

Portland City Council Agenda
 Written Testimony - Item 794/776

Agenda Item	Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
1	776 League of Women Voters of Portland			Yes	09/03/24 8:29 PM
2	776 Christian Orellana Bauer, Former Member Police Accountability Commission	Support with changes	<p>As a former member of the Police Accountability Commission (PAC) I would like to advocate that council make further modifications to the draft code as it currently stands. While some improvements have been made since its original publication last fall there are still various changes that would benefit the eventual outcomes of this proposed body, better reduce harm from police violence, and improve trust in both the CBPA and the system of policing as a whole.</p> <p>Some of these include changing panel numbers as mentioned in various communications with the city to the recommendations from the PAC's original draft code and growing the overall total board members from 21 to 33 to manage expected case load and increase capacity to better serve the community, reducing the number of police designees on the nominating committee as this will weaken community trust for our most vulnerable populations, re-implementing various elements of the PAC's original draft code that created more avenues for community input such as appeals, public meetings, as well as all continuous improvement sections of the code to continue adapting to the communities needs as they shift overtime which is very sensible and would provide clear sustainable benefits to the CBPA.</p> <p>The other beneficial changes are numerous but I trust you have heard and will hear them from my fellow former members so I will leave you with these for the time being.</p> <p>The PAC did meticulous research into various best practices of community oversight boards across the country in order to create a system that would best serve the community within our regulatory structures. As it currently stands I am concerned this new body may not be the grand improvement that Portlanders had hoped for when they voted this measure through in 2020. Please consider adjusting the code one final time given the amount of care and consideration that went into developing the PAC's original proposal.</p> <p>With a Desire for a More Just and Equitable Future Always, Christian</p>	No	09/03/24 10:50 PM



League of Women Voters of Portland

PO Box 3491, Portland, Oregon 97208-3491

503-228-1675 • info@lwvpdx.org • www.lwvpdx.org

Date: September 4, 2024

To: Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners Gonzalez, Mapps, Rubio, and Ryan

From: League of Women Voters of Portland
Carolyn Buppert, president
Debbie Aiona, Action Committee chair

Re: City Code for Community Police Oversight Board

The League of Women Voters of Portland began studying policing in Portland in the 1960s and has been engaged in issues related to law enforcement and police accountability since that time. We supported Measure 26-217 and the Police Accountability Commission's (PAC) recommended code.

The League appreciates the improvements the city has made to its draft code since its release last fall. It would benefit, however, from additional modifications that will build trust, incorporate transparency, result in improved policing and accountability, and support a successful civilian oversight board.

Continuous improvement: Effective police oversight systems do more than handle individual complaints. They incorporate methods that capture what is learned from individual misconduct cases in order to facilitate continuous improvement in policing and accountability.

We recommend that the city add provisions for systemic findings, Sentinel Event Reviews, and regular performance reviews of the Office of Community-based Police Accountability and its community board. Systemic findings in misconduct cases identify training, equipment, policy, supervisory, and other issues beyond the individual officer's control. Sentinel Event Reviews are inclusive, comprehensive non-blaming examinations of undesirable events involving the police that aim to avoid future harmful outcomes. Expert performance reviews of the new accountability system will help ensure it performs effectively.

Community Board for Police Accountability -- panel sizes in deadly force cases: The public and city are placing a great deal of responsibility in the hands of the Community Board for Police Accountability (CBPA). The city should avoid policies that will make the board's job more difficult than it needs to be. The draft code calls for a minimum of 11 out of the 21 CBPA members to participate in deadly force and in-custody death cases. We understand investigative files in these more serious cases can be extremely lengthy and are required reading for the panelists. We do not understand why it will take more people to hear these cases under the new system than it does now. Indeed, tying up so many in time-consuming preparation risks board member fatigue and resignations. The code should maintain our current policy of seven panel members in deadly force cases.

League of Women Voters of Portland:

To promote political responsibility through informed and active participation in government.

Public trust in the new system: For years, we have heard that individuals who believe police have harmed them do not trust a system in which the police investigate their cases. The fact that, under the new system, internal affairs will continue to investigate a large number of cases will erode public trust. The OCPA should handle all misconduct complaints from the new system's inception. Furthermore, including law enforcement representatives on the nominating committee will also lead some to doubt the new system's legitimacy.

Complaint Navigator: The draft code appears to allow assignment of a Complaint Navigator only in cases where there will be a full investigation. That would leave complainants whose cases never reach that stage without assistance. In the interest of providing support to all complainants, the city should consider making it clear in the code that complainants are entitled to a navigator from the start of the process.

Right to appeal: An important feature of our current accountability system is the complainant's right to appeal findings in misconduct cases. This right is not included in the draft city code. Police officers continue to have more than one avenue for appeal, while complainants will only be able to appeal dismissals. This imbalance will lead some to question whether our new oversight system is fair to all. In the interest of fairness, the complainant's right to appeal the findings in their case should be restored.

Incorporating transparency: Under the new system, proceedings in misconduct cases will take place behind closed doors, but the CBPA will vote in public. In the interest of transparency and increasing public understanding, a basic explanation of why the complaint was filed, a list of allegations, bureau directives considered, findings, and discipline imposed should be shared at that public meeting and in written reports. Names of officers and complainants can be protected, balancing privacy considerations with the public's right to know.

Misconduct case findings: The draft city code calls for two findings in misconduct cases: sustained or not sustained. It is accepted practice elsewhere and in Portland, however, to use four findings. Findings used in Portland include: sustained, not sustained, exonerated, and unfounded. Four findings allow for more nuanced dispositions and are recommended by national experts. Portland should continue this practice.

Conclusion

The League has worked for years for an effective civilian police accountability system. We expected that with the passage of Measure 26-217, Portland would finally enact a system with jurisdiction over all cases of police misconduct, independent from the police bureau, and governed by a community board. Per the mandate from city council, the Police Accountability Commission designed such a system. The city's proposal adheres to the basic provisions of the charter amendment, but fails to include many of the features that would create the type of system Portland voters supported when they overwhelmingly passed Measure 26-217. Even at this late stage, there is room for improvements to the draft code and the League urges you to carefully consider our recommended changes.

