

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

PORTLAND POLICE BUREAU
Training Advisory Council
Training Division

Meeting Date: 07/08/2020

CAMPBELL: I think I got most everybody. I just want to confirm. So - there we go. So, as a reminder, this meeting is being recorded for public record laws. It's some of what we usually do with the small, little recorders, only this time, it's going to be a heck of a lot easier to transcribe because they'll actually get all of the names right. All right. So, when I call your name, please unmute yourself and let me know you're here. Sheri Anderson?

ANDERSON: Here.

CAMPBELL: Leslie Bruncker?

BRUNKER: Here.

CAMPBELL: Jillian Burke?

BURKE: Here.

CAMPBELL: Marlene Cable?

AVILES-CABLE: Here.

CAMPBELL: Shawn Campbell. I'm here. Dave Coates?

COATES: I'm here.

CAMPBELL: Karen Daniels?

NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE

CAMPBELL: Okay. Tyler Hall?

NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE

CAMPBELL: Walter Hull?

HULL: Here.

CAMPBELL: Jim Kahan?

KAHAN: Kahan. Here.

CAMPBELL: Sorry. It's that extra A. It throws me every time.

KAHAN: Leave off either A to pronounce.

CAMPBELL: Kwame Kinabo?

NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE

CAMPBELL: Okay. Gary Marschke?

MARSCHKE: I'm here and only once.

CAMPBELL: Britton Masback? I know he's going to run a little late, but he will be joining. Mark Milinski?

MILINSKI: Here.

CAMPBELL: John Pahlke? John? We're not picking you up, John. Still not getting you. Okay. We'll let you get it figured out on your end, and we'll continue forward. Christopher Rossi?

ROSSI: I'm here. Thanks Shawn.

CAMPBELL: Frank Santos?

SANTOS: Here.

CAMPBELL: Mark Schorr, or is it Schorr?

SCHORR: Schorr, and I'm here.

CAMPBELL: Sarah Suniga?

SUNIGA: Here.

CAMPBELL: Kezia - your name is another one I keep screwing up, and I apologize.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 2 of 52

53 **WANNER:** Kezia. I'm present.
54 **CAMPBELL:** And Sylvia Zingesser.
55 **ZINGESER:** Here.
56 **CAMPBELL:** Excellent. Well, that's 17 members out of the 21 here, so
57 we do have a quorum. Thank you as well to our visitors of the public
58 who are watching our meeting today. It's greatly appreciated to have
59 your presence. Just to kind of get an overview because this is a
60 little different on Zoom, what we will be doing is at the end, we
61 will have our normal public comment period, but in the meantime, we
62 do ask you to remain muted and watch the meeting until we reach that
63 period. We also ask that you keep the comments section free unless
64 you have some kind of issue or something like that. I've noticed
65 that some of these meetings, people have used it as a running
66 comment which kind of makes it not so useful for us to help utilize
67 in these meetings. So, if you could keep that clear as well, it
68 would be greatly appreciated. There we go. And if any public members
69 want to see the public - the documents we will be voting on today,
70 please send an email to ppptac@portlandoregon.gov. It is in - excuse
71 me. It is in the chat box, and we will send those documents out to
72 you. Members, you should have had the documents sent out to you
73 several times, so hopefully you have them. All right. I'd like to
74 start this meeting a little differently just because of everything
75 going on. Yes, Portland Cop Watch, there is an agenda posted on the
76 website. It looks like Kwame is just joining right now too, so we'll
77 let his audio connect. All right, as I was saying, we're going to
78 start this meeting out a little different because of the many things
79 happening in the world right now. It felt like something where we
80 should probably at least make reference to them before we get
81 started today because we're living in a very different world than we
82 lived in one month to two months ago. I would like to thank everyone
83 for joining us this evening. As chair of the Training Advisory
84 Council, I would like to take a moment to make an opening statement.
85 We are living in extraordinary times, and it felt wrong not to say
86 something addressing these times. On May 25th, a Minneapolis police
87 officer name Derek Chauvin kneeled on George Floyd's neck for nearly
88 nine minutes killing him while three other officers stood by and
89 people recorded events and begged Chauvin to stop. It's a horrifying
90 video to watch, so horrifying that since that day, protests and at
91 time even riots have spread across the nation. It must be recognized
92 that this incident - it must be recognized that this incident was no
93 outlier but rather a more acute symptom of an ongoing problem. While
94 Mr. Floyd died a long way from here, his death has shown light on
95 issues in our community that need to be addressed. People do not
96 take to the streets for weeks on end when things are going well. As
97 a community, we have failed in our ideals. There are many things
98 that can be said about the issues at hand. We could spend this
99 entire meeting and more discussing them; however, I am a person who

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 3 of 52

100 has always believed more in the importance of actions over words.
101 Given this, I will keep this statement short. The current system is
102 not working. It does not work for the community. It does not work
103 for the Portland Police Bureau and its officers, and it most
104 certainly does not work by those affected by the consequences of the
105 systemic bias and racism inherent in our society. Change and reform
106 are not just needed, they are an undeniable necessity. There is a
107 lot of emotion surrounding these issues which is not a bad thing
108 given that passion drives us forward. However, we must ensure that
109 our passions are matched with (inaudible). We must consider
110 everything with open minds and open hearts, striving to understand
111 without the bias the world - without bias, the world in which we
112 find ourselves. We must recognize the humanity of everyone involved,
113 the commonalities and divergences in our experiences. We must take
114 note of the complexity of the issues we currently face. We cannot
115 become mired in the past. The progress that has been made cannot be
116 ignored, but neither can the fact that we still have a long way to
117 go. We must hold those given authority in our community accountable,
118 but we must also hold ourselves accountable for the demands and
119 expectations put upon them. There is an opportunity here to make
120 things better. It's an opportunity we cannot waste. As the Training
121 Advisory Council, we must do our part. This evening's meeting is the
122 culmination of significant work carried out by volunteers over the
123 past month, and I thank everyone for that, but it's also just the
124 beginning, so let's get to it. All right. I call this meeting to
125 order. Would somebody like to read the mission statement of the
126 TAC?

127 **ZINGESER:** I would volunteer, but I can't see very well, so maybe
128 somebody else could.

129 **FEMALE:** I'll read it.

130 **CAMPBELL:** Does somebody have the agenda open so they can -

131 **FEMALE:** I've got it. The mission of TAC is to provide ongoing
132 advice to the chief of police and the training division in order to
133 continuously improve training standards, practices, and outcomes
134 through the examination of training, philosophy, content, delivery,
135 tactics, policy, equipment, and facilities. The mission of the
136 Portland Police Bureau is to reduce crime and the fear of crime by
137 working with all citizens to preserve life, maintain human rights,
138 protect property, and promote individual responsibility and
139 community commitment.

140 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you. All right. Do we have a motion to approve the
141 previous meeting's minutes?

142 **ZINGESER:** I make a motion that we approve the previous minutes -
143 the previous minutes from the last meeting.

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

145 **KAHAN:** I second.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 4 of 52

146 **CAMPBELL:** We have a second from Jim. To make this easier for the
147 minute part, I would just ask is anybody opposed to accepting the
148 minutes?

149 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

150 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Thank you. Moving forward, just kind of some
151 opening announcements. To describe what we're going to be doing for
152 voting here for most things when we get down to the recommendations,
153 reports, and letters, because of how Zoom works, we will just be
154 going through everyone's name and asking you what your vote is.
155 That's just kind of the easiest way we can do it with how this setup
156 works. We will allow people to vote yes, no, or abstain. To kind of
157 give you an idea of what we've been up to lately over the past
158 couple of months, we - I am proud to say that with what's going on
159 that as chair, I have been meeting a lot with the chairs of PCCEP
160 and the Community Review Committee which is the group that oversees
161 the independent review board because we've been working closer
162 together to try to figure out how we can find areas of commonality
163 so we can all push as one with the hopes that by more organizations
164 pushing in certain areas, we'll get more of a response from our city
165 leaders and the bureau leaders. Some of these that we've already
166 seen as we released a joint statement which I sent out to everybody
167 recently. We still haven't heard anything back from that, so we are
168 discussing where to go from there. We've - also tomorrow, I'm
169 participating at a PCCEP town hall about police accountability which
170 I have sent the link information to everybody, and for any of the
171 public people watching, if you are interested, you can find it on
172 the PCCEP website just by googling Portland PCCEP. We are also
173 looking at ways where we can support each other's recommendations
174 which is what three of the letters that we will be voting on today
175 pertain to, where there are PCCEP recommendations that the steering
176 committee thought that there would be areas that the TAC would
177 support, and so we'll let the TAC vote and decide. All right. Any
178 questions about how we will be moving forward today?

179 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

180 **CAMPELL:** All right. So, let's move on to update on current status
181 of task forces. As most of you know, most of the task forces were
182 basically put on a hiatus for a period of time due to fact that we
183 did not have - the police bureau did not have the resources for us
184 to meet with people due to the ongoing protests. The good news is it
185 sounds like that things are starting to calm down enough to the
186 level where we will be able to restart all of the task forces later
187 this month. I will be sending emails out to the individual task
188 forces so that we can get the processes back started, and we will
189 get back on track. I would like to say a special thank you to the
190 PS3 Task Force as well as the Leadership Task Force who are the
191 groups that put together two of the items that we will be voting on
192 today who are putting in the extra time and extra effort during the

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 5 of 52

193 - and having a fairly quick turn-around time on the work that they
194 did do. In fact, it was under a month which is pretty impressive for
195 most of the work we do to create some of these recommendations that
196 we're going to be pushing forward today. Would any member of the
197 task forces like to say anything before we move forward?

198 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

199 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Up next on the agenda is an update on Training
200 Division activities. I believe that's with Lieutenant Stewart.

201 **STEWART:** Hello. First, I want to introduce Caitlyn Atwood. She is
202 replacing Kate Bond (sp) and is going to be helping me. She has been
203 wonderful even only having been here a couple days, and I'm sure she
204 will streamline a lot of our work together. So, it's been obviously
205 a huge month or so for us. We basically shut the division down
206 earlier in the month and had most of our people working the ongoing
207 protests and civil disturbances. We were able to remove most of our
208 trainers from that, although we still have some of the division
209 working on it, and get our academy, our advanced academy, going
210 again. So, we currently are finishing up one advanced academy. The
211 division - we still have - the captain is largely assigned to
212 working - about half our leadership team has been kind of pulled to
213 deal with protest-related stuff which just leaves myself and one
214 other lieutenant in the division running things. We are preparing -
215 you know, getting ready to try and do some work around both our
216 regular in-service, our command in-serve, and our supervisor in-
217 service. We had our first sergeants' academy which was - we were
218 supposed to run three this year. The first one was cancelled, but
219 we'll have the second new sergeants' academy. We were going to run
220 three academies for our newly promoted sergeants, and we just shut
221 the first one down and moved them into the other two. So, we will be
222 starting that off at the end of the month, and then we will be
223 starting planning here - we're starting our - well, we got our Needs
224 Assessment Process going, but we're getting to the point in our
225 Needs Assessment Process where our analysts will be meeting with our
226 trainers to start projecting out our training that we'll probably
227 initiate around January or February of 2021. That training, at least
228 initially, is largely going to be online. Bringing officers in,
229 we're - with all of the budget cuts and stuff, we're really short of
230 officers right now, so if we try to bring them in and train them in
231 the building, it creates significant overtime costs that we can't
232 afford right now. So, we've invested in some online learning tools
233 and are basically in the process of developing - we're hoping to run
234 at least half, maybe two-thirds, of our in-service this year
235 virtually and deliver it kind of in chunks to officers so that they
236 can avoid being pulled entirely out of patrol. So, we're planning
237 that right now. I think that is everything we've got going on. It's
238 been kind of chaotic, but I think we're sort of getting into a

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 6 of 52

239 groove here where we're getting back to the work of the training
240 division.
241 **CAMPBELL:** Any questions?
242 **SANTOS:** Yeah, Greg, this is Frank, I just have a quick question.
243 Cait Atwood, what role does she play?
244 **ATWOOD:** Oh, I'm going to be the training (inaudible) -
245 **SANTOS:** Oh, you're there. Okay. Sorry.
246 **ATWOOD:** I'm right here.
247 **SANTOS:** Oh, you're right there. I'm sorry. I'm Zoomed out right
248 now.
249 **ATWOOD:** Greg might be able to speak more since I'm new to the role,
250 but I'll be essentially taking over, yeah, Kate Bond's position. I'm
251 a training analyst here.
252 **STEWART:** Yeah. So, she'll be helping us with the TAC. And then
253 we're also - you know, we're kind of continually trying to improve
254 how we're doing lesson plans, and we're moving them into a share
255 point system so we can have better versioning control, and she's
256 going to help spearhead some of that work which will be huge for us.
257 You know, we're continually working on the lesson plans and trying
258 to do a better job, but the versioning has always been difficult
259 just doing it out of, like, you know, file systems. So, it will be
260 nice to have a better system to control that process, and she's
261 going to help us with that.
262 **SANTOS:** That's fantastic. Thank you. Caitlyn, are you part of the
263 force or outside of the force?
264 **ATWOOD:** I'm part of the professional staff here at Portland Police
265 Bureau.
266 **SANTOS:** Great. Great. Thanks.
267 **STEWART:** And we're in a room together.
268 **ATWOOD:** Yes.
269 **STEWART:** So, we've got a little Zoom room here which is why we're
270 masked up, but -
271 **CAMPBELL:** Any other questions?
272 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**
273 **CAMPBELL:** I do. I have a question real quick for you. With the
274 expectation of these budget cuts affecting training and having to
275 look at a model where a lot more of certain coursework is online,
276 what is kind of the expectation for the long term? Is this going to
277 be, like, a long-term change or just kind of surviving this year
278 kind of change?
279 **STEWART:** I would say it expedited the direction we were already
280 moving in. So, we'd already taken a lot of our training and moved in
281 online, things like CPR refreshers, some of our legal updates. What
282 we'll do is we'll do as much of the classroom portion that we can
283 online, and then we have drop-in times for, like, physical skills.
284 So, I'm going to lower this for a second. So, the - when we had to
285 cancel in-service, we kind of abruptly moved a lot of that online

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 7 of 52

286 and were able to manage it, and then we did the Zoom academy. I
287 think I talked a little about it previously, but we delivered some
288 basic training online using Zoom and finally had sent a couple of
289 our people to online course development classes. So, really, we were
290 kind of headed into that direction. And initially, our thought was
291 less about saving money and more about - we consider time in the
292 training division really precious because we have a bunch of tools
293 here like our scenario village, access to our trainers, access to
294 our driving pad. There's a lot things here that our officers can
295 only do in this facility, so our initial thought was to try to push
296 as much of what was delivered in a classroom that wasn't unique to
297 this building into an online environment so that we could capitalize
298 the amount of time we spent working on scenario-based training kind
299 of here in the building. And it just so happened that with the costs
300 and all of the different things going on that we kind of accelerated
301 those plans. But I think it will be a good thing. I think it will -
302 it will position us that when the financial situation improves, I
303 think it will leave us in a position we wanted to be in anyways. So,
304 it's definitely not something we're just doing because we have to do
305 it.

306 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you. Do we have any other questions from the TAC
307 members?

308 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

309 **CAMPBELL:** All right.

310 **MALE:** I'm sorry, Shawn. I did one additional question for Greg.

311 **CAMPBELL:** Please.

312 **MALE:** What is the annual budget for the training organization,
313 yearly budget?

314 **STEWART:** Well, so we have three budgets that are really pertinent
315 to us. We have a personnel budget which is largely fixed, and I
316 honestly don't know that one off the top of my head because it
317 doesn't really impact us. It's kind of fixed dollars.

318 **MALE:** Right.

