

Springfield Police Advisory Committee Minutes

Thursday, February 3, 2022

Location: Zoom

Committee Attendance: Joe Pishioneri-Councilor, Brittney de Alicante – Cultural Minority Community, Barry Lind – Faith Community & Committee Chair, Michael Bean – Local Business, Jonathan Hayes – Neighborhood At-Large (1), Karla Berg – Neighborhood At-Large (2), Teresa Dillon – Neighborhood At-Large & Committee Vice-Chair (3), Adam Jenkins – Neighborhood At-Large (4), Jenna McCulley – School District 19, Eric Adams – Willamalane Parks

1. Welcome and Call to Order at 6:03pm
 - a. Roll Call completed.
 - b. Brief introduction of newer committee members for those who were absent at the last meeting.
2. Minutes for January 6, 2022 approved with a few grammar and language clarifications.
 - a. Chair Barry Lind joined the meeting at 6:08pm, just after minutes approval.
3. Business From the Audience
 - a. Shaay Gallagher-Starr. Ward 6. Expressed thanks to the committee for suggesting a civilian review board.
 - b. Kevin Schaper. Ward 2. Shared support for the proposed recommendation to Council for the civilian review board. Mentioned prior department issues and incidents.
 - c. Carlan Kephart. Ward 6. Expressed appreciation to the sub-committee for the civilian review committee recommendation to improve public trust.
 - d. SJ Lohr. Shared thanks to the sub-committee in preparation to the joint SPAC-Council meeting. Would like to see a civilian review board and auditor like Eugene. Shared thanks to Chief Shearer for changes he has made.
 - e. Monica Olson. Ward 4. Shared support for a civilian review board and would be willing to join the board in the future.
4. Committee Response
 - a. Michael Bean clarified the subcommittee made the recommendations and were presenting to SPAC for their consideration and potential presentation to City Council.
5. Business from Springfield PD
 - a. SPD Update. Chief Shearer shared the following:
 - i. Officer Garcia-Cash is a new K9 officer. He just completed the 160 hour training course and is now certified by the Oregon Police Canine Association
 - ii. Shared the sad news that longtime police volunteer and past committee member Jack Martin recently passed away.
 - iii. Shared a staffing update, including vacancies, recent hires and individuals in training.
 - iv. Shared plan to honor local Springfield community members during Black History Month.
 - b. Policy Review
 - i. First review final Policy 13.4.1-Department Issues Smart Phones
 - o Chief Shearer shared the many advantages smart phones provide to officers. They are an important tool, including investigative, information sharing, and translation opportunities. Officers were previously issued flip phones with limited function.

- Chief Shearer summarized and highlighted key areas of the policy.
- Michael Bean commented that the policy appeared to be good.
- Terri Dillon asked if each officer was issued their own phone. Chief confirmed each officer receives their own phone.
- Joe Pishioneri asked if cell phone reimbursements to employees still occurs. Chief Shearer advised the stipend for personal phone use was discontinued.

6. Business from the Committee

a. SPAC Scheduled Policy Review

i. Policy 54.3.0, Communications with Persons with Disabilities

- Chief Shearer clarified that VRI services utilizes an iPad to provide sign language translation services.
- Brittney de Alicante asked who has the iPad. Chief Shearer shared the on-duty watch commander carries the iPad. Chief Shearer noted that officers should be able to use their new smart phones for this purpose in the future.
- Barry Lind asked if everyone had a chance to review the policy or had questions.
- Michael Bean shared that he read the policy and the content was pretty standard and thorough.

b. Committee Annual Report – Draft. Barry Lind thanked the subcommittee (Michael Bean, Brittney de Alicante, and Jenna McCulley) for preparing the draft annual report and for their excellent work. He appreciated Michael’s earlier clarification that this is a draft for the committee to review and approve. Barry suggested the review begin with the “Next Steps and Discussion” section that includes three recommendations and get feedback from everyone.

i. Regarding draft recommendation “Based on the prior 18 months of community engagement with SPAC, oversee a public process for consideration and implementation of a police oversight commission or similar body”:

- Joe Pishioneri thanked the subcommittee for their work. On a related topic, but separate section, Joe inquired about the draft report’s listed goals for 2022. Sub-committee members reaffirmed that the listed goals were suggestions and would need SPAC input and approval. Joe commented the content of the sub-committee’s draft report goals may create confusion from the public’s perspective. Terri Dillon agreed.
 - Michael Bean noted the draft report was intended to be reviewed and edited prior to being made final and shared with Council. He advised he was unaware the draft report would be online prior to SPAC review.
 - Eric Adams commented that SPAC could review the goals at this time or pull them from the report and add a comment that SPAC is still developing 2022 goals.
- Eric Ward asked if the recommendation was for Council or SPAC to oversee the recommended process. Jen McCulley and Michael Bean confirmed that the recommendation was for Council to oversee it.
- Barry Lind transitioned discussion back to the first recommendation.