Agenda Item	Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
776	Dan Handelman Portland Copwatch		<p>The PAC was asked to expand on the language in the City Charter using the lenses of equity and other City core values. The Commission spent 20 months doing just that, researching other systems, listening to stakeholders including police, and drafting a detailed plan.</p> <p>As we testified in November, the City Attorney has gutted most of the PAC's proposal. Some pieces of the plan were dependent on other parts, so various problems in the City's plan only became apparent upon further study.</p> <p>The City held public forums in December and July to take feedback. None of our elected officials were at those meetings. That's one reason it's unreasonable that you are planning to vote on this code today. Another is that several suggestions came up in federal court last Thursday that should lead to changes in the Code, but you had already submitted it to the Council Clerk days before the court hearing.</p> <p>* COMPLAINT NAVIGATORS: The current version says that complainants will be assigned a staff person to help them navigate the complex police accountability system "no later than on intake of a complaint by the Oversight System __to conduct a full investigation__." The problem is that, like in the current system, nobody knows whether the complaint will lead to a full investigation, a supervisory review, mediation between the complainant and officer, or if it will be dismissed. This language needs to be fixed (35.040.040 A10).</p> <p>* JURISDICTION: The City Attorney seems fearful that the new Board and its staff will not do a thorough job investigating and making decisions about cases. The current system is failing in part because people who feel they are harmed by the police (a) do not trust police to investigate themselves, which happens in 90% of investigations, and (b) officers are rarely held accountable. The latest IPR report shows that only 5% of allegations by community members get Sustained vs. 50% of those made by officers against other officers. There needs to be a fundamental shift in how these cases are handled. The Code and Charter make it clear that all decisions have to be based on current policy and law, so "what if" scenarios need to stop driving decisions. PAC recommended that every case involving a community member should be investigated by Board staff. Instead, the City has assigned most complaints to Internal Affairs-- with no means for the community member to appeal the outcome, as exists now. The City is also asking the Board to come to Council to expand its jurisdiction even though the Charter allows them to investigate cases "as they see fit."</p> <p>* BIAS: The code requires Board members to make reasonable decisions, including "promptly, fairly, and impartially," "fair, reasonable, objective, and consistent with applicable laws, rules, policies, and procedures." There is no need for language about being biased for or against the police. The City tried to argue that the Boulder Colorado case was different because it had to do with the "perception" of bias instead of "objective demonstration," but that hardly matters if you do not define bias. Copwatch would like to see these clauses eliminated, but now that they are baked into the Settlement Agreement what about a definition like this: "bias for or against the police' refers to Board members _acting in their official capacity_ and failing to make fair, reasonable, objective and lawful decisions. It does not include statements made about the need to hold officers accountable in general, nor statements about the proper way to respond to emergency calls or about funding responders, for example." Remember, the current vague criteria could be used to exclude people who show favor toward the police, not just police accountability advocates. (continued after dashed line in attachment)</p>	Yes	09/04/24 1:45 PM
776	Unite Oregon	Oppose		Yes	09/04/24 2:47 PM
776	Sameer Kanal			Yes	09/04/24 3:22 PM

Mayor Wheeler and members of Council

My name is Dan Handelman, I use he/him pronouns, and I'm both a member of Portland Copwatch and a former member of the Police Accountability Commission.

The PAC was asked to expand on the language in the City Charter using the lenses of equity and other City core values. The Commission spent 20 months doing just that, researching other systems, listening to stakeholders including police, and drafting a detailed plan.

As we testified in November, the City Attorney has gutted most of the PAC's proposal. Some pieces of the plan were dependent on other parts, so various problems in the City's plan only became apparent upon further study.

The City held public forums in December and July to take feedback. None of our elected officials were at those meetings. That's one reason it's unreasonable that you are planning to vote on this code today. Another is that several suggestions came up in federal court last Thursday that should lead to changes in the Code, but you had already submitted it to the Council Clerk days before the court hearing.

* COMPLAINT NAVIGATORS: The current version says that complainants will be assigned a staff person to help them navigate the complex police accountability system "no later than on intake of a complaint by the Oversight System __to conduct a full investigation__." The problem is that, like in the current system, nobody knows whether the complaint will lead to a full investigation, a supervisory review, mediation between the complainant and officer, or if it will be dismissed. This language needs to be fixed (35.040.040 A10).

* JURISDICTION: The City Attorney seems fearful that the new Board and its staff will not do a thorough job

investigating and making decisions about cases. The current system is failing in part because people who feel they are harmed by the police (a) do not trust police to investigate themselves, which happens in 90% of investigations, and (b) officers are rarely held accountable. The latest IPR report shows that only 5% of allegations by community members get Sustained vs. 50% of those made by officers against other officers. There needs to be a fundamental shift in how these cases are handled. The Code and Charter make it clear that all decisions have to be based on current policy and law, so "what if" scenarios need to stop driving decisions. PAC recommended that every case involving a community member should be investigated by Board staff. Instead, the City has assigned most complaints to Internal Affairs-- with no means for the community member to appeal the outcome, as exists now. The City is also asking the Board to come to Council to expand its jurisdiction even though the Charter allows them to investigate cases "as they see fit."

* BIAS: The code requires Board members to make reasonable decisions, including "promptly, fairly, and impartially," "fair, reasonable, objective, and consistent with applicable laws, rules, policies, and procedures." There is no need for language about being biased for or against the police. The City tried to argue that the Boulder Colorado case was different because it had to do with the "perception" of bias instead of "objective demonstration," but that hardly matters if you do not define bias. Copwatch would like to see these clauses eliminated, but now that they are baked into the Settlement Agreement what about a definition like this:
"'bias for or against the police' refers to Board members acting in their official capacity and failing to make fair, reasonable, objective and lawful decisions. It does not include statements made about the need to hold officers accountable in general, nor statements

about the proper way to respond to emergency calls or about funding responders, for example."

Remember, the current vague criteria could be used to exclude people who show favor toward the police, not just police accountability advocates.

* STRAIN ON VOLUNTEERS: The City is requiring a majority of members to vote to pass matters before the Board (35.20.010 C1) and at least 11 of the 21 members to review complex deadly force cases, which means they have to read 1000+ page reports (35.40.050 K). These kinds of requirements will lead to either many meetings being canceled, as we understand happens often with the Police Review Board, and/or member burnout.

* THE WILL OF HALF THE CITY VS. THE PPA: Over 301,000 people voted for a Board with no police officer members. The City found a loophole and is insisting on putting police designees on the nominating committee. In court it was revealed this was a result of bargaining with the Police Association. Those who remember the Community Oversight Advisory Board, the precursor to the PCCEP, know that trying to get police and community members to come to agreement on topics of accountability will lead to dysfunction. These police designees should be removed from the code (35.20.010 B2). Similarly, PAC proposed not having former police officers on staff, to be consistent with the Charter, but the City removed this provision.

