



**Accountability Subcommittee Meeting**

**Friday, October 28, 2015**

**1pm-3pm**

**Sellwood Library**

**7860 SE 13<sup>th</sup> Ave.**

**Portland, OR 97202**

**Draft Minutes**

**Members present:**

Tom Steenson

Myrlaviani Rivier

Meeting commenced at 1:00 PM

**Presentation by City Auditor Mary Hull Caballero with Q & A regarding police accountability**

Mary Hull Caballero provided an overview of the Auditor's Office structure. All reports and audits are on the Auditor's website: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/auditservices/27096?>

*To whom are recommendations made?*

Depends on who's being audited. When an audit is published, auditors check back in at the end of the year to see how recommendations are being implemented.

*How are auditors assured their independence and objectivity?*

There are six elected auditors in City of Portland. Other five responsible for executive and legislative branches. Mary's job is to keep an eye on the other six elected officials.

Charter: if an auditor walks into a city office and asks for documents, employees must comply.

Plans to add function on auditor's website where people can suggest audit topics.

A vote of the council can't compel an audit. It's the Auditor's call.

IPR and Internal Review are the two largest offices. 11-12 staff people in each.

*Rochelle asked Mary to talk about the last two police audits.*

Police training audit came out in February 2015. Findings: The Portland Police Bureau (PPB) needed to continue going back to topics covered in prior trainings. Participants did not demonstrate that they'd fully absorbed the information.

*What is the relationship between Auditor and City Attorney (CA)?*

City Attorney provides legal services to every office in the City. The Independent Police Review (IPR), which is part of the Auditor's Office, doesn't provide legal advice.

*Jimi asked if Mary could comment on who collects data, who has access to it, and where conversations and debate occur.*

The model is dynamic and in process of changing. Model chosen in 2001. IPR does intake and interviews, gathers evidence. Now the model is to do intake and monitor all cases. The new piece is because there has been running dissatisfaction from community on how IPR was set up and because the Department of Justice (DOJ) has said IPR needs to be more independent.

The role of IPR and PPB's Internal Affairs (IA) is to gather facts. No public discussion at this point.

At Citizen Review Committee (CRC), if there's an appeal, there is a public comment section.

Mary said she hasn't seen any public discussion at the Mayoral level.

IPR must sign off on case before it goes to the Review Board or to the Chief.

*Rochelle, regarding different oversight systems across the country, asked Mary what kind she would create if she could. Mary said she has focused more on making the current model.*

The DOJ suggested that instead of Commanders making findings, IPR and Police Review make a decision.

Mary has asked for two additional independent investigators.

She would like to get community consensus on the next steps for change.

The goals of COAB are to revisit the system and see if it can be improved. Opportunities: CRC wants to create opportunities for public feedback.

*Tom asked if Mary had seen the COAB's recommendations, and if the DOJ had forwarded them.*

She meets with Jonas regularly who has passed recommendations to her, but she doesn't know if COAB created them.

*Suggestion that if there are some cases the community is skeptical about IA doing, they could go to IPR.*

Mary said IPR usually works on protest cases, juvenile, biased policing cases, etc. There is a need for more investigators. The desired goal is seven.

Concerning the Police Review Board: Mary was impressed by how comprehensive the reviews were. A no stone unturned kind of thing. She was sorry they were not public because they're very thorough and worth experiencing.

### **Discuss/forward recommendations regarding draft Q2 COCL Report**

Only two COAB members currently on the Accountability Subcommittee. Tom was the only AS member present.

Proposal is to gather information on people's feedback. It will be sent out to the Mental Health Crisis Response Subcommittee (MHCRS) in written form with comments from this meeting so MHCRS can turn those into recommendations.

Rochelle:

- Thought COCL was too generous in giving partial compliance for some things. Could have used non-compliance but initial steps taken, etc.
- On the bottom of p. 30 – CIT: Initial training is 40 hours. Concerned PPB doesn't follow the Memphis Model- spread training out over time. It's unclear how many hours at one given time. There needs to be justification for spreading it out over time rather than as a 28-hour class. Concerned that the training is watered down, that it could appear as not as important as other trainings that aren't spread. Would like COCL to weigh in on what it thinks about the spreading out of training. Would like the DOJ expert on Crisis Intervention Training, a psychiatrist, to weigh in on spreading the training.
- p. 33- haven't received documentation of ECIT process. But COCL gave partial compliance. Also p. 38-39 – partial compliance, but PPB provided no documentation... Just two examples.

Jimi would like COCL to give AS info on how PPB has been using their new training facility to implement training changes.

Michele wonders if the spread is partly because we learn something and then go do scenarios, which they have done a lot of this year.

Tom shares Rochelle's concerns. Thinks COCL hasn't been very analytical on PPB's responsibilities in the Settlement Agreement.

Jimi was concerned that COCL still did not have any sense as to what Portland's communities are made of or like. Suggests that COCL reach out and speak to more people within the Portland community that aren't police officers. Perhaps in the quarterly reports say, here's what COAB did, here's where things stand, here's what COAB plans to do in the next quarter.

Debbie asked if it made sense to recommend another category like "not enough data to know?"

Mary Claire emphasized that this is an ongoing process, it's a marathon, this is a legal document that PPB is now trying to implement. PPB is trying to get more clarity on what kind of documentation DOJ wants. Also, police bureaus have not historically collected this kind of data.

Tom mentioned that he recommended at a DSUFCS meeting that COCL should identify who is influencing the COAB. Feels COCL should demonstrate transparency.

### **Selection of non-COAB members for the Accountability Subcommittee**

Amy clarified that AS can't add community members because it needs a majority vote of Accountability members and there are only two members on the committee.

Kalei feels a great chill has been placed on community input to the COAB. Idea of having armed officers in the room with mothers who have lost children to police violence, and have them equally welcome, is a challenge. The community needs to cooperate, find a shared vocabulary. It is possible, it's happening in other parts of the country. Part of being courageous is being patient. Part of patience is practicing kindness.

Time of meeting:

- Rochelle proposes 2<sup>nd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> Monday evening of the month.
- Tom recommends the 2<sup>nd</sup> Mon on-going, or if CEOPS wants to switch night, AS could do third Thursday.
- Presentations should be ready for the 11/9 meeting (2<sup>nd</sup> Monday) 6-8pm, at the COAB office.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.