

**PORTLAND POLICE BUREAU
Training Advisory Council
Training Division**

Meeting Date: 11/10/2021

KAHAN: I haven't seen Sarah Schurr yet.

CAMPBELL: I don't think Sarah Schurr is going to make it. All right. I'm calling the meeting to order. Welcome, everybody. If you look in the chat, I'll paste it again just in case, but that is the link to the agenda for anybody who would like to look at it. We have a lot of - we have a lot of people here who might be new to the meeting, so I'll go over some of the ground rules. This is the meeting of the Training Advisory Council on November 10th. I am the chair, Shawn Campbell. In general, we record all of our meetings in lieu of taking minutes. These - this recording is then transcribed and put on our website usually within a month of the meeting taking place. If there is any members of the public who wish to make comment, we have a public comment period at the end of the meeting where everyone will be allowed to speak up about anything that they wish to speak up about. With that, we will go ahead and get started. Can we start out with somebody reading the mission statement? How about - let's see. Who (inaudible).

BURKE: I'll do it.

CAMPBELL: Oh. Thank you, Jillian.

BURKE: Not a problem. The mission of the TAC is to provide ongoing advice to the Chief of Police and the Training Division in order to continuously improve training standards, practices, and outcomes through the examination of training philosophy, content, delivery, tactics, policy, equipment, and facilities. The mission of the Portland Police Bureau is to reduce crime and the fear of crime by working with all citizens to preserve life, maintain human rights, protect property, and promote individual responsibility and community commitment.

CAMPBELL: Thank you, Jillian. All right. As our opening piece of business, we need approval of the previous minutes. To make this simple, does anyone have any issue with the minutes as posted on the website for the meeting in September?

ANDERSON: No.

NEWMAN: No.

CAMPBELL: All right. Going once. Going twice. Sold. The minutes are approved as is. All right. We'll move on now into new business. We have a lot of stuff to get through today, so we won't have any delays. We'll start out with Chair Updates. Let's see. Let's start with the chair updates with update on our work with some of the other advisory groups. Let's start out with our work with the coalition of advisory groups, the CAG. Jim is the main

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 2 of 39

representative for the TAC to that group. Jim, would you give us a brief update of our - anything new with the CAG?

KAHAN: Anything new with the CAG? Well, we've sort of gotten into a bit of a kerfuffle with the COCL. The draft second quarterly report said that the Coalition of Advisory Groups had irreconcilable conflicts among its members, and the city should dissolve it or the people who were fighting should resign and all sorts of that, and it became - it was news to us since we meet once a month, and we basically get along fairly well because we have no commitment that we have to agree about everything. We just want to discuss, and we are open to disagreements. So, we have drafted a response to the COCL, and how should I put it? The COCL sort of responded saying, "Well, you know, I have my sources. I have to protect them, but I will withdraw everything I said about the CAG." And then the rest of it I have characterized as using a cocktail napkin to cover a large behind. Stay tuned. It's not over. And that's been pretty much eating us up. In the process of composing the response to the COCL, every single advisory group got involved. Every single advisory group made comments. Every single advisory group had something to add to our response putting the lie to the idea that we can't talk. So, that's it.

CAMPBELL: Thank you, Jim. Do any members have any questions about the work with the CAG currently?

ALL: (None heard).

CAMPBELL: All right. The other area to update as far as the coalitions that we work with, we as well work with the PCCEP and CRC and meet with them regularly. We have continued to meet regularly with the PCCEP on a monthly basis as well as the CRC, and then we tend to meet with various parts of city council advisors, Mike Myers who is the Community Safety Transition Director, and the various leadership team members of the PPB for various discussions on a monthly basis. The city council members have kind of dropped off. We only get about one or two commissioner staff attending these meetings anymore, so there has been some discussion about what's the future point of these meetings. We have a meeting on Friday where the main focus is going to be questions about kind of what is the strategy of the PBB moving forward to deal with the various issues that the PPB is facing. Obviously, there's going to be a lot of questions around what's going to happen with the budget which is currently what's happening in an ongoing city council meeting which is taking place right at this moment.

MARSCHKE: Shawn, can I be the acronym police? This is Gary.

CAMPBELL: Of course, Gary.

MARSCHKE: So, would you explain the acronyms you mentioned earlier?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 3 of 39

CAMPBELL: Yes. The CRC is the Citizen Review Committee which is the citizen's group that oversees the Independent Police Review which is the current accountability body for the Portland Police Bureau, and the PCCEP is the - let me see if I can remember all the letters - the Portland Committee for Community Engaged Policing which was created by the settlement agreement as a group of community members who basically make recommendations to the mayor's office about changes to the police bureau. They're housed in the Bureau of Equity and Human Rights. Any questions about any of the work - the meetings that go on with the PCCEP and CRC?

ALL: (None heard)

CAMPBELL: Thank you. I will say that the work here in the TAC, we have prided ourselves in that we are one of the few groups that actively engages with about every other advisory group that's involved directly within the city with the Portland Police Bureau, and we take a lot of pride with that, and it gives us a lot of connections that we otherwise wouldn't have. So, it's good that this work continues. With that, I don't really have any other updates for the overall Training Advisory Council as our group. I will say that the steering committee has been working over the past few months having strategic retreats, developing some ideas of how we might be able to improve the group over time in areas such as recruitment and retention, the work that we do day to day as well as how we can make sure task forces stay on track and various other things. We're looking forward to getting something out that we can share to the overall group that will then be open for comment and further refinement depending upon the needs of the TAC as a body, but we don't expect to probably have anything out fully until probably the new year. Any questions about that work? Morgan?

MOORE: Yeah, I just - the meeting that, Jim, you were talking about, were there meeting minutes, or is there recording that people can review of that meeting?

CAMPBELL: Are you there, Jim?

KAHAN: What meeting are you talking about, Morgan?

MOORE: The one you were just referencing as far as the CAD? The CAG?

KAHAN: The CAG? Okay the CAG is a self-organized, self-led group which chooses not to publish its minutes or record its stuff because there are members there that don't want other people sort of looking at them, and in some instances, this is a very good choice on their part in my opinion. And that was part of the COCL - the COCL, the acronym, Mark, is Compliance Officer and Community Liaison. It's a bunch of people in Chicago that are supposed to make sure that the settlement agreement is being adhered to. Another thing, the COCL took all of these private groups to task because they didn't have

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 4 of 39

their minutes in the Portland Police Bureau website, which of course they have no obligation to do so.

MOORE: Thank you, Jim.

ANDERSON: Jim, could you explain just which - who those groups are and how they identify themselves?

KAHAN: Certainly. Six of the groups represent diverse communities throughout Portland. They include the African American Advisory Council; the Asian and Pacific Islander Advisory Council; the acronym is ASC, they used to be called the sexual minorities roundtable, and that's a better description of who they are; the Muslim Advisory Council; the Slavic Advisory Council. How many have I got? Am I missing any yet? The Latino - the Latino Advisory Council. That's six of them plus the Behavioral Unit - Police Behavioral Unit Advisory Council and us. The two of us, the Behavioral Unit and us, are a different type than the other six. We do have people that we talk with, in our case, the Training Division and the BHU, the Behavioral Health Unit. We talk to them. And Mental Health Association people are very prominently displayed. Their mark is part of that as well. So, those are the eight groups that belong to the Coalition of Advisory Groups.

CAMPBELL: Any other questions before moving forward?

ALL: (None heard).

CAMPBELL: All right. Moving forward, the next - pardon me. The next item is an update from the Training Division on their activities.

GJOVIK: There we go. Hey. Good evening, everybody. I know I've met a few of you guys at the strategic retreat in the steering committee meetings. My name is Chris Gjovik. I'm the new captain at the Training Division. I took over in, at least, in mid-September and have tried to hit the ground running but drinking through a little bit of a fire hose here. So, we've got a lot of stuff on deck for 2022. It's going to be a really busy year. Just a few of the things we're working on right now, and actually the last part of 2021: To wrap up 2021, we have a Supervisor In-Service that starts next week. We have a PS3 Academy that starts the first week in December. We have a coach's school that is going to be, I believe, the first part of January. Our annual In-Service starts the second week in January. Our Advanced Academy starts the second week in February. So, we have three distinct programs that are going to be all running at the same time which is incredibly personnel and facilities intensive. So, we are going to be basically running our tails off. And then the rest of the year, we've got all sorts of other things we need to plug in. We've got two hours of ABLE training. We've got a second day of In-Service that's going to land in the fall, and that will likely surround our new force policy that's going to be implemented between now and then. We have a second Advanced Academy that's coming in

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 5 of 39

fall. Undoubtedly, we'll have more crowd control training, and we're constantly making content to put up on our LMS, our Learning Management System website, so people can do self-paced learning on new directives that come out and new techniques, tips and techniques, legal updates, and things of that nature. So, I know a little bit about what you guys do, probably enough to be dangerous at this point, after sitting through the steering committee meetings. So, I appreciate your little bit of grace as I try to get my bearings. But I'm excited to be here, and this has been a great learning experience for me. And along with me being new, Jason Jones who just hopped on his camera there, is the new training lieutenant who took over for Greg Stewart, so I'll let him introduce himself.

LT. JONES: Welcome, everybody. I think I met many of you last session. I'm Jason Jones. I'm the acting lieutenant of the Training Division. And a little bit about me, I've been a longtime satellite instructor with the Training Division teaching ethics, procedural justice, crisis intervention, enhanced crisis intervention, deescalation, and some of the softer skills. I'm also a firearms instructor. So, it was really exciting to be a part of this team, and I look forward to continue working with all of you. If you ever have any questions, I'll put my email in the chat, and I welcome any questions you might have.

CAMPBELL: Thank you. Is there any questions about the current activities of the Training Division? And please feel free to speak up. I can't see everyone because we have a lot of people in the room today.

ANDERSON: I will ask, when will you allow ride alongs?

