understand.

1249 **MALE:** She's just presenting--

1250 **MALE:** That's fine.

1251 **MALE:** So, keep that in mind. I know you - this is a passionate

1252 topic in the group, but--

1253 **MALE:** She can defend herself.

1254 **MALE:** Oh, she's doing--

1255 **MALE:** Very well.

1256 **MALE:** She's doing a great job. But I wouldn't be doing my job if I

1257 didn't at least throw that out there.

1258 **KATE:** Yes. I think - I think it's - it's Bob then - then Ben, if--

1259 **MALE:** Yeah, just to quickly say, it seems to me, perhaps that using

1260 the Stops - the Stops - using the Stops data in response to your

1261 question Danielle would solve the problem. Let's see the Stops

1262 data, all of it. And we can make - we can make the comparison, you

1263 don't have to.

1264 **KATE:** Okay. And - and that - and to that I will say, there is a -

1265 there is a Use of Force Dashboard as well as a Stops Dashboard, both

1266 are available online. It - it's difficult to have a dashboard that

1267 has everything all at once and that's because the data doesn't talk

1268 to each other very well. All these data - they're literally hosted

1269 on different servers, it - it's from a purely practical perspective.

1270 But yes, the numbers are readily available in that - in that

1271 analysis. Yes, that - yeah, from an analytical perspective would -

1272 yes, I would agree with that.

1273 **CAMPBELL:** I believe Ben and then Bob, as far as--

1274 **BEN:** Thank you. Thank you, Danielle. Thank you, Ed. I appreciate

1275 all that the two of you have said and thank you again for your

1276 presentation.

1277 **KATE:** Mm-hm.

1278 **BEN:** I've - there's a thing that you said and - and - and I've

1279 heard it a couple of times and I just want to be really clear about

1280 this. Are you saying that currently the custody numbers are the

1281 denominator on the ratios shown in the subject use of force

1282 percentages, when the use of force percentages are percentages taken

1283 from all interactions not just the custody interactions, or am I

1284 misunderstanding that?

1285 **KATE:** So, yes, but if I'm understanding you correctly - let me

1286 clarify here. So, this is force compared to - to calls - so, all

1287 calls. This is subject of force to custody. So, this data - so,

1288 this data right here, this 6351, is this 6351 right here.

1289 **BEN:** Yeah. So, it goes (inaudible) slide?

1290 **KATE:** Yes.

1291 **BEN:** Okay. So, the top portion - the top table here--

1292 **KATE:** Mm-hm.

1293 **BEN:** This is still Ben, for our transcriptionist - so, the top
1294 table here, is this - are all of the subjects in the top table
1295 people who went into custody?
1296 **KATE:** Yes, all of these people - all these subjects - would also be
1297 in this right here and these percentages right here is this number-
1298 **BEN:** I - so, I haven't (inaudible) any differences (inaudible)-
1299 **KATE:** Male whites versus 75 right there.
1300 **BEN:** I have color vision differences, I don't see your pointer
1301 (inaudible).
1302 **KATE:** Oh, of course. So, the number for male white, 120, the 44
1303 percent right there-
1304 **BEN:** Is percentage-
1305 **KATE:** Is the result of this being divided by this 275 right here.
1306 That is the numerator versus denominator. But, if we were talking -
1307 so, this subset right here - and these are the exact same charts as
1308 - as the last graph. This is - this number - this 275 to the 6,351
1309 in terms of the - yes.
1310 **BEN:** Okay, thank you. So-
1311 **KATE:** Yes.
1312 **BEN:** I would - and I think I hear my colleagues murmuring this
1313 direction and I think Ed may have just pointed to it a moment ago, I
1314 would very much like to see - along with a contextual reference to
1315 the demographic data for the City of Portland from the Census
1316 Bureau, I would love to see these use of force data for all calls -
1317 citizen initiated and officer initiated-
1318 **KATE:** Mm-hm.
1319 **BEN:** To see the use of force statistics on the demographics of
1320 those people - the subjects on whom force was used as a proportion
1321 of all of the calls.
1322 **KATE:** Of all of the calls.
1323 **BEN:** Like as a comparison with all of the calls so, not-
1324 **KATE:** I'm going to pull up here and - and you'll have to forgive
1325 me, but I - what I'm going to do as I'm still answering your
1326 questions is pull up our new Dashboard-
1327 **BEN:** Right.
1328 **KATE:** And I can show you some of its capabilities because this very
1329 likely might have that.
1330 **BEN:** I guess what - what I'm thinking is, for example, if I see
1331 that all of, you know - there were 275 subjects on whom officers
1332 used force - so there's 275 citizens on whom officers used force -
1333 our community members on whom officers used force during the quarter
1334 then affect - and 44 percent of them were white men then I'd like to
1335 know what percentage of the people that officers interacted with
1336 were white men. Because that, rather than the custody numbers,
1337 seems like it might be the appropriate comparer there. And I would
1338 also like to be able to compare the interaction with the demographic
1339 data because I think that's also informative. And, to take that one

