

MINUTES

Civilian Review Board & Police Commission
300 Country Club Road
Eugene, Oregon

November 9, 2016
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT:

Civilian Review Board: Eric Van Houten, Chair; Lindsey Foltz, Vice Chair; Maurice Denner, Rick Roseta, Steve McIntire, Chris Wig

Police Commission: Bill Whalen, Chair; Edward Goehring, Vice Chair; Mike Clark; Will Davie; Edward McGlone; Steve McIntire; Scott Nowicki; Terry Robertson; Claire Syrett; Bob Walker; Marshall Wilde

Police Auditor's Office: Mark Gissiner, Leia Pitcher, Vicki Cox, Beatriz Hernandez

EPD: Lieutenant Carolyn Mason, Sergeant Larry Crompton

EPEA Representative: Officer Chris Mackey

Commissioner Whalen convened the Civilian Review Board (CRB) & Police Commission at 5:32 p.m.

1. AGENDA AND MATERIALS REVIEW

Mr. Van Houten welcomed the group and covered the agenda.

No changes to the agenda were made.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

3. MINUTES APPROVAL

No minutes to approve.

4. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS, HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION LIAISON AND POLICE COMMISSION LIAISON

Mr. Denner explained that at the Human Rights Commission the ACLU explained a proposal to require citizen review before new technology was acquired by law enforcement agencies. This is being proposed nationwide. It should be interesting to follow as it moves forward. He was struck by the fact that EPD has been doing that for a long time. He was pleased to see that this may become a national effort.

Welcome from Mr. McIntire.

Ms. Syrett was pleased to be there since she had been absent for medical purposes. Today was her first full day back at work. She was able to arrange coverage for another meeting in order to be present tonight.

Ms. Foltz stated she appreciated the police service and the citizen involvement. She also thanked the auditor's office for their contribution. She has accepted another position and that was her last meeting.

Mr. Gissiner introduced Beatriz Hernandez, the new Community Engagement Coordinator and Translation Specialist.

Mr. Van Houten thanked the group for the joint meeting, he attended the joint meeting last year and expressed it was good to be together again. He affirmed that in this arena the two teams could work well together. A big issue has been bias, how does it happen and how do they manage it? He provided a tentative date of December 15th for a Bias Training to be presented by a professor from NCU. This session would provide training and development.

Mr. Whalen welcome Ms. Syrett back to the Commission.

Mr. McGlone informed the group that a few months ago he brought up the potential ability of police to use a drone or robot to execute lethal force. He continued that recently a police helicopter in North Dakota Pipeline was engaged by a drone. Drones are also being used to land phones, drugs and money into prison yards. He felt the trend will develop and must be addressed in the future.

Chief Kerns thanked the group for their work and expressed his pride in the new building, which the department moved to in 2012.

5. GREETING FROM MAYOR ELECT: LUCY VINIS

Mayor Elect Lucy Vinis greeted the group, stated it was her special pleasure to be there and thanked many at the table for their work and relationships. She has circulated and was delighted to see them assembled. She was there to listen and learn and was officially Mayor Elect as of today. She counted on those with experience to direct and navigate security, public and human rights. She affirmed her desire to look to this group for leadership and offered gratitude for their service and sacrifice. She continued that she was looking forward to meeting everyone and getting to know them.

Mr. Whalen turned over the meeting to Mr. Van Houten and explained that this portion will not be recorded.

Mr. Van Houten explained they were less formal than Robert's Rules. They have found discussion is valued and that was what would take the team forward. The task was to discuss. He affirmed this task was taken with the highest responsibility.

6. CRB-LED REVIEW OF INCIDENT OF EXCESSIVE FORCE AND DISCUSSION OF RELATED POLICIES

Ms. Pitcher explained that while CRB members receive the entire investigative packet, Oregon Public Records law prohibits the release of personnel information related to a case. Therefore, CRB practice is to refer to the involved employees as Officer A, B, etc.