We don't have enough time to detail all the other changes, but here are some ideas:

--Ensure that the public can know the allegations that the Board is voting on, rather than just saying "Allegation #1" and "Allegation #2." If the officers are anonymous, why not state the charges on the record? (35.40.060 E3)

--Findings should include re-naming all four current categories with easy-to-understand names, not the two that were decided on by a Deputy City Attorney because it is a "pet peeve" having four. Having more findings leads to a more procedurally just system. (35.10.040 B)

--Panels reviewing non-deadly force cases should have a minimum of five members, not three, to ensure diversity. (35.40.060 B)

--The section on ride-alongs and community academy should be amended to include language such as "or alternative educational opportunities" and the City should discuss ideas with the community, not just among themselves. (35.20.010 G8)

--The City has decided that people who voted for Measure 26-228 knew that would give the Mayor the power to hire and fire the Chief, and thus to take away the Board's authority to investigate from measure 26-217. Not so. The Board should always investigate the Chief as stated in the Charter but if the proposed discipline is termination, then the Mayor should make the final call. (35.10.040 A1)

--All the ideas the PAC put in for continuous improvement should be restored. We can't imagine that these were left out because the collective bargaining units do not want to see their training or the Board itself learn as they goes along.

Thank you

Hello Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners,

My name is Je Amaechi and I am the organizing director at Unite Oregon. For decades, Unite Oregon has worked alongside marginalized communities - including immigrants, refugees, Black, Indigenous, and people of color (IR-BIPOC) - to advocate for their rights. We know firsthand the deep mistrust many in our communities feel towards law enforcement, stemming from a long history of discriminatory policing practices and lack of meaningful accountability.

The passage of Measure 26-217 was a historic step towards rebuilding that trust, by establishing an independent, community-led oversight system with the authority to investigate cases of police misconduct. However, the current code makes a mockery of the strong, transparent, and accountable system envisioned by voters.

One issue is that the code currently limits the assignment of a Complaint Navigator to cases undergoing a full investigation. This restriction leaves many complainants without support during the process. Complainants with disabilities, or those for whom English is not their first language, will be especially affected by this decision. I urge the City to ensure that all complainants have access to a navigator from the very beginning.

The lack of an appeal process for community members is another glaring gap. While officers are afforded multiple means of appealing disciplinary actions, the community is left without any meaningful recourse if a misconduct case is dismissed without a full investigation. Providing an appeals process for community members would be a powerful step towards restoring trust. It would demonstrate a genuine commitment to hearing all voices and ensuring that misconduct allegations are handled with the utmost rigor and impartiality.

The code also includes a clause requiring members of the CBPA to avoid bias for or against law enforcement. The language on bias is overly broad, not to mention it's unnecessary because the code already requires objectivity. Given the fact that it's clear that the police, as well as at least one member of this Council take any criticism of the police to be a biased view, it's hard not to believe that this language around bias will be used politically, to suppress valid criticisms of racist & ableist policing practices. Moreover, the requirement for CBPA members to participate in police ride-alongs could actually end up creating bias towards police, which I suspect is exactly the point.

Another deeply troubling issue is the removal of the requirement for the oversight system to conduct regular reviews and audits of its operations. This would have allowed for a systemic examination of incidents, rather than just focusing on individual officers. Removing this capability is a major setback for addressing the root causes of misconduct. Self-reflection and continuous improvement are essential for any accountability mechanism to remain effective and credible. Eliminating this mandate essentially gives the system a free pass to avoid scrutinizing its own practices and performance. This prohibition of examining systems and providing systemic findings directly contradicts the city's core values. The city has committed to "actions to dismantle institutional and systemic racism". Yet, you have inexplicably taken away the CBPA's ability to investigate and address these very systemic issues. This glaring inconsistency raises serious doubts about your genuine commitment to the principles of anti-racism and equity that you have so prominently espoused.

For far too long, the public's faith in the police accountability system has been severely undermined by the clear conflict of interest inherent in having the police investigate allegations of their own misconduct. Time and again, we have heard from community members who feel that this self-policing approach is incapable of producing truly impartial outcomes. Regrettably, the new proposed system continues to perpetuate this problematic dynamic. By allowing internal affairs to maintain jurisdiction over a significant number of cases, the city is signaling a troubling lack of commitment to addressing this long-standing source of public distrust.

Furthermore, the inclusion of law enforcement representatives on the nominating committee is another deeply concerning element that will only serve to further undermine the body's legitimacy in the eyes of the public. The perception of undue influence is unavoidable when those who are meant to be held accountable are granted a direct role in shaping the very oversight mechanism designed to scrutinize their actions. The community deserves an accountability process that is truly free from the inherent biases and conflicts of interest that have plagued the old system. Anything short of a truly independent and civilian-led accountability system will be seen as yet another empty promise, leading to more resentment and discord.

The stakes could not be higher. The ability to effectively address police misconduct and transform the culture of the bureau hinges on the public's willingness to believe in the integrity and impartiality of the oversight process. By passing this code as is, the city

risks squandering this critical opportunity for meaningful and lasting change. I urge you to carefully consider my recommended changes to ensure the success of the Board.

Thank you for your time and attention to these critical issues.

Sincerely,
Je Amaechi

Mayor Wheeler, Members of City Council,

Thank you for your time today. For the record, my name is Sameer Kanal, and I had the honor and privilege of serving as the Project Manager for the Police Accountability Commission from September 2021 through the presentation of the PAC's work to you in September 2023. I remain a City employee, but I want to be clear that I am not testifying in my professional capacity, so that I may speak to you in a personal capacity - informed by my previous experience as the PAC's Project Manager.

I will focus my comments on requesting an amendment to remove Section 2 of this Ordinance, which is the Emergency Clause that makes this document an Emergency Ordinance. This clause has minimal benefit, but inordinate cost to community input, and trust in the new system.

As you know, an Ordinance is the type of Council document which is used when changing City Code, aka City Law. It generally requires a first reading at one Council meeting, and then a second reading at a later Council meeting, which gives members of the public at least 12 days from the date the City Council's agenda is formally published to understand the document, and two opportunities to take time out of their schedule to show up, or to write testimony. When an "Emergency Clause" is added, the Council guarantees only 5 days from the date the agenda is published, and only one opportunity to give testimony.

In this particular case, the Council would declare that an emergency exists because the City Council is required under the terms of our Settlement Agreement with the federal Department of Justice to approve the final changes to City Code within 3 weeks - 21 days - of the approval of the text by the judge. That happened on August 29 - six days ago. In other words, following the normal process of a first and second reading would allow for the law to be followed, between the Council meetings this week AND the next two weeks.