1340 step further, I would love to see the 2x2 on demographics of citizen
1341 initiated versus officer initiated calls with or without force.
1342 **KATE:** Okay. So, a lot of that data is available - a lot of it.
1343 **BEN:** Okay.
1344 **KATE:** It's not all in this Dashboard, it's not all handled by my
1345 team, but a lot of that data we have a team of about 20 analysts
1346 that work up - up on the floor on Central Precinct and any number of
1347 them is - one of them works specifically with stops data, one of
1348 them works specifically with crash data, one of them works, you know
1349 - so, we have the data that you're asking for, whether it lives in
1350 one place or anyone has worked through all those different analyses,
1351 I don't know, but I know a lot of it is readily available on the
1352 various Dashboards and reports that we put out. So, this is the new
1353 Dashboard that we have so this is looking purely at individual in
1354 force incidents and it doesn't look like we have custody information
1355 on this page - force by subject status-
1356 **KESSIA:** Can I - can I ask a question?
1357 **KATE:** Of course.
1358 **KESSIA:** This is Kessia. This actually is a question of Lieutenant
1359 Clark. For all of the calls for service self initiated and not in
1360 the calls for service, I'm assuming there's reports written on some
1361 of those from the officers and on some of those you're going to get
1362 some more thorough information collected like demographics. Some of
1363 it you're not-
1364 **CLARK:** Correct.
1365 **KESSIA:** So, I don't - so, what you're asking for I think you get
1366 partial information (inaudible).
1367 **CLARK:** At least most of our contacts have no paper attached to
1368 them.
1369 **KESSIA:** So, the reports now (inaudible) incomplete data, although
1370 it's super interesting, but it's just being misrepresenting because
1371 it's impartial.
1372 **CAMPBELL:** Real quick because we are starting to push our time on
1373 this and this is obviously a subject that is much more detailed than
1374 what our time allows - my apologies, Bob - for-
1375 **BOB:** That's all right.
1376 **CAMPBELL:** I would suggest that the task moving forward, if TAC
1377 would like to continue moving forward with this then we should
1378 create a task force so that the dialogue can happen in the passion
1379 it should as opposed to poor Kate here who can't even speak for her
1380 boss or her boss's bosses. It should be a dialogue going with
1381 Lieutenant Dobson and I believe the best to go forward with that is
1382 to be with a task force.
1383 **KESSIA:** I think that's a great idea - this is Kessia - and I think
1384 we can find out what's possible to get from data that is collected
1385 and what's possible to be. And then with (inaudible) the comparers
1386 as well and I'd be happy to serve on the task force. If - if it's
1387 created.

1388 **MALE:** Do you want to lead the task force?
1389 **GROUP:** [laughs].
1390 **MALE:** If I had the time to lead a task force.
1391 **CAMPBELL:** Is there any motion to create such a task force, because
1392 we are not going to solve this today.
1393 **KESSIA:** I'll motion to lead-
1394 **CAMPBELL:** We have a motion-
1395 **KESSIA:** (inaudible)
1396 **CAMPBELL:** We have a motion from Kessia - did I pronounce that
1397 right?
1398 **KESSIA:** Yeah, you did.
1399 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you.
1400 **SYLVIA:** I'll second it.
1401 **CAMPBELL:** We have a second from Sylvia.
1402 **SYLVIA:** Sylvia.
1403 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have anybody who, discussion, or anybody who would
1404 like to volunteer for the task force if it is created?
1405 **FEMALE:** I will.
1406 **FEMALE:** I will.
1407 **FEMALE:** I will.
1408 **CAMPBELL:** (inaudible) get some names here.
1409 **MALE:** Sarah, I would like to also, since I have a lot of
1410 statistical background, I feel like I could be beneficial, if that's
1411 all right.
1412 **BEN:** This is Ben. I would also like to serve on the task force.
1413 **CAMPBELL:** All right.
1414 **MALE:** (inaudible) just of what - I need to understand what - one
1415 thing she said.
1416 **CAMPBELL:** Okay.
1417 **MALE:** You're using a term I didn't hear before - Stop data?
1418 **KATE:** Stops data, yeah.
1419 **MALE:** What - what's that mean?
1420 **KATE:** Individuals who - who are stopped on the road, who have their
1421 car pulled over.
1422 **MALE:** For those - for those people the - the proper denominator is
1423 the whole city population.
1424 **KATE:** Yes, because-
1425 **MALE:** Okay, that's all I wanted to-
1426 **KATE:** Because everyone-
1427 **MALE:** That is the-
1428 **KATE:** Yes.
1429 **MALE:** That will show what officers are seeking out.
1430 **KATE:** Yes, and it's what - and it's very possible, I would
1431 encourage you to pull up our Stops Dashboard.
1432 **MALE:** Okay, fine. That's all I wanted to ask.
1433 **FEMALE:** But wouldn't custodies also fall into that?
1434 **MALE:** No.

1435 **FEMALE:** I mean, doesn't everyone have the possibility to be in
1436 custody in - in-
1437 **CAMPBELL:** At - at this time we need to move forward with the
1438 business on the table. I understand that there are still a lot of
1439 questions and everything involved, but (inaudible).
1440 **FEMALE:** Could she - could she just ans - yes or no to the ans - to
1441 the question first?
1442 **KATE:** You're asking about comparing custodies to population data?
1443 **FEMALE:** Yeah.
1444 **KATE:** Custodies to population data, that - that-
1445 **FEMALE:** Yes.
1446 **KATE:** Could - yes, that could be-
1447 **FEMALE:** So, that's what I'm-
1448 **KATE:** That would be okay, comparing force to population-
1449 **FEMALE:** Okay.
1450 **KATE:** Is remove - yeah, removing one, but yes.
1451 **FEMALE:** So, in - in light of that, including the census data -
1452 including the census data per context because I'm looking at this
1453 and 22 percent - I'm looking at the - the custodies data for the
1454 Quarter 1 - and 22 percent of the African American population is
1455 represented here. I'm sorry, but I'm not going to let it go.
1456 **KATE:** And - and I - and I don't expect you to. I - I completely
1457 understand.
1458 **FEMALE:** I mean, I - I'm not - I'm not directing this at you
1459 personally-
1460 **KATE:** Yes.
1461 **FEMALE:** I know you're just running the numbers, so it's-
1462 **KATE:** But I absolutely understand your desire.
1463 **FEMALE:** I hope it doesn't feel like I'm directing this at you.
1464 **KATE:** No.
1465 **FEMALE:** It's - but this is a problem and if we don't have a full
1466 understanding of the data that we have, then we cannot make informed
1467 recommendations. I'm sorry.
1468 **CAMPBELL:** All right. So, we have a motion on the floor to create a
1469 task force to investigate creating a recommendation based upon the
1470 official request. We have Danielle, Kessia, Sarah, Shawn, and Ben.
1471 It'll be up to the task force to choose a lead for it and let me
1472 know. Do we have any discussion about the creation of the task
1473 force? Not seen. All in favor say aye.
1474 **GROUP:** Aye.
1475 **CAMPBELL:** All opposed. Motion passes. Thank you. I will be in
1476 contact to staying out to give the directions on how to move forward
1477 on that through our official process. All right.
1478 **KATE:** Are there any - are there any remaining questions that I can
1479 answer (inaudible).
1480 **MALE:** No, you're going to get (inaudible).
1481 **GROUP:** [laughs]
1482 **KATE:** Well, thank you all very much.