Ms. Pitcher offered a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Summary of Facts--Civilian Review Board & Police Commission--November 9, 2016*:

Summary of Facts

- CRB does not release names of employees involved in administrative investigations. This presentation will follow that practice.
- Officer A and Officer B were dispatched to a bar where a man (Mr. B) was refusing to leave. They spoke with the caller and Mr. B when they arrived. Mr. B asserted that he was being assaulted. Officer A asked him whether he was injured and, when Mr. B did not indicate any injury, Officer A disputed whether he was being assaulted
- Mr. B then called 911, ostensibly to report his assault. Officer A decided to arrest Mr. B for misuse of 911 and trespassing. Officer A and Officer B engaged in a physical struggle with Mr. B in order to effect the arrest.
- Per policy, Sergeant C prepared a use of force to report in Blueteam. The report documented focused blows by Officer B, Taser deployment by Officer A, and a bite to Officer A's finger by Mr. B.
- Officer A and Officer B transported Mr. B to the jail. Mr. B was in handcuffs and seated on a bench in the pre-booking area while Officer A filled out paperwork.
- Mr. B and Officer A were engaged verbally while Officer A was filling out paperwork. Officer A then approached Mr. B rapidly and pulled him from the bench to the ground; the incident was captured by video cameras at the jail.
- Mr. B's head appeared to the bench and the floor. While he was on the ground, Officer A used his knee to push Mr. B's head to the floor twice. Officer B then approached and held Mr. B's legs; jail deputies then entered the room and took Mr. B into the jail.
- Mr. B was treated for injured by jail staff.
- Sergeant C was notified of the use of force at the jail prepared another use of force report in Blueteam. Sergeant C did not offer a recommendation on whether the use of force was within policy.
- Our office reviewed the use of force reports. We also received an anonymous complaint regarding the use of force at the jail. A criminal investigation into Officer A's actions at the jail followed.
- The administrative investigation was suspended pending the conclusion of the criminal investigation and prosecution process.
- Officer A was found guilty of official misconduct and assault. He was sentenced to 60 days in jail, suspended following two years' probation.
- The administration investigation followed the close of the criminal investigation; for the most part, it adopted the criminal investigation.
- The City and Officer A came to an agreement about Officer A's separation and he is no longer employed by the City.

Allegations

1. Use of Force: That Officer A used excessive force when he grabbed Mr. B, a handcuffed suspect, from a bench in the Lane County Jail book-in-room, and took him to the ground. During the takedown, Mr. B suffered a laceration and bruising to his head and face.

2. Conformance to Laws: That the level of force used by Officer A on Mr. B during the takedown in the jail constituted the misdemeanor crime of Assault IV and Official Misconduct I, in violation of EPD policy.
3. Courtesy: That Officer A used coarse, profane, and insolent language with Mr. B and failed to control his temper, while engaging in unprofessional verbal exchanges.
4. Unbecoming Conduct: That Officer A's actions and demeanor were unprofessional, unbecoming and brought discredit to him and the department.
5. Unsatisfactory Performance: That Officer A failed to conform to the standards of his rank or position, failed to take appropriate action, and failed to perform professionally during the arrest and detention of Mr. B.

Recommended Adjudication

1. Use of Force
 - EPD recommendation: Resigned during internal investigation
 - Auditor's Office concurred
 - Chief concurred
2. Conformance to Laws
 - EPD recommendation: Resigned during internal investigation
 - Auditor's Office concurred
 - Chief concurred
3. Courtesy
 - EPD recommendation: Resigned during internal investigation
 - Auditor's Office concurred
 - Chief concurred
4. Unbecoming Conduct
 - EPD recommendation: Resigned during internal investigation
 - Auditor's Office concurred
 - Chief concurred
5. Unsatisfactory Performance
 - EPD recommendation: Resigned during internal investigation
 - Auditor's Office concurred
 - Chief concurred