319 **STEWART:** Then we have what's called an EM&S which is external
320 materials and supplies, and that includes everything from our ammo
321 to subscription fees to external trainers we bring in. We were
322 trying to build a mindfulness program, so we had some external
323 trainers come in and do some mindfulness training, things like that.
324 That got cut in about half which was a huge hit. And so, that's
325 really limited a lot of our - and that was the budget we did most of
326 - that was the money we largely spent. And then our third bucket
327 would be the overtime money. Overtime, that is - and that was we -
328 overtime kind of gets paid two ways. If we bring an officer in to
329 train, that officer's precinct might have to backfill that person if
330 they run beneath minimums. That money comes from the street, but if
331 we paid an officer on their day off to come in and be a trainer, we
332 had a separate budget for that. And that budget has been hit pretty

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 8 of 52

333 hard too. We're looking at creating some limited-duration training
334 positions using officers who have training backgrounds that have
335 recently retired because we can pay them - it's less expensive than
336 using overtime. There's a whole bunch of benefits. We don't - 1) We
337 don't pay benefits, 2) They don't get vacation, 3) We only have to
338 pay them when we're here, and 4) They're about 50 percent less than
339 paying an officer overtime.

340 **ZINGESER:** Right.

341 **STEWART:** So, we're looking at doing that with some of the overtime
342 money to save money.

343 **MALE:** So, I'm just curious, Greg, does the city publish the actual
344 dollars -

345 **STEWART:** Yeah.

346 **MALE:** That go to training? They do?

347 **STEWART:** Yeah. The city budget comes up - I want to say our EM&S
348 this - well, I know that this year it's about \$1,060,000, like
349 \$1,062,000, for EM&S. Personnel costs I can't remember off the top
350 of my head again because largely that one - 1) It's fixed, and 2) It
351 varies because people come in and - I mean, it's money we can't use,
352 and it changes whenever somebody transfers in or out of the
353 division.

354 **MALE:** Right.

355 **STEWART:** And then the overtime budget, I believe, was about
356 \$500,000.

357 **MALE:** Okay. Thanks, Greg.

358 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Any other questions?

359 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.**

360 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Then we will move on to elections. Elections
361 are something actually we should have done in May, but that meeting
362 got cancelled because of COVID, and so we're doing it in July. So,
363 we're a little bit off our time schedule, but that's all right. We
364 all have to deal with the world that we live in. Currently, we have
365 people - sorry. We are doing elections for both chair and steering
366 committee. Chair is a two-year tenure where you run the meetings,
367 and you lead the steering committee, and you also act as the public
368 representative of the TAC. The steering committee is a five-member
369 group that serve a one-year tenure which, basically, they are the
370 ones who act as the leadership committee for the TAC. They both set
371 the agendas as well as basically setting the long-term goals and
372 targeting of the areas that we look into over time with the approval
373 of the whole TAC, of course. Running for chair, we have myself, and
374 running for steering committee, we have Sheri Anderson, Jim Kahan -
375 got your name right that time - Gary Marschke -

376 **KAHAN:** Thank you.

377 **CAMPBELL:** Mark Milinski, and Sylvia Zingesser. Is there anybody else
378 that is interested in running for steering committee or chair?

379 **NO AUDIBLE RESPOSNE**

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 9 of 52

380 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Going once. Going twice. And it looks like
381 Brit - let's just give Brit a moment here to connect in.
382 **MASBACK:** I'm here Shawn.
383 **CAMPBELL:** Perfect. You're exactly right where you were going to
384 come in. We're just right now at elections.
385 **MASBACK:** Perfect.
386 **CAMPBELL:** Just to give a real quick overview again, running for
387 chair is myself. Running for steering is Sheri, Jim, Gary, Mark
388 Milinski, and Sylvia. If nobody else wants to run, what we can do is
389 because we have the exact number just to fill the seats, we can just
390 have a motion to fill the seats with those who have been nominated.
391 If that's acceptable, we'll take a motion for that on the floor.
392 **HULL:** So moved.
393 **CAMPBELL:** So moved by Walt. Do we have a second?
394 **FEMALE:** I second.
395 **FEMALE:** Second.
396 **CAMPBELL:** We have a second. All right. We're going to try our fancy
397 voting way here. So, when I say your name, unmute and tell me yay,
398 nay, or abstained. Sheri Anderson?
399 **ANDERSON:** Yay.
400 **CAMPBELL:** Leslie Brunker?
401 **BRUNKER:** Yay.
402 **CAMPBELL:** Jillian Burke?
403 **BURKE:** Yay.
404 **CAMPBELL:** Marlene?
405 **AVILES-CABLE:** Yay.
406 **CAMPBELL:** I am a yay. Dave?
407 **COATES:** Yay.
408 **CAMPBELL:** Is Karen Daniels on yet, or is she still off?
409 **NO AUDIBLE RESPOSNE**
410 **CAMPBELL:** Tyler?
411 **HALL:** Yay.
412 **CAMPBELL:** Walter?
413 **HULL:** Yes.
414 **CAMPBELL:** Jim?
415 **KAHAN:** Yay.
416 **CAMPBELL:** Kwame?
417 **KINABO:** Yay.
418 **CAMPBELL:** Gary?
419 **MARSCHKE:** Yay.
420 **CAMPBELL:** Brit?
421 **MASBACK:** Aye.
422 **CAMPBELL:** Mark?
423 **SCHORR:** Yay.
424 **CAMPBELL:** John?
425 **PAHLKE:** Yay.
426 **CAMPBELL:** Chris?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 10 of 52

427 **ROSSI:** Yay.
428 **CAMPBELL:** Frank?
429 **SANTOS:** Yay.
430 **CAMPBELL:** Mark Schorr?
431 **SCHORR:** I'm sorry. I voted for Mark Milinski.
432 **CAMPBELL:** We have Mark Milinski then?
433 **MILINSKI:** Yay.
434 **CAMPBELL:** This is bringing me back to when I was in high school and
435 we had all of the kids with the same name. Sarah?
436 **SUNIGA:** Yay.
437 **CAMPBELL:** Kezia?
438 **WANNER:** Yay.
439 **CAMPBELL:** Sylvia?
440 **ZINGESER:** Yay.
441 **CAMPBELL:** Motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much to
442 everyone for volunteering to serve as part of the leadership for the
443 TAC in this coming year, and I would like to also say thank you very
444 much to everyone who has been part of the TAC leadership. Yes, Dave?
445 You have your hand raised. Oh, sorry, Jim, you have your hand
446 raised.
447 **KAHAN:** Is this through next July or next May?
448 **CAMPBELL:** I would say our bylaws say one year from the election, so
449 it will probably be through next July. Dave, did you have you hand
450 raised too, or did I misread that?
451 **COATES:** Nope.
452 **CAMPBELL:** I would like to thank the people who are here who served
453 last year that are still a part of the group including Dave, Sylvia,
454 and Brit, and then a special thanks to Bob who actually he was fully
455 going off the TAC in May, but obviously that didn't happen, so he
456 volunteered to continue with us until elections could take place.
457 And I know he's got a lot of other stuff he does with the net groups
458 and everything, and so I would just like to say it was greatly
459 appreciated for Bob stepping up, and he was an integral part of
460 working through a lot of these recommendations and letters and
461 reports we put together as well, and it's greatly appreciated. I
462 will say, Bob, we're going to miss you.
463 **ZINGESER:** Yes.
464 **CAMPBELL:** You were - you did a lot for this group, and it's greatly
465 appreciated. Your gold watch is in the mail. I promise. All right.
466 Does anybody else want to speak before we move forward?
467 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**
468 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Next up we have the Quarter 4 2019 and Quarter
469 1 2020 Use of Force Summary. Lieutenant Stewart, do you know if
470 Lieutenant Niiya has connected in yet?
471 **STEWART:** I do not see him. I told him to be here at about 7:15-7:20
472 based on the things. Let me check real quick. Yeah, he should be on
473 in about 15 minutes. He's been working a ton, so.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 11 of 52

474 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. So, would anybody be opposed to moving forward in
475 the agenda and then coming back to that once Lieutenant Niiya
476 connects on? I imagine, yeah, the answer is going to be no. "Oh, I
477 prefer to wait. Thank you." All right. So, given that Lieutenant
478 Niiya - we're waiting for him because we're actually running ahead
479 of schedule here, which is pretty amazing, we're going to move on to
480 some of the votes on the recommendations and letters. The first one
481 that we will vote on is the item listed as number one - Oh,
482 actually, here's - it looks like Jeff Niiya just connected here. So,
483 maybe we'll get back on that. Hello, Lieutenant Niiya?

484 **NIIYA:** Good evening. Sorry. I thought I was going to go a little
485 bit later.

486 **CAMPBELL:** No worries. We're actually running a bit ahead of
487 schedule, so it all worked out.

488 **NIIYA:** Excellent. Well, let me - if you guys are ready for me,
489 Shawn, I'll just get my screen sharing here. Hold on just one
490 second.

491 **CAMPBELL:** Perfect.

492 **NIIYA:** All right. Can everyone see the presentation?

493 **STEWART:** Yep.

494 **CAMPBELL:** Yes.

495 **NIIYA:** Okay. So, Shawn, I know you have some new members to the
496 committee, I believe, so let me just introduce myself to everyone.
497 My name is Jeff Niiya. I'm a lieutenant with the police bureau. I'm
498 currently the force inspector, but if it hasn't been told already,
499 this will actually be my last presentation. I'm getting moved to a
500 different assignment next month. I've been with the bureau for a
501 little over 23 - 22 years and have presented to this committee for
502 the last about year or so. So, this presentation, since we missed
503 one earlier, will be around Q4 2019 and Q1 2020 and some of the
504 force numbers that we have in our report. So, for the members of the
505 committee, I do not do this alone. I have three amazing analysts
506 that work with us that compile all of the numbers. So, you can see
507 their names here on the beginning of the slide. They do a lot of the
508 data work on this. What I bring to this is a review from a law
509 enforcement perspective and kind of look for policy, training, and
510 other tactical trends that we might want to review as a bureau. So,
511 I will get into the slide presentation here. This presentation,
512 working with Shawn in the past, is something that we've kind of
513 standardized. So, you'll see this kind of presentation each time
514 unless there is a desire from the committee to change something. So,
515 looking at a comparison here between Q3 2019 and Q4 2019, you can
516 see that we had a reduction in our custodies between quarters as
517 well as a reduction in our calls for service. The force number are
518 relatively flat across the board there. There was a little bit of a
519 decrease between the custodies and the force, but in the force used
520 by the call load, it stayed the same 0.21. So, no real changes. As

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 12 of 52

521 you see the presentations and read the reports every quarter, you'll
522 notice that quarter by quarter, there is very little change. So, the
523 quarter 4 applications of force, this breaks down what we used in
524 Q4. Again, keeping up with trend that we've had for the last plus
525 years is our control against resistance and resistant handcuffing,
526 which is the lowest level of force that we have that we report, was
527 about 66 percent of the reported force in Q4. (Inaudible) again as
528 the applications kind of break down there. Takedowns have been up a
529 little bit, but if you recall, I have been kind of tightening up
530 what we're considering a take down. We have either a takedown, which
531 is kind of the standard what you probably see someone doing, you
532 know, doing, like, an armbar or pushing someone to the ground fairly
533 hard, and then we have a takedown controlled which is more of a
534 multiple officer-type situation where they are maybe picking
535 somebody up, you know, by all of their arms and legs and gently
536 placing them down on the ground to control them. In order to just
537 really redefine that, I have been very (inaudible) on a takedown is
538 a takedown. So, unless it was completely controlled and you're
539 holding every one of their arms and legs for the most part or there
540 is a kind of a very little resistance, we're going to count that as
541 a takedown. So, that's why you might see a little bit of a higher
542 number there on the takedowns from previous quarters. Changes over
543 time, so again as I said, quarter to quarter, you're not going to
544 see a whole lot of difference there. So, what we do on this slide is
545 we present the last four quarters, and as you can see here, we have
546 been pretty steady between that mid 8,500 or 85,000, excuse me, up
547 to almost to 100,000 for calls of service. Custodies have pretty
548 much remained in there - if you look at Q1 and Q4 for last year,
549 they're actually fairly similar, almost identical, as well as calls
550 for service and custodies and force applications. So, again, you can
551 see there the applications of force over time, resistant
552 handcuffing, control against resistance. Those (inaudible) very low
553 level of force applications are the ones that are leading the way.
554 These attributes for individuals involved in force, this is at the
555 subject level, so you could have multiple applications, but what
556 we're looking at here is someone that is on the report, reported to
557 be armed or in mental health crisis or transient as we get further
558 here, houseless. You'll see that this is at the subject level, so
559 these numbers are a little bit lower compared to overall numbers.
560 **CAMPBELL:** Hey, real quick, Lieutenant Niiya, sorry to interrupt. We
561 do have a question from a member.
562 **NIIYA:** Go ahead.
563 **CAMPBELL:** Gary Marschke wants to know how did the quarter 1 through
564 4 2019 numbers compare to trends in previous years?
565 **NIIYA:** You know, I have not had a chance to look at the previous
566 annual reports. I'm going to be very honest with you folks. I'm
567 probably not as highly prepared for this meeting as I have in the

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 13 of 52

568 past. I have been working on the protests much like most of the
569 officers have. I've had literally five or six days off since
570 Memorial Day, and my job duties have not revolved around the force -
571 looking at the force for the most part. I apologize. I do not have a
572 good answer for what the annual report looks like for 2018.

573 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Thank you.

574 **NIYA:** So, again, you can see our - at the subject level here,
575 there is not a whole lot of trend or change over the last quarter in
576 2019 for any of these attributes, pretty steady for the most part
577 with all of our numbers. Custody percentages here, we break this out
578 by male/female and race, and you can see that, again, we have a
579 large percentage of the custodies and stuff, force being used, on
580 white males and then breakdown further from there. The unknowns, I
581 don't know where those came from. I would suspect that might be a
582 scribe's error where someone failed to mark that on a report and we
583 just didn't capture it.

584 **CAMPBELL:** Real quick, going back to that, looking at the 2019
585 numbers comparing the subjects that have force used against them
586 compared to those taken into custody, which by my understanding, the
587 custodies is a good way to kind of measure interactions instead of
588 comparing the population?

589 **NIYA:** Yes. As we've discussed in the past, I'm - as discussed in
590 the past, the custodies is a good way that we look at our force
591 applications rather than as a population. Population changes how you
592 define who is in the populous when you have people coming and going
593 from a large metropolitan area like Portland as well. Plus, with us
594 with force, that's where the interaction is occurring. You know, we
595 have - there's something, as I've said before, it takes two people
596 in order to have a force event. It takes the officer and the person
597 that we're engaging with. The one thing that I will readily admit
598 that we do not do, and we've talked about how we do this, is capture
599 the data of the people that we engage with that don't have force
600 around them, right. And so, this - but for right now, we like using
601 custodies as our benchmark for the force percentages.

602 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. So, given that, is there any concern given that the
603 ratio of black subjects of use of force compared to custodies is
604 significantly higher than the same ratio for the white group?