1483 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Moving forward, if it's all right with
1484 everybody we'll just skip over the break for the sake of time. If
1485 you do need to use the bath - the bathroom, please feel free to step
1486 out on your own.

1487 **BOB:** I need another cookie.

1488 **CAMPBELL:** If you need another cookie, Bob, go ahead and grab it.
1489 We did skip over one item and my apologies, it'll go really quick -
1490 an update on current status of Study of Patterns in Use of Force
1491 Reporting. At the July meeting I was tasked with by the TAC to
1492 create a study of patterns that had been noted priorly - in prior
1493 times in private discussions before in the Use of Force Reporting.
1494 It was supposed to be done by this meeting, I apologize - it is not.
1495 It will be done by the November meeting and it will be going through
1496 the correct process of allowing PPB to view it and have comment to
1497 it before we have anything final that gets passed, of course so,
1498 just kind of an update on that. All right, moving on from there, I
1499 believe that we have Lieutenant Clark who is going to discuss a
1500 little bit about - to us about training around how PPB deals with
1501 protests and demonstrations. A few comments before we get started.
1502 Please remember that originally this was supposed to be Lieutenant
1503 Dobson and at the last minute he had to deal with his own issue so,
1504 obviously Lieutenant Clark doesn't have the same prepared materials
1505 that Lieutenant Dobson would have. Also, it should probably be
1506 stated that I need to remind everybody, I know that protests
1507 especially are an area that can create a lot of passion, but we need
1508 to handle this professionally. It should be mentioned that PPB
1509 cannot discuss anything currently under investigations and it should
1510 be mentioned that, of course, as TAC, our emphasis is on training so
1511 please keep that in mind as we go hear from Lieutenant Clark.
1512 Basically we aren't here to investigate specific events. That's a
1513 whole different community organization, a whole different group
1514 that's in charge of that. We're here to understand the training and
1515 suggest ways to improve the training.

1516 **CLARK:** I - I guess to start with, I and Lieutenant Dobson aren't
1517 exactly sure what you would like to know.

1518 **MALE:** We were mostly looking for kind of an - we don't know
1519 anything about how PPB trains for protests and demonstrations.

1520 **MALE:** Every officer is not trained for that.

1521 **MALE:** No.

1522 **CLARK:** It - it depends. And - and that question gets more
1523 complicated too so, are you wanting to know, like what kind of
1524 training the - the line officer has or what kind of training the
1525 incident commanders have that are making the - moving the chess
1526 pieces and running the operation?

1527 **FEMALE:** I think-

1528 **CLARK:** All of it was-

1529 **FEMALE:** The generalist information to start with would probably be
1530 how the line officer is given that kind of training, you know, and
1531 then maybe normal field course training differs from that.
1532 **KATE:** So, I will say having Lieutenant Dobson - we ran through a
1533 presentation yesterday so I got to see what he had prepared for
1534 tonight and he did have a breakdown of - of the different - the -
1535 the foc - the emphasis of each training component and the number of
1536 hours that they receive from mobile field course, for the Rapid
1537 Response team, for all these different groups and - and the certain
1538 kind - kinds of events that they might respond to. So, he had all
1539 of that prepared in his PowerPoint so, that is for - a topic for the
1540 next discussion, absolutely.
1541 **CAMPBELL:** I guess given that, would the TAC like to wait until the
1542 next meeting for this discussion so that Lieutenant Dobson and his
1543 prepared material can actually be here? Instead just throwing poor
1544 Lieutenant Clark out on the fire and-
1545 **CLARKATE:** Well, whatever you guys want to do.
1546 **MALE:** Yes.
1547 **FEMALE:** Yes.
1548 **CAMPBELL:** All right. We will move that to the next meeting unless
1549 there is anybody who is against it - all right, done. That moves us
1550 on, do we have any other new business?
1551 **MALE:** Yes.
1552 **CAMPBELL:** And TAC announcements. Yes, Ben.
1553 **ED:** My - this - my new business is the announcement that I'm become
1554 old business. A couple of months ago I shared with Shawn that I
1555 intended to leave after the end of the year as it - by a quirk in
1556 scheduling I have conflicts for both the November and January
1557 meetings so this will be my last time with you. And it ends eight
1558 years of volunteering starting with six years on the Police Review
1559 Board in 2010 and with the advent of this council in 2012. I want
1560 to thank you for your forbearance both with my tendency of sometimes
1561 dominate conversations and also my activist instincts both online
1562 and in the room on occasion. And I also just want to say in a word
1563 of encouragement that I don't think that in any of the six years
1564 that I've been on the council that it is as well-equipped as you all
1565 are making it today and I - my colleague's-
1566 **FEMALE:** I agree, yeah.
1567 **ED:** Been here six years who (inaudible) as mine as well.
1568 **FEMALE:** Yeah, I agree.
1569 **ED:** I'm very impressed with that and I - and I wish you well. And
1570 just finally by way of a brief valedictory I understand collegiality
1571 is important (inaudible) if you read and go back and read the
1572 mission does involve supporting the vision and the chief. But there
1573 is also an implied oversight. And I think that it is to the benefit
1574 of the Training Division - and I think that Brian and Bob and I
1575 think Erica from what little I've seen so far (inaudible) represent
1576 the best and the brightest of the - the right people have been put

