

TRAINING ADVISORY COUNCIL
March 13, 2019
PPB Training Complex
6:30 -8:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Shawn Campbell, Chair
David Coates
Danielle Droppers
Robert Fischer
Sylvia Zingeser
Sarah Suniga
Tyler Hall
Kezia Wanner
Venn Wilde
Sara Carlson
Karen Daniels
Walter Hull
Richard Mohle
Edna Nyamu
John Pahlke
Frank Santos
Christopher Rossi

MEMBERS ABSENT

Judy Low
Gary Marschke
McKay Fenske

TRAINING STAFF PRESENT

Captain Erica Hurely
Lt. Greg Stewart
Liesbeth Gerritsen
Jody Halia
Emma Covelli

PPB STAFF PRESENT

Lt. Christopher Lindsey
Mary Claire Buckley
Shannon Smith
Amanda Trygg
Lauren Leonard
Callista Gomez

GUESTS PRESENT

Dan Handleman
Debbie Aione
Ryan Morrison

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
53

PORTLAND POLICE BUREAU
Training Advisory Council
Training Division

Meeting Date: 03/13/2019

CAMPBELL: So, just as a reminder, we record each (inaudible) and then get put in the transcripts up on the website. That's our way of taking minutes. So, when you speak, please start by saying your name so the transcriber can actually figure out who you are because with this many voices, it would be pretty impressive if they could get it right otherwise. I call this meeting to order. As usual, we will start with the reading of the mission statement. Does somebody want to read the mission statement. Don't everybody -

WANNER: I'll read it.

CAMPBELL: Thank you, Kezia.

WANNER: This is Kezia. 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. Right. First thing, do we have a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting according to the transcription on the website?

FISHER: Bob Fisher. Yes, I so move.

CAMPBELL: Thank you, Bob. Do we have a second?

ZINGESER: This is Sylvia Zingesser. I second that.

CAMPBELL: Thank you. All approved signified by saying aye?

ALL: Aye.

CAMPBELL: All opposed? Motion carries. All right. Now that all of the official starter stuff is done, I would like to say welcome to everybody who is new here this evening. It was a long recruitment process, and it's very exciting to see so many new faces here. Given that, I think it would be probably a good idea if we kind of go around the room and each of us kind of give our little 1-minute, 30 seconds - the 1-minute spiel about who we are, kind of our background, and why we are interested in being part of the work that TAC does. Since I called for it, I'll start. My name is Shawn Campbell, and I am the chair for at least the next year and month. We'll see how it goes from there. My background is in economics and data and policy analysis, and I joined the TAC because I wanted to be part of some of the changes I saw coming in the Portland police and the national policing as a whole. How about we go to the right?

PAHLKE: All right. My name is John Pahlke. My first meeting. I'm pretty excited about it. I was happy to see food out there. Background is in business, business operations, HR, staffing. I got involved - I have a connection to the police department and want to participate in how they are represented and see what impact I can

54 have here and, frankly, maybe be mayor someday. So, I wanted to start
55 getting involved in the city.

56 **ZINGESER:** I'm Sylvia Zingesser, and I'm a charter member, and I'm
57 with NAMI, Multnomah National Alliance of Mental Illness of Multnomah
58 County, and I do have a son who lives with a mental illness, and we
59 have had contact with the police, and what I can tell you is that
60 things are much, much better than our first encounter that we had.

61 **COATES:** I'm Dave Coates. I'm a native Portlander. My background is
62 human resources management, and I joined TAC to get reengaged with
63 the community.

64 **HALL:** My name is Walt Hall. I am the executive officer of the
65 Disabled Parking Enforcement, Traffic Division, of the Portland
66 Bureau of Police. And I was approached to belong to this particular
67 unit because of my background in (inaudible) work. But at any rate,
68 the fact is that I decided that this could be a good fit for me, and
69 I really appreciate you approving my application, and I'm a new
70 person, and thank you very much, and this is my first meeting. Thank
71 you.

72 **WILDE:** My name is Venn Wilde. My pronouns are they, them, their. I'm
73 a transgender, non-binary community activist, mathematician, context
74 disruptor, and dancer and many other things besides. I joined the
75 training advisory council because I care deeply about how policing
76 impacts the many communities that I'm a part of and the many
77 communities of which I'm not part and yet which I feel deeply in my
78 heart to be interconnected with me, and you'll learn more about he as
79 we go on together (inaudible).

80 **STEWART:** Greg Stewart. I am new to the training division (inaudible)
81 lieutenant. I am here to help supervise the analysts. I used to work
82 in the bureau's crime analysis unit, so I have a background in that.
83 We have several (inaudible) division that help with training
84 evaluation and other sorts of evaluations of the division. I'm very
85 excited to be here.

86 **FISHER:** My name is Bob Fisher. I am a retired public health
87 physician. I retired to Oregon about 10 years ago, and to get
88 engaged, I started volunteering for a number of civic organizations.
89 I thought this would be somewhere that I could maybe help. It's
90 simple as that. No agenda.

91 **SANTOS:** Frank Santos. I'm new to the board, and my background is in
92 town development, and I just thought it would be a great way to give
93 back to the community.

94 **WANNER:** I'm Kezia Wanner, and I've worked in the past for the
95 Portland Police Bureau. I currently work for the Multnomah County
96 Sheriff's office, and I'm a believer and advocate of our public
97 safety system in the region and making the improvements that we need
98 to make to the system so that it can serve our community. So, I'm
99 happy to be here. I've been on the TAC for about two years now.

100 **DANIELS:** I'm Karen Daniels. I have a head cold. I just moved here
101 about almost two years ago from a very small town, so it's been an
102 adventure. And I just - same thing. I just wanted to get engaged with

103 other members of the community, so I applied, and here I am. I also
104 have a bit of a connection to law enforcement, so I'm on their side.

105 **MOWLIE:** My name is Richard Mowlie, and I am currently the chairman
106 of the Wilkes Community Group that surrounds this area. And a couple
107 years ago, one of our members had a rather unfortunately run in - he
108 was 85 years old and ran into the police and I couldn't - I did not
109 know how to find out anything, and he didn't either. And so, Judy
110 Lowe, I know from some other place, suggested that I come here, and I
111 did come here, and they helped me a lot, and I got a lot of answers,
112 and that really helped. So, I was kind of focused on this group which
113 is a good thing. I am a retire bank examiner from Texas. I do a lot
114 of emergency work with Bob over there on the emergency team,
115 Multnomah County amateur radio guys - the guys who go beep, beep,
116 beep, beep, beep, beep. Those guys, they are a strange group. But
117 this is my first meeting, and I am glad to be here, so thank you.

118 **LINDSEY:** My name is Chris Lindsey. I'm a lieutenant with the
119 Portland Police Bureau. I am filling in for Lieutenant Craig Dobson
120 while he is away at the national academy. So, I apologize. I'm still
121 new to this like some of you all here. So, I'm learning as well as
122 we're going along. I'm also not trying to sit away from anyone. I
123 thought my analyst team over there may work. (Inaudible) but I work
124 with the force auditor group and the force analysts over there who do
125 amazing work every day, and I'm here to help (inaudible).

126 **HALL:** Hi, everybody. My name is Tyler. This is my second term on the
127 Training Advisory Council. I have been interested as a person with a
128 psychology degree and issues affecting mental health crisis and
129 homelessness. That's been something I've been involved with outside
130 of this group for several years. And that's part of the reason I came
131 to this group was to try and focus on many issues that we could do to
132 improve community policing but also specifically around homelessness
133 and mental health.

134 **ROSSI:** Good evening. My name is Chris Rossi. I have an emergency
135 management background. New to the group, but just kind of wanted to
136 get more involved with the community. And so, that's why I'm here.

137 **CRAWLSON:** Sarah Crawlson. I've been in town for about 17 years. I
138 was originally from the East Coast, and I am a management consultant.
139 I've spent - I've done a lot of volunteer work in the community. I
140 was a (inaudible) for several years. I spent the last five years
141 working with a veteran's non-profit, and I felt like this was a good
142 fit to get a little bit more engaged in the community. I'm sort of
143 interested in how different community groups and different issues
144 that are affecting Portlanders are really interrelated. So, I'm
145 excited to be here.

146 **DROPPERS:** Good evening, everyone. My name is Danielle Droppers. In
147 my day job, I work for the Oregon Health Authority Office of Equity
148 and Inclusion. I've been part of the TAC for a little over a year
149 now, and I'm especially interested in issues related to racial equity
150 and strengthening some of those issues that continue to persist in
151 the system. Thank you.

152 **EDNA:** Good evening, everyone. My name is Edna (inaudible), and this
153 is my first day here. I work for a non-profit organization for
154 community health workers around the state. And why I'm here, I
155 usually participate for interview panel Downtown for new officers.
156 So, I got the invitation, and I applied, and I got it. But I also
157 want to be here because I think it's very important to increase
158 diversity as I can see in the room. So, I think we need more voices
159 of people of color, and I'm happy to be here.

160 **GERRITSON:** My name is Liesbeth Gerritson, and I work for the
161 Portland Police Bureau. I'm a civilian. I'm a non-sworn member. I
162 work in the training division, and my background is in mental health,
163 and I'm an organizational psychologist.

164 **HURLEY:** Thanks. My name is Erica Hurley. I am the captain of the
165 training division, so this is my humble abode out here, and this is
166 not my first meeting.

167 **CAMPBELL:** Let's go ahead and get the non-members also that are not
168 sitting at the table.

169 **HALIA:** Hello, all. I am Jody Halia. I've probably emailed all of
170 you. I've worked at the training division for about four and a half
171 years here, and I will be your primary contact really behind the
172 scenes. When I'm not organizing this, I assist in developing
173 curriculum.

174 **CAMPBELL:** Let's go ahead - and if we could go down this end too.
175 Just given all the new members, some people might not recognize
176 (inaudible) who is here.

177 **AIONE:** Do you want the public too or just -

178 **CAMPBELL:** Yes, the public, please.

179 **AIONE:** Oh, Debbie Aione, (inaudible) Portland.

180 **LAUREN:** I'm Lauren (inaudible). I'm one of the (inaudible) auditors
181 at PPB. I've been there for about three months, and I'm excited to be
182 here.

183 **SMITH:** I'm Shannon Smith. I am also an auditor with PPB.

184 **GOMEZ:** Calista Gomez. Also a force auditor. Been here less than a
185 month.

186 **AMANDA:** I'm Amanda Trey (sp) (inaudible), and I've been here for
187 about a month.

188 **MARY:** I'm Mary (inaudible) police bureau (inaudible) months.

189 **MORRISON:** Hi, I'm Ryan Morrison. I was a police officer in Houston,
190 Texas until December, and I've been in Portland for three weeks. I
191 just wanted to see what this was all about.

192 **HANDLEMAN:** I'm Dan Handleman. I'm with the group Portland Cop Watch,
193 and I've been coming to these meetings since you all started.

194 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Thank you everybody. Just for a quick update
195 that I forgot to mention, many of you will probably notice that the
196 agenda before you is slightly different than the agenda that was sent
197 out. That was because of a sudden change - today, in fact - where we
198 were going to have time to comment on the upcoming body cam system
199 that was going to be adopted by the city, but it was recently decided
200 by City Council not to move forward with that at this time. And so,
201 that portion has been cancelled for now until City Council figures

202 out what they want to do. If you have any more questions about that,
203 I'm sure the paper will (inaudible) after the meeting. But on the
204 plus side, it gives us more time to kind of handle some other areas
205 and maybe actually have a meeting that doesn't go long which would be
206 nice. All right. So, how about for the starter, we'll have Captain
207 Hurley give us an overview of what the training division does, kind
208 of give a sense to some of our newer members of exactly what kind of
209 our purview is as the training advisory council.