5:50pm Chris Wig joined the meeting

Issues for CRB Discussion

- Complaint Intake and Classification
 - Ms. Foltz stated the intake was timely. Blue Team system means that the notification is very seamless. It came in the same night it occurred. She appreciated that efficiency.
 - Mr. Gissiner affirmed BT was a software program that came in around 2009 and it shifted the paradigm for reports. Prior to that, if an officer used a taser, the officer would fill out their own report and perhaps it would have been reviewed by supervisor. Now, BT required that they must respond for property damage and use of force, injury, search, pursuit, high speed chase, K9, property damage, vehicular accident. Supervisors are required to enter the report and internal affairs and the Police Auditor's office can review those reports. This incident was reviewed the following morning. Anytime something happened at the jail he would be curious. Given the circumstances, the IA coordinator might decide it should have been pulled over to internal affairs, she did that for this case.

These incidents were looked at every time. He appreciated that officers used the system and it seemed that it brought the temperature down in most scenarios with questions such as “are you injured? Etc.”

- Ms. Foltz inquired at what point was it clear there would be a criminal investigation.
- Mr. Gissiner responded that it was likely made clear at the weekly Thursday meeting, so within the week of the incident. Chief Kern made the decision about the investigation. It took some time before the video was available and once the investigator saw the video it was then a decision would be made
- Mr. McIntire asked if there were one or more police officers present at the jail. Yes. He wondered why was it limited to the one officer when others were present and also have a duty.
- Mr. Gissiner replied that the Sergeant responded immediately, and reports were written in a timely fashion. It was less than 2 seconds on the video and yes there was duty to intercede. The concern was the verbal interaction prior to the assault. Confirmed with Ms. Pitcher if he could say assault. She confirmed. In his opinion the criminal case dragged on too long. He asked if there were allegations of misconduct for other officers, Ms. Pitcher responded no.
- Mr. McIntire inquired if the other officers were involved appropriately.
- Mr. Gissiner responded that the supervisor was contacted and responded.
- Ms. Pitcher clarified the use of force reporting policy had not yet been updated at the time of the incident. This was a case from 2014. \
- Mr. Denner affirmed that with the information that it was a case prior to change in policy he felt the Sergeant did an outstanding job recording and documenting.
- Mr. Van Houten brought up that the 5 allegations seemed redundant and asked how could they have been addressed differently? Mr. Gissiner reviewed the 5 allegations and did not have any disagreement with the first 4. Mr. Van Houten agreed.
- Complaint Investigation and Monitoring
 - Mr. Wig had wondered why it took so long for the investigation, but now he understood.
 - Mr. Gissiner clarified that the EPD began interview very quickly, but then there was a gap because the interviews had to be transcribed. Once investigators reviews the transcription, they returned for more interviews, which again were transcribed. He stated his belief that it was approximately one year from the time the DA received the case until there was a trial. There was also an attorney change and a murder trial that interrupted the DA. As a reminder, he continued, the Defendant was entitled to a fair trial.
 - Mr. Denner inquired about the interviews with the crime detectives, he did not see any truthfulness or Miranda warnings in the notes.
 - Ms. Pitcher responded she did not know much about how Miranda warnings are typically documented, and that in administrative interviews, there is a truthfulness admonishment. She also stated that while EPD can compel an administrative interview, a criminal interview cannot be compelled.
 - Mr. Gissiner added that to his recollection there was a Miranda warning, but he does not know where it was documented.
 - Mr. McIntire affirmed he thought it was timely.
 - Ms Foltz agreed. It was thorough and timely, but lengthy due to the process not neglect.
 - Mr. Van Houten added he was thankful for a community that held everyone accountable.
- Relevant Department Policies and Practices
 - Ms. Foltz expressed concern for other officers and their involvement. The incident escalated from the moment they walked in, such as the unproductive banter. She said she

thought a co-worker should have intervened and did not understand why peers allowed him to become so physical. Why did they not consider the other officers and their duty to policies? Also, she felt the paid administrative leave was much too long and wasteful. Other officers should have perhaps responded differently to prevent it. The 2 years of paid leave was unacceptable. She used other extreme use of force incidents and stated the Blue Team system should use data to train and preserve officers when there are red flags. BT could be used for prevention of escalated events. Also, because she did not see the discipline side, there was not a clear discipline matrix or expectation, which could have led to better accountability.