1577 in place and it's been a privilege to work with them. But I think
1578 their feet need to be held to the fire because they need the
1579 resources and the resolve historically - nothing special about
1580 Portland - historically police agencies are as more resistant to
1581 change than probably any place but the military and maybe more so.
1582 And so, to the extent that training plays such a strong role in
1583 that, by all means I could encourage - I apologize for what you went
1584 through, but I took it as a good sign and I wish you all well.

1585 **FEMALE:** Thank you.

1586 **GROUP:** [clapping]

1587 **BEN:** Think I'll leave.

1588 **CAMPBELL:** And on behalf of the TAC, I would just like to say thank
1589 you for all your years of service. You've been here, I believe,
1590 since the beginning and if it wasn't for the people who started
1591 putting things together, we wouldn't be here where we are today.
1592 Thank you. Angie, did you have something?

1593 **ANGIE:** Yes, I have a couple announcements from Ann Parmeter - so,
1594 at one point we were doing happy hours every other month and that
1595 was an opportunity for people to come together in a casual
1596 environment and brain storm and process. I wonder if people are
1597 interested in picking that up again. So, they haven't been
1598 incredibly well attended, we had one that was a great success maybe
1599 a year ago so, we're trying to do them on the off months. So, the
1600 next one would be October 10th - so, we're doing the second Wednesday
1601 of the month, October 10th. Is that something, by a show of hands,
1602 would people make an attempt to attend? And if I see enough hands
1603 then I'll make this happen again. Okay, awesome. So, I'll send out
1604 an email blast as we get close to that date. Another relevant thing
1605 for training professionals, I am speaking at the Association of
1606 Talent Development. Their annual conference is just right down the
1607 road at the Airport Sheraton and that is on November 8th and I'm
1608 presenting on Rapid Video Development for E-Learning. So, if anyone
1609 is able to attend that conference and would like to go or if you're
1610 not able to attend and you just want to sit with me sometime and
1611 learn how I make videos - and you can make videos on your phone and
1612 edit them for training-

1613 **FEMALE:** Wow.

1614 **ANGIE:** Whatever - let me know if you're interested.

1615 **FEMALE:** That'd be cool.

1616 **CAMPBELL:** I'd like to take the opportunity real quick just to
1617 recognize Deputy Chief Day here with us. And for some people who
1618 came on, some of the newer members, we worked with Deputy Chief Day
1619 for years while he was in charge of the Training Division. I just
1620 want to say welcome and I'm glad you could make it today.

1621 **DAY:** Thank you. Can I say a few words?

1622 **CAMPBELL:** Of course.

1623 **DAY:** Oh, thanks.

1624 **GROUP:** [laughs]

1625 **DAY:** Well, I don't know if I've ever said just a few words. Easy,
1626 Ed, don't have to follow up on that.
1627 **GROUP:** [laughs]
1628 **DAY:** Is this really your last hurrah?
1629 **ED:** Yes, it is.
1630 **DAY:** Wow. Well, thanks. I appreciate it, you know that.
1631 **ED:** We've been through a little bit together.
1632 **DAY:** We've been through a little bit together - yes, we have.
1633 Thank you very much. I've learned from you and I've appreciate it.
1634 Hey, I just wanted to take a moment and come back, say thanks. You
1635 know, I came out here in June of 2016, I was assigned out here in
1636 July of 2016. It was a challenging time for me personally and
1637 professionally and many of you just, you know, welcomed me, were
1638 gracious in allowing me to kind of get up to speed, to listen, to
1639 learn, and I really appreciated that. And that was important to me
1640 because the way I was promoted then I went on vacation and then
1641 meetings-wise I didn't get a chance to be here in the spring when I
1642 was reassigned downtown. So, from both a personal standpoint and a
1643 professional standpoint I wanted to say thank you for that. And I
1644 also - I have been around a little while. I've been involved in a
1645 few community-led events in my time and I don't say lightly or
1646 disingenuously that this is one that has the opportunity and has
1647 displayed the ability to move the needle in some ways that makes me
1648 hopeful that it will continue. You know, just your longevity speaks
1649 to your faithfulness and the renewed interest in it, leadership -
1650 Shawn, Suzanna, other people, I think goes a long ways. And so I
1651 would just encourage you to keep on. I - I've had a long day myself
1652 as all of you have. I know it's not, you know, no cry-me-a-river
1653 because we're all working late tonight, but was energized sitting in
1654 the back listening to the discussion. I was super impressed with
1655 Kate, I leaned over to Leslie (inaudible) and you're right, she
1656 doesn't need any defending, but I also appreciate the way Lieutenant
1657 Clark stepped up. But just, you know, the ability to have that
1658 conversation, the thoughtfulness. Danielle, your statements
1659 resonated with me as a leader in the organization, I heard that loud
1660 and clear and I appreciate your boldness and candor and
1661 professionalism in putting that out there and the, you know, ongoing
1662 interest that you have, you know, really that I sense to make us
1663 better. And that's what's a passion of mine, that's why I've stuck
1664 around. I believe in the - in the Chief, I believe in - in where
1665 she wants to be and where she wants to see this organization go and
1666 that was a really a long - large motivating factor for me accepting
1667 this appointment. So, it's a new position, I sort of tell people
1668 I'm building the plane while I'm flying and one hand it's the
1669 hardest job I've ever done, the hardest I've ever worked, but it's
1670 also pretty special to be able to step in and create something new
1671 and be a part of the organization that I've - that I've spent almost
1672 three decades serving in. So, you know, with that being said - I