605 **NIYA:** So, you know, I - we've talked about this before, Shawn, and
606 I've talked about this at PCCEP when I presented at PCCEP a couple
607 months ago. There is a larger discussion here that is outside of my
608 shop as a force inspector. There is certain questions that I have,
609 that we have as a community, why is it that any one of these
610 demographics of this - of these people on this screenshot right here
611 feel the need to resist the officers at the time of custody? You
612 know, there is some historic stuff that is going on here. There's
613 some feelings that I'm sure that are perpetuated. I don't know how
614 to capture that data wise. How do we - you know, we don't have a way

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 14 of 52

615 of going out there right at the moment of custody after someone has
616 had a force event. You know, we have sergeants go out there and talk
617 to the person but go through a systematic set of questions to gather
618 data in a, you know, format that we can use. So, you know, Shawn,
619 again, I don't have the answer to that question. I know - you know,
620 we're still engaged with Marlon in the equity office about some of
621 the work that he's doing. I think, you know, last time we had an in-
622 person, which seems like forever ago that we had an in-person
623 meeting, you know, Marlon was talking about his challenge of his
624 office transforming him to, you know, the person in charge now and
625 trying to backfill his position and get some of that work done. So,
626 are we there yet? No. Do I have all of the answers? I do not at this
627 time. Can we find a way moving forward to try and gather some better
628 information? I would hope so.

629 **CAMPBELL:** Yeah, I mean, I think that's the main concern right now
630 with a lot of the general population is just the feeling that the
631 bureau is aware of this problem, and they are actively pursuing
632 trying to look more into it.

633 **NIYYA:** And, you know - and again, it's - you know, I know you like
634 looking at the data, Shawn, and others on the committee, but I'm not
635 a data guy like that, but what I've learned over this year working
636 with my team is if you want to really look at something, it's all
637 about the data, right, and making sure it's clean data, you don't
638 have dirty data. And feelings - you know, you talk about feelings.
639 Feelings are a (inaudible) right, but if we're going to look at the
640 data, we need some hard data to kind of attribute to some of these
641 things. And so, you know, does that mean, like, there's a
642 questionnaire that we ask someone to fill out after a custody event?
643 Are they going to be willing? I don't know. Those kinds of things.
644 There's a lot of ways I think we can go about trying to find some
645 information, but yeah, until we have some path forward, it's going
646 to take a little bit of time, and you know, for those of us who have
647 been around the police bureau for a long time, we are a slow moving
648 large rock, you know, as the earth moves, right? We want change fast
649 and want answers quickly, especially in today's day and age, but,
650 you know, we want to do it right. We don't want to do something
651 that's going to cause more problems and more questions down the road
652 and have to redo all of the work. So, I would ask for some grace and
653 give us some time to look at this, especially once we have some time
654 again. A lot of our stuff has been put on the side burner because of
655 our other responses, and we want to get back to this work, and we
656 want to start looking at this.

657 **CAMPBELL:** And we have a question from Gary Marschke real quick, and
658 then I think Frank, you want to say something after that?

659 **HULL:** I'd like to say something.

660 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. So, let's go Gary, Frank, and then Walter. Gary?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 15 of 52

661 **MARSCHKE:** There we go. I had to unmute myself. So, yeah, and I'm
662 not sure that this is quite a question either, so I just raised my
663 hand. You know, I think I have to agree with the lieutenant in that,
664 you know, we can squeeze the data to death and ring these numbers
665 out as far as they can go, but it's really the systemic change
666 that's required that's pointed out by these statistics. And so, I
667 think, you know, I again agree with the statement about the fact
668 that we really need to see the kind of change that makes resistance
669 not an issue so that it really is not something that we need to
670 statistically track because it's an aberration, not a regular
671 occurrence. That's my two (inaudible).

672 **CAMPBELL:** Frank?

673 **SANTOS:** Yeah, Jeff, just a quick question. In regard to this data,
674 how is it shared with the public? Besides posting it on a website,
675 does the public information officers share this information with the
676 public? I see this a lot in the TAC meetings, but I'm just curious
677 how much of the public see this in some fashion?

678 **NIYA:** You know, a good question, Frank. Could we do a better job
679 communicating this? We could. I think, you know, we do rely on our
680 public facing web page. We rely on the open data. You know, we are
681 very open with our data, like, download everything we put up there.
682 You can download it. Shawn has done that many times and manipulated
683 the data which is great. Can we do better? Absolutely. And I think,
684 again, that kind of goes to the "What does the future state look
685 like?" How can we do better holistically, not only with the data but
686 how we communicate that data out, gather information back from the
687 community in order to provide the information, you know, in a way
688 that is consumable and understandable. You know, and going back to -
689 Shawn, yeah, you're looking at percentages? Yeah, I mean, we look at
690 percentages, but, you know, the thing I kind of look at as well is
691 the force subjects in numbers. (Inaudible) force event with 38
692 individuals that identified as male black, Q4. Out of 940 custodies,
693 38 people had a force event, and, again, going back to the previous
694 slides, nearly 66 percent of our force was category four, resistant
695 (inaudible) from control against (inaudible), which if you look
696 across the country, probably 99 percent of the law enforcement
697 agencies don't even consider that force and are not even tracking
698 that data or that information. So, always, can we do better? Yes.
699 But I am very satisfied that, you know, we are using force
700 appropriately. We have a low number of actual individuals that are
701 having a force event on them.

702 **SANTOS:** Yeah, so if I could tack onto this real quickly, do you
703 know of any initiatives within PPB that's going to take on this
704 challenge around real-time communication?

705 **NIYA:** So, our PIO's office is always trying to revamp. I know that
706 they've added staffing. So, at one point, we had one person that was
707 in charge of all communications relating to the bureau. That has now

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 16 of 52

708 been expanded to a team and especially into what's happening today,
709 but that team idea was in place even before all of these protests
710 started. So, I'm hoping that as the team gets solidified and
711 training and experience start occurring that we can be proactive and
712 responsive with our communications.

713 **SANTOS:** Great. Thanks.

714 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Walter?

715 **HULL:** Well, first of all, I'd like to say that when I look at this
716 chart and when I look at all of the other figures of which, well, we
717 have in our possession, I want to congratulate all of the people in
718 the Portland Police Bureau. In the first place, I've been around -
719 before I retired, I was around for 14 years, and I saw a constant
720 situation where we had more and more hostility with the public over
721 the years. It seems incredible to me that when you look at these
722 figures that there is a tremendous amount of goodness, kindness,
723 being extremely careful. One of the things that is not on this chart
724 is during this past year how many of our officers were shot or shot
725 and killed and those - those figures are incredible, and those
726 figures reflect that our officers are careful. They are judicious,
727 and they are really, in my opinion, doing an excellent job. And what
728 I see is that we need to help them in certain ways to help them even
729 do a better job, but I don't see these figures as a criticism at
730 all, period.

731 **NIYA:** Thanks, Walter. I'll just say, Walter, for our purposes here
732 at Portland - I think it was in the chat. Yes. We have thankfully
733 not had any officers shot here in Portland.

734 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Tyler, do you have a question?

735 **HALL:** Yeah, I was just asking Walter to clarify. You were saying
736 there - one of these figures was impressive. Which figures
737 specifically are you referring to that impresses you the most?

738 **HULL:** Well, when you have 90,000 custodies and then look at these
739 statistics, that's incredible. I mean, think about it. Go down the
740 list. You have 90,000 encounters. I mean, ladies and gentlemen, the
741 fact of the matter is these people are doing a hell of a job, and
742 I'm really proud of them, and I can't say that enough.

743 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Any other question or comments?

744 **HALL:** Thank you for clarifying, Walter.

745 **CAMPBELL:** Any other questions before we move forward?

746 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

747 **CAMPBELL:** Okay.

748 **NIYA:** I'll just finish up this slide deck here real quick. We
749 always kind of end with the deadly force. For those on the committee
750 that are new, my team and the force inspector's office currently do
751 not review deadly force cases. That's done by our detective
752 division, but we always put a slide in here showing what occurred
753 during that course. So, we did have one officer-involved shooting
754 back in December 2019. I looked this up just before I came on

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 17 of 52

755 because there's always a question of what was this because we can
756 never remember unfortunately with all of the other stats and data
757 going on. This was the gentleman out in (inaudible) precinct, I
758 believe, at, like, 102 and Stark area/103 and Stark. So, if that's
759 good, I will move onto the Q1 2020. Give me a moment here to share
760 that, please. So, you're going to see pretty much similar numbers
761 here. Q1 custodies, so this is going to show some of the COVID
762 information in this, and this is going to be why a lot of our
763 numbers are just going to drop a lot here in some manners because of
764 the COVID getting near the end of Q1. Custodies went down
765 significantly there. Force numbers are still - again, percentage is
766 roughly still the same as before. It's flat like I talked about
767 previously with the quarters over time. Again, our control against
768 resistance and resistant handcuffing are the leading types of force
769 applications that we have going on for Q1. Takedowns again are up
770 there in the third place even though less than 10 percent, but I
771 talked about the reasons why. Taser use, again, you probably saw
772 before was low in Q4 2019. Again, it's low here in comparison to
773 some other years past. Changes over time, again, the calls for
774 service steady up to this point. Custodies, again, went down. Force
775 events went down. So, the - again, in my opinion, that was because
776 the trailing in of the COVID started there as well, and we changed
777 our responses to calls for service and other things. (Inaudible) see
778 again that the applications of force are pretty steady over time
779 versus the quarterly that we just talked about. Attributes, again,
780 at the subject level, you can see the reported armed. These are all,
781 you know, holding fairly steady with the applications and the
782 subjects involved over time. And I failed to mention this on the
783 first slide deck, so for anybody that is new in the committee, the
784 transients, that has been an issue with our reporting, and I
785 probably should mention this that we have done a poor job of
786 documenting and reporting what transient really means. If you just
787 refuse to give an address when you're getting a citation or booked
788 into jail, they sometimes just mark "Transient" down. And so, there
789 has been no good method within the bureau to train folks on how to
790 define what transient or houseless is in regard to our reporting.
791 And so, that's something else that we're looking at changing as
792 well, and I think Training Division might have already started doing
793 that with some of the advanced academies is having that discussion
794 in class. I've got to double check with them. I know that was a
795 discussion at one point. So, please understand that the transient
796 labelling is not always the greatest metric for us.

797 **CAMPBELL:** We have a question from Mark Schorr. How is the data
798 calculated as far as overlap, e.g. a transient with mental health
799 and/or addiction issue?

800 **NIYA:** Very good questions. So, yes, in these slides, you could
801 have the same individual depending on the attributes that are on an

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 18 of 52

802 FDCR. You could have a person across multiple attributes on these
803 slides. So, as the officers are filling out the FDCRs, if they are
804 armed and intoxicated with mental health, then they are going to get
805 each one of these attributes assigned to that subject. Let me - I've
806 got to click back on my screen here. Okay. Here again is the custody
807 percentage that we just had the discussion on the previous slide
808 deck. The, you know, numbers - custodies, again, are down
809 (inaudible) issue has gone down as well.

810 **CAMPBELL:** Sylvia, could you mute your microphone? We're getting a
811 little bit of feedback from you. We have two quick questions for
812 you. Sarah Suniga has a clarification question. Animal aggressive
813 versus suffering. She doesn't recall that distinction before.

814 **NIIYA:** Yes. I think that was partly out of the (inaudible). We
815 added a category for less lethal on an animal, so if you should use
816 pepper spray, a taser, or, like, an impact tool on an animal. That
817 was added to 1010. So, I believe that we broke out the aggressive
818 versus suffering to kind of show - because aggressive would go, I
819 think if I remember right, and excuse me because it's been a while,
820 towards the potential less lethal use to an animal. Suffering is, of
821 course, like the deer that gets hit by a car and then we have to put
822 it down which happens very rarely, thank goodness. We do have
823 wildlife in the City of Portland, and every once in a while, we have
824 to use a handgun or a rifle or something else to end the suffering
825 of an animal. So, we do track that as a force event just so that we
826 are understanding when someone is discharging their weapons within
827 the city.

828 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. And we have a question from Frank. Will 2020
829 Quarter 2 data include protests and civil disturbances, and how does
830 that get tracked in the data?

831 **NIIYA:** So, yes. We do have a crowd control report that comes out
832 separately from the quarterly reports, and in this, I will tell you
833 that we're still in the middle of all this, and we're still trying
834 to catch it up with the reporting. We don't - like you saw, we only
835 have three analysts that are doing all of this work. I will prepare
836 you now that our numbers are going to be skewed because of all of
837 this. You know, as we've seen over time - you know, we've been
838 pretty steady for a long period of time. This last six weeks is
839 going to skew our numbers. Will we have lessons learned? Probably.
840 But we don't have all of the data compiled yet. We have not had all
841 of the reviews done to this point. So, again, I will come back to
842 you, I'm sure, at some point and have that discussion with you about
843 what's been occurring the last six weeks.

844 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you.

845 **NIIYA:** All right. So - I've got to clear my screen again. We have
846 not had any officer-involved shootings up to this point for this Q1.
847 So, that's the end of the Q - the two quarters that we have for your
848 presentation today.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 19 of 52

849 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Do we have any questions from the TAC?
850 **HALL:** Yeah, Tyler here. This is perhaps an unconventional question
851 for you, Officer Niiya. The overall, like, reporting of data each
852 quarter, each year - I've been here for four/five years almost now,
853 when you see this as a representative of the police, you're
854 reporting it and doing a fantastic, faithful job of reporting that,
855 but I'm more curious when you see this as a fellow citizen of
856 Portland, what are your thoughts? What do you feel when you see this
857 data?
858 **NIYA:** Well, so, I mean, I will tell you - again, so I started here
859 in 1996, and lots has changed. Training has changed, expectations
860 have changed, you know, how we approach calls, and some of that's
861 done because of your work on the TAC, right, is talking about how to
862 improve things. I will say this that police officers, law
863 enforcement, are never going to get away from having to use force.
864 That's just part of our job, and we understand that signing up for
865 this. How do we go about doing that? I believe we are doing a better
866 job of it than when I started in 1996. I'll be very honest with you
867 about that. We have more tools now than when I started. We have more
868 training. We have better training around de-escalation and
869 communication and how to talk. I will tell you, you know, I was a
870 traffic officer, motor officer, and DUIs was my thing. I had to deal
871 with intoxicated people all of the time. That's really where I
872 learned how to talk to people, right. In order to get someone to
873 take a breath test, you really wanted to earn their trust and talk
874 to them and look at them as a person in a bad situation. That's how
875 I really learned how to communicate to people and deescalate and
876 talk to people. Now, these kids that are coming out, they're getting
877 that in the basic academy. They're getting it further when they come
878 back to Portland for the advanced academy. So, these numbers, this
879 data that I'm seeing here is far better than when I was an officer
880 on patrol and what was expected of me in my role. Can we do better?
881 I will always say we can always do better, and I think again, that's
882 where the partnership comes with your committee and the work that
883 you're doing. I see this force inspector role as a very important
884 role, and I am sad that I am having to leave this role. I find
885 myself getting my fingers in the training division. I find myself
886 responding to policy questions. I look at the tactics. And so, you
887 know, how can we do better? I look at officer wellness. I look at
888 people that might need better report writing skills or better de-
889 escalation skills or, you know - I feel that we have put processes
890 in place today that helps drive this data into real world actionable
891 things for our officers to make it better for not only them but the
892 citizens of Portland and beyond, right? I mean, we don't just
893 interact with the citizens of Portland as we've talked about. We
894 have people coming into our city all of the time. So, I am - I'm
895 proud of these numbers. I am, you know, here to support the data

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 20 of 52

896 that my team does. I think that we collect a lot of data. We collect
897 more data than a lot of police departments do, and we probably have
898 more data than we know what to do with at times. Because of the lack
899 of resources - you know, I would love to look at the data in
900 different ways. You know, could we look at calls for service that
901 result in injuries to both officers and citizens, and could we do
902 something in the response based off that data? You know, we have
903 that. I just don't have the time or the resources to do that. So,
904 you know, I think that's a long way to say I'm happy with where
905 we're at compared with where we were. Do we have a path forward?
906 Yes. And can we do better? Yes.

907 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. We have a question from Sheri, and then it looks
908 like we also have a question from Karen after that. Sheri?

909 **ANDERSON:** Sure. This is kind of an odd question, but I'm wondering
910 what role does weather play in these statistics?