GJOVIK: Yeah, that's a great question, and that's ultimately up to the chief's office. It's a bureau-wide thing. We still have pretty significant COVID restrictions on our workplace, so as soon as those are lifted - I believe the next goal date is right after the first of the year for people to start coming back to work in earnest. I'm really hoping that holds true and people stay healthy and we can do that. We've really missed having people out on ride alongs and exposing people to the work we do. Kind of along that note, I - before the meeting, I was talking to Shawn. It really was surprising to me that you folks haven't been invited to see our trainings in the past, and I would like to change that and make sure that we have a Training Advisory Council presence when we're developing our classes so you guys actually can see what we do and have input, real-time input, before we take these classes to, you know, to our In-Services or to our Advanced Academies and things like that. So, I'll be working with Shawn to try to get on - or to get on his schedule and make sure that we have a couple people that show up to

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 6 of 39

the - basically, the final dress rehearsal piece, of these trainings so we can get your input before we go live.

ANDERSON: Thank you.

GJOVIK: You bet.

CAMPBELL: Any other questions? Yes, Jonathan, we usually hold public questions and comments to then, though if you want to put it in the chat, we can see about maybe getting it answered. Thank you. Phil, did you have a question?

LEVINSON: Yes. I participate in the Interfaith Peace Action Collaborative, and we do have retired officers and current officers participating, and we've broken up into some groups over the last several weeks where we talk about issues related to how Portland wants to be policed, how people of color want to be policed, and a variety of issues. And one of the things that popped up in one of those meetings was having citizens from the community actually come and look at some of those training scenarios to comment how they'd react under those circumstances. So, I just thought I'd throw that out.

GJOVIK: Yep. I appreciate that, and Shawn and I are working to make that happen, so. That's one of the goals of - the goal is to make that happen before our 2022 In-Service that starts in January.

CAMPBELL: Any other questions?

NEWMAN: Can I ask a question? Isn't that the point of the TAC, actually?

GJOVIK: That was my understanding. That's why I was a little shocked that it hasn't happened, so. I don't know how we got to the point we did, but after doing some research, it didn't seem like there was any reasonable barriers to prevent this from happening any longer, so.

CAMPBELL: To clarify one thing, the TAC has historically been able to come to dry runs in the process throughout for at least the last four years that I know of. What we're talking about is actually the opportunity to see some actual training where they're actually giving the training at the time.

GJOVIK: Correct. Yeah. So, this - you'll be able to observe the student interactions with the instructors. You know, obviously, not being involved in the scenarios, kind of a sole observer role, but actually be able to see the final product. I think it gives a little bit better experience than seeing how, you know, seeing the original product that is sometimes rough when we're doing dry runs. So, I'm hoping this is a better experience for you folks.

LEVINSON: I think the reason I raised that, I know that TAC is supposed to be involved in that. My view is the TAC isn't totally representative of a lot of members of the community who might view issues related to policing very differently than we do.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 7 of 39

GJOVIK: Yep. I completely understand. We work closely with Lauren and her office at the IO as well. So, we're going to start here, and we're going to see how we can expand it and see how it works and go from there. So, we've got to - we have to have a starting point at some place, so this is where we're going to start for now.

CAMPBELL: And I'll say, Phil, too, that is an issue that's been brought up in a little bit in the strategic retreats, but it's something that - it's on my radar as well as how we can make sure that a diverse group of people have access to see things.

LEVINSON: And I know it's not swept under the table, but sometimes if somebody doesn't say something, it sort of goes away.

CAMPBELL: I totally understand. Do we have any other questions concerning the current work of the Training Division?

ALL: (None Heard)

CAMPBELL: All right. I will say - clarify a few things before moving forward. There have been - and I should have done this at the beginning. My apologies. There have been a few changes in the agenda compared to the first one that got sent out. We did send out an update. Just a couple changes are that originally in the agenda we had that we were going to get the quarter three Use of Force Report tonight. That is not going to happen because it has not been released to the DOJ yet. So, we cannot get it before the DOJ. So, that will be taking place at our January meeting. However, we will still get the follow up that we asked for in the increase in the use of force in the first half of 2021. The other change is that we will be, which is what we're going to move into next, is we did have some members able to attend the ABLE training that the police had which is the police intervention - I can't remember all that ABLE stands for, but it's basically officer - training for officers to intervene when other officers are doing something they see as problematic or wrong. This was a training that was required by the - was one of the things that came out of 2020, and it was both supported by the DOJ as well as many of the advocacy groups. It's out of Georgetown University. I'll open it up to the members. I'll start out with Jim and open it up from there since Jim wrote the report that's on the website, and I'll put the link here in the chat.

KAHAN: No, I did not.

CAMPBELL: And I'll give a chance for everybody who attended that training to speak up as well. Jim?

KAHAN: I did not write the report. All six of us wrote the report.

CAMPBELL: My apologies.

KAHAN: Bottom line is we were very impressed. This could be a game changer for the PPB. And there was a lot of good things that were going on there. Like everything else, it can be tweaked. It can be improved. For example, the ABLE is a course that is required by a

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 8 of 39

new law that was passed this year. Basically, it says that if a cop sees another cop doing something illegal or out of policy, you've got to stop them and/or report them if certain kinds of things, and they've got to do that. And so, this is a course that's doing it. The Portland Police Bureau is the only unit that has been approved by the people in Georgetown to teach this course. And that's a good news/bad news story about the course because, in my opinion, Georgetown is too close - they're putting too close a hold on it. It's hard to adapt it to the particular circumstances of the unit on which you're - the unit that's receiving it, and there may be differences you want to emphasize. They control the slides. You can't modify the slides, but the pattern was getting very close to doing really nice things about that. I'd like to defer to anybody else who wants to talk about it. Morgan, you look like you want to say something.

MOORE: I'm moving too much. Phil, do you want to ask a question first? You disappeared.

LEVINSON: Go right ahead, Morgan.

MOORE: (Inaudible) is I think there's a lot of potential. I agree with what Jim is saying that Portland is a unique city, and there's some unique - I would like to see it personalized as much as we can, but there are issues with that as well. And I do think though that there's a lot of potential for culture change, and there seems to be really good buy in, and the team, the trainer team, is just working their butts off. So, I believe there's a lot of hope in it. Patrick, I'm going to call on you now. You were there.

KAHAN: Jill?

LEVINSON: Some of the things that -

BURKE: Yeah, you were, weren't you?

KAHAN: Your hands up. That's why I said, "Jill." Yeah

BURKE: Oh.

LEVINSON: I also want to point out that one of the components for ABLE is for officers to identify when other officers are having mental health and personal problems and to help to intervene in those problems before they have a negative impact on that officer's performance. And I know one of the issues has always been anonymity. I mean, in the military, it's - historically, it's been a problem to say that you have some mental health or some crisis issues that are interfering with your job, and that's a great way to never get promoted. And ABLE is - has - my understanding of the presentation was that there is - there are officers who are trained to assist other officers who are having personnel problems, personal problems, and it is totally anonymous. The other thing that I find beneficial about this program is that Georgetown has created a three-year follow up to see how effectively the training is incorporated into

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 9 of 39

the daily practices of what officers do. And I also find that it was very beneficial to know that officers were trained - as part of the training, were essentially encouraged to ignore rank when dealing with issues. If there happens to be a sergeant on the scene who is doing something inappropriate, it is okay for a patrol officer to step in, and there are - and it was very good in terms of showing strategies for how to do that so that you're really not doing it in a confrontational way but in a supportive way.

CAMPBELL: Would anyone else who attended the training like to comment on it?

ZINGESER: Sure. I was really encouraged by the program, but it showed about three different ways to intervene. And I think they showed one clip in Seattle that actually took place of how to actually do that intervention, and it was during a protest and where two officers, one was putting on the handcuffs to the person, and the other one was trying to hold the person down so that they could put the handcuffs on, and that person actually put his knee on the guy's neck, and the other officer noticed it and just quietly pushed his knee off. And so, there - I think that as this is taught that officers will learn when to intervene, and the other piece of that is to not be upset that you've been intervened, to teach them how - that this is to save them as well as to save the situation. And this up in Seattle during this crowd control event, that was - they didn't - they had - he only had a few seconds in which to take an intervention, and I just thought that was really a good real-life example. They had other examples that they had staged, and I thought that they were good. I'm encouraged.

KAHAN: Morgan. You raised your hand.

MORGAN: (Hearing nothing)

KAHAN: Okay. One thing that was not part of the curriculum but we found out was that the PPA, the Portland Police Association, is in favor of ABLE training. I think that would blow some people's minds. But they see that it is in the benefit of all of the officers to have this kind of blame-free way of getting better. So, I thought that was very promising.

CAMPBELL: Any questions from any of the TAC members to the group that attended the ABLE training?

MOORE: I'll add one final thing here that was probably more relevant here than the wellness update later, and I don't want anybody on the Wellness Team who is here right now to miss it, that there is - I'm all about, like, positive reinforcement too, and there is talk about - one of the things I brought up and questioned was will there - how can we recognize what's going well, right, so that it's not always just ridicule, ridicule, ridicule towards what is happening poorly with the PPB, and what is the community's

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 10 of 39

responsibility to acknowledge that some things are going well? And so, there was - there is already talk of, like, an ABLE reward system or some kind of recognition system for interventions that go really well, and I think that that's a really important thing to keep an eye on and to, you know, hold with a lot of love and honor.

CAMPBELL: Barry, I believe you had your hand raised.

NEWMAN: Yeah. Actually, I would add to Morgan's statement, I think - you know, that was not why I raised my hand, but, you know, I think it's important that the community can acknowledge that the Portland Police Bureau is actively trying to improve. You know, it's not like they're sitting there, you know, hunched over with their arms crossed holding their breath until they turn blue. I think that there is an active involvement on a lot of levels for - you know, for them trying to improve. So, I think there should be - somewhere along the line, there needs to be some community recognition that that's the case and that change doesn't happen necessarily overnight and that everything is not going to magically be better. But what my question was to the people who went to the ABLE training, which is why I actually raised my hand, is that, you know, getting to a culture of a blame-free environment is nearly impossible given the fact that in almost no venue that I've ever seen where people talk about having a blame-free environment, you know, where criticisms or where issues that get raised are supposed to be done in a way that enables positive change without casting dispersions and pointing fingers and, you know, impairing people's careers, for example. I've almost never actually seen that happen. So, is there some means that's being developed to really create that culture, you know the blame-free culture where people can be criticized and where it is done in a, you know, to sound a little trite, you know, in a loving and caring way to make - to help people get better rather than - you know, and to correct problems rather than to be blaming people and having it impair their career.