210 **HURLEY:** So, those of you over here, if could get you to turn around
211 a little bit. So, the training division. Many of you have been here,
212 and some of the tech members have been here for years, obviously, so
213 you will know this information, but for those of you that are new, it
214 might interest you. So, this is the training division which doesn't
215 work - Oh, how about turning it on. See, that's why we have Jody. She
216 runs all this. Without her, I would have no idea. There you go. So,
217 the building that you're in here is a little over 62,000 square feet.
218 It has four classrooms, the largest being this one that you're in.
219 They can also divide into two classrooms. We also have a PVO, or
220 Patrol Vehicle Operations, that's in the back where we can do driving
221 and driving skills in the back, and that's about three and a half
222 acres. We also have our admins. We have a whole video studio so we
223 can actually create videos and to be able to push out information. We
224 also have a defensive tactics area which is our mat room so that we
225 can work on that which is about 5,000 square feet. Scenario Village
226 which is actually is buildings put together inside so we can learn
227 how to clear buildings, how to - We can actually drive our cars into
228 the streets so we can do scenarios throughout that in cars. We have -
229 each of the buildings is a little different. So, we have one that
230 looks like a bank. We have one that looks like an apartment building.
231 We have a couple that look like houses, some that have basements in
232 them and crawlspaces so you can learn how to clear and how to deal
233 with those particular obstacles in a house. And then we have two
234 actual shooting ranges. This is our organizational chart that - I
235 don't think I'm that old and I can't read because it's so tiny, but
236 it's basically the chief of police and it goes all the way through
237 the investigations and each of the branches and so forth. So, we are
238 the training division, and we fall under the services branch which is
239 AC Davis. And this is the organizational chart for us. So, as you can
240 see, I'm up there at the top as the captain, and then we have three
241 lieutenants, we have four sergeants, and then a various number of
242 officers each that teach in different areas. And some of the things
243 that people always ask questions about is kind of our hiring process,
244 right? How do you become a Portland police officer? And it is a
245 somewhat long process, but it's an intensive process, and we do that
246 specifically for a reason. So, the first thing that they do is the
247 written test, and it's a pass/fail. So, there's no - it doesn't
248 really matter where you get on that list. As long as you pass it, you
249 move onto the next section which is the physical ability test, and
250 you can see on the side there what that physical ability test is.
251 And, again, it too is a pass/fail. So, it doesn't matter how fast or
252 slow. As long as you do it within the time frame, you pass it and

253 move on. Then we do an oral board. The oral board is made up of a
254 sworn member as well as community members. Again, that is a
255 pass/fail. So, once they go through those questions, they either pass
256 that section and move on or they don't. The background investigation
257 is the longest portion of it, and it is the most intense portion of
258 the process in order to get hired, and there is a reason for that,
259 right? I mean, you don't want any of your Portland police officers
260 out there with a background that questions their ability to be able
261 to do this job or their ethics or any of those things. So, that
262 background looks very intensely into that. So, not only the people
263 that they tell us they want to talk to, but then we ask those people
264 and a then few more, and we keep going on down the list until maybe
265 we get to the people you didn't really want us to talk to to
266 determine whether or not you are for this job. We then do a
267 psychological evaluation. And so, we have a psychologist company that
268 is on staff, and all of our people go through that. And then the very
269 last is the medical evaluation to make sure that you can see and do
270 all of the basic medical things to be able to do the police work. The
271 new officer training which is really part of what we are - so the
272 first thing they do is they go down to DPSST, and that's in Salem.
273 It's a 16-week course where they actually live on campus down there
274 for 16 weeks, and they go through the process to become a police
275 officer. That is run by the state, and every officer that is a
276 certified law enforcement person in the State of Oregon has to attend
277 that. So, that is required. And then they come back here. We actually
278 normally send them out to the street with a field training officer.
279 They spend anywhere from three to four months on the street with a
280 field training officer, and then they come back to us for what we
281 call the advanced academy. So, Portland does things a little bit
282 differently than the rest of the state in a good way, but we are a
283 large city versus some of the small, rural counties. So, DPSST
284 teaches to a one or two-man department as well as teaching,
285 obviously, to us. So, some of the things that they teach at DPSST
286 doesn't really work for a city our size. We have more cover. We have
287 more people. We have traffic division and canine division and all of
288 these other specialty units that a lot of small agencies don't have.
289 So, we bring them back, and we have another 10 to 12-week advanced
290 academy to go over the skills that we expect as well as our policies,
291 right? So, our policies are actually stricter than state law. And so,
292 we want them to understand what our policies are and be able to use
293 those in their job. And then they - and throughout that time, they
294 head back out to the street, and they have a field training officer
295 for that time. It is an 18-month period, so they are on probation for
296 18 months from the time they are hired until they get off, and during
297 that time, they are evaluated for the entirety of the 18 months to
298 determine whether or not they are fit to be a Portland police
299 officer. Well, actually, I already just said all this. So, the basic
300 academy - you can tell I don't do this one very often - is the 16
301 weeks. That's a picture of it. Again, it's down in Salem, and they
302 live down there. And then we have our 10 weeks. So, this is 10 weeks.
303 That's what we cut it down to. We're actually, I think, going to

304 increase it back up to 12 weeks. There's some things in it when I
305 took over the training division that I think were missing and just
306 some new needs that we have. And so, I think we're going to add a few
307 things. One of them being a bike course because, for whatever reason,
308 our officers aren't - we don't have enough of bicycle trained. And
309 then, again, or EFTAT (sp) program. So, it's 18 months. They have an
310 FTO. They work a minimum of 24 weeks with a coach actually in the car
311 with them, and then we do what's called Phase 5. So, they have a
312 coach that follows them around, but they are actually in a separate
313 car so that they can make some decisions. And then we do ongoing
314 officer training. So, the training division here does what we call
315 in-services, and it's an annual in-service. We have an annual service
316 for every rank now. So, every officer goes through a minimum of 40
317 hours a year of in-service, and then each of the ranks actually
318 increase that. So, when you go up to lieutenant, commander, and so
319 forth, you'll get additional training on top of this. This is kind of
320 where you guys come into play. The TAC makes recommendations for us
321 on what training we need. So, we talk to you about some of things
322 that we may see as a police officer to say, "Hey, this is some needs
323 that we see of this is what we are observing." The TAC also looks at
324 things, asks questions. They look at our force report. You look at
325 all of those different things, and you give us feedback. That goes
326 into our Needs Assessment so that we can determine how to use that
327 and to train on it the following year. The training division has a
328 patrol vehicle. It's called PDO. They have control tactics which is
329 your hands on. We do firearms. We do patrol procedures which is
330 really an overview of all of those things. So, when I say that, it
331 means that you learn how to drive a car, you learn how to do control
332 tactics, and you learn how to do firearms, and then we put you
333 through a scenario where you should be using all of the skills. You
334 should be using interdisciplinary skills also, which is our language
335 skills, our ECIT, all of those things. They should all come together
336 in patrol procedures to make sure that you can actually take all of
337 these things that we teach you separately and in the classroom and
338 use them when you are out on the street. We do crisis intervention.
339 We have a 40-hour class all new officers are required to go to and
340 then the ECIT which is an additional certification on top of that. It
341 is with BHU. Liesbeth is very key in that training. It's an
342 additional 40 hours.

343 **CAMPBELL:** Maybe just mention what the acronyms stand for.

344 **HURLEY:** Well, that's not as much fun. So, crisis intervention is a
345 CIT officer. Everybody is CIT trained or crisis intervention trained.
346 And ECIT is - give me the E.

347 **GERRITSON:** Enhanced.

348 **HURLEY:** Thank you. Enhance. I knew it was something extra. Enhanced
349 crisis intervention team member. So, they do additional training. And
350 then in-services ongoing refresher training for crisis intervention.
351 We do it yearly.

352 **MALE:** And what is BHU?

353 **HURLEY:** Oh, sorry. BHU, Behavioral Health Unit. So, the bureau has
354 its own unit called Behavioral Health Unit that ECIT and the CIT is
355 run out of. Well, they help create the curriculum for, I guess I
356 should say. Is that correct?

357 **GERRITSON:** Yep

358 **HURLEY:** Is that accurate enough, Liesbeth.

359 **GERRITSON:** Yep.

360 **HURLEY:** And any questions on any of that? That was a lot.

361 **FISHER:** Yeah. Bob Fisher here. About how many staff do you have -

362 **HURLEY:** Here?

363 **FISHER:** In the training unit, permanent staff. What is your budget,
364 and what is - about, and what percentage of the police budget is the
365 training bureau?

366 **HURLEY:** So, the two budget questions, I actually cannot answer to
367 you. I don't know what my percentage of my budget is, the bureau, and
368 we're about a \$1 million dollars out here for budget now. Having said
369 that, it covers a whole lot of things. So, we do all of the
370 ammunition which is about \$800,000 for ammunition, firearms, non-
371 lethal weapons, all of that kind of stuff. So, that's the biggest
372 budget, and that's why we have the biggest budget at the training
373 division. Staffing-wise, I have about 42 officers out here including
374 four sergeants and three lieutenants.

375 **FISHER:** Thank you.

376 **HURLEY:** You're welcome. Anything else?

377 **SMITH:** I want to say that this city's entire budget is available
378 online.

379 **HURLEY:** Oh, thank you.

380 **FISHER:** Oh, thank you.

381 **HURLEY:** Anything else? Well, that was easy.

382 **CAMPBELL:** Right. I know that we sent some materials out to the new
383 people as far as our bylaws and orientation, but I imagine - I
384 remember my first meeting where it kind of felt like getting thrown
385 in the deep end a little bit. I promise that passes. Did anybody not
386 receive those materials?

387 **FEMALE:** I don't know that I got the minutes. I'll check.

388 **CAMPBELL:** The minutes are just on the website.

389 **FEMALE:** I'll check.

390 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. All right. Given that, does anybody have any
391 specific questions about what the TAC does or what we are doing or
392 how we function that we can answer real quick because we have a
393 little bit of extra time. Does anyone have something that they didn't
394 understand from the orientation materials or anything? Bob?

395 **FISHER:** Bob Fisher here again. I hope you stress that we get the
396 pictures and a brief bio online. I mean, it was a very brief bio
397 around here, but I think it was useful. And so, please, has there
398 been follow up on that, Jody?

399 **HALIA:** I think I have five of them.

400 **FISHER:** Do you have mine? Okay.

401 **CAMPBELL:** Yeah, I have it here to mention it a little later in the
402 agenda.

403 **FISHER:** Thank you.

404 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Well, given that, we will move on with our
405 normal kind of meeting agenda. Next up, we will have an update on the
406 current status of existing task forces. For people who are new, we
407 create task forces that begin the work on creating recommendations
408 towards specific areas. The task forces are created by a vote of the
409 full TAC, and then they work until their work is done, and then they
410 present recommendations to us which are then also voted on by the
411 full TAC. So, let's start with the emotional intelligence task force
412 led by Venn.

413 **WILDE:** This is Ven Wild. I'm on the emotional intelligence task
414 force. We have been slowly putting together availability for our
415 first meeting. We have not yet scheduled our first meeting. I would
416 love to meet with my task force members after this meeting to nail
417 down a time when we could meet so that we can move forward.

418 **CAMPBELL:** Given our new members, could you just kind of describe
419 real quick what your task force is looking into?

420 **WILDE:** Yeah. So, we are looking at the ways in which officer and
421 non-sworn police bureau members might benefit from additional
422 training around how they relate with themselves, their own emotions,
423 their ability to recognize, understand, locate, express, and regulate
424 their feelings and take better care of themselves is the very
425 succinct way of putting it.