911 **NIYYA:** You know, there is an anecdotal, and I bring it up all of
912 the time, you know, during winter time when it's cold and wet and
913 rainy, people don't want to go outside as much, and normally you see
914 our numbers do kind of go down in that Q4 time period when - and Q1.
915 Can I attribute that to anything? No. We haven't really asked people
916 about that to really grab the data. I have always used that as a
917 potential when I look at the data. And also, when I look at the
918 weather and how people dress, I also can see there are times when,
919 like, our taser use, CW use, will go down because just don't
920 understand that I can't use this tool right now because this person
921 has this bulky clothing on. It's not going to be an effective thing
922 for me to use. So, yeah, whether does play into it. Can I point to a
923 datapoint for that? Not really, but it is kind of one of those
924 anecdotal things that we have out there.

925 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. We have a question from Karen and then Mark and
926 then Jim. Karen?

927 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

928 **STEWART:** Shawn, I don't know, but I see it looks like Gary and Brit
929 both have questions on my screen as well.

930 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Well, let's move on to Mark, your question next.

931 **MARK:** Yeah. Hi. Is there any with the data to track whether
932 specific officers are more prone to use force than other officers?

933 **NIYYA:** So, yes. I think Shawn might have a report up on that here
934 soon, but yes. So, the data that I have, we do look at officers
935 individually. I'm required to do that, you know, throughout the
936 quarters, and I report that back to the RU managers so that - the
937 precinct commanders and captains. I report that internally to them
938 and look at their officers, and I also look at deficiencies, right?
939 Who is having problems with report writing or review? So, a sergeant
940 or lieutenant who might miss something in the review, I also have
941 those conversations with the RU managers. So, yes, we do look at
942 that. We have internal processes both in the force inspector role

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 21 of 52

943 and then in the EIS, with our EIS systems, for alerts that track
944 individuals. And it's kind of interesting. I'll just say, you know,
945 without putting names to it, there was an officer that I started to
946 have some concerns about wanted the RU to have a discussion with
947 them. I made a phone call to the captain, and about five minutes
948 later, I got a call back saying that they had just gotten an EIS
949 alert. So, the accountability system triggered an alert for that
950 person as well. I think that shows when you have an engaged person
951 in the force inspector role and this position for the bureau that
952 the human and a computer can kind of see things similar. So, I
953 believe those early interventions are a good thing. And so, that's
954 part of what I try to do as a force inspector as well is to look at
955 individuals and intervene early before it becomes a problem.

956 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Let's have Marlene. I'm sorry, Marlene. I called
957 you Karen. My apologies. Did you have a question?

958 **AVILES-CABLE:** Yeah. And it may be out of our scope a little, but I
959 still wondered if maybe Greg or, I don't know, any of you can
960 answer. With Portland, because we don't live in a bubble, while
961 we're - our job I just to work with Portland, but I'm just curious
962 what kind of reporting the neighboring areas do because when we're
963 looking at this issue and the complexity of what happened, you know,
964 knowing - I mean, if you're driving in Multnomah County and we're
965 doing all of this stuff here but then you go over to Lake Oswego,
966 then it's a whole other world.

967 **NIIYA:** Yeah. I can tell you, so each agency has their own reporting
968 requirements. We, by far - I would say by far surpass anybody in the
969 state of Oregon, and I would put us up against many of the agencies
970 in the United States about how much data we're collecting. So,
971 you're right. There is not a true set standard across agencies. I
972 know that the state is trying to do some of that work. It's trying
973 to capture kind of a standard database for things. So, that's
974 probably something that's still on the horizon with all of the
975 reforms that are coming up.

976 **CAMPBELL:** And I will say as somebody who has tried looking at other
977 cities, out of the major cities that I have looked at, we do collect
978 a lot more data than most, and it's a lot more - just even getting
979 your hands on the raw data is a lot more easy than with a lot of the
980 other cities that I've looked at.

981 **NIIYA:** Yeah. You say transparency and open data to a lot of
982 agencies, and they have a blank stare at you. For us, I mean, that's
983 just - it's been the norm for how many years. Here's our stuff. Look
984 at it. And we're comfortable with that.

985 **CAMPBELL:** Okay, let's - Jim, you have a question?

986 **KAHAN:** Actually, I had one, and I have another one that's more
987 important. The unimportant one is the wonk-ish one that you might do
988 better comparing quarter to quarter, so quarter 1 2019 to quarter 1
989 2020 might tell you something that controls roughly for time of

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 22 of 52

990 year, and that's worth (inaudible) doing. The other one is a deeper
991 question. All of the data that you've presented were by subject.
992 What was done to a subject with use of force. How are you going to
993 do that given the events of the past several weeks? If you fire a
994 teargas grenade, who is the subject? If you shoot rubber bullets,
995 who is the subject?

996 **NIIYA:** Yeah, so you're feeling my pain right now and the pain of
997 the police bureau. So, I will say this, you know, just to prep you,
998 again, that this process that we have here is something that works
999 very well for a patrol situation where we have an engagement with
1000 one or two people and we take a custody. This process has never been
1001 great for crowd control, and I'll be honest, I don't think when we
1002 were sitting down working with our DOJ partners and others that, you
1003 know, this was really - the contemplation of this process and this
1004 data collection in a crowd-control situation. So, we are trying our
1005 best, and I know that there's going to be challenges for the
1006 reporting on this, and we're going to have to work through that. You
1007 know, we - I've already - you know, before kind of some of this, I
1008 was already starting to look at some reports before Lieutenant Simon
1009 came on board. The - you know, we're doing a lot of work. I would
1010 say we're gathering a lot data even with the situation that we're
1011 in, but I'm sure we're going to come out of this with some
1012 recommendations for improvements, and we'll probably be, you know,
1013 bringing those forward to you guys as well in a report.

1014 **KAHAN:** Let me take an intermediate step. What if you have an actual
1015 subject, is there a difference in patterns of use of force based on
1016 how many people are around at the time? Let us compare a one on one
1017 between an officer and a subject, and I hate to bring this up, but
1018 I'm going to do it. George Floyd was a one on one with a whole batch
1019 of people watching. Do you guys have any way of looking at that and
1020 knowing whether or not there is a difference?

1021 **NIIYA:** I would say at first blush, no, not really. The data we
1022 capture is the - what the officer is doing at that moment or
1023 officers. We have multiple officers potentially involved with a
1024 subject. So, at first blush, I would say no, but we might have to do
1025 a deeper look into that.

1026 **KAHAN:** How would you have dealt with the four officers in that
1027 situation through data collection?

1028 **NIIYA:** So, if - well, we have multiple officers all of the time
1029 that are engaged with one subject. That's actually one of our
1030 training principles now is we want to have multiple officers there
1031 to help de-escalate or use a lower level of force. So, every officer
1032 that has a reportable force is required to report that to a sergeant
1033 and write a report about that, and then that gets reviewed in the
1034 after action. So, if we have four officers involved and one subject
1035 arrest, then all four of those people will be expected to write
1036 force reports.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 23 of 52

1037 **KAHAN:** Even if they didn't hurt the person who was actually
1038 applying the report, but if they were present, they have to report
1039 it?

1040 **NIYA:** So, if they - so, under our settlement agreement and our
1041 policies, which now are driving our policies, the - you know, if
1042 officers witness a force event that is more than a category 4, so
1043 something like a takedown or, you know, pepper spray, that kind of
1044 stuff, they are required to write a report about that. So, we do
1045 have a mechanism in place for having officers write reports for
1046 force they witness, and you know, I - again, I've been here since
1047 96'. We've always had a, you know, policy or requirement that much
1048 like the (inaudible) for interceding. You need to intercede. You do
1049 not let someone use illegal force or commit a crime on somebody. So,
1050 that's something we've been doing as well. So, you know, to answer
1051 your question, the officers, if they use force, are required to
1052 report it. If they don't, there is accountability systems in place
1053 to handle that. If someone believes an officer is doing something
1054 wrong, again, we have policies and procedures in place to hold that
1055 person accountable.

1056 **CAMPBELL:** All right. We have questions from Gary then Brit then
1057 Frank. Gary?

1058 **MARSCHKE:** Actually, no. I didn't have a question. I don't know how
1059 I got in the mix.

1060 **CAMPBELL:** Sorry about that. Then Brit.

1061 **MASBACK:** Yes, lieutenant, my question is just procedural, and you
1062 may have already mentioned this, but what exactly is happening to
1063 your position? Is someone new cycling in, or is the mandate of the
1064 position itself changing?

1065 **NIYA:** Oh, sorry. No. We've had some internal movement with Chief
1066 Lovell getting promoted now.

1067 **MASBACK:** Okay.

1068 **NIYA:** Of course, new chief (inaudible) around. So, Lieutenant Rob
1069 Simon who I believe is on the call as well - Lieutenant Simon will
1070 be taking over as a force inspector. So, he's already tentatively
1071 transitioned. We're double filling the role right now. There was
1072 hope that I would be able to help transition him into that role over
1073 the next five weeks when I technically get moved on August 4th, but
1074 because of my duties around the protest, we've not really had much
1075 time with each other. But I'm working with him, getting him up to
1076 speed, about the force inspector role.

1077 **MASBACK:** Okay. Thank you.

1078 **CAMPBELL:** Frank?

1079 **SANTOS:** Yeah, Jeff, just a quick question in regard to - it looks
1080 like the data that's being generated is primarily one-on-one
1081 interactions with the officer and the public or the folks that are
1082 being detained. Are you considering looking at the data sets for
1083 protests and civil disobedience type of things in a different way? I

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 24 of 52

1084 imagine it would be really hard to be able to go to the level of
1085 detail that you have for the one-on-one officer versus a broad
1086 protest. Is the bureau looking at different ways of representing
1087 that data?

1088 **NIIYA:** So, yeah. We've always in our crowd-control reports which,
1089 I'll be very honest has been hit and miss getting them up on the
1090 website in a timely fashion, the crowd-control methodology is a
1091 little different than the methodology that the team uses for these
1092 reports. So, we do report when we can - I mean, we report the
1093 applications of force, of course, and all of that kind of stuff.
1094 When we have an arrest and we can attribute force to a subject, of
1095 course, that makes it very, you know, apples to apples as well, but
1096 yeah, the methodology overall for the protest is a little bit
1097 different and rightfully so because much like we just talked about,
1098 there's many subjects that we don't know about. You know, we have an
1099 FDCR where an officer is reporting, "I did this, but I don't have
1100 anybody in custody because they ran off." So, yeah, it's a little
1101 different reporting, but we will, of course, be transparent with our
1102 data as well that we pull out of this protest.

1103 **SANTOS:** Great. Thank you.

1104 **CAMPBELL:** Any other questions?

1105 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

1106 **CAMPBELL:** All right. I've got two questions for you and a
1107 statement. How about that?

1108 **NIIYA:** All right, Shawn.

1109 **CAMPBELL:** The statement I don't expect a response to because we've
1110 talked about this many times.

1111 **NIIYA:** Okay

1112 **CAMPBELL:** But I do think it is fair to recognize, looking at the
1113 data, that the bureau has made dramatic steps in reducing the amount
1114 of force used. Many of the types of force are not recorded over long
1115 periods of time, but if you do look at the types that are, since
1116 2008, pointing a firearm has been reduced from 1,000 people a year,
1117 somewhere around 1,000 people a year down to 75 in 2019, and you see
1118 similar stuff in strikes, kicks, control holds with injuries, and
1119 several others. That being said, some things have remained
1120 consistent in that data is the racial disparity of custodies to
1121 force where even though the force has gotten smaller, that disparity
1122 has remained which is something that I think is important to look
1123 into over time, and I hope that we continue to do it as well as the
1124 bureau. Another area of concern is that even though we have reduced
1125 overall use of force, the amount of deadly force incidents have
1126 stayed fairly, between 4-8 a year with a couple years where we had
1127 two, but those are fairly rare. And these are kind of the areas that
1128 I see that are very important when we look at this force data even
1129 though - I don't expect an answer right now, obviously, Lieutenant
1130 Niiya. Just for me when I look at it, these are the places that kind

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 25 of 52

1131 of still stick out to me though I think that it is good that we have
1132 reduced overall force, and I think that's something the community
1133 and the bureau should be proud of.

1134 **NIYA:** Shawn, I appreciate that, you know, and like I mentioned to
1135 PCCEP, I think everyone of us in the bureau is open to a
1136 conversation about how we can look at this and improve. You know, we
1137 want to be part of that conversation. We want to be, you know,
1138 looking at how the data drives that. You know, we are a data-driven
1139 organization. But we need to make sure that we - again, like I said,
1140 we just don't do things to do them, not thinking about them, and
1141 having it cause things down the road that need to be changed again.
1142 So, we'll take this as we can. I know, again, Marlon is doing some
1143 great work in the equity office. I have high hopes that he is going
1144 to drive the conversation much like we talked about with you guys a
1145 few months ago, and we look forward - all of us look forward to
1146 being a part of that.

1147 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. I'm going to ask my question real quick, and I see
1148 Kwame has a question down there. I'm assuming that you watched the
1149 George Floyd video like many of us have.

1150 **NIYA:** Yes.

1151 **CAMPBELL:** Now, me just being a layman watching it, obviously, I'm
1152 not an officer. I'm not trained in spotting these things. But it
1153 seems looking at that, not including the putting the knee on the
1154 neck, which is not a use of force that is allowable for most bureaus
1155 and definitely not for the Portland Police Bureau in that kind of
1156 context, it seems like the three types of force that were present
1157 were a resisted handcuffing, a controlled takedown, and a control
1158 against resistance. Would that be fair?

1159 **NIYA:** I would probably say yes looking at the way we define it.
1160 Yes.

1161 **CAMPBELL:** And I guess I just bring this up because we consider all
1162 three of those low levels of force, and yet just the one change in
1163 that, the one little difference of he put his knee on that man's
1164 neck is all the difference it took to make that something where it
1165 was a low level of force used on somebody to an incident that has
1166 sparked an entire nation into basically going out on the street. And
1167 I guess I just say this out of the caution of we shouldn't assume
1168 that just because something is a low level of force that it
1169 shouldn't be given the same type of review that higher levels - what
1170 we consider higher levels of force are.

1171 **NIYA:** You know, Shawn, I will say this. That's a good point that
1172 you make, a valid point. I would say that - you know, and again, I'm
1173 not there. I'm not a part of their policies. I'm looking at this
1174 much like you, as a third-party citizen. Applying it to what we
1175 would do here in Portland, I would say that they didn't do what we
1176 would do and it's the follow up, right. So, that follow-up care
1177 after you're in custody. I think you're going to see our officers

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 26 of 52

1178 (inaudible) officers (inaudible) that follow-up piece after the
1179 custody has been made. You don't sit there and have someone lay on
1180 their stomach, you know, for that long. We put them in (inaudible)
1181 position. We get them up, we put them into a car, we sit them up,
1182 we sit them on a sidewalk (inaudible) medical responding quickly.
1183 There is a lot of factors that went into that. I will not downplay
1184 the low level of force that started the whole thing, but you have to
1185 look at the whole sequences and everything, and I would say that our
1186 officers, our training, our procedures, the expectations that we
1187 have as supervisors with our officers, if it was a situation back
1188 here, they would not have been met. I'll just say that.

1189 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Kwame, you had a question?

1190 **KINABO:** Yeah, my question is off topic a little bit. So, if we have
1191 officers that have more complaints, and they maybe take (inaudible)
1192 between the judges and the police, is there - do we have a record of
1193 how many cases that police have been - citizens have been reported
1194 that Officer, let's say, Shawn has been doing A, B, C for and then
1195 behind the scenes - this is the thing I'm looking for is do we have
1196 any record - the reason I'm asking this question because I think
1197 it's becoming, like, a habit, like, I have a problem, because I know
1198 Judge Shawn or Judge Tammy is going to walk on my side. Those are
1199 the things I'm if we have a record of that if, you know,
1200 (inaudible). Do I make myself clear?