CAMPBELL: Phil?

LEVINSON: Yeah. My impression was that there is no requirement, unless there is a violation of policy or law, that requires an incident of intervention. For example, the one that Sylvia pointed out in the Seattle circumstance where the officer had his knee on the person's neck, and another officer with him just moved that knee out of the way, those kinds of things, as I understood the training, are not reportable. These are just basically benign kinds of interventions that resolve a potentially problem situation. So, for example, that would be a situation. You have a situation where an officer sees another officer might be having personal problems, kind of talking to him and encourage him to talk to one of the people who are available with the bureau to help them through any kind of

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 11 of 39

personal problems. That's not reportable. It's all done anonymously. Other situations that were pointed out in the training is, for example, there was a situation that was presented early where somebody was taken into custody, and instead of their hands being handcuffed behind their back with their palms outward, they were placed handcuffed with their palms together. The officers involved did not search the suspect appropriately, and as a result, that person while be transported was able to get his hands onto a weapon and kill the officer who was transporting him. So, those are - so, the idea is to encourage intervention to prevent harm. And those situations where you are intervening to prevent harm and no policy or law is violated, that is not reportable. It's just totally between the people on the scene. So, there's no threat there.

CAMPBELL: Thank you. Jim?

KAHAN: To answer the question, "Has anybody ever seen this work," my answer is yeah. I've seen it a lot. I've done work in transportation safety. I've done work in appropriateness of care. I've done work, actually, with the police, admittedly in the Netherlands, which is a different universe, but where a non-blame - a non-blame principle is the guiding principle, and it changes culture. And the good news is that it changes culture in better than a snail's pace. It's usually a pretty good twitch. So, as I said, I think this is very promising. There's no guarantee that it will work, but there - I don't see anything that's more promising coming down the pipe right now.

CAMPBELL: Jim. Any other questions or comments?

ALL: (None heard).

CAMPBELL: From anybody before we move forward?

BUCKLEY: Shawn, if I might just make one comment towards this conversation, because we've been involved in this, obviously, from the time we first explored it, is that in following up Barry's comment, I think it's important for the group to know that this wasn't a reactive training. It wasn't the result of the statute that was passed by the Oregon legislature. In fact, we had initiated our involvement with this training long before that was passed. ABLE, you know, came from - New Orleans started up the program which was called EPIC at the time and got so much demand from other police bureaus that they were swamped. And so, Georgetown University Law Center agreed to take it over on a national level. And it's by application. The cities, you know, have to - the police bureaus have to apply and make commitments to the organization including not only having the, you know, 10 hours this year but three more years of at least two more hours a year to continue this, so it's not just a one and done. And the bureau applied and was accepted. It was something that DOJ also was supportive of because Jonas Geissler was - you

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 12 of 39

know, works on the New Orleans case as well. But it's something that the bureau - you know, it was even talked about when Chief Outlaw was here, and then Chief Lovell obviously, you know, picked up on it and was very anxious to - for the bureau to get involved in it. And so - and I think from all the reports, it is going very well, that the team is - the teaching team is doing a great job, and in fact, a team from D.C. from the program actually happened to be in Portland recently and watched and wrote a very, you know, very laudatory critique of what the team is doing here in Portland. So, we were very pleased, and we are very committed to continuing this and hopefully getting to your culture change as you mentioned, Barry. That's the whole point of this, so thank you.

CAMPBELL: Just for clarification, the training is ongoing right now with the bureau as far as In-Service, is that correct?

BUCKLEY: The training is going now. It ends in December, I believe. Everybody in the bureau will be through it, and they're actually now looking at whether we will do one for non-sworn in the bureau. So, it's something that, you know - and, you know, I know that Jim brought up that the PPA was against it, and most of the members - we did have, you know - I mean, clearly had some concerns because there are, you know, people that think about this. You know, when they initially heard about it, we were concerned, but all the - I think most of the members have found it to be a very worthwhile training, and all have said really positive remarks about it. So, I think it's well accepted by the members who have gone through. What we will do is have the two-year - next year in 2022, there will be the follow-up class sometime during 22.

KAHAN: Mary Claire, I want to make clear. I was told that the PPA is in favor of ABLE training and that my source is Jamie Resch.

BUCKLEY: Oh, yeah. No, absolutely. That's what I mean. There is - I mean, we -

KAHAN: You said - I heard the word *against*. Maybe that's not what you said.

BUCKLEY: Oh, no, no. Sorry. No, no. Absolutely not. I think they were - we were very pleasantly surprised at how open and receptive and accepting all the members have been who have gone through it. So, again -

KAHAN: I have yet to talk to a member, over more than a dozen, who did not think it was a really good training.

BUCKLEY: Yep. Yeah. And that's a good thing. I think that's a good sign for - to your point about changing culture.

CAMPBELL: Excellent. Thank you. Any other last questions or comments before we move forward?

ALL: (None heard)

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 13 of 39

CAMPBELL: All right. So, since this was feedback that we gave to the bureau, it's already been given to the bureau; however, we do do a procedural vote to put it on our website permanently. Currently, it's only on draft form, so I will go - I will entertain a motion to permanently post this feedback on our website.

NEWMAN: So moved.

CAMPBELL: Anybody have a second?

ZINGESER: I second.

CAMPBELL: All right. I will call the rule. Your votes can be yes, no, or abstain. Patrick?

ALEXANDER: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Sheri

ANDERSON: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Jillian?

BURKE: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Shawn is a yes. Nathan?

CASTLE: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Cheryl?

EDMONDS: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Tyler?

HALL: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Albyn?

JONES: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Jim?

KAHAN: Yes

CAMPBELL: Phil?

LEVINSON: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Gary?

MARSCHKE: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Morgan?

MOORE: I'm sorry. Posting the ABLE information?

CAMPBELL: No, we - so, the feedback that we gave and the document that -

MOORE: Ah, yes, yes, yes. Yes. Thank you.

CAMPBELL: No worries. Never apologize for a clarification before you vote on something. Barry?

NEWMAN: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Chris?

ROSSI: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Mark?

SCHORR: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Sarah?

SUNIGA: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Kristina?

URSIN: Yes.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 14 of 39

CAMPBELL: Sylvia?

ZINGESER: Yes.

CAMPBELL: Are there any members that I've snuck in that I missed when I called the rule?

ALL: (None heard)

CAMPBELL: Seeing none, the motion passes, 18 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain. The feedback will be permanently placed on our website for public viewing. Thank you, everybody. All right. And I - before we move forward, I would just like to recognize that the TAC members who attended were Sylvia Zingeser, Morgan Moore, Phil Levinson, Kwame Kinobo, Jim Kahan, and Cheryl Edmonds. So, I would like to thank very - thank you very much to all of you who attended. It's greatly appreciated for the time that you took. It was an entire day that you spent in the middle of the week watching this, and so it's appreciated. All right. Moving forward. The next item on the agenda is a follow up on the increase in uses of force in the first half of 2021 from the Force Inspector's office. Lieutenant Chris Lindsey was going to give this presentation, but he was unable to make it tonight. So, instead we have Shannon Smith from that office, and I believe, Mary Claire, you had something you wanted to state as well.

BUCKLEY: Yeah. I mean, I want to first explain and apologize for sending out that report. I guess as you well know we got behind, and in the last time the force inspector was here, we covered - caught up on three quarters. And so, we just finished the materials, and you know, I wasn't - you know, to be honest with you, I had a lot of balls in the air and wasn't thinking, and we sent it to you saying that we were going to cover it tonight when I realized this morning that, in fact, the report isn't even due to the DOJ until the 15th. And so, we shouldn't really be, you know, talking about it or making it public. And to answer your question, Dan, that's why it's not posted yet. It will be posted on the 5th - next Monday the 15th. It did go out to the TAC members, you know, the presentation for tonight. We will have the force inspector provide that at your January meeting, but at the same time, we knew from your - from the last presentation, both the bureau and you had questions about some of the data that came out of those three reports and some - what looked like some trends or what have you. And so, they were going to cover tonight - you know, go over the deeper dive that they have done into that data to try and explain to you some of the issue that were - that became apparent in those - in the last presentation we had. Unfortunately, Lieutenant Lindsey had a family emergency. He left, but Shannon Smith, who is my senior force analyst on the team, is here and frankly did most of this research so is well equipped to go over with you the report that they have prepared in response to the data that came out of those three quarters. So, I apologize for

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 15 of 39

jumping the gun tonight and - but hold on to those reports, and we will cover them again, the third quarter, in January. So, thank you, and, Shannon, I'll (inaudible).