- Mr. McIntire asked what the Use of Force policy was the time. He read the policy. He noted it did not address de-escalation as a tool to help prevent use of force. 300.2 addressed how officers should handle situation and de-escalate it. Mr. McIntire continued that it was in regards to interactions with the public not other officers.
 - Mr. Denner affirmed the issue of other officers had been addressed.
 - Mr. Roseta stated that there was clearly emotion and an escalated situation. He cannot say that what the second officer did was unreasonable.
 - Mr. Denner stated he would like to have seen intervention by Officer B, but the situation was brought under control and it was a very dynamic situation. Restraining the offender helped quiet the situation.
 - Mr. Wig concurred with Ms. Foltz and Mr. McIntire.
 - Mr. Van Houten asked if there was enough information for the officers to say that they had a role to intervene, yes, but there was no policy. He asked if Officers B and C were less experienced and they were. The offending officer had seniority. Mr. Van Houten asked if it was typical to arrest someone for misuse of phone. It was the policy at the time.
- Policy and/or Training Considerations
 - Mr. Wig stated that the situation started to escalate before the event of use of force, an opportunity was lost. He would like to see more training about de-escalation while keeping everyone safe.
 - Mr. Denner brought up the issue of officer safety at the room in the jail. It was better than it was in the past, but it was not ideal. A Custody could get up off the bench and he questions whether there should be some restraint available since the structure of the room cannot be changed. It struck him as dangerous.
 - Sergeant Crompton stated that there was a risk and they have forms for those situations. There was also a personal responsibility of the officer to be aware of himself just as he would anywhere else.
 - Mr. McIntire reiterated that de-escalation training among other officers should be addressed.
 - Ms. Foltz noted that sometimes the use of force is justified, but often there was a path of opportunities leading to the situation. She emphasized that additional training on de-escalation should be a continued conversation.
 - Mr. Van Houten relayed a story of another officer that turned their back and was engaged. The room was nearly impossible to navigate. He was also concerned about the room. He affirmed the opportunity to deescalate was in the verbal banter, but was missed.
 - Chief Kerns addressed policy and training considerations, if 100% of the work force were at a 10 for de-escalation it would be a great force, however officers regularly do a good job and unfortunately others do not see that. The group will only see the extreme cases.

This case forced EPD to push their thinking and policies. Lost opportunities occurred months before the incident. He reported that other agencies have had a practice that if an officer was involved in a struggle another officer will take over at that time for transport, etc. Also, he would like to play with the language to develop policy of tactics and training, etc. He affirmed that everyone wondered why one of the officers did not step in, this was one of the most extraordinarily obnoxious subjects. Some agencies, like New Orleans, were discussing how officers could help save each other from incidents like this. How could EPD set up a training for, “I’m asking you now, step in, when I lose my temper”?