1673 mean, I don't mind taking a question or two. I know you're on a
1674 schedule, but most importantly I just wanted you to know thanks, to
1675 hear my thank you and also to know that you, you know, you have an
1676 advocate and a friend in the Chief's office. And, you know, the
1677 conversations we did have in the 22 months I'm - I was out here are
1678 not lost on me and, you know, I continue to be a promoter of your
1679 work and promoter of the Training Division. Although not directly
1680 under my command the way we're structured, but certainly I have, you
1681 know, a role and place in that discussion. So, you know, feel free
1682 to continue to use me as - as a resource in that regard. Any
1683 questions or anything? I can switch gears, I can put on my Deputy
1684 Chief hat for that if you want to ask something bureau related or-
1685 **MALE:** About the demographics, Day.
1686 **GROUP:** [laughs]
1687 **DAY:** Yeah, when Kate starts talking about it with her educational
1688 background and the way you guys were grilling her I'm, like I'll
1689 make it up and say that's the deep end of the pool. I don't know.
1690 It's why we've got Kate. All right. Well, thank you guys for
1691 (inaudible).
1692 **FEMALE:** I've got a quick question.
1693 **DAY:** Yes.
1694 **FEMALE:** I just first want to say thank you so much for taking the
1695 time to come out here. I can't even imagine - begin to imagine how
1696 busy you must be in your new position and just that you have the
1697 thoughtfulness enough to take the time to come out here is really
1698 meaningful. And I think also speaks to your dedication as well. I
1699 was just curious to hear as you're building the plane while you're
1700 flying it, what do you envision being a few of your priorities in
1701 the next year or so?
1702 **DAY:** Well, primarily - and the Chief's been very candid about this
1703 - you know, she has three primary goals. One is, you know, and they
1704 - you can put them into various orders, but you know, one of them is
1705 around crime reduction, crime reduction strategies. Another one is
1706 around, you know, community trust and relationship building.
1707 Another one is around sort of organizational wellness, excellence,
1708 training fits into that specifically. That's a passion of hers,
1709 training is a passion of hers so that's good for this addition and
1710 it's good for this program. Primarily the way that it's structured
1711 is I have responsibility for the Operations and the Investigations
1712 branch. So, that's really anything "police work related." She
1713 chose to keep the services branch, which is the Training Division as
1714 a direct report to her so, excuse me, services handles everything
1715 that sort of keeps the wheels on the bus running, you know, from
1716 Professional Standards and Training, and Fiscal, Accounting, things
1717 like that. So, I like to joke that she gave me everything that has
1718 risk, because I have everything to do with basic policing as you
1719 think of it. But, you know, so some of my primary goals, you know,
1720 is crime reduction strategies. We historically have not, you know,

1721 publically talked about the need around crime reduction, but
1722 actually crime is increasing - crime reporting is increasing I
1723 should say - and Portland is still a very - a very safe city
1724 relatively speaking, given our size and population. But, you know,
1725 we are seeing an increase in - in different areas. I mean, some of
1726 that's based on calls for service, you know, reporting crime. You
1727 know, whether that be around shootings, stabbings, assaults, things
1728 of that nature, property crime, car theft, you know, break-ins,
1729 bicycle theft, etc. So, we're intentionally looking at the numbers
1730 and want to be mindful of the fact that if we're not paying
1731 attention although we're in a pretty good place and we've been in a
1732 good place, we don't want to necessarily get to a point where all of
1733 a sudden we're going holy - what happened here? How'd this get away
1734 from us? So, what that means when we talk about crime reduction
1735 strategy for us and for me is not about we need to go out and arrest
1736 more people, you know, we need to go out and - and, you know,
1737 really, you know, lay down the law, it's more about how are we using
1738 the resources that we have. You know, I've been here almost 30
1739 years and we do a lot of things the same way because as police
1740 officers we like that consistency and I've really been charged with
1741 looking at how we're using the resources we have to impact the
1742 numbers. So, for example, the Investigative branch, the roles of
1743 detectives tend to be very reactive, trying to wait for the case to
1744 come to them and then they go out and do the follow-up. They do
1745 really good work, we have an excellent Detective Division. I'm
1746 looking at ways to maybe reorganize that. Maybe we can break up
1747 some of the silos, bring some kings together, have them work more
1748 cohesively, maybe with officers in other divisions, etc. I'm
1749 looking at ways to try and spread out some of the responsibility.
1750 We have a reporting system where maybe this and that happens here,
1751 the officer takes the report and ships it off over here, and then it
1752 just sort of falls over here and nobody looks at it. I want to go
1753 back to the commanding officer and say hey, what did you do with
1754 this? Well, we sent it over to this unit. Well, what could you've
1755 done more so while you had it and have some accountability 'til
1756 then. I was - earlier tonight at the Central Precinct command staff
1757 (inaudible) all their supervisors from Central Precinct when I told
1758 them, I said, you know, there's going to be an expectation that from
1759 my office on down that we're more engaged and more aware of what's
1760 going on around the conversation around crime. I met with
1761 (inaudible) of the ACLU today to talk about our numbers around
1762 houselessness - homelessness arrests. I think you mentioned that
1763 about, you know - you know, and once again it's not about how - we
1764 need to go out and arrest more people, but let's - what are we
1765 doing, you know. Let's really look at that and say is that being
1766 effective, is that making a difference. So, when we talk about
1767 crime reduction strategy I am looking at the numbers, but I'm not
1768 turning it into an enforcement model as much as it's a resource