- Eric Ward asked if the subcommittee had discussed potential roles of what an oversight committee would be and if so, asked what that oversight committee relationship would be with the advisory committee. Jenna McCulley shared that through review of the past 18 months of committee activity, the subcommittee identified a theme within public comment that there was confusion or a desire for a level of oversight that does not exist within the advisory committee. The goal was not to prescribe, but to recommend to Council they consider this interest as it is not the purview of the advisory committee.
 - Michael Bean noted the large amount of public comment SPAC began to receive for the first time in virtual meetings after the Thurston protest. Receipt of public criticism in this fashion was new and was not SPAC's charge.
 - Brittney de Alicante suggested adding reference to "...Council oversee a public process..." for clarification. Further discussion by Joe Pishioneri, Jenna McCulley and Brittney agreed that wording could be updated for clarity and a tone of a recommendation versus a directive.
 - Karla Berg suggested the committee agree on a plan on how to agree on new verbiage as the committee is pressed for time in this meeting. Multiple members shared ideas.
 - PD staff member Jessica Crawford provided information on how recommended edits could be incorporated prior to the joint Council meeting while adhering to public meeting requirements.
 - SPAC members approved modification of the recommendation language to include the additional word "Council" for the final report.
- ii. Regarding draft Next Steps and Discussion, Recommendations section bullet #3: Ensure the planning and execution of the new chief hiring process includes extensive community engagement and input
- Joe Pishioneri shared that he spoke with the City Attorney and clarified the recommendation is not in the scope of SPAC. A SPAC member could make a recommendation directly to the City Manager outside of their capacity as a SPAC member.
 - Jenna McCulley provided additional comment that reiterated SPAC's limitation.
 - Bullet #3 was removed from the draft report.
- iii. Regarding draft Next Steps and Discussion, Recommendations section bullet #2: Include existing SPAC committee members in selection process for new committee members and utilize city values/mission statement as part of criteria for evaluating applicants
- After discussion, clarification was made that the recommendation is not specifically outside of SPAC's scope.
 - Brittney de Alicante inquired if the recommendation would be supported as written.

- Joe Pishioneri shared he was concerned the recommendation could affect the boards, commission and committee selection processes across the board. He shared that Council is still working to refine the application process.
 - Karla Berg asked what the intent of the recommendation is and if it was a change.
 - Michael Bean commented that SPAC's insight had been previously asked for input, but acknowledged committee selection is the responsibility of the Council.
 - Barry Lind shared SPAC members are able to encourage individuals to apply.
 - Michael Bean indicated he was okay with removing the recommendation.
 - Chair Barry Lind asked if everyone was okay with striking the recommendation.
 - Brittney de Alicante noted that she opposed removing the recommendation. She would like this discussed by Council. She noted she had several concerns with the recent interviews.
 - Adam Jenkins asked for clarification on whether this recommendation was a result of the recent application process.
 - Brittney clarified the intent was to allow SPAC some input and improve understanding of the criteria for what Council is looking for in future SPAC members.
 - Adam was supportive of the idea of SPAC having involvement in the selection process of future members.
 - Eric Ward noted that if this recommendation could act as a precedence for other commissions, it could be problematic. Eric provided some examples. However, he was not opposed to putting the recommendation forward for Council's consideration.
 - Jonathan Hayes noted if the committee has too much influence on future committee member selection, there may be too many individuals with the same views and agendas.
 - Barry asked for a vote on whether to include the recommendation. Brittney de Alicante and Eric Ward voted in favor to include. As only two voted in favor, the recommendation will not be included in the final report.
- iv. Regarding the Questions for consideration and discussion section of the draft report:
- Joe Pishioneri shared some concern regarding the question "Can SPAC present to other committees as a form of community outreach/engagement?" and whether it could be a meetings issue. He was not proposing removal of the question.
 - Karla Berg asked about using the word "present" or whether the intent was something similar to 'coordinate'.
 - Brittney clarified that the question was intended to clarify options for community engagement that could be possible among committees.
 - Jenna shared that 'gathering' may be a better word than 'present' where committees naturally overlap. An example was how the bicycle and pedestrian committee topics could overlap with SPAC.

- Barry Lind suggested a change in wording from “present” to “share”.
The change in wording was supported.
- v. Due to the meeting time limitation, Barry Lind recommended the goals section of the draft report be removed and replaced with a message that goals are under development. He asked for committee feedback. This recommendation was supported by the committee.
- vi. Barry Lind expressed gratitude to the subcommittee for developing the draft report.
- vii. Terri Dillon motioned to transition the draft annual report to a final version, with the agreed upon changes made. Michael Bean seconded the motion. All SPAC members voted in favor.
- viii. Barry Lind mentioned the joint SPAC-City Council meeting on February 22, 2022.

Meeting adjourned at 7:34pm.