- Mr. Van Houten responded, we did recognize the good officers and we did get a chance to review positive situations, and this was an extreme case that occurred. Interactions with people who were inebriated or high were increasing. That officer could have been saved by other officers, one had to share that “wealth” of difficult people in order to have been a successful team.
 - Ms. Foltz added that they had look at cases where officers did their job properly. She hoped that officers saw the public review was there to help. She added that this was a long term officer and in the past had an altercation with another long term officer. She was concerned that younger officers looked up to them and they could not help. She had higher expectations from a senior officer.
 - Chief Kerns added officers should become better with time, not worse, there were higher expectations.
- Adjudication Recommendations
 - Mr. Wig agreed with all of the recommendations.
 - Mr. Roseta agreed with all of the recommendations.
 - Mr. Denner asked about the officer’s law enforcement certificate status. It was not revoked until after the criminal charges were filed. EPD could have revoked it, but it was not automatically sustained. Did this officer still have authority?
 - Chief Kern responded the officer was suspended and could not act as an officer at that point. Lt. Mason stated an employee can rebut, but it did not usually happen beforehand.
 - Mr. McIntire agreed with all of the recommendations.
 - Ms. Foltz agreed with all of the recommendations.
 - Mr. Van Houten agreed with all of the recommendations.
 - Additional Comments and Concerns
 - Ms. Foltz emphasized again the need for growth and training in order to prevent a similar situation in the future, training instead of punitive actions. She asked if Blueteam could be used for early intervention.
 - Chief Kerns replied that it was possible, but there were other things within the software that may complicate it. Some agencies believe there were programs that could do that. He continued that they reviewed every single complaint and it was a small staff so they could identify the issues. He stated that he saw every case, which is not true of larger police departments.
 - Mr. Wig thanked the chief for the training section. He appreciated that the chief heard and received what the public presented.
 - Chief Kerns replied that Mr. Gissiner was constantly scanning the world for quality practices and provided leverage for policy that made sense, the EPD was in a better place

because of his contributions. CRB has been a good thing that has held officers accountable.

- Mr. Van Houten asked, from the packet, could Officer A, based on the collective knowledge in the room have been hired as a police officer in the State of Oregon. Would this conviction have been available to an HR dept.?
- Chief Kerns replied that the certificate was revoked and he could not. There were approximately eighteen thousand departments in the US, some of those have less than ten officers. EPD was a larger size, but not too large. He has had to research officers before, but other agencies may not have the same resources, especially when officers hop from State to state, therefore, unfortunately it was possible.
- Mr. Gissiner offered his appreciation for the 600+ pages, video, etc. that had been offered to them regarding this case.
- Mr. Van Houten requested that the time for more commentary happen next time. This was not an option for a case while it was under review.

Mr. Whalen asked everyone to take a few minutes to review the policies packet and any changes they would like to make to the Underlying Policies.

- Mr. Wilde brought up that there were incident reports on public record and he found that the DA had ample evidence for the offender who bit the officer.
- Clarification from Mr. Whalen that this was not the time nor the place for that comment, but a policy discussion was permissible.
- Mr. Wilde continued the policy he change he wanted to review was the indefinite paid leave. Officials from another county which did not act appropriately, which cost the city a lot of money, therefore he felt there should be a set limit. He would like to see a policy in place. He did not agree with people who came from other counties that did not make the case a priority.
- Mr. Walker added that everyone was entitled to due process. He had a due process hearing and he was exonerated, but it affected him greatly.
- Mr. McIntire suggested the department have a conduct policy, if they were found guilty. There was a lot of integrity in question.
- Mr. Van Houten said there was a discussion about how long the paid leave should be, but to put a limit on a person who was then found innocent would have a great impact. He would like the Chief to have had more tools to handle the situation, more options. He only saw some timelines for adjudication, but could there be a better process for officers? For example, the process could move faster with higher ranked officers to do the do the officer justice and not allow it to wait for so long.
- Ms. Syrett expressed that this was a very sticky wicket and that there should be concern if an officer had an investigation they may lose pay and it could ruin their lives based on something that had not yet gone to trial. She was very troubled by that idea. She believed that employees should be protected, but also did not want to be cavalier with public funds. However, each family needs to be protected, even when it drags on in another jurisdiction. She remarked this was a dangerous path to travel down.
- Mr. McIntire, one of the other policies mentioned 301.2, he requested that policy be reviewed at some point.
- Mr. Roseta believed the city must pay while the officer had a fair trial. He would like to see legislation that other counties must process within maybe 6 months, in order to make the DA's office step up.