1769 model. How we're managing it with 71 vacancies right now in the
1770 officer ranks so, it's not, like you know, we just have a plethora
1771 of folks to draw from. We need to be wise stewards of our money,
1772 and our people and their time, but that's one of the objectives.
1773 You know, another objective I have is - and I've spoken about this
1774 probably it's my responsibility to help the Chief connect, you know,
1775 organizationally because, you know, I have the experience and the
1776 time here, she's from the outside. And so, I've really enjoyed
1777 being an advocate for her, being able to be out and about. She
1778 certainly doesn't need my support in the sense that she's highly
1779 skilled, very relational, very personal, very personal, and super
1780 smart. So, it's not like, you know, she needs Bob Day for much of
1781 anything except that I do have the history of the organization, I do
1782 have the experience of the organization. And her schedule dwarfs
1783 mine by any stretch of the imagination. We have never - and I say
1784 literally - seen a Chief with as much on her plate and as high
1785 demand as she is and so, you know, one of my basic roles in these
1786 first few months is just continuing to bridge, you know, that
1787 connection. Sort of like a COO of an organization, you know, she's
1788 the CEO but I'm the Chief Operating Officer. A lot of stuff comes
1789 to my desk to help manage to get through and so forth. You know,
1790 and the final piece - and I struggle because - and it is one of the
1791 Chief's goals around community trust and community relationship
1792 building, but when you look back over this organization and we've
1793 been talking about that since I got hired in 1990. So, although a
1794 very important goal and - and one that we want to strive for, one of
1795 my thoughts is, you know, what does that look like? We've been
1796 trying to do it for a long time. Every chief has mentioned it as a
1797 primary goal when they come in so, you know, I'm - I'm having
1798 conversations with the leadership about, you know, what does that
1799 mean? And then we're having conversations with the community. What
1800 does that mean, what does that look like being out and about. What
1801 does it mean to have restored trust, you know, what does - you know,
1802 so it's kind of like sometimes like trying to catch smoke. And so
1803 what I want to do is try and find some tangibles. I like to have
1804 stuff I can touch and feel and look for, and that seems so broad and
1805 so vague in a city so large and there's, you know, such a - just
1806 fine number of us. So, it's - it is a huge priority of mine, it's a
1807 desire of mine. My life's been changed through relationships in
1808 this community. Once again I say that, you know, both on a personal
1809 and as a Deputy Chief, but I'm looking at it from a standpoint of,
1810 you know, is it just going to community meetings? Is it just
1811 showing up at TAC? It seems like there's more there, it seems like
1812 we're missing something, and I don't know exactly what that is, but
1813 I'm challenging the conversation around that. Does that make sense?
1814 **ED:** You - I know you wouldn't be happy if I didn't put you on the
1815 spot one last time.
1816 **DAY:** Yeah, right. You're right, yeah.

1817 **ED:** I'm wondering, you - you referenced homeless, is the bureau's
1818 leadership involved in attempting to craft a strategy toward dealing
1819 with the negative impact the street people on the quality of life of
1820 Portland, commerce, and other ways, and are you being heard?

1821 **DAY:** Well, the short answer is yes on the first part. Are we being
1822 heard? I'm not sure at this point. I'm not sure about being heard
1823 or who's really going to - who really needs to listen. You know, we
1824 have strong support from the mayor in - in our work. He's very
1825 supportive of the Chief and her direction and he's very supportive
1826 of me. I don't feel like there's a disconnect in that way at all,
1827 but you know, as we have pointed out the mayor has spoken too, you
1828 know, this isn't a mayoral problem, this is really a society
1829 problem.

1830 **FEMALE:** That's right.

1831 **DAY:** It's really something for Portland and really us as a nation
1832 to look at and grapple with and I fully understand and when I'm
1833 speaking with the ACLU today, I fully understand why they look to
1834 the police. I mean, we are the obvious, you know, starting point
1835 for this conversation in so many ways. But in terms of a strategy,
1836 I think about it all the time. It is literally - our phones ring
1837 off the hook, you know, the mayor's office gets hundreds of calls a
1838 week and it's a challenge that really we have never seen in - in my
1839 career that the police are going to thousands and thousands of calls
1840 a year around, you know, traditional 911 call - there's somebody
1841 camping in the park. And then the dispatcher will typically say
1842 well, the police don't respond to a camping call unless there's
1843 something more illegal going on. So, then they'll say well, then
1844 there's a gun involved or they're doing drugs, or I think they have
1845 stolen property. And then the police show up and they have a
1846 campsite but, excuse me, they don't have all these things that were
1847 alleged but now the person's frustrated because, you know, we're not
1848 doing X, Y, and Z. We've issued one prohibited camping site in
1849 2018, that was for a - I believe a van that was warned multiple
1850 times. So, and the best I've been able to find - I'm always
1851 cautious to quote numbers - but the best that I think we'll find is
1852 I think two or three prohibited camping sites in the last two to
1853 three years. And so, it's not a statute that we've been using
1854 heavily. But, you know, on average - on the average probably city-
1855 wide maybe 30 or so camps a week that are cleaned up and addressed
1856 and, you know, largely through police and cooperation with one point
1857 of contact and others. We are at multiple tables, I was recently
1858 with the Home for Everyone executive board, which is led by the
1859 County Chair and the Mayor, talking about this. I was at the
1860 advisory board for them again last week with probably 50 people at
1861 the County building. You know, we're with partners all across the
1862 spectrum, but at the end of the day what I tell people is, you know,
1863 the police are your best outreach workers going because we're 24
1864 hours a day, 7 days a week. And our officers are being continually