1201 **NIYA:** So, I will say this that our EIS system, our employee
1202 intervention system, which tracks information, the alerts I was
1203 talking about earlier. So, one of the things that they do track in
1204 there is complaints against officers. So, we do have systems in
1205 place that managers for these officers, individuals, my manager as
1206 well, can look and see how many complaints someone has. If they get
1207 too many complaints in a time period, we get an automatic alert from
1208 the system to the RU manager. And so, we do - that is one of the
1209 factors, and a heavy factor, that we look at in regard to our
1210 officers and the holistic approach that we take. As the force
1211 inspector, you know, I'm looking at officers. You see a lot of the
1212 same names. You know, the people that are active, go out there and
1213 make arrests and work patrol, I mean, it's a subset of people,
1214 right? So, I see the same names coming through. I get a good feel
1215 for the officers, and you know, much like I talked about me calling
1216 over to the captain that, you know, I try to intervene before it
1217 becomes a complaint. If I see them on that verge that, "Hey, if I
1218 was a citizen and you did that to me, I would probably complain,"
1219 that's where I'm calling over and giving feedback to the managers
1220 back there. If I read something in a report - a good example is an
1221 officer wrote in there that, you know, they used some language that
1222 I did not think was appropriate, right, and if I was a citizen, I
1223 would probably make a complaint about that. I gave feedback to the
1224 manager saying, you know, have a discussion about that officer about

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 27 of 52

1225 better word choices because we don't need that. So, I think between
1226 what this job does, the computer system, the filing of complaints,
1227 our internal affairs, and independent police review, they all work
1228 together as far as the data collection. They're separate, right?
1229 They are independent, but they are both tracking numbers. So, we do
1230 have the robust system in tracking officers and making sure that
1231 they are within what we want our officers to do.

1232 **CAMPBELL:** Does that answer your question, Kwame?

1233 **KAHAN:** Yes, thank you.

1234 **CAMPBELL:** Jim, do you have a question? And let's -

1235 **KAHAN:** I'm going to come back to the individual versus group, but
1236 first I have to make a comment. In today's Oregonian, the head of
1237 the CRC had a comment to make about the independence of the IPR and
1238 the amount of data that are available to them and are not available
1239 to them, and it's not exactly the way you presented it entirely. My
1240 other point though that there is a great, big difference between the
1241 one-on-one type of thing that is probably well over 90 percent of
1242 the daily work of the PPB, and when you have crowd control of some
1243 sort or when you have crowds - because one of the characteristics of
1244 a crowd is that it's a crowd. Most citizens don't have an effective
1245 command to control situation over their own marchers, and sort of
1246 chaos happens. My own concern with the PPB is that their own command
1247 and control in that situation doesn't seem to be as effective as it
1248 could be, and I don't see any way of measuring that. There should be
1249 a way that the police work in tandem under disciplined situation. I
1250 know that you're doing your best to try and do this, but if
1251 something goes wrong and then cops start shoving and then cops start
1252 doing some more shoving and they feed off each other and you have a
1253 loss of command and control there, and it's that which first
1254 concerns me greatly, and second, I believe is very difficult for
1255 people in your position to measure.

1256 **NIYA:** So, I will just say let's wait until this is all over and we
1257 have some information. Today's meeting is about the Q4 and Q1, and
1258 we will wait to see what we get from the protest and crowd control
1259 information.

1260 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Let's take Sarah's question, and let's wrap
1261 this up so we can move forward.

1262 **SUNIGA:** Hi. I just have I guess a bit of a comment that I think is
1263 relevant, but I'm not expecting a response, and it's related to the
1264 use of force because, you know, myself as a member of TAC now for I
1265 don't even know. Shawn you might know, four-ish years/three-ish
1266 years, I come to this definitely as a community member, as a trauma
1267 therapist, also as an Army veteran, and I know that part of our role
1268 here is to do a ride along, and I have not done that. I have avoided
1269 doing that piece because of my own worries around the use of force
1270 to do this by myself. And there's - and I wish that wasn't the case,
1271 and I just feel like I need to - I'm feeling compelled to say this

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 28 of 52

1272 right now. I mean, the trauma therapist in the me knows not to give
1273 into fear, to not lean towards avoidance, to give myself a new
1274 experience so I can have learning and see that interacting with our
1275 bureau is safe. I know that. The Army veteran in me feels like I can
1276 - I resonate with, like, the ideas of honor and duty and respect for
1277 that role. And yet, there is a historical context here, and the way
1278 I've been approaching even setting this up, I think I indicated in
1279 the past I am a little nervous about who I might get assigned to
1280 ride with and doing that alone, and someone said, "You know what,
1281 we'll find someone. It will be great." Then I got approached, like,
1282 just a personal email by a sergeant, just one, one person, saying,
1283 "When can we set that up," and already that felt - nothing against
1284 this particular officer - but just in that way of approaching me
1285 didn't feel safe because I don't know. I don't know this person or
1286 anything like that, and at the root of that is that fear I have, and
1287 I can't imagine how many other community members just encounter
1288 that. I don't present necessarily as - you might not know looking at
1289 me that I'm Mexican. I think I'm ambiguously presenting, but I know
1290 that's what I am, and it makes me nervous. So, I just simply wanted
1291 to make that comment. No pressure to respond.

1292 **NIYA:** Well, I will just say this: We are here for you if you so
1293 choose to come out on the ride along. I'm sure we can find the right
1294 person to have you hookup with so that you feel safe and welcome.
1295 So, no pressure, and I hope to see you out there when you feel
1296 comfortable and ready to do that.

1297 **HULL:** I would like to make a comment.

1298 **CAMPBELL:** Sure, Walt.

1299 **HULL:** Very short. Sarah, one of the things that you would
1300 accomplish if you did take a ride along, and there are some FTOs out
1301 there that are excellent to ride with, and if you took a - if you
1302 took a ride, one of things that you would discover is that you're
1303 riding with people with wives, children, people that have nothing
1304 but their community at heart. They're people - they're church-going
1305 people. They're coaches for softball, baseball, basketball. These
1306 are pretty incredible people, and you - I think it would be valuable
1307 for you just to meet them.

1308 **CAMPBELL:** I'd like to, if it's all right, we're kind of getting
1309 into an area - thank you very much, both Sarah for sharing and Walt
1310 for your comments as well. If there's anybody who wants to talk
1311 about it further, please, we can do it offline just so we can keep
1312 this meeting moving forward if that's all right with everybody.

1313 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.**

1314 **CAMPBELL:** I'll just end with one last quick question, yes or no,
1315 for you Lieutenant Niiya: It seems like if you had more analysts,
1316 you would be able to do a lot more with this data that would provide
1317 more oversight. Is that - is it in your opinion, would that be true?

1318 **NIYA:** Yes. Going with yes/no. Yes.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 29 of 52

1319 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you. All right. Is everybody all right with moving
1320 forward to the next agenda item?
1321 **HULL:** Yes.
1322 **MALE:** I had a quick question, Shawn. You mentioned three types of
1323 force that you categorized used against George Floyd at least
1324 according to PPB use-of-force breakout. Could you remind me what
1325 those were?
1326 **CAMPBELL:** Yeah. It would be resistant handcuffing, controlled
1327 takedown, and control against resistance.
1328 **MALE:** Say that one more time. Sorry. I just dropped my pen.
1329 **CAMPBELL:** That's okay. Resistant handcuffing, controlled takedown,
1330 and control against resistance.
1331 **MALE:** Thank you.
1332 **CAMPBELL:** Yeah. All right.
1333 **NIYA:** Shawn, real quick, I just want to thank you very much. It's
1334 been a pleasure working all of you for the last year or so. Good
1335 luck with your work. It's important work, and I hope to see you
1336 again sometime in the future. Thank you.
1337 **MALE:** Thank you, Jeff.
1338 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you, Lieutenant Niiya, and good luck with your next
1339 position. All right. Let's move forward in the agenda. The next
1340 items we have are voting on the recommendations, reports, and
1341 letters. Hopefully, everybody has had a chance to look over them. We
1342 made a pretty good push to get people to do so prior to this
1343 meeting. If anybody in the audience has not been sent them yet, the
1344 email to send to, and we will get them out to you is - sorry, I've
1345 got to go clear back in here - could you put that back up again,
1346 Caitlyn, so it's back on the bottom of the comments section? All
1347 right. Well, there -
1348 **STEWART:** We're getting it up there.
1349 **CAMPBELL:** Here. I've got it right here. It's
1350 ppbtac@portlandoregon.gov. All right. So, the first thing we'll be
1351 voting on is number one: The five pillars of structural change.
1352 This is a letter that will be going to chief as well as to the city
1353 council. It outlines in the TAC's view - this was put together by
1354 myself and the steering committee. It outlines, in the TAC's view,
1355 the primary areas of structural change that need to be looked into
1356 to create what we consider a 21st century police report. The five
1357 pillars are accountability, procedural justice, restorative justice,
1358 officer wellness, and public safety specialization. Are there any
1359 comments or questions about this document before we vote?
1360 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.**
1361 **CAMPBELL:** All right.
1362 **HULL:** Hearing none. I think we should vote.
1363 **CAMPBELL:** All right. I will go through as we did with the others.
1364 So, do we have a motion to approve this document to be sent out by
1365 the TAC?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 30 of 52

1366 **MALE:** Jim, I move that we send it out.
1367 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have a second?
1368 **MALE:** I second.
1369 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you. All right. We will vote as before. You may
1370 vote yes, no, or abstain. Sheri?
1371 **ANDERSON:** Yes.
1372 **CAMPBELL:** Leslie?
1373 **BRUNKER:** Yes.
1374 **CAMPBELL:** Jillian Burke?
1375 **BURKE:** Yes.
1376 **CAMPBELL:** Marlene?
1377 **AVILES-CABLE:** Yes.
1378 **CAMPBELL:** Shawn is a yes. Dave?
1379 **COATES:** Yes.
1380 **CAMPBELL:** Tyler?
1381 **HALL:** Yes.
1382 **CAMPBELL:** Walter?
1383 **HULL:** Yes.
1384 **CAMPBELL:** Jim?
1385 **KAHAN:** Yes, and thank you to the steering committee.
1386 **CAMPBELL:** Kwame?
1387 **KINABO:** Yes.
1388 **CAMPBELL:** Gary?
1389 **MARSCHKE:** Yes.
1390 **CAMPBELL:** Brit?
1391 **MASBACK:** Yes.
1392 **CAMPBELL:** Mark M.?
1393 **MILINSKI:** Yes.
1394 **CAMPBELL:** John?
1395 **PAHLKE:** Yes.
1396 **CAMPBELL:** Chris?
1397 **ROSSI:** Yes.
1398 **CAMPBELL:** Frank?
1399 **SANTOS:** Yes.
1400 **CAMPBELL:** Mark S.?
1401 **SCHORR:** Yes.
1402 **CAMPBELL:** Sarah?
1403 **SUNIGA:** Yes.
1404 **CAMPBELL:** Kezia?
1405 **WANNER:** Abstain.
1406 **CAMPBELL:** Sylvia? I think you're muted, Sylvia. Other button.
1407 **ZINGESER:** Unmute. Okay, can you hear me? Yes.
1408 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you. Motion passes. All right. The next - yes?
1409 **MALE:** Can you note that it is unanimous?
1410 **CAMPBELL:** It is unanimous with one abstain. The next item is letter
1411 number two. This is a letter that was prepared by the leadership
1412 committee with special thanks to Frank Santos, and I helped with it.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 31 of 52

1413 It is a letter to the mayor - sorry, the city council and the chief
1414 of police that is basically asserting the TAC's view that it is
1415 important that when we are looking at change that we engage with
1416 proper change management to make sure that the change is done
1417 correctly and in a way that allows for an effective transition. Does
1418 anybody want to speak on this document? Sorry, first we've got to go
1419 - is there a motion to have the document be sent as described?
1420 **HULL:** So moved.
1421 **CAMPBELL:** Moved by Walter. Do we have a second?
1422 **FEMALE:** I second.
1423 **CAMPBELL:** Any discussion on the document?
1424 **HULL:** Hearing none.
1425 **SANTOS:** Shawn?
1426 **CAMPBELL:** Yes. Frank?
1427 **SANTOS:** This is Frank. One thing I noticed about both letters, both
1428 I think are spot on right as far as what we we're trying to
1429 encourage. I did notice that the opening paragraphs for each letter
1430 are, if I'm understanding correctly, are exactly the same. If I
1431 wanted to add any credibility to these letters, I would probably not
1432 want the opening paragraphs to look exactly the same on each letter.
1433 Just some thought.
1434 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. All right. Any other comments?
1435 **MALE:** I would second what Frank said. That makes sense.
1436 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Do we have a - we can put a motion on the
1437 floor to amend the first paragraph, and basically, you can say the
1438 chair with the oversight of the steering committee will do so. Do we
1439 have motion like that on the floor or -
1440 **MALE:** So moved.
1441 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have a second for an amendment to change the first
1442 paragraph in order so it doesn't match perfectly with the last
1443 letter.
1444 **MALE:** I'll second that.
1445 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Let's do it this way. Is there anybody opposed to
1446 that motion?
1447 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.**
1448 **CAMPBELL:** All right. We'll change the first paragraph of that, and
1449 I'll share it with the steering committee to get the okay prior to
1450 being sent out.
1451 **MALE:** So, Shawn, one thing. I'm a big advocate of not wanting to
1452 slow things down, so procedurally, are we going to have to have
1453 another vote next meeting?
1454 **CAMPBELL:** No. I think we can vote with it, with the amendment, with
1455 the understanding that it is just entrusted to the steering
1456 committee and the chair to take care of it prior to being sent out
1457 with the idea that it's not going to have anything added that's way
1458 out of the context of the letter.
1459 **MALE:** Right. Okay.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 32 of 52

1460 **ANDERSON:** Can I add - can I - I'm not muted. There is some value in
1461 consistency. These letters are coming from the same people, and I
1462 just would offer that the consistency might be of value in the
1463 wording being as it is.

1464 **CAMPBELL:** Any other comments?

1465 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

1466 **CAMPBELL:** How about as a compromise, how about we try to change it
1467 enough so it's not the exact wording but we keep the general sense
1468 of both paragraphs. Would that be acceptable do you think, Sheri?

1469 **ANDERSON:** For me, certainly.

1470 **ZINGESER:** I agree. I agree.

1471 **CAMPBELL:** Is that acceptable for everyone else? All right. Any
1472 other discussion on whether or not we should send this letter?

1473 **KAHAN:** Just a comment. I was in on the discussion that led to this
1474 letter, and the important thing is is that everybody wants to rush
1475 and fix things as quickly as possible, and that's certainly
1476 understandable and in many ways desirable. On the other hand as a
1477 mentor of mine once said, if you want it bad, you'll get it bad, and
1478 we're trying to avoid that.

1479 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you, Jim. Any other comments? Sorry, Sylvia. Did
1480 you have a question?

1481 **ZINGESER:** I think that it shows that we are - it doesn't mean that
1482 we're totally acting, but we are actually saying that we do agree
1483 that something needs to change. It doesn't mean that we're pushing
1484 things really, really fast in my opinion. I know that things will
1485 have to go slower, but at least we're making a statement that we
1486 want to go in that direction. Does that makes sense?

1487 **CAMPBELL:** Yes.

1488 **ZINGESER:** Okay.

1489 **CAMPBELL:** Any other comments prior to voting?

1490 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

1491 **CAMPBELL:** All Right. Sheri?