- Mr. Goehring agreed it was a slippery slope. He addressed Mr. Wilde that it may not be fair, but the hidden cost was Eugene would become known as a place where you lose pay if you have an investigation. He added, it could also affect hiring appeal. Yes it was difficult for junior officers to curb a senior officer, hard to supervise them. He suggested a departmental “safe word” to help officers communicate in the moment. He clarified this was a Procedural suggestion, not policy recommendation.
- Mr. Whalen called time for a break.
- Mr. Wilde tried to continue, but Mr. Whalen declared it was time to break.

Mr. Whalen called the meeting back to order at 7:11pm

7. DISCUSS ROLES OF POLICE COMMISSION AND CIVILIAN REVIEW BOARD

- Mr. Whalen welcomed everyone back and announced the Police Commission’s main goal was to recommend changes to police department and city council. Two city councilors sit on the commission. They are there to look at and make sure the department was hearing from the public about policies and how those policies affect the public. The desire was to have a good working relationship with the public that showed respect. The commission will focus on policies that directly affect the public or that the chief gives. He added they will bring support from the community for those changes.
- Mr. Van Houten presented for the CRB. Their main role was to review police through the police auditor’s office and looked at complaints that were internally driven, such as Blue Team reports. Concerns brought from officers and public complaint. There were on average 400 complaints annually, which was a very high number for a city of this size. People were cultured to feel free to express their concerns and opinions. Actions were to review on a monthly basis those cases presented that might impact community, but others may be trending nationally. He was concerned about the volume of high speed chases a few years ago, as an example. Blueteam was for use of force and many high profile cases that come out. They were complaint driven, at an administrative tribunal. They have tried not to make judgement on officers, “what were they thinking?!” but more what were training opportunities available, and to better understand officers. He stated that the CRB also has monthly training topics to gain perspective and knowledge. The CRB also annually reviewed Service Complaints, police complaints, and inquiries (more service oriented complaints). They meet about 10 times per year, even though the Charter only required four.
- Mr. McIntire agreed with Mr. Van Houten, simplest form was whether or not there was misconduct and how much of that was an ambiguous or lacking policy. How can the policies be adjusted to make it clearer for officers.
- Chief Kerns gave his appreciation to the approach CRB took because the police chief was responsible for policies, instead of focusing on individual officers. He reported what they learned nationally was that expectations were changing, He could not hold officers accountable to new policies that they were not trained in. Officers were working hard and waiting for additional training.
- Mr. Van Houten stated we all chose to do this work, but the commonality was everyone wanted to have a better relationship between the public and EPD, and they believe trust was increasing. Mr. Van Houten reported he has served 7 years.
- Mr. Goehring stated that when he came to Police Commission from Human Rights Commission, he was pleased to see the process. There were reasons, and he could relay those mysteries to citizens. He expressed the pleasure he found giving that translation to

the public. The CRB does not share that mission and by nature cannot discuss it with the public, so he as Commissioner relished that he was the “de-mystifier”.

- Mr. Van Houten stated that was a challenge for the CRB, they cannot share the information or the reasoning’s behind decisions. They relied on open information because discussion was critical to create transparency.
- Mr. Denner reminded the group that he was skeptical of the creation CRB about 9 years ago and his greatest concern was that it would create a situation to skewer city employees and officers, but he was pleased when he was appointed to the board that the process of review did not involve individual officers, but rather the process. It was a great approach. There were also expectations of officers that there will always be one or two blue folders in their file. He hoped that for Eugene as the CRB had matured, that the fear he had in 2008 has not occurred. The CRB was not after employees, but instead focused on process development.
- Mr. McIntyre stated he had been on the board a long time and he understood policies can take a long time to change, but as a credit to the chief, there have been many tools he had implemented to assist all parties.
- Ms. Syrett gave an extended appreciation to everyone for their service and personally for their support during her absence.
- Mr. Nowicki offered his appreciation for the process and gratitude for the work that was accomplished by the team.
- Mr. Wilde stated he understood there were laws to prevent public communication, however the public like to see public response to public complaints. He would like to see the city lobby for change in order to respond publicly to public employee issues.
- Mr. Whalen shared that representatives could provide community gathered information to the chief, which was leaps and bound ahead of other departments.