1865 put in these untenable situations which are not solvable with the
1866 things that we have on our belt or even the training we have. And
1867 so, one of the areas that we're trying to strategize in is really -
1868 as I was explaining earlier today - is, you know, we really are
1869 complaint driven so we don't have the luxury to say no, we're not
1870 going to do that when somebody calls 911 and says hey, there's two
1871 people, you know, fighting or two people whatever. So, we're show
1872 up so we're complaint driven and then our emphasis is service first.
1873 So, what is it - what is the service that's needed here? Our
1874 officers hand out multitudes of service cards, we work with service
1875 providers, I've got tons of stories of getting people in housing, we
1876 have our own program - the Service Coordination Team, we spend - the
1877 police bureau spends millions of dollars a year on, you know,
1878 programs to try and support people in addition, mental health, etc.
1879 So, you know, it's a service of - service-minded approach, just try
1880 and connect them to services. And then ultimately, you know, if we
1881 can't resolve the situation in any way, shape, or form, then
1882 sometimes there needs to be an arrest. You know, we went to 350,000
1883 calls for service roughly in 2017 and, you know, less than 5 percent
1884 resulted in arrest. So, you know, the vast majority of the
1885 interactions we're having are not resulting in custodies, but with
1886 that population - and I think somebody said it here earlier - you
1887 know, was surprised - what was surprising about, you know, 50
1888 percent of the people were arrested. I'm not saying that's an
1889 acceptable number, but it did not surprise me given the volume of
1890 interaction we're having with the houseless community at this time.
1891 And almost exclusively, not a hundred percent - certainly not a
1892 hundred percent, but almost exclusively driven by calls for service.
1893 My officers are not being directed to go out and, you know, do this
1894 and do that. We don't have to, we're getting calls to go on. Does
1895 that make sense?

1896 **ED:** Thank you so much.

1897 **DAY:** Yeah. Yes, sir.

1898 **BOB:** A quick follow up on that. My take home message from my ride
1899 around was - well, we went to nine calls in about 4 hours, okay, was
1900 the satisfied customers I saw. They were all initiated calls. I
1901 mean, they were all publicly initiated calls-

1902 **DAY:** Right.

1903 **BOB:** And people were happy.

1904 **DAY:** Mm-hm.

1905 **BOB:** They were - they were thankful the officers were there. And
1906 somehow I think with police force is missing a - missing an
1907 opportunity to be - to build on that public satisfaction and you -
1908 you seem to be kind of always protecting yourself from the criticism
1909 you're getting from - I won't say crazy people - but people with a
1910 lot of problems, all right? But I - I was astounded how - how
1911 pleasant people were to the police that were there helping with the
1912 situation and that - that was my biggest taken home message-

1913 **DAY:** Well, I-

1914 **MALE:** Satisfied customers.

1915 **DAY:** I appreciate that, you know, and our - our surveys that we've

1916 done over the years has reflected similarly, you know. In fact,

1917 ironically a lot of times people who have some unfortunate contact

1918 with the police end up having favorable reports back to us, you

1919 know. I mean, so - and I agree with you, Bob. I think it's an - an

1920 underutilized opportunity, I'm not quite sure how we'd capture that.

1921 Oftentimes, you know, we do hear from the critics and the people who

1922 are please, you know, that's a reasonable expectation and, you know,

1923 they just move on. But we do get "atta boys" and when we do, we

1924 make sure the officers are recognized, it goes in their files, we

1925 recog - you know, we support them. It'd be great to, you know, find

1926 a way to maybe capture that and promote that a little bit more, but

1927 I appreciate those comments and I'm glad that - you know, grateful

1928 you had that experience of things.

1929 **CAMPBELL:** Anything else? Well, thank you very much, sir.

1930 **DAY:** All right, thanks. Thanks for your time - thanks, keep up the

1931 good work. Thank you very much.

1932 **GROUP:** [clapping]

1933 **CAMPBELL:** All right, one last announcement before we move to public

1934 comment. The members of the task force that was created for the

1935 demographic data, please let's just meet real quick after this

1936 meeting so we can decide who the lead of the task force is before we

1937 leave.

1938 **BOB:** And same for the outreach (inaudible).

1939 **CAMPBELL:** Yeah. Yeah, the recruitment - also remember that you

1940 guys need to meet so you can figure out a date to-

1941 **MALE:** Right.

1942 **CAMPBELL:** Meet after this. Besides that we will now move into

1943 public comment. I will mention something I didn't mention last -

1944 two months ago at the last meeting. This is the time for public

1945 comment. It is if you have specific questions for a member of the

1946 TAC or something like that or if a member of the TAC wants to

1947 respond, please leave that 'til after the meeting. Thank you.

1948 Let's see, we have two members of the public. Do you want to go

1949 first, Dan, or?