426 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you. The second task force active at this time is
427 the patterns in use of force task force led by myself. One of the
428 things that TAC is given as an area that we focus on is every
429 quarter, we are presented with Portland Police Bureau use of force
430 data, and that is a requirement of the - oh, what's the right word?
431 **HURLEY:** DOJ agreement.

432 **CAMPBELL:** DOJ agreement that came about in 2012 where TAC was given
433 that as one of the things they were supposed to do. Personally, I
434 think partially was because we were the only organization existing at
435 the time for the community groups, but it is within our purview. So,
436 this - the task force, Patterns in Use of Force, is basically looking
437 at long-term data sets and annual data sets to try to assert if there
438 is any patterns that would be of interest to TAC. This task for has
439 been a little delayed because of data coming out basically. So, 2018
440 is the first year when the police bureau made full detailed use-of-
441 force data publicly available. And so, we've been going through that.
442 The data has been out, and the analysis is currently ongoing, and
443 we're hoping to be able to move forward with something by the next
444 meeting if not the one after. All right. Any questions or comments
445 about any of these task forces? You guys are too easy today. All
446 right. Moving on to the next portion will be the discussion on a task
447 force that has finished its work. The demographic data inclusion
448 recommendation. This task force was led by Sarah, but she is
449 unfortunately out today. So, I'll be handling it on her behalf. The
450 demographic data inclusion task force began with basically work that

451 Danielle started that was basically questioning why city demographic
452 data was not included in the use of force data that was presented to
453 us every quarter. Based upon the idea of without demographic data,
454 it's hard to get a context of exactly how certain groups are affected
455 and how certain groups are not based upon the numbers of custodies
456 and use of force represented by each. This task force met over a
457 period of about six months including meetings with the police bureau
458 where there are some disagreements over some things in it, but I hope
459 everyone had a chance to read it. We sent it out earlier this week or
460 - sorry. Late last week. Let's see. What can we say? Basically, to
461 summarize what the task force is recommending is that the task force
462 is recommending in order for the TAC to carry out its duties, it is
463 important for the reporting of use of force to be put into context.
464 While PPB currently includes custody data in its reporting, this is
465 felt to be insufficient given that certain populations tend to
466 interact with police to a greater degree than others. To rectify
467 this, the TAC recommends the inclusion of US Census Bureau race and
468 ethnicity demographic data for Portland and annual and quarterly PPB
469 use of force of force reports to aid in contextualizing data.
470 Demographic data should be included in all areas of the report where
471 a sample is comparatively appropriate or a comparable sample can be
472 utilized such as a similar city based on population. Specifically and
473 at minimum, this data should be included for comparison on the same
474 page of the report as the total PPB custodies. Any additional data
475 that can help strengthen the context of proportion of representation
476 should be considered for inclusion as well. To mitigate concerns
477 about comparability of data between US census and PPB custody and use
478 of force data, a disclaimer should be included along the lines of,
479 "It should be noted that a direct comparison between city census,
480 demographic data, and PPB demographic data cannot be made due to
481 differences in data sets." Are there any questions or comments about
482 this recommendation? To kind of give a bit of background about where
483 the area of dispute has been between various parties in - well, not
484 necessarily within the TAC but with the groups that we're working
485 with with this recommendation - is the idea that having demographic
486 data is statistically inappropriate because it is not a direct
487 comparison. Based up on the idea that right now, use of force is
488 compared to custodies because people who are taken into custody are
489 the one most likely to have use of force used against them. On the
490 other end of the argument is the idea that, yes, even though it is
491 not a direct comparison, it is still helpful to give an idea that
492 certain populations are more affected by the use of force than others
493 just because they have a higher custody rate. And that's kind of the
494 crux of what the TAC at this time and this recommendation is calling
495 for is basically, we understand that it's not a direct statistical
496 comparison and should not be treated as one, but we still want that
497 data included in the use of force to help us get a better idea and
498 help us visualize what the data is telling us and how it affects
499 people city wide. Questions? Comments? Venn?

500 **WILDE:** Venn Wilde. I'm happy to see this recommendation coming
501 forward at this point. It's been a conversation we've been in for a

502 year now? Longer? And it's the - you know, the thing that we're
503 asking for looks to me like the comparison that everyone I know
504 points to when people talk about use-of-force data. Like, folks on
505 the street or at the coffee shop are talking about how police are
506 using force, they're talking about the difference in terms of stops
507 versus the population data. People are talking about the difference
508 in use of force versus population data. And I think in order to
509 contextualize the use-of-force reports, it's essential that we
510 include that data that the public is thinking in terms of already.
511 So, I'm happy to support this recommendation.

512 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you. Any other discussion? Danielle, I know this has
513 been a big - would you like to say anything or -

514 **DROPPERS:** I think I've said a lot over the year of working on moving
515 this forward. So, I - at the risk of repeating myself, I think I'll
516 just echo Venn's sentiments that I'm really excited and grateful that
517 this is moving forward and grateful to all the folks who participated
518 in having these conversations. And I think the feeling of partnership
519 to want to move this forward and have some better contextualized data
520 that we can look to - you know, this is a public report, and I think
521 it's important that we provide the appropriate context to be able to
522 put the figures into perspective. That's part of transparency,
523 frankly, and it's important. So, thank you.

524 **CAMPBELL:** Yes, Frank.

525 **SANTOS:** Frank Santos. A question I had: Is this the best practice
526 that we see outside of Oregon as well, or how did the TAC board come
527 to this - is it unique to Oregon, or is it - do we see this as a best
528 practice outside of Oregon?

529 **DROPPERS:** Providing demographic data?

530 **SANTOS:** Using - providing the demographic information.

531 **DROPPERS:** I think - I mean, in my work prior to going to work for
532 the Oregon Health Authority, I spent about eight years doing research
533 and evaluation on children and family mental health. And generally,
534 when you're providing a researcher evaluation report, you do try to
535 contextualize the data that you're providing. So, it's pretty
536 standard, I would say. And also at the same time, you know, I think
537 Shawn pointed out some limitation to the data because it's not - and
538 we're not - we're not saying that it is a direct comparison. However,
539 I think that not everybody has the background in statistical analysis
540 to be able to think about contextualizing the figures that are
541 provided. And so, it's just a piece of the context that we feel is
542 important. And it is, I think, generally pretty standard to try to
543 provide some context when you're - rather than just lots of
544 statistical figures. I mean, it's not very helpful otherwise without
545 the background information, right? So.

546 **HURLEY:** To clarify, I do not believe it is best practice within
547 police agencies to do that. It may be for other types of research for
548 other deals -

549 **SANTOS:** Sure.

550 **HURLEY:** But not in this.

551 **FISHER:** Excuse me. I have my hearing aids turned up, but I can't
552 hear you. I'm reading your lips pretty well, but going forward, I'll
553 do better.

554 **HURLEY:** I apologize.

555 **FISHER:** That's all right.

556 **HURLEY:** Do you want me to repeat that?

557 **FISHER:** Yes, please.

558 **HURLEY:** Okay. So, this is Captain Hurley. I forgot to tell that to
559 the recorder. It is not necessarily best practice within law
560 enforcement to do that demographic, to add that to force data. So,
561 although it may be a context that they use in things outside of law
562 enforcement, it is not necessarily best practice for law enforcement
563 agencies to use it.

564 **CAMPBELL:** Bob?

565 **FISHER:** Bob Fisher here. Contextually, in reference to Frank's
566 question here, this is a report which is required by DOJ, is it not?

567 **CAMPBELL:** Yes.

568 **FISHER:** And my understanding would be that other police forces don't
569 normally even report this data. Is that correct? I publicly report
570 this data. I don't know.

571 **HURLEY:** Use-of-force data is - yeah, go ahead.

572 **LINDSEY:** Use-of-force data is normally publicized - sorry.
573 Lieutenant Chris Lindsey - is generally publicized. I can't say
574 regarding this specific task force. A recommendation has been written
575 and has been delivered to Captain Hurley and to the chief's office
576 for the chief's review because it's the chief's final decision. I can
577 say - I know my predecessor who will be coming back to this position
578 within a month or so - I know he's taken this on over the last year.
579 I believe this has been discussed, and, you know, there are - there
580 are some concerns regarding the data and the accuracy of it if we
581 publish it based off of current - the current census data being
582 updated - as one of the issues to bring up. So.

583 **CAMPBELL:** Bob?

584 **FISHER:** Was this kind of data put up before the DOJ settlement?

585 **LINDSEY:** I don't remember if it was or not.

586 **HURLEY:** No.

587 **FISHER:** Do you expect it will continue if and when the DOJ agreement
588 is resolved?

589 **HURLEY:** This is Captain Hurley. Maybe I should clarify that
590 question. Did you ask if we did force data before?

591 **FISHER:** Use-of-force data.

592 **HURLEY:** Yes. Use-of-force data has been gathered, and I don't know
593 how public - I mean, it's been somewhat public for years prior to
594 DOJ.

595 **FISHER:** Not with the detail that we give now though?

596 **HURLEY:** No. No. We give much more detail now than we did before.

597 **FISHER:** So, I think this is a - I would understand this to be an
598 issue that is particular to the amount of transparency that is

599 required by DOJ at this point, and this falls out of that - that
600 extensive reporting. Is that correct?

601 **LINDSEY:** Well - Lieutenant Chris - it is my understanding that this
602 - capturing this particular data of demographics is not a part of the
603 DOJ agreement.

604 **HURLEY:** Correct.

605 **LINDSEY:** So, it doesn't fall within the scope of that.

606 **FISHER:** Thank you.

607 **LINDSEY:** Capturing the data does not - the demographic.

608 **CAMPBELL:** Venn?

609 **WILDE:** This is Venn Wilde again. I will just say that I don't aspire
610 for the Portland Police Bureau to be playing catchup with best
611 practices around the nation. I'd like us to be (inaudible), and I
612 think that one of the ways in which the Portland Police Bureau has an
613 opportunity to lead is by working towards creating trust and
614 connection with the community. For example, through transparency like
615 what we're asking for here.

616 **HURLEY:** So - Captain Hurley. One of the things we have discussed,
617 and we've said this to the TAC as Dobson, who is normally sitting in
618 your seat, has said when we've had this conversation historically,
619 anyone in the public can get the demographics of the City of
620 Portland, and anyone in the public can get our force report, and
621 anybody can put those numbers together if they want to put those
622 numbers together and figure that out. Based on the way our data is
623 brought in, and based on the demographics, last was 2010, right? It's
624 2019. They're completely inaccurate probably for what we have today.
625 We, the police bureau, will not be putting those things together and
626 putting them out in a public manner at this time. So, it's not that
627 the information isn't out there if people want to put it together.

628 **CAMPBELL:** Shawn Campbell. I think one thing that provides a bit of
629 context though is this census data along with extra data such as
630 violent crimes reports or traffic accident reports that kind of give
631 even more context to the data that's shown is included in the annual
632 traffic report, traffic stops report. And I guess that's part of the
633 hang up for me is I don't understand why we can include that in a
634 traffic stop report and not include it in a use-of-force report.

635 **FISHER:** And - Bob Fisher. Captain Hurley, there's something wrong
636 with anybody can do it, but we can't.

637 **HURLEY:** So - this is Captain Hurley again.

638 **FISHER:** If anybody can do it -

639 **HURLEY:** We are asked - we are asked to put data together in a
640 specific way for DOJ and to package it in a specific way. We are
641 doing what they are requesting us to do. So, if somebody wants that
642 information in a different way, they have the ability to put that
643 together and do it. The stops data is state mandated driven, and so
644 it is done differently because it is asked for differently. So,
645 that's why the stops data is done the way the stops data is done.
646 Just to clarify.