8. FUTURE JOINT GOALS AND HOW TO DEVELOP TWO YEAR WORK PLAN

- Mr. Whalen reported there would be adjustments made to the two year work plan for the retreat in May.
- Mr. McIntire affirmed the CRB values 1:1 time with Commissioner Whalen and will add plans to formalize the process in order to accomplish more for the future.
- Mr. Wilde asked for an update on data gathering for racial profiling, it was such a touchy subject nationally.
- Mr. Walker added that in his years the May Work Plan has been at an outside location, included a vote on priorities for a task list and handled a large amount of public response. This is the process and those items cannot be added to work plan due to time. He would like to see them pick those of greatest concern and vote to include in May.
- Ms. Syrett responded, she understood prioritizing, as long as the commission left room to review. She cautioned against being too administrative.
- Mr. McIntire explained that “hot topics” can take a year to plan and another year to enact policy, but there should be a means to have flexibility to add in new policy as necessary.
- Mr. Goehring offered appreciation to the CRB, but cautioned they can never know what may be down the road. Review would have value to the officers and public, since they cannot know the outcome of a decision until a problem has arisen.
- Mr. Wig expressed an interest in closing the feedback gap between complaint, incident and prevention. He offered an example with the Barricade & Hostage policy, it was once one policy, until a situation deemed it necessary to separate and adjust the policies.

9. CLOSING COMMENTS

- Mr. Van Houten shared a thanks to Chief Kerns for his perspective and others for their information as well. He felt it was a good evening of exchange and recognized Mr. McIntire and Ms. Foltz for their hard work and upcoming departures. Also, the CRB has been a great experience from various angles.
- Ms. Foltz mentioned the CRB members did not always agree, but there was always a productive, civil discussion. She asked the group to please be aware of demographic with her replacement as the community was not represented well and she would like to see that change. She also appreciated the experience and perspective she gained.
- Ms. Syrett shared an anecdote about a high speed chase.
- Mr. Robertson added the information and process was valuable and it was nice to see both parties are parallel in their goals.
- Mr. McIntire thanked Ms. Foltz for her contributions and wished her farewell.
- Mr. Denner echoed Mr. McIntire. He also complimented the EPD because they have found a way to accept civilian input and have put it into action, they have become a model for other departments. He also recalled that back in the 90's Chief Cook had asked him if he had interest in a forum, there has been progress.
- Mr. Roseta concurred with Mr. Denner.
- Mr. Wig affirmed the same concerns of Mr. Wilde and extended farewell to Ms. Foltz.
- Mr. Davie shared he learned about the CRB and now he knew he did not want to participate, but the meeting was useful and beneficial.
- Mr. Wilde reported that Portland PD were settling with the "Feds" regarding interview process, officers have due process. He was not seeking a deadline for leave, but the public was upset and they should consider a middle ground policy.
- Officer Mackey shared he was born and raised in Eugene, left for a while, but chose to return to serve the city that raised him. He appreciated the accountability found in EPD. He continued that an officer may be heckled by the public, but they must continue to put the badge on. The incident in Dallas last summer made the job more difficult. The job will always be hard, loved ones worried and it was disheartening to hear the paid leave discussion. Officers should be held accountable, but that burden of process should not be on their shoulders. Experienced officers do not get to have bad days at work. He thanked the group.
- Mr. Goehring responded to Officer Mackey, sometimes the public has forgotten the police were people too. It can be a thankless job, not paid well but expected to take a bullet. He challenged everyone in the room to remind their public sphere that the police are people too.

10. ADJOURN

Mr. Whalen, seconded by Mr. McIntire moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

(Recorded by Tiffany Boss)