1492 **ANDERSON:** What?

1493 **CAMPBELL:** We're voting.

1494 **ANDERSON:** Yes.

1495 **CAMPBELL:** We're voting on whether or not to send this letter out
1496 with the understanding that the first paragraph will be modified to
1497 differentiate it somewhat from the first letter. Leslie?

1498 **BRUNKER:** Yes.

1499 **CAMPBELL:** Jillian?

1500 **BURKE:** Yes.

1501 **CAMPBELL:** Marlene?

1502 **AVILES-CABLE:** Yes.

1503 **CAMPBELL:** Myself is a yes. Dave?

1504 **COATES:** Yes.

1505 **CAMPBELL:** Tyler?

1506 **HALL:** Yes.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 33 of 52

1507 **CAMPBELL:** Walt?
1508 **HULL:** Yes.
1509 **CAMPBELL:** Jim?
1510 **KAHAN:** Yes.
1511 **CAMPBELL:** Kwame?
1512 **KINABO:** Yes.
1513 **CAMPBELL:** Gary?
1514 **MARSCHKE:** Yes.
1515 **CAMPBELL:** Brit?
1516 **MASBACK:** Yes.
1517 **CAMPBELL:** Mark M.?
1518 **MILINSKI:** Yes.
1519 **CAMPBELL:** John?
1520 **PAHLKE:** Yes.
1521 **CAMPBELL:** Chris?
1522 **ROSSI:** Yes.
1523 **CAMPBELL:** Frank?
1524 **SANTOS:** Yes.
1525 **CAMPBELL:** Mark S.?
1526 **SCHORR:** Yes.
1527 **CAMPBELL:** Sarah?
1528 **SUNIGA:** Yes.
1529 **CAMPBELL:** Kezia?
1530 **WANNER:** Yes.
1531 **CAMPBELL:** Sylvia?
1532 **ZINGESER:** Yes.
1533 **CAMPBELL:** Letter passes with - unanimously. All right. Moving onto
1534 the third item. This is a recommendation put together by the PS3
1535 Task Force. I will mention that this is not going to be the only
1536 work done by the PS3 Task Force. It's just that this fit nicely into
1537 the work that they were already doing at the time that things were
1538 going on, and I would like to especially thank the PS3 Task Force
1539 for the work that they put in on getting this done. I think it's
1540 most likely the fastest turn around we've ever had in a
1541 recommendation.
1542 **ZINGESER:** I agree.
1543 **CAMPBELL:** The recommendation is that we recommend that the Portland
1544 Police Bureau expand the PS3 program as officers retire by replacing
1545 75 percent of newly opened sworn officer positions with PS3s until
1546 at least a minimum of 75 PS3 positions are reached. We support the
1547 utilizing of funds to grow the PS3 program at a faster rate than
1548 annual number of retirements would allow. We recommend that
1549 performing analysis utilizing call, custody, and use of force data
1550 to better understand what percentage of current calls could be
1551 handled by PS3s. We recommend experimenting with the
1552 responsibilities of PS3s with an eye towards broadening the number
1553 and type of calls they are allowed to handle. We recommend further

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 34 of 52

1554 developing training, directives, and protocols for the bureau to
1555 better establish the PS3 as an integral part of 21st century police
1556 work and finally - and then we also recommend transitioning over the
1557 next four years towards a new officer training system where all
1558 recruits must spend at least one year as a PS3 prior to becoming a
1559 sworn officer.

1560 **ZINGESER:** Sounds good.

1561 **CAMPBELL:** Are there any discussion - oh, sorry. First, do we have a
1562 motion to accept this recommendation?

1563 **ZINGESER:** I make a motion that we accept this recommendation?

1564 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have a second?

1565 **ANDERSON:** Second.

1566 **MALE:** I'll second.

1567 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have any discussion on this recommendation?

1568 **AVILES-CABLE:** Can you hear me?

1569 **CAMPBELL:** Yes.

1570 **AVILES-CABLE:** Okay. It has nothing to do with the recommendations,
1571 but could my name be hyphenated?

1572 **CAMPBELL:** Of course.

1573 **AVILES-CABLE:** Okay.

1574 **CAMPBELL:** What should it be, Marlene?

1575 **AVILES-CABLE:** It's Marlene Aviles, A-V-I-L-E-S dash Cable.

1576 **CAMPBELL:** I will get that fixed.

1577 **AVILES-CABLE:** Thank you.

1578 **MALE:** And I'd like to just - I'd just like to offer as a member of
1579 the committee that put this together, the task force or whatever we
1580 call ourselves, that thanks Shawn for his leadership, and there is
1581 no way that that would have been turned around in the period of time
1582 that we were given had it not been for Shawn's service, so thank you
1583 very much, Shawn.

1584 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you, Gary. We all have - I think it's a team effort
1585 but thank you. Any other comments or discussion on this
1586 recommendation?

1587 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

1588 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Then we will proceed to vote.

1589 **STEWART:** I think Jim has - I think Jim had a comment maybe.

1590 **CAMPBELL:** Sorry, Jim.

1591 **KAHAN:** This is a comment - first of all, thank you very much. It's
1592 a magnificent document.

1593 **ZINGESER:** Right. I felt the same way.

1594 **KAHAN:** This is what people are really talking about when they talk
1595 about defunding the police. It's not taking money - it's not getting
1596 rid of the police. It's repurposing more efficient use of the budget
1597 to do more with the money you've got, and it's really a great job.
1598 Thank you all on the committee.

1599 **ZINGESER:** I second that.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 35 of 52

1600 **CAMPBELL:** Any other discussion? Leslie, are you trying to speak? It
1601 looks like you're muted.
1602 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**
1603 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Let's start with the vote. Sheri?
1604 **ANDERSON:** Yes.
1605 **CAMPBELL:** Leslie?
1606 **BRUNKER:** Yes.
1607 **CAMPBELL:** Jillian?
1608 **BURKE:** Yes.
1609 **CAMPBELL:** Marlene:
1610 **AVILES-CABLE:** Yes.
1611 **CAMPBELL:** Myself is a yes. Dave?
1612 **COATES:** Abstain.
1613 **CAMPBELL:** Tyler?
1614 **HALL:** Yes.
1615 **CAMPBELL:** Walter?
1616 **HULL:** Abstain.
1617 **CAMPBELL:** Jim?
1618 **KAHAN:** Yes.
1619 **CAMPBELL:** Kwame?
1620 **KINABO:** Yes.
1621 **CAMPBELL:** Gary?
1622 **MARSCHKE:** Yes.
1623 **CAMPBELL:** Brit?
1624 **MASBACK:** Yes.
1625 **CAMPBELL:** Mark?
1626 **MILINSKI:** Yes.
1627 **CAMPBELL:** John?
1628 **PAHLKE:** Yes.
1629 **CAMPBELL:** Christopher?
1630 **ROSSI:** Yes.
1631 **CAMPBELL:** Frank?
1632 **SANTOS:** Yes.
1633 **CAMPBELL:** Mark S.?
1634 **SCHORR:** Yes.
1635 **CAMPBELL:** Sarah?
1636 **SUNIGA:** Yes.
1637 **CAMPBELL:** Kezia?
1638 **WANNER:** Abstain.
1639 **CAMPBELL:** Sylvia?
1640 **ZINGESER:** Yes.
1641 **CAMPBELL:** Motion passes with 17 yeses and 3 abstains. Thank you.
1642 The next item on the docket is a report in the patterns in Portland
1643 Police Bureau Force Data Summary Reports. This is based off of
1644 looking at the raw open data that is available for 2019. This was
1645 prepared by me and reviewed by the steering committee. There is
1646 several findings in this report that are fairly consistent with what

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 36 of 52

1647 we saw in a similar report we did in 2018, largely around the fact
1648 that we do see disparities based upon race in use-of-force data
1649 though force has been greatly reduced over the past decade. It also
1650 enters - goes into a deeper dive in differences in the data set
1651 based upon race as well as looks at how the data set can be used to
1652 basically identify possible areas of officers who might be using
1653 larger amounts of force compared to their contemporaries. It also
1654 includes a number of recommendation about data that should be
1655 recorded in the open data set that currently isn't as well as some
1656 considerations and recommendations of ways to change the automatic
1657 flags in the employee information system to better capture some of
1658 the issues that were noted in the report. Do we have a motion to
1659 accept this report so we can begin discussion?

1660 **KAHAN:** Jim. I so move.

1661 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have a second?

1662 **FEMALE:** Second.

1663 **CAMPBELL:** Discussion?

1664 **MALE:** I've got a comment. I saw this, and I had a lot of
1665 commentaries on stuff, and I want to say that Shawn did an
1666 absolutely magnificent job of dealing with all of my wonk-ish stuff
1667 and either fixing things or saying why he couldn't fix them or
1668 finding a third way, and it was just a pleasure working with him on
1669 this, and he needs to be congratulated for doing this thing solo.
1670 It's an amazing piece of work for one man to do.

1671 **ZINGESER:** I agree.

1672 **CAMPBELL:** I would just like to say with - in response to it, it's
1673 something where if somebody who was really good at this statistical
1674 wonk-ish stuff did it, it could even go further. I mean, I'm
1675 somebody whose training is in bridging the gap between people who
1676 handle data and peopled who need the data, and there's people out
1677 there that can really do statistics in a way that I am unable to do
1678 at this time. So, it's not perfect, but I think it's a good step,
1679 and I've talked with Jim about ways that we can improve it next year
1680 when we do something like this.

1681 **ZINGESER:** Oh, good.

1682 **KAHAN:** I have a friend who is a professional statistician, retired,
1683 who may have some time on his hands, and I'm going to try and get
1684 him to help us.

1685 **CAMPBELL:** Further discussion?

1686 **MARSCHKE:** So, I have a question. One of the things that I kept
1687 hearing from the lieutenant that was reporting out use-of-force data
1688 is the fact that there is a lot of the data, some of which you've
1689 recommended or highlighted in your reports, that's accessible and
1690 available but they have no resources for aggregating,
1691 disaggregating, or otherwise breaking down the data to meet those
1692 requests or those needs. Is there somewhere or is it within our
1693 purview to include in recommendations increases in financial and

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 37 of 52

1694 budget resources or other personnel, which is budget resources, to
1695 support those recommendations?
1696 **CAMPBELL:** I would say that would have to be kind of its own
1697 recommendation separate because that's a bigger ask, but I think
1698 it's definitely something as we move forward we should explore in my
1699 opinion.
1700 **MARSCHKE:** But my point being, it does no good to make
1701 recommendations if we're just throwing them into the wind because
1702 there is no will much any resources or any direction to do that. So,
1703 I would recommend that whatever it takes for us to do that that we
1704 consider a separate document or a separate recommendation that would
1705 recommend allocating resources to that particular or any of those
1706 particular recommendations that the people that are reporting out
1707 data right now think would require more.
1708 **CAMPBELL:** Would you be comfortable, Gary, if this was something we
1709 brought up in the September meeting as a way to move forward with
1710 it?
1711 **MARSCHKE:** Absolutely fine with me.
1712 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you. Any other questions or discussion on this
1713 motion? Going once. Going twice.
1714 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**
1715 **CAMPBELL:** All right. We will proceed to vote. Sheri?
1716 **ANDERSON:** Yes.
1717 **CAMPBELL:** Leslie?
1718 **BRUNKER:** Yes.
1719 **CAMPBELL:** Jillian?
1720 **BURKE:** Yes.
1721 **CAMPBELL:** Marlene:
1722 **AVILES-CABLE:** Yes.
1723 **CAMPBELL:** Myself is a yes. Dave?
1724 **COATES:** Sorry, I was on mute. Yes.
1725 **CAMPBELL:** Tyler?
1726 **HALL:** Yes.
1727 **CAMPBELL:** Walter?
1728 **HULL:** Come back to me.
1729 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Jim?
1730 **KAHAN:** Yes.
1731 **CAMPBELL:** Kwame?
1732 **KINABO:** Yes.
1733 **CAMPBELL:** Gary?
1734 **MARSCHKE:** Yes.
1735 **CAMPBELL:** Brit?
1736 **MASBACK:** Yes.
1737 **CAMPBELL:** Mark M.?
1738 **MILINSKI:** Yes.
1739 **CAMPBELL:** John?
1740 **PAHLKE:** Yes.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 38 of 52

1741 **CAMPBELL:** Chris?
1742 **ROSSI:** Yes.
1743 **CAMPBELL:** Frank?
1744 **SANTOS:** Yes.
1745 **CAMPBELL:** Mark S.?
1746 **SCHORR:** Yes.
1747 **CAMPBELL:** Sarah?
1748 **SUNIGA:** Yes.
1749 **CAMPBELL:** Kezia?
1750 **WANNER:** Abstain.
1751 **CAMPBELL:** Sylvia?
1752 **ZINGESER:** Yes.
1753 **CAMPBELL:** Walter?
1754 **HULL:** Abstain.
1755 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. It passes, 18 yeses, 2 abstains. Thank you. All
1756 right. Let me close up some of these items on the doc so it's easier
1757 to find the ones that I need here. Okay, we have document number
1758 five on the list. This is a letter to city council and the chief of
1759 police voicing our support for a PCCEP recommendation regarding -
1760 that was made in December 2019 regarding changes to the PPA
1761 agreement. This is part of our move to bind more of the groups
1762 together by instead of making our own separate recommendations at
1763 times instead just voicing our support for recommendations. Do we
1764 have a motion to put this on the floor for discussion?
1765 **MALE:** I move.
1766 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have a second?
1767 **FEMALE:** Second.
1768 **CAMPBELL:** Discussion?
1769 **ZINGESER:** I would think that it would be good for us to be able to
1770 work with the other community groups in concert, that it would have
1771 a stronger presentation to the mayor and the city council and also
1772 to the chief of police and the PPA.
1773 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Just so we can put it out there, the recommendation
1774 of the PCCEP included improving Portland's civilian oversight
1775 system, improving the accountability in arbitration rules encased in
1776 the agreement, fixing the public complaint process, instituting an
1777 comprehensive mandatory drug testing for people who are involved in
1778 deadly force incidents, and better managing the secondary employment
1779 of officers who work outside as security for different groups
1780 outside of their normal police work. Any further discussion? Going
1781 once. Going Twice.
1782 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**
1783 **CAMPBELL:** All right. We will proceed to vote. Sheri?
1784 **ANDERSON:** Yes.
1785 **CAMPBELL:** Leslie?
1786 **BRUNKER:** Yes.
1787 **CAMPBELL:** Jillian?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 39 of 52

1788 **BURKE:** Yes.
1789 **CAMPBELL:** Marlene?
1790 **AVILES-CABLE:** Yes.
1791 **CAMPBELL:** Myself is a yes. Dave?
1792 **COATES:** No.
1793 **CAMPBELL:** Tyler?
1794 **HALL:** Yes.
1795 **CAMPBELL:** Walter?
1796 **HULL:** No.
1797 **CAMPBELL:** Jim?
1798 **KAHAN:** Yes.
1799 **CAMPBELL:** Kwame?
1800 **KINABO:** Yes. Sorry, I was muted.
1801 **CAMPBELL:** No worries. Gary?
1802 **MARSCHKE:** Yes.
1803 **CAMPBELL:** Brit?
1804 **MASBACK:** Yes.
1805 **CAMPBELL:** Mark M.?
1806 **MILINSKI:** Yes.
1807 **CAMPBELL:** John?
1808 **PAHLKE:** Yes.
1809 **CAMPBELL:** Chris?
1810 **ROSSI:** Yes.
1811 **CAMPBELL:** Frank?
1812 **SANTOS:** Yes.
1813 **CAMPBELL:** Mark S.?
1814 **SCHORR:** Yes.
1815 **CAMPBELL:** Sarah?
1816 **SUNIGA:** Yes.
1817 **CAMPBELL:** Kezia?
1818 **WANNER:** Abstain.
1819 **CAMPBELL:** Sylvia?
1820 **ZINGESER:** Yes.
1821 **CAMPBELL:** Motion passes with 17 yeses, 2 noes, and one abstain. All
1822 right. Next is a letter to the mayor and city council supporting a
1823 PCCEP recommendation made on June 23, 2020 concerning the police
1824 duty to intervene. It's - this one was selected to be included due
1825 to the fact that it does specifically mention the need for training,
1826 looking at ways to help officers be in a position to intervene if
1827 they see other officers performing things that are against
1828 directives or policy of the police bureau or would otherwise out
1829 life in danger. Do we have a motion to put this on the floor for
1830 discussion?
1831 **ZINGESER:** I make a motion.
1832 **MALE:** Motion.
1833 **ZINGESER:** Oh, go ahead.
1834 **MALE:** You can second, Sylvia.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 40 of 52