647 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you.

648 **DROPPERS:** This is Danielle. I just wanted to really quickly add
649 that, you know, I understand that this census data out of date. The
650 decennial census is out of date given that it was last issued in
651 2010. However, there are also estimates that are provided along the
652 way, and most state agencies use those for their budgets. It's pretty
653 standard across state agencies to use census data estimates,
654 decennial census. I think the argument that we can't use it because
655 it's not accurate falls a little flat, frankly. And I think that if
656 we want to espouse transparency from the bureau, part of building
657 trusting relationships with the community is to go the extra mile. To
658 be truly transparent through action and not just by saying that we
659 want to be transparent, but you have to put action to that, and I
660 think that this is one of the ways of going the extra mile for our
661 communities, and it's time to lead to Venn's point. Thank you, Venn.

662 **PAHLKE:** All right. This is John Pahlke. So, a couple questions. I
663 don't understand how data that's inaccurate can fall flat. I mean, if
664 it's inaccurate, it's inaccurate. So, why are we proposing that we
665 put out a report that everybody seems to agree is based on data
666 that's not accurate? What's it going to take to get that data
667 accurate? Where are we finding those numbers or estimates so we can
668 agree on something that says, "These are the number's we're going to
669 use," and that's going to be consistently used so that the
670 information that does get sent out is accurate? If you're sending out
671 inaccurate information and basing your decisions on inaccurate
672 information, you're not serving anybody.

673 **CAMPBELL:** So, for a point of clarification - this is Shawn - the US
674 Census Bureau as we know it every ten years puts out the US census
675 which is an actual go out and count how many people exist.

676 **FISHER:** It's an estimate.

677 **PAHLKE:** Right. Do we have -

678 **CAMPBELL:** And then every year after that, the US Census Bureau also
679 releases what they call and Annual Community Survey which is more of
680 an estimate based on surveying a certain percentage of the population
681 and then using the previous - the census and what's happened since to
682 try to guesstimate what the population is until it gets corrected by
683 the next 10-years census.

684 **PAHLKE:** So, there is a standard number that can be looked at
685 consistently even though - then why do we keep saying it's
686 inaccurate?

687 **CAMPBELL:** This disagreement is because the 2010 census, we don't
688 know how accurate it is anymore.

689 **FEMALE:** We're too close to the 10.

690 **CAMPBELL:** Because it's been 10 years, and that's just how census's
691 work.

692 **PAHLKE:** But if there's a yearly update of an estimate.

693 **CAMPBELL:** Right. The disagreement is how accurate that is and
694 whether or not it's accurate enough to put into the report. Now most
695 state agencies and community agencies do use US census data of that
696 type for those kind of demographic estimations.

697 **PAHLKE:** And that's the information we're talking about basing this -

698 **CAMPBELL:** Yes.

699 **PAHLKE:** Percentages on?

700 **CAMPBELL:** Yes.

701 **PAHLKE:** Okay.

702 **CAMPBELL:** Any other questions or comments? Yes, Dave?

703 **COATES:** This Dave Coates. The question I'm going to ask is we now
704 have a full year of data for calendar year 2018. I'd just be
705 interested to see what does the demographic - I don't know if I'm
706 ready to say, "Let's incorporate it going forward." Part of it, I'd
707 be interested to see 2018 data. What does it look like? I mean, if
708 the data is available, we should be able to do that analysis. So.

709 **HURLEY:** This is Captain Hurley. The data for what? Our force data?

710 **COATES:** Comparing the force data to the demographic data for - force
711 data from calendar year 2018. The Q4 report just came out, so we
712 should be able to get 2018 rollup and be able to analysis there.

713 **HURLEY:** Okay.

714 **COATES:** I'd just be interested to see what it looks like before I'm
715 willing to put a formal proposal together.

716 **CAMPBELL:** Any other comments or -

717 **HALL:** Walt Hall. A point of order - you said - Dave, you said
718 something about a proposal of what this data was going to bring?
719 Recommendations of actions or what are you speaking of?

720 **COATES:** I have no idea what the data is going to look like.

721 **HALL:** Okay.

722 **COATES:** I think we've all got an opinion on what the data is going
723 to look like, but, again, until you actually see the data line up,
724 use-of-force report and the demographic data, we just don't know. So,
725 I think it's worth taking a look. You know, we finally have a full
726 year of data that's similar in 2018. My proposal would be let's -
727 let's take a look at that data and see what it tells us. If it really
728 is something that is going to truly add value, then I think that's
729 when we make the proposal. But right now, there's a lot of
730 assumptions being made of what the data is going to look like, and
731 none of us have seen it.

732 **CAMPBELL:** I've seen it, but I look at the data all the time.

733 **COATES:** Okay.

734 **CAMPBELL:** And that's one of the things that the patterns of use of
735 force task force is tasked to give is what the 2018 and that kind of
736 information. Sorry, actually -

737 **WANNER:** This is Kezia, and the thing that strikes me about getting
738 more data sets and putting them together is that it gives more
739 information. It also raise more questions, and then the onus is going
740 to be on the police bureau to try to succinctly tie together the
741 corollaries and how the data sets relate to one another such as you
742 have demographic data, you'll have a census or the community survey,
743 you'll have the use of force, and then a breakdown of demographics of
744 use of force. But then you'll also have to do the same, which you do
745 now, for the demographics of those that you have in custody. So, I
746 think it's really going to be multiple data sets and the

747 interrelatedness of those which just means that it gets more
748 complicated, probably a little bit more difficult to explain to those
749 that don't live in this world. And so, I think that's just where it
750 needs to go because people will draw really easy corollaries if you
751 were to have the census demographic information, use-of-force
752 demographics, and they would say, "This looks odd," or "it looks
753 wrong." But there's a lot more context that needs to go along with
754 that to explain the situation and the numbers.

755 **STEWART:** Greg Stewart. I would like - I think you hit the nail on
756 the head. I was involved in the creation of our stop (inaudible)
757 reporting, and I do a lot of research with Portland state on both
758 police stops and police use of force nationally. And the issue in
759 both of those areas is what's called benchmarking. If you research,
760 like, police use of force or police stops data, it's, "We're going to
761 report the amount of force we use," and it's what do you benchmark
762 that against. Census data is in traffic stops, a commonly used
763 benchmark, but it's also accepted in that study, that field, to be a
764 poor benchmark. It's not considered a good benchmark. What's sort of
765 the gold standard of benchmarks and what we started trying to do with
766 traffic stops, which led to the issues Kezia's speaking about, is
767 providing - the best practice is to provide a range of potential
768 benchmarks. So, you might look at - use daylight savings to look at
769 stopped before and after daylight savings in what's called the veil
770 of darkness study. You might use arrest data. You might use the
771 census data, but what happened is we ended up going down this rabbit
772 hole where these reports we were creating became ever larger and
773 larger and larger. And we actually scaled back our efforts at
774 reporting stops data when the DOJ came into town because the
775 reporting requirements became so globally large. So, I'm not - I'm
776 agnostic on whether to include census data in this report - if you
777 asked Greg Stewart personally, not Greg Stewart, police Greg Stewart
778 - I'm, like, I don't think it's a particular useful benchmark. I'm
779 sort of agnostic about it. What I would argue is that we have that
780 sort of best becomes the enemy of the good where we start down a
781 rabbit hole. Because once we report this, my experience has been then
782 somebody else is going to be, "Well, you should also include that,"
783 then "You shouldn't do that," and then "We need this other piece of
784 data." And what happens is we spend a tremendous amount of time
785 collecting data that's readily available elsewhere and have less time
786 to analyze the data. The census data is super - it's not like - I
787 mean, like, if you told me, "Greg, would you rather have arrest data
788 in this report or census data," I would say, "Let's include the
789 arrest data," because that's something public can't get. The public
790 can google census. You know what I mean? Like, you can google - and
791 there's some other technical reasons why it's not super appropriate,
792 and that has to do with, like, ethnicity. We report ethnicity as a
793 race. The census data reports race and ethnicity. So, even if you
794 were to put the two numbers together, every Hispanic person who also
795 happens to be African-American is going to get reported differently
796 in the two data sets. And, again, I'm agnostic. Whatever sort of
797 makes the group happy, but I do think we need to be fully aware of

798 sort of the complexity of the issue. And I think Kezia kind of hit on
799 it where it's, like, if you're going to ask for stuff that's going to
800 create more work forever, I would try to choose things that are super
801 meaningful in terms of benchmarking. And, again, I would say that the
802 arrest data is a much more relevant benchmark and on that, again, the
803 public can't access as easily. You know, the format of the current
804 report, I think, optimizes on both - in terms of optimizing the
805 amount of effort it takes to create the report but providing the
806 maximum amount of information to the public. And that's just
807 something to think about.

808 **CAMPBELL:** Venn?

809 **WILDE:** A comment and motion. The comment is I appreciate (inaudible)
810 say, Kezia, which I understand you to be saying this a direction we
811 need to go that, yes, there will be more work of explaining some of
812 the correlations, and that's work that needs to be done, and partly
813 because - I think I understood you to be saying that the - you know,
814 as people have pointed out, the general public can and many of us in
815 the general public do google the census data and make comparison
816 ourselves, and when that comparison is made by us sort of off line,
817 we don't get the benefit of whatever insights you might have from the
818 bureau about how those things compare to each other or if you think
819 that they don't. And if you include the data, then you have the
820 opportunity to say, like, this data refers to this data and this kind
821 of information, and this data refers to that kind of information. So,
822 yes, that is a little more work, but it's the direction, I think, you
823 were saying Kezia we need to be headed. And I have a motion, but I
824 see your lips moving and wanted to clarify.

825 **WANNER:** Almost. This is Kezia again. I do think that we need to be
826 able to have good data sets around this information, and I think if
827 the census is determined to be one of the best ways that we get sort
828 of the environmental scan of demographic data that is a foundation of
829 what Portland police operate within the community and it serves a
830 purpose for us or serves - serves a purpose for the police or serves
831 a purpose for the community to have that data, I think it should be
832 provided. But I also think that it's useful for us to be judicious in
833 the data that we think should be combined with force data, what is
834 the purpose, what would be most relevant, what tells the story, or
835 whatever, you know, sort of helps unwind what's going on behind the
836 use of force numbers. And I don't know all of the data sets to make a
837 recommendation. The census is widely used. It's a foundation for a
838 lot of different conversations that are data specific. There may be
839 others. So, I just think we should be judicious in sort of making a
840 recommendation that would task police with doing a lot of work when
841 maybe that is or isn't the best data set. I think if there are
842 others, we could hear about them, and I'm just not sure what those
843 are.

844 **WILDE:** And then, Venn Wilde again, I would move that we adopt the
845 recommendation that's been put together by the demographic data
846 inclusion and annual report (inaudible) use-of-force reports task
847 force.

848 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have a second?

849 **DROPPERS:** Second from Danielle.

850 **CAMPBELL:** Second from Danielle. We kind of jumped the gun on the
851 discussion. So, we can continue the discussion if anyone wants to.

852 **DROPPERS:** This is Danielle. I want to add one other point and just
853 say what actually hasn't been said. We have a national epidemic of
854 people of color being over represented in all interactions with the
855 police force, and I think that is the true importance of this, and I
856 don't want lose sight of that. And I think that's ultimately why this
857 has come forward. That's ultimately why the transparency is so
858 important, and that's ultimately why if - again, if we want to build
859 trust, if we want to have transparency, this is part of that work. I
860 welcome further conversations to talk about additional data sets. I
861 wants us to have the best data possible too, but I haven't heard
862 anybody come forward with something that feels like it wouldn't be
863 skewed because we also have to, again, keep it in context. We can't
864 use a denominator that's going to be over represented with people of
865 color. We can't use custodies as our denominator. It's skewed because
866 those communities of color are coming into contact with our police
867 force far more often. That is not a legitimate denominator. It does
868 not work. That is not an appropriate data set to use. So, if someone
869 can bring that forward and be helpful in this conversation and
870 suggest something that is not the census data, I would completely
871 welcome that, but I haven't heard that as part of this conversation.