SMITH: Thank you. Yes. So, thank you for having us tonight, and Lieutenant Lindsey did leave me his notes. He had taken notes in his last meeting that he attended, and you had very specific questions, particularly about two force types. I'm going to share my screen here. Let's see if it will let me. Yes. So, hopefully you can see it. So, this is just the presentation he presented last time which this slide, I think, is where questions came up regarding increases in CEWs and increase in Strikes/Kicks. In particular, in Q2, we had 63 Strike/Kicks, and the CEW applications were 34. So, he did dig into it, and like I said, he gave me his notes, and what he found were - was that there were four cases that basically contributed to those numbers the greatest. There was, in fact - let's see. About 60 percent of the total applications of the 63 Strike/Kick applications, so that's 38 of the applications, are attributed to those four cases. And four of those cases also led to the majority of, or greater percentage, 41 percent, of the CEW applications. So, 14 of those applications were in two of the four incidents. He looked at kind of any commonalities between them, and in two of the cases, the person involved was under the influence of drugs or alcohol, was highly affected by it. They all involved four incidents - four persons who were highly resistive and aggressive. He also did a deeper dive into the involved officers in those incidents, and he looked back one year at their uses of force over that year just to verify that this isn't like officers are changing their practice or escalating, using a tool more often than another, and he didn't find any evidence of patterns in practice or anything like that when he looked into it. It appears to be these four incidents were anomalies or just really big incidents that required officers to use more applications of CEWs and Strikes/Kicks. So, that's where we were at thus far with that. That's what he found. So, that's that piece. I'm going to stop sharing that for a moment. And the document, I believe, has been sent to you previously. I'm going to share this again. It's this one. This, pardon me, Changes in Force Statistics, Q1 2019-Q2 2021, and hopefully you can see this. I know some of the graphs are kind of small, and I don't know how this is coming through Zoom, but if you have it, I'll kind of talk through it in order. So, if you want to follow along on your laptops or whatever you're using, computers/computer screens. So, first up, we were -

CAMPBELL: Shannon? Shannon? Could you possibly go into the view and just zoom it in a little bit?

SMITH: Yes.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 16 of 39

CAMPBELL: Or you could use it down in the bottom right corner. Yeah. There we go.

SMITH: Like that? Does that work better?

CAMPBELL: Yeah. Maybe like one more?

SMITH: Okay. How's that?

CAMPBELL: Thank you. Perfect.

SMITH: Yeah, I know. It's - the numbers are small. Sorry about that.

CAMPBELL: I'm slowly having to accept I need reading glasses at some point. I'm trying to avoid it, so any help you can give me.

SMITH: I refuse to accept that, so good for you. So, we were asked to - why force is increasing so much in 2021, and that's what led to this analysis. And when we looked into it, we realized we were comparing it to 2020, and 2020 numbers were so odd because of COVID and the protests and officers shifting from their normal patrol duties to Mobile Field Force and RRT roles and things like that. So, 2020 just looks very - it doesn't make a lot of sense, and we wanted to show that, and so - or analyze that to make sure that we were correct. And you'll see later, we came up with, like, a benchmark using 2018 and 2019 numbers which we feel is a better benchmark when comparing force because - and I don't want to say throw out 2020. We need to look at 2020, but in terms of comparison, it's a better benchmark because it's pre-COVID. It's pre the protests, but I'll show you that a little later. But just getting started, yes, you can see on the first couple slides - on the first couple graphs here, you can see, yes, cases are up, but when you compare it to 2019, they're hovering, at least on average, right around where we were in 2019. You can also - we also looked at are the number of applications per incident increasing, and again, we found that they're right around where they were in 2019. But you can see there's, like, a huge dip in Q2 2020 which is right around when, you know, kind of prime COVID time, when that first started, and then later you see the effects of patrol switching to Mobile Field Force and RRT roles. And then we wondered are more officers per incident using force and maybe that's why the numbers are up. If there's more officers responding, are they using more force? And you can see there is a slight increase there, and I'll touch back on this when we get to the call priority piece later, but there is a slight increase there. It is slightly up from where we were in 2019.

CAMPBELL: Just to clarify real quick, this is only force for officers on patrol. It does not include crowd control events, correct?

SMITH: That is correct, yes. Yes.

KAHAN: And there were a lot of officers who were on crowd control instead of doing patrols in 2020?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 17 of 39

SMITH: That is correct. Yes. Yes. Hence why we think there's a huge drop off. Other things we looked at - I assume you're all familiar with Directive 1010, the Use of Force Directive, in that there are different categories of force. PPB doesn't have a force hierarchy, but they do have categories of force which largely are influenced by the outcome of subject injury, but it does correlate to the type of force as well. But we looked at that, and we did see that category three or higher events did increase as well in that we're seeing an increase in the use of tools such as CEW, less lethal, aerosol restraint, things of that nature. So, those are areas where we are seeing an increase. And, again, when we get to the call priority piece, that might explain some of it. We are still - this is ongoing analysis. I mean, we do this every quarter. These next charts also show this. So, the first chart here, category three versus category four, shows you how that has changed over time. Category four is this gray line that you can see up here. And, again, it's not quite where it was in 2019, but we are seeing an increase in - pardon me. Category four is the percent of total up here, and the blue is the category four bar raw number. But we are seeing an increase in category three or higher in later 2020 into Q2 2021. And then this next one is the types of resistance and how that has increased over time as well. Again, we're still not proportionally where we were in 2019 there as well. And then the chart here is comparing the Force Data Collection Reports where an officer used a tool versus (inaudible) without a tool. The green indicates less, the yellow indicates more, the scale, so those are just demonstrating what I just told you. So, finally getting into the calls for service piece, and this has been kind of interesting to look at. The next step we're going to look at are custodies, and we're going to do a similar analysis on those. But in looking at Dispatch calls for service and priority level, BOEC call takers, based on criteria that come in from a, someone, a citizen calling in to report a crime or request service, they assign a call priority. And I'm not sure what their criteria is, but if it meets certain criteria, they assign, you know, high, medium, or low priority to it. So, what we have found is that higher priority calls have increased in 2021, and you can see that over here on the left. And (inaudible) make it a little easier. I don't know if you can see my mouse now. But over here on the left, you can see that higher priority calls are increasing when compared to the same period in 2019 but also that low priority calls have decreased. So, they - in 2019, lower priority calls made up a greater proportion of the calls versus now where higher priority calls are making up a greater proportion. And, in fact, it's the first time that they've seen this. Like, we are - Portland Police Bureau has a central analytical unit called Strategic Services, SSD,

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 18 of 39

and they had told us this is the first time they've seen this where there are almost equal numbers of high-priority and low-priority calls. Because typically, it's mostly low-priority calls. So, that's been a new development. That's been unique to late 2020 into 2021. But also in looking at the call types, which call types are not necessarily always correlated to the actual crime behind it, it's just what information the call taker had at the time that they took the call. Sometimes call types get updated when the officer closes the call but not always. So, there is some correlation. It's just not real tight. It's not, like, an offense type or something like that on an offense report, when an officer takes a crime report, but it is somewhat correlated. So, what they found is that call types that are associated with more unpredictable or violent behavior have increased. So, this table down here, sort of mid-page here, things like shots fired has increase which I know is kind of obvious. Assault, domestic violence, those types of calls have increased in - from 2019 compared to 2021. So, going back to the slight increase in the number of officers per call, calls with higher priority, the protocol is that more than one officer responds if available because they're considered potentially - you know, they have criteria in them that could require more officers to respond. So, that could explain why we're seeing a slight increase in the number of officers involved in force cases. But, again, this is something we need to keep track of over time and see if it continues. And then the other thing down here towards the bottom of this table is that lower priority - typical - typically, lower-priority calls like unwanted persons or parking problem or things like that have decreased the most when compared to 2019. This is where we get into - this next page is where we get into the comparisons using the benchmark - so, this 18/19 average is the benchmark that we proposed using for our analysis that we found to be a more accurate, because it's not affected by COVID, and it's not affected by the protests, and this just demonstrates it further where it shows the differences in comparing 2020 and comparing 2021. So, we're thinking in some ways, 2021 numbers are returning to 2019 or the 2018/19 average. But, again, we have to keep watching it. And this is just similar. It's just showing the raw numbers. The other thing that we found is that the number of cases with persons in mental health crisis or drug or alcohol affected or armed has increased compared to 2020, but as well as compared to 2018 and 2019 as well as to that average. So, we're seeing more persons impaired by drug and alcohol; therefore, you know, deescalation could be less effective in mental health crisis and armed persons. And, again, this table just demonstrates that with raw numbers and the percentage of the overall. And then always one caveat to these subject conditions is that, you know, a

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 19 of 39

person can be all three. You know, they could be in mental health crisis, they could be impaired by drugs or alcohol, and they can be armed, so it's not an exclusive category here. Then looking at the current rise is shootings and homicides in Portland. And as you can see, the increase in that activity looks like it kicked off right around Q3 2020, as I'm sure you all know, and has remained pretty elevated, again - and comparing to 2019, you know, it was - yeah, a dramatic increase. So, the rise in force does seem - and the rise in high-priority calls for service also seem to be following that trend where right after Q3 2020, right around Q4, we started seeing, like, the greatest increase in force and particularly in using tools like CEW and less lethal and aerosol restraint. So, that is our findings thus far. I think that's it. Yes? That is in depth, and I guess I'll open it up to questions. Sorry. I went through that pretty fast, so hopefully that made sense.

CAMPBELL: No worries, Shannon. Thank you. Just to kind of summarize my understanding of what you're saying here is according to this report, the big things that are kind of causing what appears to be a spike in force is actually the fact that we've seen a sharp - we're basically returning back to force levels that we used to see in 2019/18 - and 2018 but it looks different because custodies are lower, and there's been a sharp drop in lower-priority calls but not medium and high-priority calls. Would that be fair to say?

SMITH: Yes, that's correct. But then we're also seeing an increase in the force type involving tools such as CEW, less lethal, and aerosol restraint possibly due to, you know, these higher-priority incidents or due to responding to more shooting-related incidents and things like that. We're hoping that the custody data will sort of illuminate a little bit more of this, right, because often force is used as a result of the custody. So, we're hoping that will basically be able to paint a more complete picture of this.

CAMPBELL: All right. I'm going to open up the questions. Please use the hand-raise function on Zoom to make it easy for me. You can find it down in the bottom right in reactions. And I see Morgan. You're first.

MOORE: Thank you. Thank you, Shannon. So, my question is regarding the school incident reports. I work with juveniles, and I'm wondering why are there school incident reports here and not juvenile in general, and what is differentiating that for you?

SMITH: So, the school incident here on this page is referring to the call category which used to be tied to the specific Youth Services Division who would handle school incidents. So, this is a change from Q1 2019. And so, you would expect a decrease of 233 because - I cannot remember, unfortunately, when Youth Services -

MOORE: Are you talking about school resource officers?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 20 of 39

SMITH: Youth Services in general. It did include school resources officers. But yeah, so that was the cause of that decrease, and that's what this is representing. It's a call type, and it decreased by 233 in - when compared to 2019. But, again, I cannot remember when that division - when those officers were moved out of that division into other parts of the bureau. I don't remember timewise, but it's been definitely - I thought it was some time in 2020, but I could be wrong.