The other reason noted is to avoid delay in establishing the Community Police Oversight Board. Keep in mind that it has already been 1,401 days since the people of this City voted, by an 82 to 18 percent margin, to establish this board. I am not blaming this Council for that delay, but what I am saying is that it's important to get it right. With the major public input in this process having come during the Police Accountability Commission's work - with over 1,500 people giving direct input, and hundreds more actively observing and attending events and meetings - and with very significant changes being made since that process by a much smaller pool of people, this Council document is the last and most significant time remaining for Portlanders to weigh in. Changing from 1,401 to 1,408 days, a less than one half of one percent increase in the time from the voters' approval to the City Code approval, is a very small delay to allow people to express their views.

Scheduling this six days after the judge approved the final text, five days after the text was formally published for review, during a holiday week in which many people are out of town, and with only one opportunity to weigh in has the result, however noble the intentions, of dramatically reducing the opportunity for the -community- to weigh in on the final version of the

-community- police oversight board, which was not a Council initiative but rather an overwhelming vote of the people of this City.

I know that you, as Councilmembers, believe that City leadership has an obligation to listen to the people of this City, the people who elected each of you as well as passed the ballot measures whose implementation often are the subject of Council discussions. As someone who used to be the staff member supporting both the development of the implementation or transition plan, and the community input into this process, my personal evaluation of this is that the benefit from one more week of community input dramatically outweighs the cost of a less than half of one percent delay given how much has changed from the last time that significant community engagement was done. And it's not just my evaluation - it's yours as well, given that the document says "we need to get this done in 3 weeks" and we're only six days in.

For these reasons, and to ensure that the community police oversight board is supported by the community it will serve, I ask that you amend out Section 2 of the document, give the City seven more days to read and form opinions about the proposed new City Code and structure of the new community police oversight board, and give everyone one more opportunity to weigh in on this over the next two weeks before your deadline under federal law.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my request, and I remain available to you and your offices, as well as the City Attorney's Office, as a resource throughout this process.

Agenda Item	Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
6 776	Anonymous		The public voted for a community board-governed police review and accountability system. This has already been a delayed process that continues to disregard community efforts and feedback, in favor of pushing through a deliberately hindered and less than ideal version of what the public overwhelmingly voted for. Making this an emergency ordinance further disregards public input. Public oversight should not involve police deciding how or who would investigate them. This strips measure 26-217 of accountability and is not the will of the people. In being concerned about bias, assess and address your own bias and be accountable to your constituents by listening to demands for change through true police accountability.	No	09/04/24 4:38 PM
7 794	Anonymous	Support	Very excited to see this go in. Even as someone who doesn't think the Police are evil - I think it's important that we put more governance over the Police here to ensure that they work for the people - build trust. Even if you do everything right, if you're not trusted, you're not effective.	No	09/08/24 7:46 PM
8 794	Charlie Michelle-Westley			Yes	09/10/24 8:36 PM
9 794	Matt LaVine			Yes	09/11/24 8:21 AM
10 794	Sameer Kanal			Yes	09/11/24 11:38 AM

September 10th, 2024

TESTIMONY FOR ITEM #794 WEDNESDAY SEPT 11TH. TO CITY COUNCIL

This is Charlie Michelle-Westley, Indigenous woman of this Land our Home here in what is now called Oregon and Washington where settler colonization perpetrated genocide so you could reside here and attempt to dismantle our ways, degrade us, our culture and land and tried to thoroughly assimilate the survivors into america's culture of racism, capitalism, patriarchy, oppression, nothing less than a government that continues to keep in tack a policing reign of terror to BIPOC and other marginalize communities.....which continues today to keep rules, policies, laws, etc. that only benefit those in power more specifically certain white society and BIPOC who feel they must also support this white supremacist systemic state in order to think they are safe and heard....instead of being a proponent to anti-racist change they have chosen to be a barrier for true Liberation and safety for us BIPOC.

More betrayal as the city ignores this Land Acknowledgement:

“Portland, Oregon's land acknowledgements recognize the history of the land and the Indigenous communities that have lived there **(here)**, and acknowledge the need for action to support them today:

- Indigenous communities

Portland acknowledges the many diverse Indigenous peoples who live and work in the city, **and honors all Indigenous communities, past, present, and future.**

- Traditional village sites

Land acknowledgements recognize the traditional village sites of many tribes who lived along the Columbia River, including the Multnomah, Kathlamet, Clackamas, Chinook, Tualatin Kalapuya, and Molalla.

- **Systemic policies**

Land acknowledgements acknowledge the systemic policies of genocide, relocation, and assimilation that **still impact many Indigenous families today.**

- Indigenous knowledge

Land acknowledgements center Indigenous knowledge, creativity, and resilience.

- Action

Land acknowledgements are a call to action to support Indigenous peoples, cultures, and homelands.”

This city council, city attorney, mayor, PPB/PPA have all disrespected my people, my ancestors, me and this Land Acknowledgement and have ignored the call to Action when you all dismantled the Measure 26-217, OCPA, Community Board for Police Accountability, DOJ Mandates and the community you claim to represent.....we know now you do not represent us, far from it.

I challenge most of your changes to the Oversight System, CBPA/OCPA because they are steeped in systemic racism you all refused to acknowledge and approved by the racist systemic powers and those that benefit from those changes. Those changes continue to reveal the toxicity of this city of Portland, to us, but also as Angela Davis says, “.....racist state violence has been a consistent theme in the history of people of African descent.....represent an unbroken stream of racist violence both official and extralegal, from slave patrols and the Ku Klux Klan to contemporary profiling practices and present-day vigilantes.”

We mistakenly thought you were the party of the people, you all had a “D” after your names, always had hope in the Democratic Party but we were betrayed, we didn’t realize this didn’t include us as it’s hard to tell the parties apart any more with continued racist systemic leadership.

What happened to you all that has caused you to rule without humanity, compassion, or integrity and ignore true humane needs? When your priority is for the greedy not the needy you must ask yourself, why? When another priority is a cities aesthetics instead of the wellbeing of its most downtrodden, do you ask yourself why, is this who we as a city really want to present to the world? Hurt people hurt people, I’m not talking about just some of those whose lives are in traumatic shambles or marginalized, I’m talking about those in power, because that is what is happening here with the deliberate blocking of a true oversight system to hold police accountable, the city is co-signing the excessive and deadly force, it’s allowing the murder of community members and without any accountability and that’s on you, the next shootings are very possibly on you!