872 **WANNER:** This is Kezia. If that's really the purpose of us trying to
873 ferret out the percentage of individuals in the census population,
874 the percentage demographically of the population of the city of
875 Portland that end up being, I'll just say, arrested, because that's
876 really thing. It's not - use of force is the next step. I'm going to
877 say it's those that come into contact and then are detained or
878 arrested by police. It's more of the relationship between those two
879 things that I think is sort of the underpinning of the data that
880 we're trying to talk about here. That's what I'm understanding from a
881 lot of our conversations is that it's - that's a corollary right
882 there.

883 **FISHER:** Call to question.

884 **CAMPBELL:** Hold on. Please don't interrupt when -

885 **FISHER:** Oh, I'm sorry.

886 **CAMPBELL:** It's all right.

887 **WANNER:** Oh, I'm almost done. But, I mean, I'm really - that's the
888 thing that I see that is missing because it's, like, you're taking it
889 - it's like you're taking two steps here. You're taking demographic
890 data, which is everybody, the percentage of our population and break
891 it down by demographics that are coming into contact and getting
892 arrested by police or detained, and then those that are in that group
893 that then are having use of force, their experience of use of force.
894 So, I think we're missing that middle piece which is demographic
895 population of our - demographic breakdown of our population and those
896 that are getting arrested and coming into custody. So, I think that
897 that piece maybe we haven't talked really very fully about.

898 **DROPPERS** This is Danielle, and I agree, but I also don't think it's
899 an either/or. I think it's an and. I agree.

900 **CAMPBELL:** Did you have a motion that you'd like?

901 **FISHER:** Yes, call to question.

902 **CAMPBELL:** We haven't done call to question in a long dang time. Call
903 to question is basically like this half vote, right?

904 **FISHER:** Yes.

905 **CAMPBELL:** Let's see. We'd have to have a vote on that. Is there a
906 second to call to question? Lack of a second, motion fails. I would
907 just like to say one last thing before I ask for any more discussion.
908 I guess for me, part of this is the fact that the groups that are
909 watching the police that are not a community group, they are using
910 demographic data, and regardless of whether the city or the police
911 bureau thinks it's proper or not, they do use it, and it seems
912 important to me that if these groups are going to be using that data,
913 then the police bureau themselves should probably as well use it just
914 so that they can put in that context in their reports so that
915 hopefully, it's used properly in these ways because right now, I
916 don't think it's used properly all of the time because, I agree, it's
917 not the best measure against custodies. Custodies are the best
918 measure for use of force, but it is missing that added piece of every
919 time a person of color has a use of force done against them, it is a
920 larger portion of their population in the city being affected than
921 the other groups, and that's why I support this. Because, to
922 summarize again, other groups are using it, so we might as well be
923 able to say why we think it either is important or isn't important as
924 a police bureau and because certain groups are more affected by it.
925 It's because their custody ratios are different, and that has a lot
926 of things beyond just what the police do. It has to do with the
927 justice system, it has to do with history, socioeconomic issues, all
928 these other things. But just because it's complicated doesn't mean we
929 shouldn't talk about it, and it doesn't mean that we shouldn't be
930 willing to say if everyone else is using this measurement, then we're
931 going to use it to, and we're going to tell you how to use it
932 properly. Is there any more discussion?

933 **DANIELS:** This is Karen Daniels, and I'm with Dave. I just think it
934 would be nice to see, like, the quarterly report sample report with
935 the data in it, with the demographic data in it, because I'm a visual
936 person, and, you know, it would be, I guess, nice to see what it's
937 going to look like.

938 **CAMPBELL:** All right. So, these are - would you (inaudible) do a
939 motion to table which would basically be set this down until the next
940 meeting?

941 **FISHER:** We have a motion on the floor though already, don't we?

942 **CAMPBELL:** A motion to table would be with that.

943 **MALE:** It would postpone the motion.

944 **CAMPBELL:** Correct.

945 **MALE:** I call to question.

946 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have a second for call to question which would force
947 a vote?

948 **FISHER:** Second.

949 **CAMPBELL:** All in favor of having a vote, say aye.

950 **MULTIPLE:** Aye.

951 **CAMPBELL:** All opposed?

952 **MULTIPLE:** Nay.

953 **CAMPBELL:** All right. We're going to have to a hand raised vote here.

954 All in favor, please raise your hand.

955 **WILDE:** This is to end discussion?

956 **CAMPBELL:** Yeah. All right. All opposed? Motion carries. All right.

957 We will now have a vote on the motion on the table to formally accept

958 the demographic data inclusion and annual and quarter use of force

959 recommendation. When - if this is approved, it will be sent to the

960 chief of police. All right. All in favor, please signify by saying

961 aye.

962 **MULTIPLE:** Aye.

963 **CAMPBELL:** All opposed.

964 **MULTIPLE:** Nay.

965 **CAMPBELL:** Let's do a hand vote. Please raise your hands if you are

966 in favor. All opposed? 11-3, motion passes. Thank you. As - since

967 this has been passed, it will be added to the next needs assessment

968 which is sent to the chief of police. Is that the proper way of -

969 **HURLEY:** So - this is Captain Hurley. Basically, what happens is this

970 is now a formal recommendation from the TAC committee, okay? So, the

971 TAC is saying to the chief of police, "We would like this done." The

972 chief of police then will look at what you have recommended, and then

973 she will make a response to this about whether or not she would like

974 to adopt it or not, and sometimes it's adopt part of it or not,

975 right? So, this is just now - you voted to say officially from the

976 TAC, "We are making this request of the chief of police." Okay?

977 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you for the clarification. All right. Moving on. We

978 will now move on to the update on moving forward regarding a wellness

979 program. To give a bit of background, this was a discussion that

980 started at our last meeting following basically a discussion between

981 Captain Hurley and myself and then discussion amongst the group that

982 basically showed that there really exists no form of any kind of

983 wellness program that's significant within the Portland Police

984 Bureau. A wellness program basically handling mental and physical

985 needs to make sure that people are in the top condition to do the

986 jobs that we send them out to do. From that discussion, we had some

987 discussion with the steering committee about where to go from here,

988 and it was decided that we would create a task - with approval from

989 the TAC, of course, we would create a task force that would move

990 forward on creating kind of a recommendation of what we would like to

991 see a wellness program include and kind of the direction we would

992 like to go with that. To kind of give a little context, we're not

993 talking about designing a wellness program to the nitty gritty at

994 this point just because we as a group do not have the knowledge or

995 time to do that. This would be pretty much trying to form a

996 recommendation saying, "We as the TAC support the creation of a

997 wellness program that meets this criteria." I would like to put a

998 motion on the floor for the creation of a wellness program task force
999 led by myself.

1000 **WILDE:** Second.

1001 **CAMPBELL:** We have a second from Venn. Discussion? I think I laid out
1002 everything on my end before the discussion. I need to work on that.
1003 Any other discussion? All right. All in favor of creating a wellness
1004 program task force, please signify by saying aye.

1005 **MULTIPLE:** Aye.

1006 **CAMPBELL:** All opposed. All right. Do we have anybody who would like
1007 to volunteer to be a part of this task force? Let me write this down
1008 real quick.

1009 **ZINGESER:** Sylvia.

1010 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Sylvia, Kezia, Richard. Anybody over here? All
1011 right. I will get in touch with you after the meeting. Thank you.
1012 Motion passes. Task force is created. Myself, Sylvia, Kezia, and
1013 Richard. All right. Moving on. We have a quarter-four update for the
1014 use of force, overview from the professional standards division. To
1015 give background to the new members, about once every quarter, the
1016 Portland Police Bureau puts out a report on their use-of-force data,
1017 and we are required by the DOJ to get an update of it. And so, we sit
1018 down and get an update. Yes, Bob?

1019 **FISHER:** Are we required to comment on it officially or just to look
1020 at it?

1021 **CAMPBELL:** We are required to look at it, and if we see anything of
1022 interest, we are to comment on it.

1023 **FISHER:** Thank you.

1024 **SMITH:** All right. My name is Shannon Smith. I am one of the analyst
1025 auditors. I work for the inspector. For those who are new, the
1026 inspector, like he just explained, is required to come and talk about
1027 any potential trends or anything like that that we've seen in our
1028 quarterly force reports, and we already introduced new team members
1029 over there, so I'm just going to jump right in.

1030 **CAMPBELL:** So, this question real quick, with the new team members,
1031 how many analysts do you have now on the staff?

1032 **SMITH:** We currently have four.

1033 **CAMPBELL:** Okay.

1034 **SMITH:** Last time, for those who are new, we had discussed - there
1035 was a large decrease in the amount of force. We had a 30 percent
1036 reduction in the FDCR. We really don't have an explanation for why
1037 that occurred, but as you can see this quarter, it still remains
1038 pretty flat. There's not a decrease of - well, it went down by one,
1039 but it did not go back to where we were seen in previous quarters. We
1040 did have a decrease in the number of cases. It amounts to about 5
1041 percent. It's actually only nine cases that decreased this quarter.
1042 Again, we can't really pinpoint into something specific. It could be
1043 a multitude of factors contributing to it. Again, comparison of our
1044 executive findings, you did see a pretty substantial decrease in
1045 officer-initiated calls. That caused the percentage of force that
1046 resulted from an officer-initiated call to go up a little bit. It's
1047 still less than one percent (inaudible).

1048 **CAMPBELL:** And maybe real quick, just mention what the difference
1049 between an officer-initiated and a citizen-initiated call is.

1050 **SMITH:** So, officer initiated, a self-initiated, activity is often
1051 what it's called. Like, those are your traffic stops or subject
1052 stops. Citizen initiated, they have called the police for services
1053 basically. That's essentially it. Those are always typically less -
1054 well, they have been always less than one percent result in a use of
1055 force. Custodies also decreased rather substantially this quarter,
1056 but we're still right around three percent of our custodies resulting
1057 in a use of force.

1058 **MALE:** Is custody arrest or what's the -

1059 **SMITH:** So, in Portland, because they have a lot of custodies that
1060 aren't true arrests, like an arrested for a crime, they have a
1061 custody for, let's say, a civil hold to transport someone on a mental
1062 health hold or someone (inaudible). Those are called custodies. And
1063 because force can arise from the custody, now (inaudible) resistance,
1064 holding someone down on a gurney or something like that, that counted
1065 as a use of force. That occurs a lot in, like, a mental health hold
1066 situation. So, that's why use custodies versus just arrest.

1067 **HURLEY:** And, can you - just because we have so many people here, can
1068 you give them a quick definition for our force because for us, right,
1069 what you believe force may be and what we call force may be two
1070 different things.

1071 **SMITH:** Right. Right. So, PPB considers things such as resistant
1072 handcuffing. So, if someone resists while the officer is attempting
1073 to put handcuffs on, that is a use of force. Control against
1074 resistance, which I just talked about, is literally someone who
1075 resists an officer attempting to hold them or control them in some
1076 way to get them into custody. That's another form of force. There's
1077 the other ones that are probably more familiar to you like a CEW or
1078 Tasers. We call them CEWs here, pointing of a firearm, things of that
1079 nature. This report - this quarterly report has a separate section
1080 for officer-involved shootings. That's typically what people hear
1081 about in the media. But in Portland Police Bureau, they literally
1082 report force for thing such as resisting handcuffing and control
1083 against resistance. That's not common for too many police bureaus.