MOORE: No, I think you're right. Late 2019/2020, but it's just interesting to me that that would still be on here as opposed to juvenile in general. You know what I mean when that is a separate - that's unrelated to PPB at this point for reporting, right?

SMITH: Well, it's only on here to show a decrease in the call category -

MOORE: Okay.

SMITH: In that it used to comprise this percent high priority. It used to comprise about 20.8 percent of the high-priority call volume, and that has fallen, you know, 233 incidents.

MOORE: Okay.

SMITH: And so, I guess it's trying to show that proportionality that although that comprised of 20 percent of the high-priority - or 20 percent of those were high-priority incidents, the high-priority calls are still increasing in spite of that. So -

MOORE: Thank you.

SMITH: (Inaudible).

CAMPBELL: We've got Jim, and then we've got Gary on deck.

KAHAN: Hi. I'll ask the question I put in the chat. How does PPB compare to the other jurisdictions in all of these changes over the past two years, and are we an outlier in any of them?

SMITH: That we have not looked into yet. Those are excellent questions. I am writing those down. Thank you. No, we have not done that analysis yet on how we're comparing to other jurisdictions. I mean, I do read other reports and stuff like that, but I haven't compiled everything and compared it to PPB, so I cannot speak to that.

KAHAN: I'd love to hear it when you get it done.

SMITH: Okay.

KAHAN: It could be very interesting because (inaudible) say all sort so of strange things.

SMITH: Yeah.

CAMPBELL: All right. We have Gary, and then we have Albyn on deck.

MARSCHKE: Hey. All right. So, this is Gary. So, first of all, clarification. I thought I heard in the report, Shannon, that there was a spike of some sort in low-priority calls?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 21 of 39

SMITH: Low-priority calls used to comprise the majority of the dispatch call types. So, they - the majority used to be a low-priority style call.

MARSCHKE: All right. So, there hasn't been a significant increase in low-priority calls?

SMITH: No. It's been a significant increase in high-priority calls.

MARSCHKE: Gotcha. Do we have a sense of any of that being connected to, you know, the homeless camps? I've been seeing a huge spike in reports about issues with homeless camps and homeless folks on, you know, some of these social networks like Nextdoor and all where a lot of the neighbors are complaining. And so, I'm just wondering if that has - has had any impact on the high-priority calls or if we even know.

SMITH: We, unfortunately, don't know just looking at call data because it's not as rich. We could potentially dig into offense data and see what crime reports are being taken and see if there's anything that can be gleaned from that, but I will note it as something to look at.

MARSCHKE: Okay, cool. That answers my questions.

SMITH: Okay.

CAMPBELL: Gary. Albyn?

JONES: Hi. I was wondering, Shannon, that - so that something I was thinking about in the earlier data that we looked at at the last meeting where things get counted in multiple categories, and also - I mean, so my feeling is that when I look at your graphs and so on, I'm nervous about making any inferences from them because I don't know what - how things are being put into categories and whether they're in multiple categories. So, one particular question that came to mind watching it this evening is the difference between an incident and an action. So, when there is an incident that involves a use of force, say strikes or kicks, what's being counted? Is the number of strikes being counted, or is the incident the count? And that - you know, that can easily lead to weird things showing up in your summary data when you have a single incident or a small number of incidents, you know, if there are multiple strikes or kicks or whatever applications of force. In a small number of incidents, it can inflate the average. So, I'm curious how you think about the difference between incidents and actions. And then also, going back to the graphs if we could, there was a graph you were talking about when you were talking about increases in use of force, and it was a little hard for me to see it. It was too small for my feeble glasses here. I think - was it - no, the one above that. I think it was maybe. Was it that one or the next or one down? I think it was - there were three line graphs side by side and - ah, this looks like

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 22 of 39

the one. So, I couldn't actually look at this, but the one on the far left represents what?

SMITH: High-priority calls.

JONES: Okay. And so, when I look at that graph, I don't see a trend. I see it bouncing around -

SMITH: Right.

JONES: You know, one side or the other. That number - yeah, that number is higher than all the other numbers, but it's not very much higher, and you've got some lower - you know. So, I'm a statistician just for the record and -

SMITH: Right.

JONES: And when I look at that, I just don't see a trend. I see noise.

SMITH: Right. What it's trying to show is that - the number of what the series is trying to show is that the number of high-priority calls is nearly equal to the number of low-priority calls right now.

JONES: Okay. Well, that's different than saying the number of high-priority calls is increasing.

SMITH: Well, it has increased. It is increasing overall, and the percentage of high-priority versus low-priority, you know, the proportion is increasing.

JONES: Well, okay, but the proportion is - you know, that relationship is being driven by the decrease in low-priority calls it seems to me because, again, that does not appear to me that there is a dramatic change in high-priority calls.

SMITH: It's definitely not dramatic, and if you look down here - oops. My window. Oops. Stop this. If you look down a little bit - if you look down here, you'll see - my annotations are everywhere - you'll see that the numbers are not great, right, because we're dealing not with huge changes and same with force. We're not dealing with huge changes. These are not large increases in anything, right. It's just increases.

JONES: Well -

SMITH: So, we're talking about, I guess (inaudible) -

JONES: Again, when I look at the time series, there might be a slight trend in terms of the high-priority calls, but it does not look like much of a trend to me. You know, the relationship between high-priority and low-priority calls is interesting, and I could, you know, imagine reasons for that. You know, I could speculate, but, you know, the point is rather that the change in percentage appears to me to be almost entirely driven by the decrease in low-priority calls rather than by an increase in high-priority calls.

SMITH: I mean, it could be, although certain call types are increasing that are higher priority call types, like in raw numbers.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 23 of 39

JONES: Mhm. Anyway, that - I don't want to derail the rest of the discussion, but I just - I feel like - you know, again, going back to the difference between actions and incidents and other statistical questions, I feel nervous about drawing strong inferences from a lot of these pictures that I'm seeing.

SMITH: Yeah. I wouldn't draw strong inferences. I mean, there's no statistical testing. We haven't done group testing like ANOVA testing or anything like that. It's just trends in proportions or increases. I mean, that's what this whole Applications of Force slide is showing you. That's what Lieutenant Lindsey demonstrated last time. So, there's - this hasn't been statistically tested, you know, using group testing methods or anything like that or controlling for certain variables or, you know, using multi-varying analysis or anything like that. So, this is just general proportional increases or number - and increase in raw incidents or in this case applications of force. So, to circle back to your first part of your question regarding our consideration between applications and instance, we report on applications of force in terms of it's literally the number of times a force type is used, not the number of instance where that force type was used because that's more, I guess, informative. Because if you say that there were - like, using the example of these cases that Lieutenant Lindsey looked into where there were largely 4 cases driving those numbers, that would be reported as 4 versus, you know, 38 applications, right. So, it paints a very different picture as to how much is being used of different force types. So, that -

JONES: Yeah. And I want to see both pictures.

SMITH: In the Force Summary Report, it does report the force types per the person, per demographic. So, we do report force types that way per demographic. I don't remember if that was a request that came from the TAC or one of our other community groups or The Monitor or someone like that, but they specifically requested the number of times, you know, a different force type is used against a demographic, different demographics. So, that is in the Force Summary Report.

CAMPBELL: All right. I'm putting the link to those in the chat. We do need to move forward because we are behind. We have time - Barry, if you have a question, we can have it before moving forward. Oh, you're still muted, Barry. Barry, you're muted. We can't hear you.

NEWMAN: Sorry. My bad. The - partly to address Albyn's questions, also because I had - and I don't know if it's feasible to do this or not, but part of the reason why we're getting this report was because we looked at the last four quarters, and there seemed to be a strong trend going upwards, and that was something that caused concern. However, when you look at things over the last couple of

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 24 of 39

years, really, you know, other than there being a drop in the first, maybe first and second, quarter of 2020, it turns out that we're probably about on par with what was going on before. So, you know, from the standpoint of trends, it doesn't appear that there is a massive trend going upwards other than what it looked like, you know, when you're only looking at four quarters. But one of the questions that I had, and it seems that there is kind of a partial answer there, I was going to ask if there's a metric for the degree of resistance on the part of - you know, on the part of someone who is begin arrested, and there kind of is because there was one - there was a three thing. You know, one was passive resistance, one was aggressive - I forget exactly what it was, and the other one was very aggressive or violent or whatever. What my question would be is is there a way of correlating the number of events, like, in other words, like you said, well, there's - there were 4 cases that accounted for a large number of those. Yes, you see the types of resistance as aggressive, passive, and physical or active. You know, I think that - is there a way of correlating, like, how many of the events that occurred, you know, like 5 kicks, 2 sprays, 3 this, you know, use of a baton - you know how does that match the, you know, an individual who was, you know, in - who was being aggressive, for example? Because you might expect to see that, but if it turns out that there were, like, 17 applications of force against someone who was passive, maybe that's not so good.

SMITH: Right.

NEWMAN: And I don't know - you know, it doesn't appear that there is that, you know, correlation being looked at here, and that's something that might be of some value, I think. That's all.

SMITH: Yeah. I agree. And, yeah, it is very aggregated here because on the left-hand axis here, on this axis, it is the number of applications, but you're right. If it was just breaking out the resistance and then, you know, breaking out the number of applications used and stuff like that, that would be more informative, like, less aggregated, I guess I think is what you're suggesting.

NEWMAN: Yeah. And is there some way - I mean, because aggressive can be categorized probably in a bunch of different ways -

SMITH: Yeah.

NEWMAN: And if someone is pushing back versus someone who is, like, forcibly trying to kick the crap out of the arresting officer.

SMITH: That's true.

NEWMAN: So, I don't know if there's a way of getting a little bit more granular in terms of that description of resistance.