Measure 26-217 was a reactionary measure to an uprising by folx who know police violence has been a horrific racist act since policing was invented. It still baffles me how hard you all fight to keep your violent white supremacist systemic patriarchy in place, have you asked yourself why? What is your fear, because until you do your own self-inventory and long term anti-racist, equity, inclusivity training around your racism, privilege, entitlement, and desire to keep the oppressed oppressed, the traumatized re-traumatized you will continue to be a part of the problem instead of the solution. Who hurt you to make you hurt those you should be trying to uplift? Why do you also keep your knee in the back of our necks? This is not great leadership..... is it selfish, self-centered power and greed.

I know you hold me in contempt, but that is because Radical Truth for Racial Justice is so hard for you to hear, ask yourself why?

Restore the Community Board for Police Accountability to truly be a model of Racial Justice and great leadership and police accountability by including the city's Core Values instead of Devaluing them.

And as James Baldwin said "If one really wishes to know how justice is administered in a country, one does not question the policemen, the lawyers, the judges, or the protected members of the middle class. One goes to the unprotected – those, precisely, who need the law's protection most! and listen to their testimony."

Here is a reminder of how you all can know how justice is administered:

RESOLUTION No. 37492 As Amended

Adopt Anti-Racism, Equity, Transparency, Communication, Collaboration, and Fiscal Responsibility as the Core Values of the City of Portland as recommended by the Bureau of Human Resources and Office of Equity and Human Rights to inform a unified workplace and city culture, systems, policies, practices, and procedures. (Resolution)

Anti-Racism

WHEREAS, the City of Portland is committed to being an anti-racist institution; and
WHEREAS, addressing issues concerning anti-Blackness will be a priority for the workforce and city; and
WHEREAS, actions to dismantle institutional and systemic racism will be the responsibility of every employee and resident; and
WHEREAS, racism, discrimination, and bias will not be tolerated within the workplace or our communities; and
WHEREAS, oppression, violence, and hate speech towards people of color is condemned by the City of Portland; and

Equity

WHEREAS, the intersectional identities and lived experiences of our workforce and over 650,000 residents are valued; and
WHEREAS, we acknowledge Oregon's history of exclusion and are dedicated to rebuilding trust through reconciliation and restorative justice; and
WHEREAS, solidarity and the preservation of diverse communities and their cultures enhances the livability and vibrancy of our beautiful city; and
WHEREAS, equity, access, and the removal of institutional and systemic barriers to resources and opportunities is essential in diversifying our workforce and the public good; and

WHEREAS, our vision to lead people, cultivate change, and develop a culture of innovation, inclusion, and inspiration will strengthen our city and communities; and

WHEREAS, sense of belonging, support, and safety are vital for a diverse, equitable, and inclusive city and workforce; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Equity and Human Rights was established in 2011 and is charged with setting the foundation and accountability mechanisms for the City's equity work; and

Transparency

WHEREAS, transparency is essential to upholding the principles of democracy; and

WHEREAS, reimagining political processes occurs through accountability; and

WHEREAS, Portland, OR being the first city in the United States to adopt an Open Data policy leads the nation in developing a culture of information sharing; and

WHEREAS, trust is established and maintained through integrity and inclusion; and

Communication

WHEREAS, communication serves as a catalyst for transformative change; and

WHEREAS, knowledge sharing will impact our workplace and communities; and

WHEREAS, the art of storytelling and narratives can promote a culture of inclusion; and

WHEREAS, the power of our collective voice will unify our city; and

Collaboration

WHEREAS, our belief that we are Better Together promotes collaboration and the cocreation of knowledge; and

WHEREAS, the nexus of politics and public service will connect our workforce and communities; and

WHEREAS, civic engagement and collective action will empower our employees and residents; and

WHEREAS, institutional knowledge and awareness is gained through inclusive outreach and public engagement; and

WHEREAS, all behaviors, actions, decisions, and systems shall reflect a culture of accountability and commitment to the City's core values; and

Fiscal Responsibility

WHEREAS, the City of Portland is dedicated to being fiscally accountable to the public; and

WHEREAS, fiscal resiliency, climate action, equity, and the needs of our most vulnerable populations will be the focus of every budget decision; and

WHEREAS, community values, addressing inequities, and transparent budgetary decisions are essential to developing trust; and

WHEREAS, rethinking budget processes will ensure the economic sustainability of our city; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Anti-Racism, Equity, Transparency, Communication, Collaboration, and Fiscal Responsibility are adopted as the Core Values of the City of Portland

by City Council; and 37492

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution is Binding City policy.

Passed by the Council: Mayor Ted Wheeler Prepared by: Allison S. Prasad, Ph.D. Date Prepared:
June 11, 2020 Mary Hull Caballero Auditor of the City of Portland By Deputy

Dear City Council,

I write in enthusiastic and desperate support of police accountability, of racial justice, of healing and reparation, of democracy, and of beloved community. Because of that, I must object to almost everything this City Council has done with respect to 26-217, the Police Accountability Commission, and the Community Board for Police Accountability. In the matter at hand, I urge City Council to do what is needed to return the amendments to City Code back to what was proposed by the Police Accountability Commission.

I have closely followed Portland's work on Police Accountability over the last 4 years. As a result, I have already given significant testimony on the matter multiple times. My testimony to Judge Simon and the DOJ are included below. They make the case that City Council has been approaching this issue problematically for some time. Before that, though, I must address what seems to be a form of thinking guiding the City Council.

Over the recent discussions about police accountability, I have heard multiple members of City Council mention that your thinking is guided by the idea that it isn't 2020 anymore. This could mean multiple things—every one of them is problematic.

It could mean that city council members don't care about 26-217 like they did in 2020. This would be irrelevant. Lawmakers don't get to not uphold the law because it isn't the year the law was passed, or they don't care about it like they did the year that the law was passed.

It could mean that Portlanders don't care about 26-217 like they did in 2020. This, again, seems flawed—as 82% of the city voted in favor of 26-217 and most are imagining that it is being implemented like they voted for. And, for those who are aware of the city council's persistent obstruction to the PAC created by 26-217, this may help explain why just this week Willamette Week put out a poll showing fewer than ¼ of Portlanders feel represented by even one City Council member.

Finally, "it isn't 2020 anymore" could mean that the reason we needed police accountability that existed in 2020 doesn't exist anymore. I would ask what has changed? How has police violence been reduced? How has racial justice increased? How has white supremacy in the city been disrupted? I would argue that the answer to all of these questions is that they haven't. In fact, with the onset of Rene Gonzalez's "tough-on-crime" rhetoric and approach, all of these have become even bigger problems. So, finally, I ask you to please look at the history of the use of "tough-on-crime" and "law-and-order" rhetoric. Regardless of intent, political party, or context, these types of policies have universally had racist, classist, ableist, and oppressive impacts. Please rethink your approach. Please do better for our community.