1084 **HURLEY:** So, to clarify, if you go to take someone in the custody,
1085 and you grab their arm, and they pull away from you, that's force.

1086 **SMITH:** Right.

1087 **HURLEY:** So, that is counted in this. So, when you look at our force
1088 data, right, if you go to take someone into custody and they pull
1089 away, and you hold on, which is you using your muscle against their
1090 muscle, right, and then you use that muscle to put them into
1091 handcuffs, that is force. So, there's no injury. There's not taking
1092 them to the ground. There's no what you kind of look at in the media
1093 as being - you know, this isn't NYPD. So, don't think TV. Force for
1094 us is a little as that. So, three percent of custodies, right, result
1095 in force, but when we mean *force*, we mean as little as pulling away.
1096 Does that make sense to everybody? Okay. I see a look of what?

1097 **SANTOS:** Well, I just wasn't - this is Frank Santos. I just have a
1098 clarifying question. So, you mentioned an individual on a gurney?
1099 **SMITH:** Right.

1100 **SANTOS:** And if an officer has to - if they're thrashing about and an
1101 officer has to get them to stay on the - that's considered use of
1102 force?

1103 **HURLEY:** Yes. Yes, it is. So, for instance if - this is Captain
1104 Hurley again. So, for instance, if an officer is asked to go to a
1105 location to take somebody to put them on a hold or a mental health
1106 hold and they sit on the gurney or they are placed on the gurney, and
1107 they just hold their arm down while they put the restraints on, that
1108 is a use of force.

1109 **SANTOS:** All right.

1110 **MALE:** In my ride along, there was a mental health case that was not
1111 cooperating, and they called an ambulance, and the ambulance people
1112 used for force to hold the person down.

1113 **HURLEY:** Yes.

1114 **MALE:** And -

1115 **HURLEY:** So, the fire and ambulance can -

1116 **MALE:** Officers don't usually have gurneys around them, do they?

1117 **GERRITSON:** No. It's only with an ambulance.

1118 **SMITH:** Yeah, the gurney was assisting medical (inaudible) custody.

1119 **EDNA:** I have a quick - this is Edna. So, for example, the community
1120 member is already expecting the police coming. They have their hands
1121 up, they're kneeling down, and still the police come with a lot of
1122 force. Is that count for still a force from - is that force used
1123 there if the person is, like, having hands up.

1124 **HURLEY:** What does the officer do though. It's the officer's action
1125 that we're looking at.

1126 **EDNA:** Like, the officer will come and just really use a lot of force
1127 to handcuff the person or put the person down who is already, like,
1128 hands up and just trying to follow the instructions.

1129 **HURLEY:** So, force is only force if there's a resistance, right. So,
1130 if we - if we ask - if we decided - if say to somebody, "You're under
1131 arrest," right, and we hold their arm and put it where we need it -
1132 excuse me - put it where we need it in order to put handcuffs on.
1133 That is not force. It's only if they pull away, then it's force.

1134 **EDNA:** But that aside, the person who say the police used force.

1135 **HURLEY:** Yeah.

1136 **EDNA:** But it does not count on the police side as force, what I see
1137 like is force.

1138 **HURLEY:** If you say it's force and make a complaint of force, we will
1139 investigate it. Every single one, we investigate. They go to internal
1140 affairs.

1141 **STEWART:** Also, if there's likelihood of injury. So, like, even if
1142 they didn't resist, if the person was, like, thrown to the ground,
1143 that would get investigated as force. Like, if like what you're
1144 saying - you're saying they're up and the officer just tackles them
1145 or something, then even if they didn't resist, if the action is, you

1146 know, reasonably likely to cause injury, that would be investigated
1147 as well.

1148 **CAMPBELL:** Say your name.

1149 **STEWART:** Greg Stewart.

1150 **SMITH:** Another point, important point, about the percentage of use
1151 of force that results from custodies is, and we talked about it last
1152 time, is it had previously been just over four percent, and it
1153 decreased to three percent. The remaining standing three percent,
1154 that's probably also due to decrease in force overall. Regarding
1155 persons involved in force, for those who are new, we capture in our
1156 quarterly report. We report on drug and alcohol-affected persons,
1157 armed persons, people in mental health crisis, and those who are
1158 considered transient at the time that force is used. Importance this
1159 quarter that we noted, there's a pretty substantial increase in the
1160 number of armed persons, and you'll perhaps see some - when we get to
1161 the point of the firearm numbers, you'll see why that's important.
1162 Yes, sir.

1163 **FISHER:** Bob Fisher here. I don't see the numbers there, but in the
1164 report that you sent us, okay, there was a big discrepancy, as I saw
1165 it, between the number of cases of people who were armed and then -
1166 or it was reported armed or armed, and then the actual arms were at
1167 much, much smaller.

1168 **SMITH** Yes.

1169 **FISHER:** In other words, there was a big number of people who were
1170 reported armed, but they're not armed. Is that correct?

1171 **SMITH:** Correct. Yes, often that's the case. An officer gets
1172 information that the person is armed and whatever their crime is, you
1173 know, potentially a robbery or a report of someone armed with a
1174 firearm menacing someone or something like that. When they get to the
1175 scene, they find out, well, there's no weapon, there isn't actually a
1176 weapon, but the officer's initial perception is that they're arriving
1177 onto the scene to an armed person. So, that's the (inaudible). Yes?

1178 **WILDE:** This is Venn Wilde. You said there's a significant increase
1179 in the number of armed persons involved in force. What I'm noticing
1180 looking at this table is that it's a return -

1181 **SMITH:** Yes.

1182 **WILDE:** To the Q4 numbers last year and the Q2 numbers earlier - Q4
1183 numbers from the prior year and Q2 numbers from last year, and it's
1184 still lower than Q1 numbers last year.

1185 **SMITH** Yes. Yeah. And that's often the case with our force numbers.
1186 That's one of the challenges of reporting force quarterly. Because
1187 there's so little force, you see all these little variations in
1188 percentages every single quarter, and oftentimes, everything just
1189 sort of, like, goes back and forth. One quarter it's up, next quarter
1190 it's down. That's why we try to watch these trends over a long period
1191 of time just to see if there's anything meaningful with them. It
1192 takes quite a while to collect enough data to determine if it's an
1193 actual long-term trend.

1194 **CAMPBELL:** Just real quick.

1195 **SMITH** Yes.

1196 **CAMPBELL:** Just to make sure I have everything right in my head, the
1197 Under the Influence of Drugs and Alcohol, the Armed, and the Mental
1198 Health Crisis are all based upon the officer's perception, correct?
1199 **SMITH:** Mental health crisis, yes, I mean, to some degree. They
1200 usually - it's not just someone who is perceived as having mental
1201 health issues. It's someone who is actually in crisis. So, that's the
1202 differentiation there.

1203 **CAMPBELL:** Okay.

1204 **SMITH:** So, it's not just someone that's perceived as having mental
1205 health issues.

1206 **CAMPBELL:** And then transient can include both people without houses
1207 as people who refuse to give their address?

1208 **SMITH:** It can, yes. And that one is very fluid too. We see a lot of
1209 the same subjects come up in our use-of-force cases, and sometimes
1210 they have an address, sometimes they have a residence, and then
1211 sometimes they're (inaudible). So, it varies as well for subjects.
1212 It's very fluid. The other -

1213 **CAMPBELL:** Oh, sorry. One last question over here.

1214 **DROPPERS:** Sorry. It's quick. And these figure also do not - this is
1215 Danielle. Sorry. These figure do not include use of deadly force,
1216 right?

1217 **SMITH:** That's correct. Yes.

1218 **DROPPERS:** Because that's presented separately?

1219 **SMITH:** Yes. It's presented separately. The other notable thing that
1220 we noted this quarter is that the number of subjects who are having
1221 mental health crisis has dropped below 10 percent, which that's the
1222 first time that we've seen that occur. Again, I'm not sure exactly -
1223 it could be up next quarter. It's hard to say, but this quarter
1224 (inaudible).

1225 **FISHER:** Yeah, follow - Bob Fisher. The officer goes and says that
1226 the person was armed or thought they were armed. Is that always - the
1227 benchmark there is what they were told on the call? Most of these are
1228 going to be called in, are they not?

1229 **SMITH:** Oftentimes, yes. I mean, not all armed are reported armed.
1230 So, there are some armed actually when an officer arrives and, of
1231 course, has a weapon in their hand.

1232 **FISHER:** Okay. I'll drop it for now. Thank you.

1233 **SMITH:** The applications of force piece. I feel like we always
1234 struggle to figure out a way to present this in a meaningful way.
1235 Last time I trimmed it down to the top five highest or ones with the
1236 largest number of applications, and I felt like, well, I probably
1237 left something out that might be meaningful for you or not, but this
1238 really does demonstrate the variability in it a great deal. There's a
1239 lot of numbers. It's, again, making the point about, like, let's say
1240 for example, "Strikes/Kicks," increase in 91 percent. That seems
1241 massive, but if you look at it in reference to the last four
1242 quarters, it's basically returning back to a level that it was at in
1243 previous quarters. So, again, it's hard to say these things are a
1244 particular trend or something that really needs to be analyzed
1245 further until we see more data over time.

1246 **HURLEY:** And the percentages change quite a bit because, I mean, when
1247 you look at it really between 24 and 12, I mean, you're looking at
1248 the difference is such a small number, right?
1249 **SMITH:** Yes, and it causes a lot percentage -
1250 **HURLEY:** So, it causes a lot of percentages, but in reality, you're
1251 talking about, you know, 12.
1252 **SMITH:** Yes. Exactly. Yes.
1253 **HURLEY:** Right .
1254 **DANIELS:** This is Karen Daniels. And do you make note of, like, there
1255 was a big demonstration this month in this quarter, more like unusual
1256 activity?
1257 **SMITH:** So, this also does not include the crowd control data as
1258 well. So, that's not included in this data. That is in a separate
1259 area as well. That's because largely because timing, and there are so
1260 many other force types. Because there's 19 force types that are just
1261 sort of the standard force types that we collect, but in crowd
1262 control, it expands even further. They use a lot of different force
1263 types in some (inaudible). So, that what (inaudible) report.
1264 **HURLEY:** Can I clarify something just for me because I think - I'm
1265 not positive. When you look at something like less lethal, right, and
1266 so you go from 9 to 24, if you have one incident where you use a less
1267 lethal tool more than one time - so, you tried to do the Taser that
1268 failed to work. So, they went to the FM or the 40 mm, and that failed
1269 to work, so you went - does each one of those count even though it's
1270 one call, one incident?
1271 **SMITH:** Yes, so this is applications. So, literally, that could be
1272 one call.
1273 **HURLEY:** So, it could be one call that skews that all the way -
1274 **SMITH:** Yes, and it could be multiple officers.
1275 **HURLEY:** Right. That's - right. So, if you have one call, but three
1276 different officers use the Taser, that's three applications even
1277 though it's really one call?
1278 **SMITH:** Yes. Absolutely. So, any particular questions that I can
1279 clarify? I know it's a lot of data. It's hard to take that many force
1280 types and make it tidy. Yes.
1281 **DROPPERS:** This is Danielle. Can you remind me again what is a hobble
1282 restraint?
1283 **LINDSEY:** So, a hobble restraint is essentially - this is Lieutenant
1284 Lindsey. I keep forgetting. A hobble restraint is used on a subject
1285 who is - like, let's say you take a person into custody and you put
1286 them in the back of your - you put them in the back of the patrol
1287 car, and then - their, you know, hands are restrained behind them
1288 with handcuffs, but then they start, like, kicking violently at the
1289 door or they start, you know, kicking in windows. What will happen is
1290 a hobble restraint is typically used to control a subject's legs. We
1291 used to apply different methods, but we don't do that anymore. So
1292 essentially, a hobble is just - it looks like, kind of like a nylon -
1293 a nylon strap that's used just to contain a subject's legs who is
1294 kicking violently.
1295 **DROPPERS:** Thank you.