SMITH: It's really tough because in Directive 1010, it defines aggressive resistance in a very specific way, and it isn't that -

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 25 of 39

you know, it doesn't allow us to drill down unless we kind of came up with our methodology on how we're going to categorize, you know, basically on the way the officer is describing it if the officer is describing it based on their training and Directive 1010. So, it's almost like we have to kind of create our own way to subcategorize it or to, you know, recategorize it based on the way they've defined it, redefine it, I guess. So, that - we have talked about that a lot because there is an awful lot in aggressive resistance, and that gets talked about a lot, and yeah. It's a hard one. You know, maybe correlating it with if the person was armed or something like that might provide a little more detail. I don't know. It's just some thoughts, but yes. We struggle with that as well.

CAMPBELL: Okay. We're going to need to move forward. We're nearly 15 minutes behind schedule now. I would just like to say real quick as a closing to the force inspector's office and the force analysts, thank you very much for this prompt return. I know you were also doing it for the PPB leadership, but in the six years I've been involved in this, I think this is the most prompt response we've ever gotten where the bureau has looked into something in detail that we've had questions about and gave us a really well laid out, logical response to it. And I'd like to thank you for that and recognize that that is very much appreciated. All right.

BUCKLEY: Thank you, Shawn. We'll keep trying.

CAMPBELL: I know if I'd picked on you long enough, we'd get along some day.

BUCKLEY: Well, you'll be pleased to know we are finally getting three additional force analysts. These people have done nothing but force for probably the last 18 months, and it has inhibited their ability to do these deeper dives which, you can tell, you know, are very, you know, valuable not only to you but to the bureau. And so, we're very hopeful with the addition of more analysts that we can continue to do these kinds of things. So, thank you for the opportunity to share it with you.

CAMPBELL: Moving forward, the next item on the agenda is an update on officer wellness programs with Sergeant Todd Tackett and Officer Leo Harris to kind of give you the - what we had with the idea of doing this was basically we looked at Restorative Justice as a group and got an update as a group, and now we're doing Officer Wellness. The idea of this is not to replace the work being done by the task forces but rather to give the entire group a broad understanding of what's involved in these subjects so that when it comes time for the recommendations to come out, we're all a step farther ahead than we normally would be. So, we're going to get the update now. PPB, it's on your com as they'd say in Star Trek.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 26 of 39

HARRIS: Shawn, thank you very much. Leo Harris here. I'll introduce myself in a minute. Sergeant Todd Tackett was teaching all day and won't be able to join us, so hopefully I will be able to answer all of your questions. Like I said, my name is Leo. I've been a police officer here in the city since 2001 and worked patrol at Central Precinct until about 2013, and then I came to the Training Division and was in charge of patrol tactics for a few years where I might have met some of you at a community academy or when the TAC started doing the work that they're doing now. So, a huge thank you all to you for your commitment and showing up every night. I know it's a big commitment for you all to be here and do the work you're doing, so we really appreciate it. In 2019, I was fortunate enough to become the Wellness Program Coordinator for a brand new program, so I'm here to give you an update tonight on that. If you have questions, stop me. I know Shawn is pretty good at handling all of that. I'm going to try to share my screen here. Shawn, do I have the ability to share my screen?

CAMPBELL: Caitlyn, does he have -

ATWOOD: I'll take a look here.

HARRIS: How about that? Can you all see that?

CAMPBELL: Yep.

HARRIS: Excellent. All right. And we're off. Like I said, stop me if you have questions. I'll try to make this quick. I know you all are running behind. Shawn asked for just a high-level overview, so I'll be leaving a lot of the little details out, but hopefully this gives you all a good picture. I was very happy to meet the other day with some of your Wellness subcommittee members, and that was really good. I'm looking forward to continuing to meet with them. So, we did start the wellness program in 2019, and our definition, which we just recently changed thanks to comments and feedback from people during the universal review for our wellness directive, is "State of being where a person is physically, mentally, emotionally, socially, and financially healthy." And our goals of the wellness program is to change personal behavior which is really a challenge. We're working on a current directive, but one of the things that directive does not do is mandate that people get enough sleep, have a good diet, stay in shape, et cetera, so we have to do it through a variety of ways. We need to motivate people, we need to train them, we need to try to remove any barriers that might be there so that they can maintain these habits of good fitness which obviously allows them to show up and be a good, productive member of the police bureau serving the community and serving their coworkers also. How we do that is through training and time in the Advanced Academy and also at In-Service. So, after they come to us and get their initial training, they then get yearly annual In-Service

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 27 of 39

training where we, of course, include wellness training and then (inaudible) wellness training time during their work hours which is a new thing which I will talk about in a little bit. One of the first things we did as a wellness program is start a one-year pilot project related to wellness training time during their work hours. That was something we thought that would be very important. We know there's a lot of barriers to making progress in some of these individual personal wellness areas. So, if you've been around the bureau for a while, you'll know that we have a lot of acronyms. An RU is a Responsibility Unit. And so, we had each RU, like, Training Division, each precinct, come up with a wellness committee, and then we helped them figure out trying to incorporate some of this wellness training time into their schedule. There was a maximum of one hour per day, and not every RU could offer that. Some offered much lower amounts, sometimes even as low as 15 minutes a day or every other day. Thankfully, we have some training analysts who had a little bit of time in their schedule. They were able to help us design some surveys and try to collect some data starting with a baseline survey and then a 6-month survey and then a one-year survey to try to show any impact from this new wellness program, obviously, but also this wellness training time during work hours. The project is starting to wrap up, and what it's definitely showing is that the one hour per day had the most amount of impact. As I've heard you all talk about in 2020 several times, there were a lot of different things that happened that affected morale and how people felt about coming to work and their overall wellness. So, this has definitely been something that we've heard back from members that has been really important. So, wellness training time during their work hours allows them to work on things like fitness and nutrition and diet and emotional health which is one of the biggest things. Before, you would have to, outside of work hours, schedule an appointment, drive somewhere, go there in person to meet with a therapist or a counselor, and now members have the opportunity to do that during work hours. And because of COVID, even us who are all here on Zoom tonight, now members can schedule a Telehealth or a Zoom visit which helps take away some of those barriers and makes it easier to do because that's obviously something that is very important that we are pushing. We know all of these areas impact our members and their ability to serve the public and serve each other. And so, we're really excited about this. We're going to try to institutionalize this wellness training time in our directive that I said was - we just pulled it down, actually, from its second universal review. Hopefully, some of you got a chance to look at that. We'd appreciate it if you did and give us any comments. Are there any questions up

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 28 of 39

to this point about wellness training time or anything before I talk about some of the classes that we've offered?

CAMPBELL: I don't see anyone with their hands raised yet, so let's keep going.

HARRIS: Excellent. All right. We'll move right on. The classes we've offered so far since 2019 at In-Service are just some foundational classes for wellness, things that we haven't really offered in the past: Cardiac health; nutrition; stress and resilience, which we've obviously offered several times, but that was a main stay; mindfulness and meditation which was surprisingly well received. I remember telling my bosses if we can get an approval rating of, like, 30 percent, I'd been happy, and it was well above 60 percent of officers that thought it was a good idea/ useful/beneficial to them, so very happy to see that. And then, obviously, the financial class related to savings and retirement and things like that. Another thing we've worked on, and this was a big project; we're still in the middle of it, is our wellness (inaudible) project. Obviously, 2020 was a challenge, and pretty much all of our members, professional staff and sworn staff, were all impacted by it one way or another. Some members were obviously impacted more than others. Our Rapid Response Team, which was phase one as you can see, was there day to day, you know, doing crowd control and interacting with people at protests and riots and things like that, but pretty much every member was impacted one way or another. We even had - you know, we heard from professional staff members who had never envisioned sitting at work in a police bureau building with somebody outside trying to light it on fire. And obviously, that fear and questioning made it really challenging to come to work. And so, our goal through this restoration project was to try to get people back on track and start the healing process. We also had members - I know earlier when I was listening to you talk about school police and them going way, members wellness was definitely impacted. Many of our members were in-school police. They really enjoyed the work that they did. Maybe based on their seniority, they would not have been able to have a day shift with weekends off, and maybe that was possible there, and then almost overnight, they might have ended up on a night shift with middle of the week off based on their seniority. So, not making a judgment about how or why that happened, but what ended up happening was Amy Bruner-Dehnert who was in charge of our EAP program and I have all these members who now their wellness has been pretty severely impacted. And one of the ways we tried to affect that was with this wellness restoration project. Phase three, we are planning. There's some challenges with our professional staff and how much time they can be allowed to go to training which is a challenge. We'd really

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 29 of 39

like to get them the full 10 hours that all the sworn members got, and we're working towards that. And then the command staff, we have not given them their part of the wellness restoration project either because it can be, understandably, a giant challenge trying to manage all of the events of last year, protect your employees, figure out which direction the bureau is going, et cetera. So, for an example of the information that we gave them during this Wellness Restoration Training, this was, I think the typical day. They started off with introduction from the chaplains. They got a class on financial wellness, and then they met with a physical therapist who did some mobility screening and then was able to walk them through some stretches and exercises that would help them if they were trying to work through or rehab physical injuries from last year. They spent a couple hours with a mental health professional, Dr. Stephanie Khan. She's a local provider. She's really good at connecting with our members. A lot of people really felt like that was a valuable way to spend their time. They had a mindfulness class and a class on alcohol and sleep, and then also, we tried to really get them focused on the things that they can control including themselves and their attitudes and things like that as opposed to all of the stuff that's happening around that we can't control. And then, obviously, a reminder and a push to keep them connected to all of the resources and have them remember or know if they didn't know all of the stuff that was available to them to get help. Any questions on that?