Thank you for your time,
Dr. Matthew J. LaVine

Dear Judge Simon,

My name is Matt LaVine. I live in what is now known as North Portland, but is actually occupied, rightful, ancestral land of many different Indigenous peoples of the Lower Columbia River—Multnomah, Clackamas, Cayuse, Umatilla, Walla Walla, Cowlitz, Chinook, Tualatin Kalapuya, Molalla, and many other peoples of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, Warm Springs, and Siletz Indians. I work in what is now known as Northeast Portland. The people closest to me live in North, Northeast, and Southeast Portland. I am deeply committed to the Portland community.

I am a senior race equity consultant and facilitator at the Center for Equity & Inclusion, where I work with individuals and organizations in our community trying to disrupt and dismantle the ways in which we have all been complicit in, and impacted by, white supremacy. I am also an academic and activist focusing on racial, gender, environmental, and social justice—speaking on such matters in venues from the Historic Alberta House to Powell’s to the Oregon Convention Center to protests around the city to meetings with the Police Accountability Commission and City Council. I also engage in mutual aid work, helping with water, food, and clothing exchanges around the city. Again, I am deeply committed to the Portland community.

I’m writing to implore you to find the City’s amendments to the DOJ settlement agreement unfair, inadequate, and unreasonable. Because of the changes that City Council and the City Attorney made to the rules for the CBPA as they were proposed by the PAC, the CBPA will no longer reflect the will of the people of Portland and will not implement the radical corrective measures required by the DOJ. I included a bit about myself before this request because I’m going to write quite a bit to argue for my position and I wanted you to have some context for my arguments. Furthermore, I want to be transparent that I’m going to write quite a bit because I’ve heard from several people that I trust that you are a Judge who listens. I want to take advantage of having a judge who listens because, unfortunately, this will be unique in the process since 26-217 was passed overwhelmingly by 82% of Portland voters.

Arguably, the place that City Council has stopped listening the most is whenever community members bring up the history and present of white supremacy in Portland, in Oregon, and in the United States. So, please, I ask you to listen to at least one argument that the question of the fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness of the City’s amendments to the DOJ settlement agreement require considering this history and present of systemic, racist, white supremacy. As James Baldwin famously reminded us, “Not everything that is faced can be changed, but nothing can be changed until it is faced.”

Since 2012, the DOJ has been trying to get Portland police to change radically because of a “pattern and practice of constitutional violations” resulting from “unnecessary or unreasonable force”. Patterns and practices cannot be understood properly if we only look at a small snapshot of them. Thus, to remedy this pattern and practice of constitutional violations, we must look at the whole history of the pattern and not just a snapshot. If we look at the

historical record, we'll see that there is an unbroken chain going back to settler colonialism and the earliest forms of anti-Indigenous and anti-Black racism which helped create this pattern and practice of constitutional violations that the settlement agreement, 26-217, and the CBPA are a response to. Policing as an American institution began with slave patrols and land thieves around 1680, then moved to enforcing the Black codes, Jim Crow, Indian Residential Schools, the war on drugs, the war on terror, and more. In Portland, specifically, there is the additional concern of a history of long-standing ties between Portland police and the KKK. This has been exacerbated in systemic ways through e.g. [the racially discriminatory demolition of homes that happened to create I-5 and Legacy Emanuel Hospital](#).

Unfortunately, this connection between policing in Portland and white supremacy is not unique. This has all been consistent throughout Portland's history. Portland was founded as part of a genocidal campaign against Indigenous peoples of the lower Columbia River and Willamette River that involved Oregon's Trail of Tears, mass executions, colonial and exploitative land grabs of white supremacists like William Overton, Asa Lovejoy, and Francis Pettygrove, as well as biological warfare in the form of malaria, smallpox, and measles. These histories have unfortunately created a current climate in which the lives of loved ones, community members, friends, parents, and children like Keaton Otis, Patrick Kimmons, Kendra James, Immanuel Jaquez Clark-Johnson, and others have been tragically ended by racist police violence.

To bring this directly to the question before you, **all of this makes it particularly concerning that e.g., the City Council has removed the ability of the CBPA to make systemic findings related to patterns and policy issues.** Instead, the board must treat all cases of police abuse as isolated incidents. Again, this is contrary to the settlement agreement's talk of patterns and practices. It is also in tension with the text of 26-217. Section 2-1001 continues the language of the DOJ settlement agreement that would require systemic investigations, talking about "practices, policies and directives". Furthermore, Section 2-1002 explicitly mentions "systemic racism". Clearly, the vote for 26-217 was a vote that said there's a problem with the *system* of policing and the *system* we use for police oversight. Furthermore, it's worth noting that the claim that some incident was an isolated result of one bad apple is one of the most common denial tactics of white supremacist ignorance.

This also makes changes to the PAC's proposal for the CBPA by the City, such as the added prohibition on CBPA members having pro-police or anti-police bias, extremely concerning. It incorrectly assumes that neutrality is the desirable position with respect to the CBPA's cases. We should not be neutral about police violence. We must be staunchly opposed to it. City Council's prohibition also clearly conflates an anti-police *position* and an anti-police *bias*. As should begin to be clear from the brief historical discussion above, an objective look at the history of policing in this country and this city leads to an anti-police *conclusion*, not an anti-police bias. Again, returning directly to your decision—the DOJ settlement agreement and 26-217 make it clear that "fair" in the case of policing does not mean neutral with respect to policing. The official position of the DOJ and the people of Portland is that PPB has a history of being unjust. This means that the settlement agreement and 26-217 both fall under the

rubric of corrective justice. This means that CBPA members should actually be *required* to hold certain views that the city is prohibiting under the heading of “anti-police bias”.

Unfortunately, this is certainly not the only case where the City’s amendments are in violation of the settlement agreement and 26-217. As voters saw it on the ballot, the text of 26-217 read “Shall Charter be amended to authorize new, independent community police oversight board to investigate complaints against Portland Police, impose discipline?” This means that an investigation into the adequacy of the City’s amendments requires at least the follow questions:

Is it new?

Is it independent?

Is it run by the community?

Does it investigate the complaints against PPB and impose discipline?

Unfortunately, the City has made changes to what the PAC originally proposed which make it so the answers to each of these are not clearly “yes”. **Rather, by allowing Police to be on the nominating committee, they have made the CBPA no longer fully independent and run by the community.** Furthermore, by not including the Chief of Police as somebody to potentially be investigated by the CBPA, the answer to the last question would be that the CBPA only partially investigates complaints against a proper subset of PPB. And, finally, every change that the City made to the PAC’s proposals was to make it less new and more of the same old status quo. This cannot stand.