1296 **SMITH:** That is all. That is a brief synopsis of the force summary
1297 report.

1298 **FISHER:** Bob Fisher here. How big of a staff do you have?

1299 **SMITH:** We now have four members.

1300 **FISHER:** You have four members. Is this typical for a police
1301 department to have this much staff looking at force? Does this sound
1302 typical?

1303 **SMITH:** It's the result of the settlement agreement.

1304 **FISHER:** After the settlement agreement, is there some expectation
1305 that it will decrease? You don't know?

1306 **SMITH:** I don't.

1307 **FISHER:** Okay. Thank you.

1308 **SMITH:** Any questions? Okay.

1309 **CAMPBELL:** I just wanted to mention one thing. Having been on TAC
1310 since - I believe my first meeting was in early 2016, and one of the
1311 very first things we got were one of these reports. And I was looking
1312 at some of the old reports that I went over when I was first joining
1313 TAC compared to now, looking at annual data, and I thought it was
1314 interesting, and I just kind of wanted to bring it up because a lot
1315 of the work that we do here, as you new members are going to learn,
1316 are not immediate change things. And they're not even things where
1317 you can definitely say, "We did this, and then this happens." But I
1318 just wanted to mention this. So, for all of 2015, there's various
1319 types of force that have always been measured. And looking at 2015
1320 compared to 2018 shows some interesting trends. In 2015, there were
1321 27 control holds with injuries. In 2018, there was one. In 2015,
1322 there was 90 incidents of police striking or kicking someone as a use
1323 of force. In 2018, that dropped to 38. Aerosol restraint, which is
1324 pepper spray, there was 29 in 2015. In 2018, there were 18 incidents.
1325 Tasers, CEW, 72 in 2015, 2018 40. Pointing of firearms, 390 in 2015;
1326 2018 153. Now, there's a lot of things that are still problems, and
1327 we don't know what's going to happen in the future with this. We
1328 don't know if next year maybe some of these uses of force won't go up
1329 because we don't know exactly what caused these declines to happen.
1330 But I think it is worth mentioning publicly that the trend is going
1331 the right way right now. And I'll be honest, I've been in this group
1332 for three years, and there's times where I wonder why I do it because
1333 it's a lot of debate, and it's a lot of things that are slow, and you
1334 don't think you're doing a lot. But I think it's important given just
1335 how things appear in the news and stuff that if you look at the data,
1336 things are getting better in a lot of ways. It doesn't mean that
1337 there's not a lot work still to do, and I'm sure Dan and some other
1338 people bring up ways that we do need to improve, but I just wanted to
1339 bring that up in context of the use of force (inaudible). All right.
1340 Any - yes, Tyler?

1341 **HALL:** Tyler. I think that's a really excellent summation of -
1342 especially because I've been with the TAC the same amount of time as
1343 you. So, for me, I've seen that too, and even from the first meeting
1344 when use of force data was presented to me, I noticed that there was
1345 some striking pieces that stood out that you are describing. And the

1346 thing that I would also like to add to that, all that being great,
1347 the thing that I am also still seeing that does come up, speaking of
1348 the media and the news, is this going back to the initial intention
1349 of why this group was set up to begin with. And the Department of
1350 Justice settlement was around the use of force against an unarmed,
1351 disabled person of color, and that caused their death, and I just
1352 read another article about Sam Rice who recently was the officer who
1353 shot him in the head through his motel room window - the guy was
1354 paranoid schizophrenic - but it's a complicated case. But I still see
1355 in the news there are still fatal incidents with the police and the
1356 mentally ill in the city that seem like, if you read it at face value
1357 and didn't know the data, you might draw the conclusion that things
1358 are changing slower than we would like. So, I would like to just
1359 bring that one case up as we have gone farther in a lot of ways, but
1360 there are still some similarities that keep coming up.

1361 **CAMPBELL:** Yes.

1362 **EDNA:** I think he had his -

1363 **FISHER:** No, no, no. You can go first.

1364 **EDNA:** Yeah, this is Edna. I agree with you. I mean, looking -
1365 listening at the numbers, I feel good about it, but then being in the
1366 community still tells a different story. And I think it will be
1367 helpful to know, yes, from 2015, things were really different from
1368 now. What caused that to - the numbers to go down? I think it to be -
1369 if we know, then we can say, "Okay, these are the reasons that caused
1370 the numbers to go down, so let's keep up with that." But if no one is
1371 keeping track of that, we just don't know why the numbers went down.
1372 It's, like, okay maybe next year numbers will go up because we are
1373 not following, like, "Oh, okay." It's, like, if you - you know, it
1374 would be helpful. I know it takes money (inaudible) capacity, but it
1375 would be really good to know, "Okay, these are the reasons. Let's
1376 keep up and maybe pull from that."

1377 **CAMPBELL:** Bob?

1378 **FISHER:** I wonder, Captain Hurley and Liesbeth, we're not sure why
1379 that is happening, but wouldn't you think that the very fact that
1380 it's so visible now - in other words, this information is so public
1381 that the officers themselves and the department itself would say,
1382 "Wait a minute. These numbers are bothersome." I wonder whether you
1383 think the fact that it's so public now, this kind of information -
1384 it's being sent to Washington. It's being sent all around. Did that
1385 change the behavior of the department's police at all?

1386 **GERRITSON:** I'll let Captain Hurley address that since she would know
1387 a lot more about that, frankly, than me, but thank you.

1388 **HURLEY:** As - this is Captain Hurley. I wouldn't put that correlation
1389 together. There's too many variables in this to know the answer. We
1390 have increased our training. We've changed our training, tools have
1391 changed -

1392 **FISHER:** Speak up.

1393 **HURLEY:** Oh, sorry. We've increased training, we've changed training,
1394 tools have changed, the number of stops, the number of custodies. I
1395 mean, there are way too many things as a variable to answer to what

1396 one thing is that may have changed those numbers. I couldn't answer
1397 that.

1398 **FISHER:** That contributed to it?

1399 **HURLEY:** I can't answer that. The data wouldn't - I would be making
1400 up stuff.

1401 **FISHER:** Thank you.

1402 **CAMPBELL:** Yes, Karen?

1403 **DANIELS:** But then I also think this will be a good place for the
1404 demographic data. I mean, if you look, and you see all of this stuff
1405 is going down, and the population is growing, then we're doing even
1406 better than - you know, if the population is going down and, you know
1407 - so, I do think the demographic information will be a good way to
1408 compare - I don't know. Make it so this report isn't just in a
1409 vacuum.

1410 **CAMPBELL:** Any other comments or anything? Yes, Danielle.

1411 **DROPPERS:** This is Danielle. I'm just wondering - and I'm sorry. I'm
1412 sure I've asked this question before, but when do we get to review
1413 the use-of-deadly force data? Can you remind me of the timeline of
1414 when those reports come out? Is that the same time frame of the
1415 general use of force?

1416 **SMITH:** The deadly force data is included in the quarterly and the
1417 annual reports. So, it's towards the back.

1418 **DROPPERS:** But we're just not reviewing it tonight?

1419 **SMITH:** Not in the summary view of it. It's just literally a table
1420 with the events, the date that it occurred, the demographics. Those
1421 cases are handled by the detective division, so we don't get a lot of
1422 information on those. There's not a lot of additional variables that
1423 we can collect on that information.

1424 **CAMPBELL:** Danielle are you just looking to where it would at least
1425 be mentioned in these summaries when something like that happens?

1426 **DROPPERS:** Absolutely. I mean, it feels like a really important part
1427 of the data that should be included - I mean, it's a type of force.
1428 It's the highest level of force, and so I'm just a little perplexed
1429 why it's not even included.

1430 **CAMPBELL:** I'd say for myself too, the next time we have one of these
1431 updates, I would like to see - I mean, obviously, you can't get into
1432 a great amount of detail on it, but just having it mentioned just so
1433 people remember as well as kind of talking about some of the
1434 demographics data as well as the use of force would be. As far as,
1435 like, the racial breakdown, I know that data is in the report, but it
1436 would be (inaudible) because that's something that has been brought
1437 up before too. Thank you. Yes, Tyler.

1438 **HALL:** Tyler. I would just like to add one follow-up thing to my
1439 comment from prior about this article referring to Sam Rice. I'm
1440 happy to share. There's a great article that we written in January in
1441 the Portland Mercury about this entire case and goes through kind of
1442 the details of that case as it transpired. So, I'm happy to share
1443 that to the group as well for reference in case anybody would like to
1444 read more about that.

1445 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Thank you. Yes?

1446 **STEWART:** Greg Stewart. I wanted to make the group aware that most of
1447 the data is available online at our dashboards. So, if anybody wants
1448 this data, you can just google - I was just googling to make sure it
1449 was still there, but if you get on your phone and google "Portland
1450 police open data," you've got our use of deadly force incidents going
1451 back to 2010. There's a tremendous amount of data available on our
1452 regular uses of force, calls - and this is all on the website and
1453 available, like, right now. So, it is - it is - it's really if folks
1454 haven't seen - we purchased Tableau and have been making really
1455 extensive efforts to provide data to the public in an open-data
1456 format which does get back to that idea that, like, where is our best
1457 use of our analytic resources. We've added a lot of analysts, but
1458 having supervised the analysts, therefore I know the amount of work
1459 that they have. And I think it's important that we be really
1460 judicious because, again, my experience having managed the analysts
1461 in the past is everybody is, like, "It would be great if we had
1462 this." So, then it's, like, "Let's add this." Then it would be great
1463 if we had that, so let's add that. So, if we could provide it like an
1464 open-data format where we can build a Tableau dashboard that's
1465 totally available. And then that just let's our analysts do - I would
1466 prefer our analysts spend more time digging into, like, the long-term
1467 trends so that we can actually get at some of the root causes of this
1468 and address the real needs versus saying - but if we tell them you've
1469 got to add this piece of data, and you've got to add that piece of,
1470 and we have to know - this went up six and that went down four. I
1471 mean, that just takes away from them doing the more important longer-
1472 term work. So, I would ask, if anybody is interested, I would
1473 recommend they go to our open-data Google Form, Police Open Data, and
1474 you can see all of the - all of what we're already making available
1475 just at everybody's fingertips.

1476 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you.

1477 **PAHLKE:** This is John Pahlke. So, the numbers look like they're
1478 getting better. What's getting worse? Is their higher crime rate,
1479 more officer injuries? Are we responding the less calls? (Inaudible)
1480 what you said about behaviors changing, is it possible one of those
1481 behaviors was, "We'll just do less," and therefore those numbers are
1482 changing?