ALL: (None heard)

HARRIS: All right. Moving on. The new classes that we had planned for 2022, our sleep class and an alcohol class, obviously both very important. Sleep, I would have really liked to have given much sooner, but we'd like to provide a really comprehensive sleep plan including sleep studies. (Inaudible) we partnered with Washington State University and maybe OHSU and then obviously just a basic class on sleep hygiene and connecting them to sleep centers and stuff like that. Alcohol, obviously very important. We want to remind them of how important it is to seek help and do it sooner than later, and also, one of the biggest things is the impact that alcohol has on their sleep. Hopefully, we will be able to build those and provide those during In-Service in 2022. It might be online, might be in person. We're not sure yet, but we're building those as we speak. The direction of the wellness program: So, what we're working towards first and foremost, right now we're working on getting the wellness directive implemented. It's gone out for its second universal review. Thanks to some of you on here, including Dan Handelman, for providing his comments that really helped us figure out the directive and help us take it in a direction we want

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 30 of 39

it to be. We're going to use that to try to institutionalize the wellness training time and some of these other wellness things that - during In-Service and Advanced Academy. Next big thing we're doing is collaborating with community advisory groups. Probably - I don't know. I shouldn't guess, but several times recently we have been to meetings, either with PCCEP or the TAC or the Coalition of Advisory Groups or one of the other advisory groups that are part of the coalition, to talk about wellness. They're all interested in helping our members heal and grow and become better humans and better police officers, so we appreciate that. That has become a very common thing. This PowerPoint you're seeing here tonight is a condensed version of the - what I've been showing to them which has taken a lot longer than 20 minutes. So, I appreciate you squeezing me in tonight. I know you had a busy schedule. The last thing we're headed toward and that we're really excited about is trying to create a peer wellness coaching program. The Fire Bureau has something similar just related to fitness. They've got 20 or so people/25 people certified as a peer fitness instructor. And so, then other members of the Fire Bureau at different times, because there's night shift and, you know, all these different times, and it's hard to bring in an outside instructor, you'll find one of your peers that have been certified, and they can walk you through nutrition and fitness-type things if you hadn't been to the gym and weren't sure to work out. We'd like to move towards that. Obviously, we have a lot of different shifts and a lot of different members with different needs, and we'd like to potentially use it also as a recruiting and a retention tool. So, we know that there's a lot of members in the bureau that are struggling. We'd like to give them one more thing to focus on, one more benefit for themselves, and obviously, if you're going to train other people in something like this, one of the best ways to learn about it is to train it. So, fitness, nutrition, sleep, meditation, and then obviously the financial component. And that would obviously be a mix of sworn members and then non-sworn members, our professional staff, who would be peer fitness coaches in these areas. Did I see a hand up?

CAMPBELL: Yes. Gary, you've got a question?

MARSCHKE: Yeah, I did. Just real quick. I'm going to try and capsulize this without going into a lot of background or whatever. Is there - are there specific attempts that are being made to normalize officers seeking mental health assistance?

HARRIS: Yes. There's a variety of ways. Obviously, we're encouraging it. One of the biggest things we're doing now that we have a wellness program and not just EAP. So, the Employee Assistance Program has been around for a long time. They have always kind of pushed people to seek counseling if needed, and I don't know

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 31 of 39

that members were really good about it. I think - you know, nationally, I think the law enforcement profession is a little bit slow to be willing to admit that they need help or that they've experienced a lot of different traumatic events that have maybe built up or have affected them. And one of the things we're doing on the wellness side to try to overcome that is encouraging people to reach out ahead of time before they have some traumatic event or before they get into an officer involved shooting and making people aware that it may not be a great fit the first time you go and meet with a counselor a therapist. So, you might need to meet with one or two, but having that number and that name and knowing the person that you're going to call. If at some point you do feel overwhelmed or you want to talk about a specific incident or you end up getting involved in a shooting, you're a lot better off if you already know who you're going to call. That's one of the ways we've tried to normalize that and make that something that is something that people can understand. I think when we explain it that way, people are like, "Oh, that does makes sense. Why wait until I need help?" We are pushing information to members that you're not going to get in trouble. You're not going to have your badge and gun taken away just because you reach out for help and you say, "I'm struggling." The majority of the EAP work and even a lot of the wellness work is confidential, so if somebody says, "Hey, I'm really struggling, and I need to go talk to a therapist," obviously, there are some things that are mandatory that they get reported, but for the most part, that's something that they're working through, and we support them as much as we can. But there's not going to be repercussions on their job which in the past (inaudible) the main barriers for trying to reach out for help.

CAMPBELL: Jim, do you have a question?

KAHAN: Yeah. Well, first of all, thank you very much. This is a wonderful presentation. I'm really glad to hear it. My question is -

HARRIS: Thank you for having us.

KAHAN: It is pretty well that in different communities in Portland, people have different attitudes about mental health, and it's to be expected that this would be reflected in the diversity of people who serve on the PPB. To what extent are you guys tracking or paying attention to that, or how is that working out?

HARRIS: I don't totally understand your question.

KAHAN: Let's try again. Different communities have different attitudes towards what mental health is. In some communities, you'll say, "Oh, you have a - you're mentally ill, and you need to get treatment." In others, you'll say, "There's nothing wrong. You're just a little disturbed, and you'll grow out of it." And there are - you can track different communities with different reactions on this

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 32 of 39

and where they find their solutions. To the extent that the PPB membership is diverse, are you tracking that? Are you adapting to the individual background and culture that your officers come from?

HARRIS: In relation to mental health? I don't know. That's a very interesting question. There are people I'd reach out to get an answer for you because I don't know the answer to that.

CAMPBELL: Morgan, do you have a question?

MOORE: Can I just reframe that one more time because, Leo - Hi. I've met with him with the team wellness earlier, and I think, Jim, if what I'm understanding your saying is that more than community, you're talking about cultural differences in mental health acceptance, right, or what that looks like in different cultural communities (inaudible) for - what's the word I'm looking for? To see if it's working or not. And if I remember right, Leo, there's not a lot of - well, you answered this correctly, but there's not a lot of specific tracking. It's really generalized tracking, right? And so, I don't know if demographically the EAP, for example, app is tracking cultural identity. Does that make sense, Leo?

HARRIS: That does. That does help a little bit, yeah. I don't know - and part of it too is, like, I don't know how we would track or tabulate which culture an officer was from and then correspond that with that group's perspective on mental health, but that does help explain it a little bit, yeah. And a lot of the stuff, obviously, the EAP does is anonymous. So, if somebody reaches out, there are quite, you know, a bit of protections for people so that they can freely reach out. That's obviously one of the reasons, one of the barriers, that we've tried to really remove so that people feel very protected. People, obviously, are very, I don't know, careful with that information, you know, and they don't want to broadcast to everyone that they're struggling or having a hard time. So, there is some tracking done about how many people we're helping and how often we do that, but yeah, it would be - I don't know that we'd have a spreadsheet with officers and which culture they're from and align that with, you know, their perspective on mental health.

CAMPBELL: All right. We're going to have to move forward because we're behind, and we want to be respectful for everybody's time, but I would just like to say real quick thank you very much, Officer Harris, for coming and giving this presentation to us. For some of you that have been around a long time, you might remember that we created a recommendation around this in 2018, and I'll say - I'm actually going to post it in here so anyone who wants to can read it, but if you read through that report and look at the presentation that Officer Harris just gave us, almost everything that we asked for in 2018, that box has been checked or is in the process of happening, and that is - I bring this up to highlight one thing.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 33 of 39

It's, a) there is progress being done, important progress, especially when you consider how much officer wellness touches not just the health and wellness of the officers but also the amount of the complaints and their interactions with the community, the use of force, the ability to retain and recruit officers, and all these different things that we're dealing with right now. It's such a big thing. But it also highlights that a lot of our work is very long term, and we might do something in 2018 and not see it fully implemented until 2021 and not get the effects of it fully until 2024, but we're moving forward, and that's important. I did want to ask one question: Given the importance of officer wellness and given that right now the city council is debating a lot about police budgets amongst many other budgets to handle the issues that we have in the city, and one of the things that really has - I've noted with this is officer wellness has not come up once in this, and I guess what I wonder is is this something that could benefit from more money being put towards it by the city into the bureau specifically for wellness in your opinion?

HARRIS: Well, I would always say yes to more money because I can think of ways it would be very helpful. Yes. There's a whole variety of ways. I mean, we would like to bring in outside mental health specialists to work in the precincts and interact with officers and other members on a daily basis. There's tons of things that I could think of that we would put that money towards that I think would have a significant impact. So, across the board, the answer is yes. And I do know that our office is talking about it a lot. I know that it keeps coming up quite a bit. I do know that the mayor's office has asked about it. So, I know it's on people's minds and that they do care, and I know that you all care. So, I appreciate you very much. I said it early on. I know this is a commitment. A lot of you probably have other things to do at 8:30 at night, and yet you're here helping out your community and helping out the police bureau, and we really do appreciate it. Thanks for squeezing me in.

CAMPBELL: Thank you. Yeah, and I would like to recognize these are recommendations that PCCEP has made as well in the past, so it's good to see this moving forward. And I will also recognize we do have an Officer Wellness Task Force which is working on looking at what currently is happening to recommend some next steps as well which is exciting. With that, we will move into the next part of it which is task force updates, so this is a nice segue. Due to the amount of time that we have, I ask that we keep the updates fairly short. Think about if you had to give a 2-3-minute presentation upon - just tell us what's the current status of the task force, kind of where you are in the process. How about if we start with Officer Wellness just so that's a nice transition?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 34 of 39

MOORE: That would be me tonight, although Kristina is here and so is Patrick. So, if you want to add to this, please do, and I will lower my hand because now I am being that person. And I would say that we have met with Leo and Todd and Amy, and we've started working on getting to know what's going on. And we have several things on our agenda to keep looking into. I don't think any of them are ready for presentation at this point. I think that from my perspective, the most important thing right now is to build relationship, not only within team wellness but within the bureau and the community at large and figure out what the best steps are from there. Patrick? Kristin? Kristina, I'm sorry. Do you disagree or want to add anything?

ALEXANDER: I agree with what Morgan has said because we are just still trying to figure things out, and we're just taking the best steps actions best. So, I agree with Morgan.

CAMPBELL: Thank you. Let's go with the Restorative Justice Task Force. What's your current status? Do we have any members from that task force here tonight?