Finally, I want to end with one last reminder of history to hopefully make it clear just how important this decision you’re making is. Those of us familiar with the history of the Civil Rights Movement know that it wasn’t southern white conservatives that killed the momentum of the Civil Rights Movement. It was actually northern white liberals that killed the Civil Rights Movement when it moved from a focus on Alabama to a focus on Chicago with the Chicago Freedom Movement of 1965-1968. We don’t hear much about it today because there were no real victories in Chicago like there were victories in the south. Rather, northern white liberals, led by democratic mayor Richard J Daley, showed that there’s unfortunately a lot of wisdom in the saying that “a liberal is someone who opposes all wars except for any that are happening at the current moment and who supports every movement for rights except any that are happening at the current moment”. Please don’t let Portland be a repeat of Chicago. Don’t let Portland be the place that the Black Lives Matter movement came to die like Chicago was the place the Civil Rights Movement went to die. Don’t let Mayor Wheeler be the white liberal name we talk about ensuring the perpetuation of racism like we do with Mayor Daley. And to you and the rest of the folx who work in government here in Portland, don’t be the equivalent of the Daley machine that let this happen in Chicago. **The people in this city—especially the BIPOC folx, people with disabilities and mental illnesses, houseless folx, and LGBTQ2S+ members of this community deserve better.**

Thank you for your time,
Dr. Matthew J. LaVine

To the Department of Justice, the Portland City Council, and the city attorney:

We are writing to alert you to a crisis in the city of Portland. There is a crisis of racist, classist, and ableist injustice rooted in a history of white supremacy. Like all places around the country, systems of policing have been central to enforcing these systems of injustice and are, thus, central to the crisis. For these reasons, racial justice in Portland requires police accountability in Portland.

From our experience with the [city council](#), we know that some of this language will make you want to respond defensively or simply stop reading. Please show us the dignity of at least hearing with an open heart why we think such language is appropriate. Please at least consider why we speak with such emotion (evidenced as recently as the [December 4th meeting](#)), why we're trying to communicate with such desperation, and why we refuse to abide the performative nature of city council's "engagement" with the [Police Accountability Commission's Final Report](#) up to this point.

Most urgently, we write to express our adamant belief that the city's recent changes to the [Police Accountability Commission's proposal](#) are racist, anti-democratic, and in violation of both the DOJ Settlement Agreement and 26-217. We imagine you agree that, if these things were true, it would be of paramount importance to reverse the city council's and city attorney's amendments to the PAC's proposal approved on [November 15th](#). So, again, please at least be willing to hear our arguments that these things are the case.

(1) City council's changes are in violation of 26-217

It has always been the case that what was being proposed when Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty led a push to get 26-217 on the ballot was a [community/civilian-led oversight board](#) to hold the police accountable. This makes the city's changes to the PAC proposal to have 3 of 11 nominating committee members to the CBPA be police representatives very problematic. That does not contribute to shifting oversight power to the community. Furthermore, by definition, one cannot hold oneself accountable. 26-217 was a recognition that police cannot be in positions of power with respect to holding police accountable. This must be reflected in the city code.

(2) City council's changes are racist

Appropriate action in this situation requires recognizing both the national and local factors at play. Throughout the entire country, racial justice requires police accountability. Policing as an American institution began with slave patrols and land thieves around 1680, then enforced the Black codes, Jim Crow, Indian Residential

Schools, the war on drugs, the war on terror, and more. In Portland, specifically, there is the additional concern of a history of long-standing ties between Portland police and the KKK. This has been exacerbated in systemic ways through e.g. [the racially discriminatory demolition of homes that happened to create I-5 and Legacy Emanuel Hospital](#).

Unfortunately, none of this has been unique. This has all been consistent throughout Portland's history. Portland was founded as part of a genocidal campaign against Indigenous peoples of the lower Columbia River and Willamette River that involved Oregon's Trail of Tears, mass executions, colonial and exploitative land grabs of white supremacists like William Overton, Asa Lovejoy, and Francis Pettygrove, as well as biological warfare in the form of malaria, smallpox, and measles. These histories have unfortunately created a current climate in which the lives of loved ones, community members, friends, parents, and children like Keaton Otis, Patrick Kimmons, Kendra James, Immanuel Jaquez Clark-Johnson, and others have been tragically ended by racist police violence.

All of this makes it particularly concerning that e.g. the city council has cut the ability of the board to make systemic findings related to patterns and policy issues. Instead, the board must treat all cases of police abuse as isolated incidents. 26-217 was a vote that said there's a problem with the *system* of policing and the *system* we use for police oversight. Furthermore, the claim that some incident was an isolated result of one bad apple is one of the most common denial tactics of white supremacist ignorance.

This also makes changes by the city to the PAC's proposal such as the added prohibition on CBPA members having pro-police or anti-police bias extremely concerning. It incorrectly assumes that neutrality is the desirable position with respect to the board's cases. We should not be neutral about police violence. We must be staunchly opposed to it. The council's prohibition also clearly conflates an anti-police *position* and an anti-police *bias*. As should begin to be clear from above, an objective look at the history of policing in this country and this city leads to an anti-police *conclusion*, not an anti-police bias.

(3) City council's changes are anti-democratic and against the [City Core Values](#). Democracy is about governing power lying in the hands of the people. The city council's changes are, thus, anti-democratic on multiple fronts. The content of the changes to the PAC's proposal keeps power from being shifted toward the community, toward the people. Even that there were these changes made behind closed doors and independently of the community also shifts power away from the people. In a *representative* democracy, the people are supposed to have power indirectly by delegating that power via election and community engagement. The people of Portland gave as strong of a voice as we've ever given to city council with 82% of the city voting to approve 26-217. Still, the city council repeatedly makes the arrogant assumption that "it's not 2020 any longer". This is not the council's decision to make. If that were the case, it should come from the people—the Portland community.

Yet, the community has overwhelmingly let the city council know since 2020 that police accountability needs to be actualized. Just look at the public testimony from 2+

years of PAC meetings and city council meetings where the PAC's work was discussed. Consistently, the majority of public testimony has been in favor of radical police accountability. Unfortunately, city council has also made it more difficult for the community to be informed with respect to police accountability—doing things like removing the requirement that settlement figures from lawsuits for police abuse be included in annual reports. Transparency, generally, was a key value of 26-217 and the PAC. Transparency about money, specifically, is important for making it clear that the current system of policing is really a systematic investment in white supremacy and a divestment from BIPOC people, from people with disabilities and mental illnesses, from people with addictions, from houseless people, and from other marginalized communities.