1483 **STEWART:** This is Greg. We've seen dramatic increases in self-
1484 initiated activity on the order of, depending on how you measure it,
1485 50-70 percent, and we've seen dramatic increases in received calls
1486 for service. So, our calls for service - I haven't looked at it
1487 lately, but when I was last in the unit, we were looking at, oh,
1488 between 20-35 percent increase in calls to us from the public and,
1489 like, a 60 percent decrease in officers doing - choosing to do
1490 something. But those two actually sort of equal out because the calls
1491 - even though calls from the public went up less and officer self-
1492 initiated went down, calls from the public take longer. So, if our
1493 calls from the public go up by, like, 20 percent, they take about 50
1494 percent longer than an officer doing a self - so, when they go up -
1495 and we've seen workload increases. When I left, the average officer

1496 was responding to, like, 40 percent more calls for service which,
1497 getting to your wellness idea, I think, is having come here from the
1498 street - not all the time because it's highly variable, the amount of
1499 activity, but there were days where people were just getting run into
1500 the ground. So, there is - I mean, like there are, like you say, a
1501 number of other things that operate beyond just - and I didn't want
1502 to go into it before, but if you look at our long-term use of force,
1503 it's been dropping since 2007. We instituted our first use-of-force
1504 task force - again, the reports are online - in 2007. We haven't
1505 measured force continuously since then, so we've changed some of the
1506 definitions. So, you have to look at, like, force types, but, like,
1507 I'll look at something like CEW or Taser usage which is fairly
1508 consistent. Again, you'll see 60-80 percent drops in use of force,
1509 and when we've done surveys on that - we did a survey in 2012, less
1510 than 1 percent of the public was aware that force had dropped. So,
1511 this was during the hype of the DOJ agreement, so I also really
1512 appreciate you bringing up that piece because we - at that point,
1513 force had been cut nearly in half, and the DOJ was here looking at
1514 our force usage, and less than 1 percent of the public knew that we
1515 had actually cut force in half already before the DOJ account. So, I
1516 think that's a really valuable point.

1517 **HURLEY:** And this is Captain Hurley. To speak to the work of an
1518 officer, we had a test - a study done, and now it's been almost a
1519 year, but each precinct, I believe it was day shift/afternoon shift,
1520 they looked at the number of - amount of time they were on the street
1521 that they were actually on a 911 call. They had 15 minutes of their
1522 10-hour shift that they were not on a 911 call. So, I mean, just if
1523 you look at it, they're not taking lunch. There's no breaks in there.
1524 That's on a 911 call. And then you asked about crime data, and crime
1525 actually has gone up pretty much across the board.

1526 **PAHLKE:** And I don't want to make - I wasn't implying that you're not
1527 doing anything -

1528 **HURLEY:** No, no! Yeah. No, no. I just - you know, just that - just -
1529 no, no, no. Just so you understand the data. Yeah.

1530 **PAHLKE:** Yeah, no. Just if - usually, if something goes down,
1531 sometimes - a lot of times, something else is getting worse.

1532 **GERRITSON:** That's a good question.

1533 **PAHLKE:** It was more of are we not responding to as many things. Not
1534 as an intentional activity but just, you know, to - because those are
1535 dramatic increases that we aren't hearing about, but is something
1536 else happening as a result of that improvement?

1537 **HURLEY:** Yep.

1538 **PAHLKE:** That's, you know, that's the questions.

1539 **CAMPBELL:** This is Shawn, and one other part that was actually very
1540 good article in Oregon Live today about - that covered some of this
1541 stuff, and one of the things they mentioned was because of the number
1542 of officers available and the increasing workload, the time it takes
1543 to respond on the calls has been steadily increasing over the years
1544 which anyone who has ever had to call the police, that doesn't really

1545 work well for you. You're not exactly in the best situation of your
1546 mind to be patient at that point. Yes?

1547 **HALL:** This is Tyler, and to, I think, just bring to light one thing
1548 about the data that was presented to us about officer-initiated. For
1549 example, just to go to your question, one thing that is kind of worth
1550 noting is that in top line, it appears, like, between Q3 and Q4 that
1551 officer-initiated went down. And I believe it went from something
1552 like 26 or 27,000 down to 22,000; however, the use of force in those
1553 incidences went up from 0.14 percent to 0.21 percent. And so, you
1554 might be led to conclude, "Oh, well, those officer-initiated
1555 instances went down," but in actuality, the amount of times that
1556 force was used went up, and it went up just by doing basic, you know,
1557 calculator math here. It was up from 35 in Q3 to almost 50 at about
1558 48 times that force was used. So, there's times where in between the
1559 numbers and the details, there is actually evidence that there is
1560 increases and when it shows a decrease. Yeah.

1561 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Anymore discussion on that before we move
1562 forward to the last bit of today?

1563 **DROPPERS:** This is Danielle.

1564 **CAMPBELL:** Yes.

1565 **DROPPERS:** I just want to make one quick comment. Talking about the
1566 dashboard. I know I say a lot of critical things in these meetings,
1567 but I think the dashboard is such a great tool, and I want to give
1568 credit where it's due because, I think, in a lot of ways, it's trying
1569 to make this data more accessible to the public, and I think it's
1570 great.

1571 **MALE:** Thank you very much.

1572 **DROPPERS:** Yeah.

1573 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Anything else? All right. Moving on to other
1574 new business and TAC announcements. One announcement we have is
1575 steering committee elections will be in May. Steering committee
1576 members are basically the executive committee of the TAC, and they
1577 serve for one year. So, if you have any interest in being part of
1578 that, please let us know before the May meeting. For you new members,
1579 in the last steering committee, there were new members who were part
1580 of it then. So, if you're interested, please feel (inaudible). And,
1581 of course, everyone who is currently serving on steering committee,
1582 I'd be more than happy to continue serving with you. It's been a
1583 pleasure. Last announcement. This doesn't mean much to the new
1584 people, but two members, Sushanah Boston and Anne Parmeter - I've
1585 known her for, like, 10 years, and I continually butcher her last
1586 name - are both stepping off of TAC. They were both long-term
1587 members. Sushanah served at chair previous to me, so I just wanted to
1588 say here in a public forum thank you for their years of service. All
1589 right. Any other new business or TAC announcements? Oh, yeah. We will
1590 be sending some information new members about doing their community
1591 academy training here. Usually, is it two nights or one night?

1592 **HURLEY:** It's usually two nights or one Saturday.

1593 **CAMPBELL:** Right. We'll send you out more information of some of the
1594 options. It's basically kind of giving you a very quick, basic

1595 overview of some of the types of training that they - the officers
1596 get here at the training facility. Other than that, we do need bio
1597 information from everybody. It doesn't have to be much. If you want
1598 to send in a picture, feel free, but you don't have to. You can look
1599 up on the website for some of the - are any of the bios up already?

1600 **SMITH:** No. I was going to wait until we had them all.

1601 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. They're, like, two or three sentences. Basically,
1602 the kind of stuff that you said during your stuff. It's a requirement
1603 of the bylaws. Also, everyone is required to do a ride along with
1604 officers once a year as a TAC member. We'll send out information
1605 about how to schedule those. Obviously, we have time. Just kind of
1606 giving you thoughts. All right. From there, we will move into public
1607 comment. Who wants to start? Dan?

1608 **HANDLEMAN:** Sure. I'm Dan Handleman. I'm with a group called cop
1609 watch, you know, police accountability through citizen action. I
1610 publish a newsletter three times a year. For those of you are new,
1611 there's a little stack of them over here. You can pick one of them
1612 up. And if you would like, we also put out - I brought a copy with me
1613 - (inaudible) is the OIR report. The OIR group is a group from
1614 California that looks at shootings, deaths, and custody by the
1615 Portland police on an annual basis more or less, and that report,
1616 just referring back to something that came up at your table today, I
1617 looked at the numbers. They put a table out of the 50 deaths,
1618 shootings and death, they put down since 2010. Fifty-five percent of
1619 the ones before the DOJ came to town were of people with mental
1620 illness. Sixty-five percent of the ones after the DOJ came to town
1621 are people with mental illness. So, there is indeed something going
1622 on, and if there's not a change, it's change going in the wrong
1623 direction. Also noted in our analysis that we're in the context, and
1624 I think I said this at your last meeting, but where there was seven
1625 deadly-force incidents between September and January, and there's
1626 been no entire year that's had that many incidents since 2006. So,
1627 again, something is going in the wrong direction there. And
1628 furthermore, there had not been an African-American Portlander shot
1629 and killed by the Portland police since Keith Notice (sp) was killed
1630 in 2010 until Quanice Hayes was killed in early 2017. Now there's
1631 been four just in the last two years, and then a fifth person, an
1632 African-American man, was shot at and wounded. In our report, we
1633 noted this is since the election of Donald Trump. You can make up
1634 your own mind if that has something to do with it, but this is just
1635 something - you know, it's a trend that needs to be looked at. In
1636 terms of the presentation of the force data, you know, I couldn't
1637 actually find the page numbers that matched what was being presented,
1638 and none of them matched exactly what was said in the report. So, it
1639 would be helpful to have presentation of the actual - what's in the
1640 report. And then if there's going to be further analysis, they can
1641 say, "We also broke down the numbers this different way." It's very
1642 confusing as a member of the public trying to figure out where those
1643 numbers are because I couldn't find all of them. But I did find page
1644 15 had the deadly force cases in it. And then - I don't know if

1645 anybody else wants to use any of this time, but another report that
1646 came out since your last meeting was the compliance officer's report
1647 about compliance with the DOJ agreement, and there was a segment in
1648 the community engagement part about those traffic-stop data that
1649 Officer Greg Stewart was talking about that he used to work on. And
1650 the report for 2016 came out last June, you know, in 2018, so it was
1651 more than year late. And then the 2017 numbers came out too, and they
1652 used the same analysis in both years. The compliance officer was very
1653 complimentary for the bureau going deep into these numbers, but the
1654 number - what they did was they said, "The gang enforcement team had
1655 61 percent of the people they stopped are African-American even
1656 though the population of Portland has six percent African-Americans.
1657 And they said though 71 percent of people who are victims of gang
1658 crimes are African-American. Therefore, the Portland police should
1659 have stopped more black people which makes absolutely no sense. But
1660 that was not only written by the Portland police bureau, but it was
1661 echoed by a compliance officer as a good job. So, there's a lot of
1662 things to consider when we're looking at this demographic data and
1663 the things you're trying to get at by posting those demographic data
1664 in these reports, and I agree with you. When you see those numbers
1665 next to each other, you know, it's between 25-31 percent of the
1666 people who are subjected to force are African-American in a city that
1667 is 6 percent black. The question is why? Why are so many people
1668 stopped by police? Why are so many people subjected to force by
1669 police? And that should be part of this data analysis. They're not
1670 just numbers, and they're all people, and we know some of those
1671 people. So, I'm sorry you didn't get to your presentation about body
1672 cameras today. I'm very interested to find out why. The city council
1673 is supposed to be voting about this tomorrow. I don't know if they've
1674 dropped that. It means I have my afternoon back. Thank you. But a
1675 point that we brought up in there is that we thought body cameras
1676 should be activated when officers engage in what we they call mere
1677 conversation, but to you and me, it's not mere conversation. So, mere
1678 conversation by law, technically, is, "Hi. How are you doing? Nice
1679 day. How about them Blazers?" But then I was talking about this -
1680 Chief Davis was at one of the body camera forums, and when I raised
1681 this issue about police go beyond that, he said, "Oh, yeah. Sometimes
1682 we say, 'Oh, this is a high crime neighborhood. You're not involved
1683 in any of that, are you?'" I thought - that to me - that's - you've
1684 crossed the line there. That's not a mere conversation anymore. Now
1685 you're trying to get information from the person about whether
1686 they're involved in criminal activity. So, I hope at some point mere
1687 conversation becomes a discussion for this group, training and
1688 policy, and all of the other implications. I will type of some more
1689 comments and send them to the chair later. Thank you, everyone.

1690 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you, Dan. Any other public comment? All right. Can I
1691 have a motion to adjourn?

1692 **WILDE:** So moved. This is Venn.

1693 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have a second?

1694 **FISHER:** Second.

1695 **CAMPBELL:** All in favor?

1696 **MULTIPLE:** Aye.

1697 **CAMPBELL:** All opposed? Motion passes. Thank you very much for
1698 coming.

1699

1700 No170_031419.doc

1701 Transcribed 03/31/19 @ 8:25 p.m. Elice Turnbull (0318et01)