1835 **ZINGESER:** Okay, I will do that. I second.
1836 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Discussion?
1837 **KAHAN:** (Inaudible) was not - had not (inaudible) -
1838 **CAMPBELL:** You're breaking up a little bit there, Jim. Jim?
1839 **HALL:** (Inaudible).
1840 **CAMPBELL:** What was that Tyler?
1841 **HALL:** Can we hit Rewind?
1842 **MALE:** Looks like his video is frozen up.
1843 **CAMPBELL:** Yeah. I did talk with Jim about this, so I do have an
1844 idea of what he was going to state. There is the fact that the
1845 legislature has passed some laws since this recommendation was
1846 initially made. Oh, there you are. Are you back, Jim?
1847 **KAHAN:** I'm back. Can you hear me?
1848 **CAMPBELL:** Yes.
1849 **KAHAN:** Well, that's exactly right. The - to what extent has been
1850 this overtaken by events or does it need (inaudible) in light of
1851 what the legislature did?
1852 **CAMPBELL:** That's a good question. We have changed this letter from
1853 its original draft to basically state that we recognize that the
1854 House bill has been made into law on June 30th where police officers
1855 in the state are now required to intervene to prevent or stop
1856 another officer engaged in misconduct. It basically now states that
1857 to meet these new requirements, it is thought that the Portland
1858 Police Bureau needs to clarify, strengthen, and further elaborate
1859 its policies with regards to this subject. And then it goes into the
1860 parts about views on the need for training basically at every level
1861 of the police, integrated fully into all types of training, this
1862 need for accountability and intervention.
1863 **KAHAN:** Okay. For some reason, my draft doesn't have the information
1864 about June 30th, but if you have a more recent draft, then my
1865 objection is taken care of.
1866 **CAMPBELL:** Okay.
1867 **HALL:** I'd like to bring up one point of this that I noticed as I
1868 read through it when it first came through was just about how its
1869 worded with, "The recognition that the failure to intervene makes an
1870 officer culpable in the policy violations they witness." And I
1871 wanted to - I think I get the intent of what this is. There's a need
1872 to make this - to make a witness do this if you're an officer, in
1873 the case of George Floyd - great, you know, solid example of this -
1874 that there is no seeming culpability for witnessing all of that;
1875 however, the thing that isn't clear in the wording of this that I
1876 struggle to wrap my head around is exactly what kind of culpability
1877 is that officer making? Is it that they are responsible for the
1878 exact same level of crime that that officer who is doing that is
1879 committing, or is there some level to that? I think there was
1880 something missing for me that I couldn't really understand what that
1881 meant.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 41 of 52

1882 **CAMPBELL:** Do you have a suggestion of how the wording can be
1883 changed at all or -
1884 **HALL:** I struggle with that, and I think when you're saying you make
1885 the officer culpable in policy violations they witness, I wonder if
1886 there's a way to make mention of with respect to the - with respect
1887 to the level of procedure that is being violated.
1888 **DRURY:** Can I ask you this, Tyler, when you're looking at that, what
1889 do you think the level should be?
1890 **HALL:** Is an officer as culpable if they see something that they
1891 don't remark on, are they as culpable as doing that exact thing
1892 themselves? I don't know.
1893 **DRURY:** The answer has to be yes, and this is the biggest challenge
1894 right now that I'm really frustrated with the police. If you were to
1895 witness a murder, and you were there with them, you would be held
1896 accountable. It's guilty by association, and that's the level
1897 standard that the citizen is held to regardless of if you didn't
1898 know. If they can reasonably - if you knew that something was going
1899 to go down, you would be held accountable to that. And so, but when
1900 we flip it on officers, all of a sudden, it's, like, "Wait, you
1901 know, we want to start changing the levels." And I just feel - I'm
1902 having a really hard time with this. It's, like, civilians are held
1903 to a higher standard than a police officer. How can that be
1904 possible? And I'm not saying you specifically, but I think in
1905 society overall there's just a - I just tweeted about this. There's
1906 just a gap in accountability in what we hold officers to. If the
1907 standard is for a community member that if you witness something,
1908 you are part of it, then the same standard has to be held to
1909 officers.
1910 **HALL:** Yeah, and -
1911 **CAMPBELL:** So, real quick if I can just interrupt. For anybody who
1912 doesn't know, Lakayana is the chair of PCCEP.
1913 **HALL:** Can I just follow up with that? I really take little to no
1914 issue with any of those things you're saying because I do agree that
1915 accountability is sorely lacking in so many cases. I just - I think
1916 murder, yes. Like, when you witness a murder and you don't say
1917 anything, that invokes so many different legal classifications in a
1918 court of law that have been codified. The thing that I don't
1919 understand is maybe the more minor cases, the things where an
1920 officer witnessed something, but it was out of procedure, but - is
1921 ever single procedure followed in every single instance of police
1922 work. I just haven't seen enough of that, and that's the thing I
1923 struggle with. It's not the extreme. It's not the everyday violence
1924 that is extreme but normalized in murder and brutality, it's -
1925 (inaudible) blanket.
1926 **MALE:** There are two things (inaudible) a little bit, but maybe I
1927 can help you, Tyler. One is if a cop - if an officer does something
1928 that is against the law to do it as we saw in Minneapolis -

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 42 of 52

1929 **HALL:** Right.

1930 **MALE:** That's one thing, and if you stand by and don't stop it - if

1931 you're aiding and abetting, that's - you're tantamount to doing it

1932 yourself. If you should have said something and say no because you

1933 were a first day or second day on the job and were afraid of being

1934 violating, you're definitely in violation of police procedure, but

1935 that doesn't mean you're guilty of that major felony.

1936 **HALL:** Yeah.

1937 **MALE:** And when we get down - and the major felony being murder. Is

1938 somebody - is a first-day officer who watches a policeman commit

1939 first or second-degree homicide also guilty of that first or second-

1940 degree homicide, that's a tough call.

1941 **DRURY:** No, it's not. I don't agree. I do not agree.

1942 **MALE:** I'm not saying you're wrong. I'm saying it's not an easy

1943 call. You've got to think about it. There are easier - there are

1944 other ones where we are definitely in agreement. If there's a

1945 violation of police procedure, and you didn't take - say, "Hey, this

1946 is wrong cop procedure," then you're guilty of something which is

1947 perhaps not as bad as the procedure itself but is itself a violation

1948 of procedure and sanctionable for that reason alone.

1949 **HALL:** Can I -

1950 **MALE:** I want to just - if I could just ask real quick -

1951 **CAMPBELL:** Real quick. Real quick.

1952 **MALE:** Real quick. I'm confused here on the idea that a private

1953 citizen is held accountable for crimes that someone else is

1954 committing. I don't believe I have any culpability if I witness a

1955 murder and don't intercede in that murder taking place, at least

1956 legal culpability. You know, and I think in an essence, we're asking

1957 the police to do something that a private citizen wouldn't have to

1958 do, and that is intercede when they see something going on. I think

1959 that we're confusing that and saying that there is a higher standard

1960 for the private citizen. I see it as the exact opposite.

1961 **DRURY:** What I'm saying is so - no, if you - first of all, I think

1962 there should be a higher standard for a police officer.

1963 **MALE:** Sure. Absolutely. Absolutely.

1964 **DRURY:** But the thing - and there's not. The standard is extremely

1965 high for a citizen and not for an officer.

1966 **MALE:** How is it high for a citizen? That's where you're losing me.

1967 **DRURY:** Because - okay. So, I'll give you a couple examples. They

1968 just arrested people who were involved in the North Precinct

1969 protests, right? Tried to set the building on fire. Should they be

1970 arrested? Sure. Absolutely. But officers who have used force against

1971 journalists have not been arrested. Officers who kicked in Brionna

1972 Taylor's door and shot her while she was in her bed have not been

1973 arrested. How is that possible?

1974 **MALE:** That has nothing to do with what we're talking about here

1975 though. We're talking about the culpability of a witness to a crime,

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 43 of 52

1976 not a perpetrator of the crime. So, you're asking for arrest of the
1977 people that committed the crime, which I don't think that anybody is
1978 arguing that that shouldn't be happening. The question in hand is
1979 the culpability of those that are witnessing the crime.
1980 **DRURY:** Yes. As a trained law enforcement officer and you witness
1981 your partners', anybody, you are sworn to protect and serve, and if
1982 you watch that and you don't do something - I don't care if it's
1983 your first day or a half of a day on the job -
1984 **MALE:** That's what we're proposing is that that culpability does
1985 exist.
1986 **DRURY:** Yes. So, I'm saying (inaudible).
1987 **MALE:** And so, that's what we're asking for.
1988 **MALE:** Sorry.
1989 **DRURY:** The standard is not there. It's just not there, so
1990 absolutely it should be - they should be culpable. If you witness
1991 something as a sworn officer, yes.
1992 **MALE:** Which is what we're asking for, I think.
1993 **DRURY:** Yeah. Yeah.
1994 **MALE:** Okay, yeah.
1995 **HALL:** Part of what hung me up was what the word "culpable" meant,
1996 and -
1997 **MALE:** To the full extent of the law.
1998 **HALL:** Okay.
1999 **MALE:** If you witness something, whatever it is. If it's - whatever
2000 that civilian standard is, that's the standard you should be held.
2001 If the person - if you - if they punched somebody and you witnessed
2002 it and you didn't say anything and the punishment for the officer
2003 who punched is that you're, you know, you're disciplined for three
2004 weeks, you should get that same discipline.
2005 **MALE:** Yeah, but we're not. You did it again. You went back into the
2006 committing of the crime. The person who throws the punch absolutely
2007 committed a crime. The person that witnessed the punch and didn't do
2008 anything to stop it did not commit the crime.
2009 **CAMPBELL:** I apologize for muting everybody. We're getting a little
2010 of the rails, and if we want to continue this discussion, I'm going
2011 to institute where you need to ask the chair, and then we will go in
2012 a normal order instead of having an argument back and forth. If
2013 somebody has an amendment or a change they would like to make to
2014 this document, we can do that. I mean, I don't think we're going to
2015 convince each other of the definition of culpable at this moment.
2016 It's obvious that there are some strong opinions both ways. All
2017 right. I'm going to - Tyler, please go ahead.
2018 **HALL:** In lieu of this discussion, I thank you Lakayana for sharing
2019 your point of view. It is one that I - also that I agree with. I
2020 would ask in this letter that we might also add, "culpable in the
2021 policy violations and/or unlawful activity that they witness,"
2022 because I think what is different in that paragraph is the use of

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 44 of 52

2023 the word, "unlawful force by another officer," and it's using that
2024 words very, very specifically. I would add to this to make it clear
2025 that policy violations are one thing, but unlawful activity is
2026 another, and sometimes they are intersecting and overlapping, and
2027 sometimes they are not. But I think making mention specifically of
2028 culpability for unlawful action is, to me, a clearer way to outline
2029 what culpability means. That's my suggestion. I wonder if people
2030 agree.

2031 **CAMPBELL:** So, Tyler, if I understand right, you're basically
2032 calling for an amendment that will add onto that last sentence so it
2033 reads, "culpable in the policy violations and/or illegal activity
2034 they witness." Is that correct?

2035 **HALL:** Unlawful activity, yes.

2036 **CAMPBELL:** Unlawful. Do we have a second on that?

2037 **MALE:** I'll second that.

2038 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Any discussion on the motion? The amendment?

2039 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

2040 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Is there anybody who would be opposed to
2041 changing that sentence that way?

2042 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.**

2043 **CAMPBELL:** All right. We can go back to the main motion now of
2044 discussion with the understanding that that sentence will be changed
2045 to read, "makes an officer culpable on the policy violations and/or
2046 unlawful activity they witness." Who would like -

2047 **MARSCHKE:** Can I call a vote?

2048 **CAMPBELL:** Gary, we have a call to vote. Is anybody opposed to a
2049 call to vote?

2050 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

2051 **CAMPBELL:** All right. We will vote on the document. Sheri?

2052 **ANDERSON:** Yes.

2053 **CAMPBELL:** Leslie?

2054 **BRUNKER:** Yes.

2055 **CAMPBELL:** Jillian?

2056 **BURKE:** Yes.

2057 **CAMPBELL:** Marlene?

2058 **AVILES-CABLE:** Yes.

2059 **CAMPBELL:** Shawn, yes. Dave?

2060 **COATES:** No.

2061 **CAMPBELL:** Tyler?

2062 **HALL:** Yes.

2063 **CAMPBELL:** Walter? Walter? Hold on. Where is Walter?

2064 **MALE:** I think he left.

2065 **MALE:** No, he's here.

2066 **CAMPBELL:** Oh, there you are, Walter. You're here. You need to
2067 unmute yourself, Walter. Well, come back to you, but you need to
2068 unmute yourself.

