

## MINUTES

Eugene Police Commission  
McNutt Room – Eugene City Hall  
777 Pearl Street

January 8, 2009  
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Tamara Miller, Chair; Joe Alsup, Vice Chair; Brooke Dodge, Tim Mueller, Ann-Marie Lemire, Juan Carlos Valle, Mike Clark, John Ahlen, Marilyn Nelson, George Brown, members; Randi Zimmer, staff; Melinda Kletzok, Linda Phelps, Interim Chief Pete Kerns, Eugene Police Department (EPD).

ABSENT: Jon Belcher, member.

### 1. Agenda and Material Review

Ms. Miller convened the meeting of the Eugene Police Commission.

Ms. Zimmer reviewed the additional material in the packets:

- A meeting schedule for the upcoming Budget Committee meetings.
- Copies of an article from the *Register Guard* on the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT).
- Copies of a guest viewpoint printed in the *Register Guard*, written by Sue Archbald.
- The commendations for December.

She noted that she had also provided copies of the Internal Affairs police summaries to commission members.

### 2. Minutes Approval: December 11, 2008

Mr. Alsup, seconded by Mr. Mueller, moved to approve the minutes from the Police Commission meeting of December 11, 2008, as written. The motion passed 7:0. (Mr. Valle, Ms. Lemire, and Mr. Ahlen had yet to arrive.)

### 3. Public Forum

**Carol Berg-Caldwell** wished to publicly thank the Police Auditor, Dawn Reynolds, for coming to the Communities for Ethical Law Enforcement (CELE) meeting. She related that Ms. Reynolds had shared her feedback from the Police Auditor Ordinance Review Committee (PAORC). She said CELE had been meeting monthly since May, 2008, and was still working to define its focus. She said it “was evolving” that they primarily address the need for effective unbiased external police review beneficial for all. She noted that Police Captain Steve Swenson had attended the previous month’s meeting and had shared good thoughts. She stated that she had asked Ms. Miller if commissioners would be interested in attending a meeting of CELE or Cop Watch and she had indicated they would be interested in doing so. She explained that the CELE meetings met at 6 p.m. on the first Monday of every month at Tsunami Book Store for an hour and invited any interested commissioners. She also wished to extend public appreciation to the President and Vice President of the Eugene Police Employees Association (EPEA), Willy Edeward and Erik Humphrey. She had met them after the PAORC meeting and she felt both of them had been receptive to her comments and were supportive of

improving matters in the community. She noted that she had written letters “blasting” the union leadership and had been hyper-critical of them when speaking before the City Council and elsewhere. She commented that it did not serve anyone to “stay stuck in the past.” She felt that this was the spirit that she shared with the two police union leaders.

**Deborah Frisch** requested that the Chief’s comments be moved up earlier in the meeting or that the Police Commission meetings be televised. She discussed some of her concerns about current Internal Affairs (IA) investigations. She did not feel that Eugene Police Department (EPD) policies regarding IA were adequate.

**Zachary Vishanoff** averred that the new committee whose charge it was to review the police auditor ordinance should look at the work that the previous committee had done and its written materials. He reiterated his story of being shot with a “less-than-lethal gun” on March 15, 2003. He alleged that the officers had “invented” a story that he had “lunged at a cop.” He hoped that he would be cleared of this some day. He was concerned that later photos taken of his bruises were still on file somewhere. He wanted to know if the photo had been sent to the manufacturer of the beanbag gun or whether it was in Homeland Security somewhere. He suggested that he could bring a videotape of the incident so that the Police Commission could see it. He said he wanted to get “some closure.”

**Majeska Seese-Green** said she wanted to see the video Mr. Vishanoff mentioned. She believed that the City owed him a process to come to closure. She indicated that she wished to testify regarding the Police Commission’s invitation to the event being put on by the Citizens for Public Accountability (CPA). She hoped the commission would come up with a different decision upon revisiting it. She felt the commission should decide to send a representative. She preferred that the commission send Mr. Ahlen, but if Mr. Ahlen could not come then she suggested that Mr. Alsup should do so.