Remember, Portland is the whitest city in a country that was explicitly founded on white supremacist principles. That should make us pause and self-reflect. And, if you really want to protect and serve community, then you'll give the community voice in this process and an opportunity to really open up this city to all! If you really want to uphold the city's core values of anti-racism, equity, transparency, communication, and collaboration, you'll return to the PAC's proposal.

(4) City council's changes are in violation of the DOJ settlement agreement. As a reminder, the DOJ Settlement agreement requires "ensur[ing] that encounters between police and persons with perceived or actual mental illness, or experiencing a mental health crisis, do not result in unnecessary or excessive force." For that, the city needs to have a "complete state-of-the-art management and accountability system". Finally, the agreement "further requires that the City and PPB put in place more effective systems of oversight and self-correction that will identify and correct problems before they develop into patterns or practices of unconstitutional conduct and/or erode community trust." The city council's amendments to the PAC's proposal do none of this. They just encourage more of the same.

Please rethink the city's amendments to the PAC's proposal. The people in this city—especially the BIPOC folx, people with disabilities and mental illnesses, people with addictions, houseless folx, and LGBTQ2S+ members of this community, all of whom suffer from the trauma inflicted by white supremacist systems, deserve better. Thank you.

Charlie Michelle-Westley
Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
Former PAC Commissioner

Dr. Matthew J. LaVine
North Portland resident, racial justice scholar, activist, and facilitator

Mayor Wheeler, Members of City Council,

My name is Sameer Kanal, and I had the honor and privilege of serving as the Project Manager for the Police Accountability Commission from September 2021 through the presentation of the PAC's work to you in September 2023. I remain a City employee, but I want to be clear that I am not testifying in my professional capacity, so that I may speak to you in a personal capacity - informed by my previous experience as the PAC's Project Manager.

In brief, my request is to conduct a broader public process around the changes made to the original recommendations, to ensure that the broader public believes in this system's legitimacy and fairness to the community.

As you know, the major public input in this process came during the Police Accountability Commission's work - with over 1,500 people giving direct input, and hundreds more actively observing and attending events and meetings. This was also the most transparent part of the process, with 127 public meetings, 23 community engagement events, and 12 focus groups; considering its relatively short 20-month timeline, the PAC had the most ways to get involved of any major process in recent City history.

Following this, very significant changes were made by a much smaller pool of people, in a series of revisions involving the City Council and City Attorneys; collective bargaining partners; the US Department of Justice; and the US Court and *amici*. These changes have been explained at two town halls, the first of which was after only the City Council and City Attorneys had made revisions; collectively, fewer than 50 members of the public weighed in during these town halls.

I agree with Mayor Wheeler's consistently-expressed view that the new police oversight system needs to both *be* legitimate and be *perceived* to be legitimate. I was not involved in bargaining with police, so I cannot speak to their views on legitimacy, other than to say I also agree with Mayor Wheeler that this is an important long-term indicator of the system's legitimacy. I am concerned that the *public* will not consider this new system legitimate, absent further engagement. Current concerns that relate most closely to previously-received community input include:

- First, the lack of a detailed definition of *bias* gives the public no certainty that expressing views in social media posts, including broad statements such as "Black Lives Matter," will not disqualify them from service (or, under 35.020.010F, prevent their appointment). While the terminology of "objective" may be designed to address this, a detailed definition of bias is necessary to achieve a uniform, fair standard - which is required for objectivity. The Charter (2-1001) required "fair and impartial" investigations, a requirement which applies to the Board's duties when hearing a case. The PAC offered a definition in their report. This or a different definition, focused more narrowly on the *duties* of a Board member, might help gain public trust.
- Second, the nominating committee includes police as *voting* members. Some members of the public have expressed concerns to you already. I would offer that in my experience from a different past role (Advisory Boards and Commissions Manager), the idea that the other 7 members could "outvote" the 3 police representatives does not reflect how nominations are often done when *multiple* vacancies exist. Often, a large pool of candidates are reviewed en masse by a panel. In some cases, as with the PAC's

initial appointments, each panel member votes “yes” or “no” on a candidate, with those getting the most “yes” votes advancing. While at the City, I have seen examples of a high proportion of reviewers supporting multiple candidates, and a small proportion of reviewers’ opposition ruling out some. Having a longer-term community engagement process, and being open to adjustments to this, could help gain public trust in the process.

- The third reason is the scope of the new system’s work. The single most common piece of input the PAC heard was to ensure that the police do not investigate police. Their recommendations reflected that, and have been changed to a far narrower scope, with many allegations remaining the responsibility of Internal Affairs. Like everything else, this remains the Council’s decision within the scope of the Charter text; however, this may be the most important thing to engage meaningfully with the public about given previous community interest and input.

There are other concerns that members of the public have raised (e.g. ride-alongs, panel sizes, removal of complainants’ right to appeal) which raise more functional concerns (such as barriers for people with disabilities, whether diversity within three-person panels, board member overload from eleven-member panels on complicated cases). These are worth addressing too.

I know that you believe that *community* views on this system’s legitimacy are vital indicators of its overall legitimacy. Given that Judge Simon’s ruling means that the nominating committee cannot be seated until at least January 2, 2025, there are nearly four months for the current Council to engage meaningfully with the community about the current text. Meaningful engagement is not presentations or one-way communication; it is not town halls which are announced primarily through the City website; it is not claiming that few people want to be involved in discussions of this issue. It includes recognizing that when a *volunteer commission* did its work, 1500+ people weighed in, and that the *City Council* could reasonably expect more interest given its relative power. Meaningful engagement is both two-way communication and the opportunity for adjustment. Ultimately, meaningful engagement is co-creation of policy.

For these reasons, and to ensure that the community police oversight board is viewed as legitimate by the community it will serve, I ask that you consider engaging meaningfully with the public over the next four months, especially about the bias definition, nominating committee, and scope of work, and ensure that in January the new system is able to be supported by the public.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my request. I remain available to you and your offices, as well as the City Attorney’s Office, as a resource throughout this process.

Portland City Council Meeting
Wednesday, September 4, 2024 - 2:00 p.m.
Verbal Testimony

	Agenda Item	Name
1	776	Chris Olson
2	776	Je Amaechi
3	776	Debbie Aiona
4	776	Dan Handelman Portland Copwatch
5	776	Barbara Bochinski
6	776	Charlie Michelle-Westley