2069 **CAMPBELL:** Jim?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 45 of 52

2070 **KAHAN:** Yes.
2071 **CAMPBELL:** Kwame?
2072 **KINABO:** Yes.
2073 **CAMPBELL:** Gary?
2074 **MARSCHKE:** Yes.
2075 **CAMPBELL:** Brit?
2076 **MASBACK:** Yes.
2077 **CAMPBELL:** Mark M.?
2078 **MILINSKI:** Yes.
2079 **CAMPBELL:** John?
2080 **PAHLKE:** Yes.
2081 **CAMPBELL:** Chris?
2082 **ROSSI:** Yes.
2083 **CAMPBELL:** Frank? Oh, sorry. Frank had to go, so he's - Mark S.?
2084 **SCHORR:** Yes.
2085 **CAMPBELL:** Sarah?
2086 **SUNIGA:** Yes.
2087 **CAMPBELL:** Kezia?
2088 **WANNER:** Yes.
2089 **CAMPBELL:** Sylvia?
2090 **ZINGESER:** Yes.
2091 **CAMPBELL:** Walter? I'm not sure what happened to Walter, but the
2092 motion passes with 17 - yeah, there is a - you can give a little
2093 thumbs up down in the reactions, Walter.
2094 **HULL:** You can hear me now?
2095 **CAMPBELL:** Yes, I can hear you. Your vote?
2096 **HULL:** No.
2097 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you. All right. That is a total of 17 yeses, 2
2098 noes. Motion passes. All right. The final item on the docket is
2099 number seven. This is a letter to the mayor and - sorry, to the city
2100 council, mayor, and police chief supporting the PCCEP recommendation
2101 for establishing restorative justice training for all members of the
2102 Portland Police Bureau. Now, this is a recommendation from PCCEP
2103 that was actually written by Brit who is a member of PCCEP, and it's
2104 - the basic tenets of it are that the school resource officers had
2105 begun training in restorative justice which is an alternative to the
2106 criminal justice system where you bring together victims and the
2107 people who have committed a crime so they can discuss and together
2108 find a way to move forward as far as negotiating some type of how to
2109 make amends, and it keeps people, especially youth, out of the
2110 criminal justice system which, as we all know, has a way of chewing
2111 people up if they're in there too long. The letter goes a little
2112 further. It states that we support it for the youth programs with
2113 the idea that we should look at expanding it further for other low-
2114 level crimes for adults as well. Do we have a motion to put it on
2115 the floor?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 46 of 52

2116 **MASBACK:** Hey, Shawn, I wasn't going to say anything since it's my
2117 recommendation technically, but just to clarify, obviously we're not
2118 training school resources officers. I may have misheard you, but
2119 that's not a program anymore. I think that in some ways, the
2120 training is based off a restorative training that was given to
2121 school resource officers back when they were a program.
2122 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you.
2123 **MASBACK:** That was probably the language that we used. Yeah, okay.
2124 Thanks.
2125 **CAMPBELL:** Yeah. And that's a correct clarification. Sorry if I
2126 misspoke. It was being trained in the school resources officer
2127 program until that was removed by city council in the -
2128 **MALE:** Right.
2129 **CAMPBELL:** Yeah. And - all right. Do we have a motion to put this on
2130 the floor?
2131 **MALE:** Motion.
2132 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have a second?
2133 **MALE:** Second.
2134 **CAMPBELL:** Discussion? Going once. Going twice.
2135 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.**
2136 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Let's vote. Sheri?
2137 **ANDERSON:** Yes.
2138 **CAMPBELL:** Leslie?
2139 **BRUNKER:** Yes.
2140 **CAMPBELL:** Jillian?
2141 **BURKE:** Yes.
2142 **CAMPBELL:** Marlene?
2143 **AVILES-CABLE:** No.
2144 **CAMPBELL:** Shawn, yes. Dave?
2145 **COATES:** Yes.
2146 **CAMPBELL:** Tyler?
2147 **HALL:** Yes.
2148 **CAMPBELL:** Walter?
2149 **HULL:** Yes.
2150 **CAMPBELL:** Jim?
2151 **KAHAN:** Yes.
2152 **CAMPBELL:** Kwame?
2153 **KINABO:** Yes.
2154 **CAMPBELL:** Gary?
2155 **MARSCHKE:** Yes.
2156 **CAMPBELL:** Brit?
2157 **MASBACK:** Shawn, I forget. Am I abstaining here, or should I vote
2158 yes?
2159 **CAMPBELL:** You can do whatever you choose on this one. I don't think
2160 it's a conflict of interest the fact that you wrote this for another
2161 group.
2162 **MASBACK:** Okay. Then yes.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 47 of 52

2163 **CAMPBELL:** There's nothing that you can personally gain from this as
2164 -
2165 **MASBACK:** Yeah. I just wanted to make sure, but yeah. I'll vote yes.
2166 **CAMPBELL:** Mark M.?
2167 **MILINSKI:** Abstain.
2168 **CAMPBELL:** John?
2169 **PAHLKE:** Yes.
2170 **CAMPBELL:** Chris?
2171 **ROSSI:** Yes.
2172 **CAMPBELL:** Mark S.? Mark, (inaudible) hear you.
2173 **MALE:** Unmute.
2174 **SCHORR:** Sorry, abstain.
2175 **CAMPBELL:** Sarah?
2176 **SUNIGA:** Yes.
2177 **CAMPBELL:** Kezia?
2178 **WANNER:** Abstain.
2179 **CAMPBELL:** Sylvia?
2180 **ZINGESER:** Yes.
2181 **CAMPBELL:** Motion passes with 15 yeses, 1 no, and 3 abstains. All
2182 right. That brings us to the end of the documents. We have one more
2183 thing before we move into public comment. This has been brought up
2184 by several members, and so it was decided to add it here was the
2185 idea of revisiting the recommendation that we made to include
2186 demographic data in police reporting. As it's known, this was
2187 rejected by the bureau, but the idea would be basically to have the
2188 chair with the steering committee's hope draft a letter that would
2189 be sent asking the bureau to revisit it given the current
2190 circumstances of what has changed since that initial rejection. Do
2191 we have a motion to put it on the floor?
2192 **MALE:** So moved.
2193 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have a second?
2194 **FEMALE:** Yes.
2195 **KINABO:** I second.
2196 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Discussion?
2197 **KAHAN:** Jim here.
2198 **CAMPBELL:** Yes, Jim?
2199 **KAHAN:** The demographics are very important. The objection that
2200 well, they're sort of loose and foggy, and we don't really know
2201 what's happening as an excuse for not presenting any at all strikes
2202 me as feeble. Better to specify exactly what the demographics you
2203 are using so then you can say, "Well, there's overrepresentation
2204 relative to this population or this population," but it's a ballpark
2205 that's worth looking at, and it's better than nothing at all. If you
2206 acknowledge the weakness of your data, and that will allow you to
2207 put confidence intervals around it, you can actually make a
2208 statement, especially if the data hits you in the face and they
2209 exceed all confidence interval estimates. I mean, that's better than

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 48 of 52

2210 just saying, "Well, we can't get it perfect, so we're not going to
2211 do it at all."
2212 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you, Jim. Any other discussion?
2213 **SUNIGA:** Hey, this is Sarah. When we initially drafted this
2214 recommendation, you know, I think part of what we proposed was that
2215 caveat of really describing the limitations of using that
2216 demographic data but that it was in service of cultivating a sense
2217 of trust and changing the relationship with the community. And so, I
2218 just really want to put that plug in there too. It's a good-faith
2219 effort to be transparent.
2220 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you, Sarah. Anybody else?
2221 **MALE:** I'll just add into that if I can, Shawn, that while I have
2222 some hesitations behind the data as well, I kind of feel like we're
2223 at this point saying no to something we don't know and that if we
2224 saw the data and saw it presented with the numbers, I think that
2225 this group could make a recommendation based on that or pivot if we
2226 see that this isn't accurate or isn't doing what we hoped it would
2227 do, but right now we don't even know what it will do, so I think
2228 it's worth taking a look.
2229 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you. Any other discussion?
2230 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**
2231 **CAMPBELL:** Right. Going once. Going twice.
2232 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**
2233 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. We'll vote. Sheri?
2234 **ANDERSON:** Yes.
2235 **CAMPBELL:** Leslie?
2236 **BRUNKER:** Yes.
2237 **CAMPBELL:** Jillian?
2238 **BURKE:** Yes.
2239 **CAMPBELL:** Marlene?
2240 **AVILES-CABLE:** Yes.
2241 **CAMPBELL:** Myself is yes. Dave?
2242 **COATES:** No.
2243 **CAMPBELL:** Tyler?
2244 **HALL:** Yes.
2245 **CAMPBELL:** Walter?
2246 **HULL:** No.
2247 **CAMPBELL:** Jim?
2248 **KAHAN:** Yes.
2249 **CAMPBELL:** Kwame?
2250 **KINABO:** Yes.
2251 **CAMPBELL:** Gary?
2252 **MARSCHKE:** Yes.
2253 **CAMPBELL:** Brit? I think Brit had to jump off. Mark M.?
2254 **MILINSKI:** Yes.
2255 **CAMPBELL:** John?
2256 **PAHLKE:** Yes.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 49 of 52

2257 **CAMPBELL:** Chris?
2258 **ROSSI:** Yes.
2259 **CAMPBELL:** Frank is no longer here. Mark S.? Mark S., are you still
2260 there?
2261 **SCHORR:** Yes.
2262 **CAMPBELL:** Sarah?
2263 **SUNIGA:** Yes.
2264 **CAMPBELL:** Kezia had to jump off, and that leaves Sylvia.
2265 **CAMPBELL:** Sylvia?
2266 **ZINGESER:** Yes.
2267 **CAMPBELL:** Motion passes with 15 yeses, 2 noes. All right. Thank
2268 you, everybody. That completes everything on our agenda except for
2269 public comment. Is there anything that people would like to raise
2270 before the TAC before we move into public comment? And I will say
2271 too thank you very much for surviving through us with this longer
2272 than expected meeting. Trying to jam two meetings worth of stuff
2273 into one meeting is not always fun, but I think we've done pretty
2274 well.
2275 **ZINGESER:** Yes, we did it. Thank you, Shawn.
2276 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Anybody else -
2277 **MARSCHKE:** Shawn? Shawn, if I can, yeah. I just wanted to bring up
2278 something that has been floating around in social media around
2279 renaming or recharacterizing our law enforcement community. Tom
2280 Potter I think has been reporting this for quite a while in that it
2281 really need to change the language around how we refer to our law -
2282 what we currently call our law enforcement officers by referring to
2283 them as peace officers. And so, I really would just like to throw
2284 that out as a general comment for the good of the order, maybe
2285 something that can inform and guide our discussions and
2286 recommendations in the future and something that is worthy of
2287 pondering. It's part of changing the culture is to change the
2288 language. That's all I got.
2289 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you, Gary. (Inaudible), you have something?
2290 **BRUNKER:** I have something -
2291 **CAMPBELL:** Leslie, yes?
2292 **BRUNKER:** To add on. I did send the slide deck on a whole training
2293 that helps to get officers to that place where they are called peace
2294 officer as opposed to enforcement, so - and I think, Shawn, you
2295 forwarded that to everybody. So, I would really like if we could
2296 have a conversation about that next time.
2297 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Can you send me an email to remind me, and I'll
2298 bring it up with the steering committee at our next meeting, and
2299 we'll get it (inaudible)?
2300 **ZINGESER:** Good.
2301 **BRUNKER:** Thanks. Okay, great.
2302 **CAMPBELL:** Okay. Tyler and then -

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 50 of 52

2303 **HALL:** Yeah, the thing that I would like to say just at the very end
2304 of this session, and I haven't been as vocal about saying this in
2305 other sessions, is that as a council member, it is for the police a
2306 little bit frustrating to have it be read "our use of force" again
2307 for this quarter and to have yet again the same racial disparities
2308 make very plain on the page, and that's something that has been here
2309 for a while and has been a - has been an awful thing to be seeing
2310 every single quarter and to also have a recommendation to include
2311 census data for Portland be kindly rejected, kindly rejected, and
2312 I would voice my frustration that, again, we're not able to put
2313 those two statistics side by side and yet they exist in the public record
2314 but we just can't see them next to each other. It is very
2315 frustrating, and I really hope that that could change.

2316 **CAMPBELL:** Thank you, Tyler. Anybody else before we move into public
2317 comment?

2318 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

2319 **CAMPBELL:** All right. For public comment, please put something in
2320 the chat so I know who is who. I'm not always seeing these hands
2321 raised. I do see Portland Cop Watch, so we'll recognize Portland Cop
2322 Watch. Dan?

2323 **HANDELMAN:** Hi, yeah. This is Dan Handelman with Portland Cop Watch.
2324 Hello, everybody. Thanks for your very ambitious meeting, and I'm
2325 glad you were able to pass all of those recommendations including -
2326 I really like the idea of you supporting the PCCEP, and I know the
2327 chair has also been in touch with the citizen review committee who
2328 also is making recommendations and statements. This is something
2329 we've been advocating for a very long time in Cop Watch, and it
2330 warms me to see that happening. Of course, about the last comments
2331 you're making about the demographic data, I completely agree that it
2332 was very frustrating to hear members of the police bureau in this
2333 day and age not only kind of gloss over the overrepresentation of
2334 African Americans in the Use of Force Data but to forget the name of
2335 a man who was shot just seven months ago, which is Koben Henriksen.
2336 He was shot and killed by the Portland police, and he said he had
2337 revisit it in order to remember which one it was. It's not that
2338 there are that many shootings in a year. There was another shooting
2339 incident where a man, a houseless man who is mute, this past month.
2340 He was not hit by a bullet, but it's still a shooting incident, and
2341 that should, I'm hoping, show up in the second quarter data. We also
2342 have been complaining for a very long time about how the use of
2343 force in crowd situations has not been included in the quarterly
2344 force data because when you look at how - you know, when you ask is
2345 the Portland Police Bureau using too much force and you look on the
2346 streets now, you see that the Portland Police Bureau is using a lot
2347 of force. I understand the frustration of trying to figure out how
2348 many people they use force against, but certainly they can say how
2349 many times officers launched weapons, hit somebody with a baton,

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 51 of 52

2350 rushed at them, and engaged in other violence which is causing harm
2351 on the community. And, again, you know, the lieutenant said that he
2352 was in pain because he had to redo the data. These people are in
2353 pain because they've been hit by rubber bullets and other
2354 projectiles and inhaled tear gas and other kinds of chemicals. So,
2355 the police seem to no amount understand the harm that they do to the
2356 community is harm to human beings. We're asked all of the time to
2357 think about the police as people, we're - the community is people
2358 too. And I think in terms of the disparate numbers in the force, the
2359 question of whether there is more resistance from people in the
2360 black community may also be partly because of an internal bias where
2361 something is perceived as resistance because of the color of the
2362 person's skin that might not be perceived as resistance when a white
2363 person does it. As an example, Jeremy Christian was taken into
2364 custody while he was holding something in his hand that he could
2365 have used as a weapon; whereas we know that if he were a person of
2366 color, he might not have survived that encounter. So, those are some
2367 of the things I just wanted to say. I also just, as a frustration,
2368 asked for the documents to be mailed to us at about 7:00. I received
2369 them at 8:10 as you were in the middle of your discussion. And so,
2370 I'm hoping you can come up with a better system even if it's putting
2371 shared documents on the screen like some other people do in Zoom,
2372 but I just didn't have them to look at during the meeting, so. But
2373 thank you again for all of your hard work.

2374 **CAMPBELL:** And my apologies for the documents not getting out. That
2375 is something that we will fix before the next meeting. Do we have
2376 anybody else from the public who would like to speak prior to close?

2377 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**

2378 **CAMPBELL:** I would like to say thank you for Lakayana for coming and
2379 attending our meeting. It's always good to get some perspective from
2380 another group and to basically find any way we can to start working
2381 together. I think this is excellent.

2382 **DRURY:** Yeah, I appreciate you having me. I apologize if I
2383 interrupted that section, and I didn't realize if you guys had
2384 public comment at the end, so - but was happy to be here. I really
2385 enjoyed the discussions that you guys had and hope to attend future
2386 meetings and have other PCCEP members attend as well.

2387 **CAMPBELL:** So, I'm sorry for cutting you off in the conversation
2388 there too.

2389 **DRURY:** That's what you've got to do. Nope, that's your role. So,
2390 you've got to do what you've got to do.

2391 **MALE:** I'd like to offer a special thanks to Lakayana and Shawn and
2392 CRC and all of those people for that joint statement that we saw.
2393 It's really the kind of thing that we need to show that the various
2394 review people are unified and concerned, and they can't divide us.
2395 That's important.

2396 **MALE:** Here, here.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 07082020
TAC Meeting / N/A

07/08/2020
Page 52 of 52

2397 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Any other comment? Do we have a motion to
2398 adjourn?
2399 **MALE:** I move to adjourn.
2400 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have a second?
2401 **ZINGESER:** I second.
2402 **CAMPBELL:** Do we have anybody opposed?
2403 **NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE**
2404 **CAMPBELL:** All right. Well, thank you very much everybody for
2405 spending an extra half hour with us tonight. I think we got a lot of
2406 work here done and we -
2407 **ZINGESER:** Yeah.
2408 **CAMPBELL:** I didn't think we were going to get it done this quickly,
2409 so thank you very much. Everybody had a wonderful night.
2410 **ZINGESER:** You too.
2411 **MALE:** Thank you.
2412 **CAMPBELL:** And the new steering committee, I'll be sending an email
2413 out to you guys fairly soon. All right. Good night, everybody.
2414
2415 TAC 07-08-2020
2416 Transcribed 09/13/20 @ 1:34 p.m. Elice Turnbull (0913et01)