ANDERSON: I'm here. I'll start talking because I don't see other folks from our group. We are meeting next Wednesday I believe it is to get deeper into this. We've already found out that, or we know, that there is a group within the police department that's already looking at restorative justice, so we don't want to - we can't really get in too much to what they're doing, but what we can do is support them and offer our support and suggestions on what things that we might be looking at, that we are looking at, and help them look at how training might impact restorative justice. So, we'll have more to say about that at our next meeting after we meet next week.

CAMPBELL: Does anyone else from the task force want to add anything?

EDMONDS: So, this is Cheryl. Yeah, we did meet, and what we decided was we were a little bit ahead of what was actually going on in the bureau and that they have just - they're working on what they're going to do with restorative justice. So, we don't really have anything to critique per se or to look at a training that's, you know, already been developed. So, what we're going to do is educate ourselves on what's possible and pose maybe some ideas as they're developing the Restorative Justice Program. So, we have a goal of presenting in the January meeting to this group our recommendations.

CAMPBELL: Thank you. The Crowd Control Task Force.

NEWMAN: Jillian, do you want to say something, or I could just do a brief thing.

BURKE: That works for me, Barry.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 35 of 39

NEWMAN: Okay. We have developed a preliminary list of people to start talking to regarding crowd control, and we're actually in the process right now that we have Doodle polls out for our committee working with Caitlyn to try to set up some of those initial meetings. And I would add that similar to restorative justice, you know, the crowd control training is still in process. So, I think part of our work is going to be looking at what they're doing and offering perhaps suggestions as well as maybe looking at future avenues of work that can be done. So, we're done.

CAMPBELL: Thank you. Does anyone else want to add anything?

ALL: (None heard).

CAMPBELL: All right. Then let's have the final one, the quality assurance task force.

KAHAN: Yeah. All six of us are here right now. We had a meeting a week and a half ago, and all six of us attended that meeting. I think that we've closed off our let's expand in as many directions as possible and see how many pieces of the elephant we can look at, and now we're trying to put together an elephant. And in putting together the elephant, we're getting more of a focus of who do we want to talk to to find out what is really feasible, what is really likely to be successful, and to narrow down what are the types of recommendations that we will make. It is my hope that we will have something close to a draft of a set of recommendations by the March meeting of the TAC. Don't - I don't wish to be held to that, but I think it's entirely within the realm of possibility. And since everybody else is here, if anybody wants to add or subtract anything from what I've just said, please pop in.

ALL: (None heard)

CAMPBELL: All right. Thank you, and thank you to everyone serving on the task forces. It's probably one of the more important things that we do as a group, and it's always behind the scenes, so people don't understand the depth of work that goes into these recommendations. So, it's greatly appreciated. Just kind of closing comments before we move into public comment period. To close out, thank you, everybody for bearing with us. We're going to be a little late, but we're pretty well on time. Our next meeting will be in January, and I'll say as well - there we go. And I'll say as well - sorry, I lost my train of thought there. We will be starting recruiting again. The steering committee will be talking about it at our next meeting, and we will probably be looking at opening up where we'll be putting out for recruiting again on January 1st. So, if you just kind of keep that in mind that you'll probably be getting emails about spreading it out through your networks as well. We'll try to spread it out to as many groups as possible so that we can continue getting a lot of excellent members here in the group. I

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 36 of 39

don't think we're going to have a lot of seats this year just because we have so many people who are so fully engaged which is refreshing and wonderful, but we'll work through that, so just keep an eye out for those emails. And with that, let's move into public comment. To keep this simple, if you'd like to have public comment, please put your name in the chat. I see you already, Dan. So, how about if we start with you? Can you hear me, Dan?

NEWMAN: You have to unmute.

HANDELMAN: Sorry. I have to double unmute my phone because I have a mute on it too. All right. So, yes, I'm Dan Handelman with Portland Cop Watch, and I have a couple comments. Some of them are related to each other. I posted some things in the chat. There are two links in there. One is to a graphic that Portland Cop Watch just updated on Monday showing every officer who's been involve in deadly force since 1992 when we started as a group, and we found out that 18 officers involved in deadly force incidents retired or resigned in this past year, and we encouraged the bureau, the city council, not to allow those folks to get back in the rehire program that they're talking about. And by the way, that city council hearing is still going on about the budget. I testified at that. It started at 2:00, and it's still going right now. The other one - the other link is to our analysis of the compliance officer report. You should have gotten that. I'm not sure if staff had a chance to forward it to you. I only put it out this morning, but one of the things that's in there that resonates with what you were just talking about is the deadly - the force - the amount of force that's been used that has gone up. They show that the force to custody ratio, and I think you might have heard this already, but it went up from about 3.5 percent of custodies that involved force to about 7 percent of the custodies that involved force. And I don't know if that's related to the higher-priority calls or whatever, but that was not part of the presentation tonight, and, you know, you should look at the compliance officer's report and our comments if you have a chance. Just as a side note, this is the kind of thing I do all the time. I'm not trying to single people out particularly, but in our deadly force graphic, Officer Gjovik shows up in a use of deadly force in 2004, the death of a black man named Willy Grigsby. If you weren't aware of that. And again, not - you know, there's no judgment here, but I also was - learned through a city council hearing about the Clean and Safe Program that Chair Campbell is now an employee of the City of Portland working on that - analyzing that program, and I don't know if there's any rules or conflicts about that, but I'm glad to see Chair Campbell still running this group the same way before he was hired by the city. I was a little troubled by the comment that the Coalition of Advisory Groups chose not to put their

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 37 of 39

minutes up, and that's somehow a wise move. We are very - you know, especially if these groups are supposed to be representing the community, it would be good for the public to know what's being said on their behalf. The Behavioral Health Unit Advisory Council has been meeting behind closed door since 2013, but they just this year started doing public meetings every quarter, and it wasn't until the third meeting that just happened in October where I said, "You really should be looking at deadly force cases that involve people in mental health crisis," that the DOJ actually jumped and said - after the chair said, "That's not in our purview," and said, "Who told you that?" And now they might consider looking at deadly force cases through the mental health lens which is a very important thing to do. I was very happy to hear Officer Harris note that Portland Cop Watch - he used my name specifically, but it was from our group - put in comments about the Wellness Directive. In fact, our comment was that every one of the three comments we made on that directive were accepted. Now, our remaining concern is that it refers to customer service, and a lot of times when the police show up to take someone into custody, they're not really a customer who said, "Hey, police, can you come and take me into custody." So, I really think, you know, there might be better language used around that. And so, the Flying Focus Video Bus - another group I'm with is called Flying Focus Video Collective. I told you all I did a show about the Training Advisory Council last year. I don't know if anybody had a chance to watch that. There's a little minute and a half or two and a half long minute that will be on our show, which is our anniversary recap show, this coming week. It's about halfway into the show, and I posted the dates and times that you can watch that in the chat. I hope that the crowd control work group is working also with the Citizen Review Committee. I seem to remember that you started discussing whether or not to support the crowd control work group's recommendations at your last meeting, but I can't remember what the outcome of that was, but they - they also had a meeting today. So, I was at City Council, the CRC crowd control workgroup meeting, and now I'm talking to you all. So, anyway, thank you for your time, and I hope that our comments are helpful. Thank you.

CAMPBELL: Thank you, Dan. Your comments are always helpful and most welcome. Is there any other members of the community who would like to speak up or have any comments or anything?

ALL: (None heard)

CAMPBELL: Al right. Seeing none, I will take -

NEWMAN: Bob Fischer raised his hand.

CAMPBELL: Oh, sorry, Bob. I didn't see your hand. Please - thank you there, Barry. Bob?

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 38 of 39

FISCHER: Hey, actually, Shawn, I put it in the chat too. Hey, listen, I wanted to compliment you on bringing up the reference to how this issue of officer wellness has developed. That really came, as I saw, really sparkplugged by the TAC in pushing this Officer Wellness Program forward. And I'm want to - I'm sort of a dinosaur in that I was sort of back there in those old days, and I'm really impressed with the - what I think of the progress that has gone on in the TAC. I mean, the - I was happy to see you having a better relationship with the Use of Force people. They were responding to the TAC in a way that, you know, that you had apparently questioned. And of course, this ABLE program, this active bystander for law enforcement, to me, that was a bit of a fall out with from what we did with the implicit bias. When we were worried about implicit bias, meaning police officers just sort of implicitly maybe are having a negative reaction towards certain parts of the public, we talked at that time also about, wait a minute, they were probably overlooking things that were being done by fellow officers. And I'm really glad to see that this ABLE program has taken off and is trying to sensitize officers to what their colleagues are doing that may need some help. Anyway, I'm just delighted to see the progress that you all have made with the TAC program. Again, this is sort of a comment from a dinosaur, but I'm just delighted to see what's going on here. And you've got, what, 38 people on the TAC meeting? We never had anything like that. First class. Good. Good.

CAMPBELL: For those of who are newer who might not have guessed, Bob is former TAC member, and it's - Bob, it's really good to see you again.

FISCHER: Thanks.

CAMPBELL: All right. Just for the sake of time, is there anyone else with the public who would like to make a comment?

ALL: (None heard)

CAMPBELL: All right. Seeing none, do we have a motion to adjourn?

LEVINE: I move to adjourn.

CAMPBELL: Do we have a second?

MALE: Second.

CAMPBELL: Do we have anybody opposed who would probably be the most hated TAC member ever if they tried to say - no, just kidding. Oh, Mark, no. All right. Well, with that -

NEWMAN: Most hated tonight. So, no objections.

CAMPBELL: With that, we will adjourn. Thank you very much, everybody, for your time, and we'll see you in January for the next meeting, and all the work we'll be doing in the meantime through the task forces. Everyone, have a wonderful night.

CONFIDENTIAL TAPED STATEMENT

IA# TAC Meeting 111021
TAC Meeting / N/A

11/10/2021
Page 39 of 39

Transcribed 12/16/21 @ 7:27 p.m. Elice Turnbull (1212et01)