1950 **DAN:** Okay. I'm Dan Handelman, I'm with the group Portland

1951 Copwatch. We just put out our 25th anniversary issue of our

1952 newsletter so, if you'd like to get a copy of this at the end. I

1953 also brought with the Stops Data Collection Report from 2016. It

1954 didn't come out until June of this year and a lot of it is, I think,

1955 them - police trying to make statistics fit into a model that

1956 doesn't say they're oh, representing African Americans because they

1957 look at Crash Data instead of Demographic Data. So, I appreciated

1958 your conversation before and I'd like to continue it with somebody

1959 at some point. When you're recruiting for your members, make sure -

1960 remember to try to recruit from the African American community

1961 because there's a very large girth of that population well presented
1962 on the group. I'm glad you had discussion about pointing a firearm
1963 being a Level 4, that's always concerned us, especially gun safety.
1964 You know, you point your gun at something, you have to be expected
1965 that you're going to be able to shoot it and it's very disconcerting
1966 that it's - but I also knew that (inaudible) a lot of agencies don't
1967 even collect that - those data. Chief (inaudible) who is the first
1968 one I think put that in place after a lot of community concern. I
1969 was concerned that word bad guy was used to talk about a criminal
1970 suspect. This isn't the movies, you can't shoot a gun out of a
1971 person's hand, you also shouldn't call people good guys and bad
1972 guys, it's just not - that's not the way the world really works.
1973 Batons can also be used to push protestors, which of course is
1974 counted separately from these other data (inaudible) I don't agree,
1975 but they explain it to you. And you can a video one of our members
1976 being pushed up the sidewalk by a baton at May Day last year on
1977 YouTube dot com slash PC Justice Works if you haven't seen that
1978 already. Just so you know, there was an alarming number of shoot -
1979 officer involved shootings in the state of Oregon. We put out a
1980 news release. It reached 25 by the end of July, which is usually
1981 how many there are in one year. They're now at 26 because there was
1982 one in Beaverton last week. And interestingly, Multnomah County
1983 Sheriff shot at somebody who was also shot at by Gresham Police. In
1984 terms of the statistics where you have the same suspect sometimes
1985 showing with different force events, the same person got shot at by
1986 two different police agencies this year. That's the first time
1987 we've ever seen that. He's still alive. People say I'm not a
1988 police officer, I don't know what they should or shouldn't have
1989 done. I'm not a doctor, but I know not to leave surgical implements
1990 inside of somebody so I think that's, you know, there are certain
1991 things that we all can agree officers shouldn't be doing. I think
1992 there was some hint of this from the bureau that, you know, the
1993 baseline should be moving towards zero. I'm counting the force
1994 incidents there are in a year and I'm hopeful we can reach that
1995 someday. I don't - I don't know, I don't want to go on forever and
1996 ever, but I do. There was - I told Captain Bell that in (inaudible)
1997 2007, 2009 the IPR did some force reports with the bureau and I
1998 distinctly remember that there were force cases that didn't end in
1999 custody, I'm going to go back and check them. I also thought there
2000 used to be such data in these force reports here that - that showed
2001 the outcomes, but I - I'm going to have to double back and I'll get
2002 back to you about that. But that was one of our big concerns, why
2003 would there be forced used and then you don't even take the person
2004 into custody - there's something going on. Police report policies
2005 were changed when the Settlement Agreement was changed in April and
2006 they went to (inaudible) council last week so now an officer is
2007 accused of misconduct and says I agree I did this conduct, I'll take
2008 whatever punishment you give me if I don't have to go in front of

2009 the Police Review Board anymore. This is relative to you for a
2010 reason. That being said, that case is never going to come up for
2011 training and policy issues, for the Police Review Board right now,
2012 get to look at the cases that come before them for training policy
2013 issues. So, we recommend to the Chief that those cases that be
2014 handed - the case file be handed to the Police Review Board. I hope
2015 you'll support us in that idea. We did manage to get the city
2016 council to agree to put their stipulated discipline cases into the
2017 semiannual Police Review Board reports, which were very highly
2018 redacted but at least we'll find out, you know, since it's
2019 (inaudible) an officer admitted this kind of misconduct and got some
2020 kind of discipline for it, otherwise these cases would've just gone
2021 and the public wouldn't know about it. The DOJ agreement goes back
2022 before Judge Simon on October 4th because the new Portland Committee
2023 on Community-Engaged Policing was put together. I'm (inaudible) a
2024 list of people who were picked for it, I had some questions about
2025 that list and, again, you were all part of the Settlement Agreement
2026 so, I'm hoping you're following all that. And there was one meeting
2027 here where the - the people who've been on it forever can explain
2028 how it happened - where people from all the different advisory
2029 boards walked through this facility together and I encouraged at
2030 that time that you should all interact a lot more. I think once the
2031 PCC is - P - is up and running that you should have contact with
2032 them. The Citizen Review Committee, you know, the (inaudible)
2033 Advisory Council, it would be nice for you all to kind of talk to
2034 each other. I'm very concerned that people are calling the police
2035 and saying homeless people have guns and drugs when they don't.
2036 That sounds like false reporting, it sounds like those people should
2037 be getting taken into custody instead of the houseless people who
2038 have nowhere else to go. And for your information, we went down cop
2039 watching around the Bud Clark Commons and a couple people have told
2040 us that a lot of them around there are being stopped and asked for
2041 their ID and they said hey, is there any suspicion that I've
2042 committed a crime, the police are just saying oh, this is a high
2043 advise area, we don't need probable cause, which is, I don't think,
2044 how the law works. So, I thought you might want to look into that.
2045 I mean, I don't know if it's a training issue or policies, but that
2046 - that's what I had. Thank you.

2047 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you, Dan. Any other public comment? All right,
2048 can we have a motion to adjourn? From Ed? Ed's last motion?

2049 **GROUP:** [laughing]

2050 **CAMPBELL:** A sentence from Sylvia? All in favor?

2051 **GROUP:** Aye.

2052 **CAMPBELL:** All opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

2053

2054

2055 TAC Meeting - 09122018 doc

2056 Transcribed 09/30/2018 @ 8:10 p.m. CANDY G.