#### **4. Comments from Chair and Items from Commissioners**

Ms. Zimmer welcomed Mr. Brown. She underscored that she served as a resource to the commission. She noted that the Web site had archived materials as well.

Ms. Zimmer announced that Chuck Hare had resigned from the Police Commission. She said they would begin the process of selecting a replacement for him. She indicated that the commission might have to add new members to committees, noting that Mr. Hare had planned to participate on the Public Outreach Committee set to begin in February. She asked anyone who had interest in joining the committee to let her know. She stated that the applications for the commission were available online.

Ms. Miller explained that the commission would convene an interview committee to interview applicants and anyone interested in participating should let Ms. Zimmer know.

Ms. Miller thanked all the members of the public who came to speak before the commission. She expressed appreciation for their time and effort. She said there had been a lot of discussion regarding sending a representative of the Police Commission to the CPA panel. She felt that she had not had access to enough information about it when they first discussed this.

Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. Nelson, moved to reconsider sending a member of the Police Commission to the Citizens for Public Accountability panel event planned for January 21, 2009. The motion passed unanimously, 10:0.

Ms. Miller asked Mr. Valle if he would be willing to represent the Police Commission at the event.

Mr. Valle questioned whether Mr. Ahlen or Mr. Alsup could represent the Police Commission better given that they had served on the commission for longer than he had. He also wondered what had made Ms. Miller move to reconsider the previous position.

Ms. Miller responded that she had originally thought the focus of the panel would be on the police oversight ordinance efforts, but the representative of the CPA had convinced her this was not the case. She said she would consider Mr. Alsup or Mr. Ahlen the appropriate choice for that role if this was the case, but since it was not she felt that Mr. Valle was a more appropriate choice.

Mr. Valle agreed to attend the panel. He said he would be honored and would do his best to represent the Police Commission.

Mr. Alsup thanked Mr. Valle for being willing to do so. He added his welcome to Mr. Brown and also noted that he was sorry to lose Mr. Hare.

Mr. Alsup stated that he had gone to the State of the City Address and he wanted to congratulate the Violent Crimes Team. He noted that the team had handled 1,300 cases of child abuse in one year, among several notable accomplishments.

Mr. Alsup related that he and Mr. Ahlen had attended the first meeting of the PAORC, which had mostly focused on the group process and protocols. He thought it would be a good group and he was pleased and confident that there would be a good outcome.

Mr. Alsup shared that he would be attending the inauguration of Barack Obama and would be allowed to sit in the security area, having won a slot in a lottery through Senator Ron Wyden's office.

Mr. Ahlen clarified that Police Commissioners could take this time to respond to public comments made during that portion of the meeting. He said the only thing they could not respond to was an allegation made against an officer. He suggested that they restructure the introductory remarks prior to the public comment segment of the meeting to let people know of this.

Mr. Ahlen expressed a preference for having any emails submitted that were relevant to the commission's discussion included in members' packets in order to maintain transparency.

Mr. Valle said he also attended the first PAORC meeting. He had been pleased to see a lot of support for facilitating public comment both at the beginning and at the end of the meeting. He was also pleased to see the representatives of the EPEA at the table. He underscored the importance of having buy-in and support from them. He felt they would bring a lot to the table. He added that he was looking forward to the Public Outreach Committee that was planned to begin meeting in February. He was not certain yet what role the committee would play, but he felt that once it convened it would become clearer.

Mr. Mueller related that he also had attended the first PAORC and had been glad to see a number of police commissioners there. He also was pleased that the committee planned to hold two segments for public comment during its meetings.

Mr. Mueller stated that he had attended the State of the City address. He was pleased to hear the Mayor mention community policing several times.

Mr. Mueller passed around several items for the commission's perusal: a call for prison reform by Senator Webb and an article regarding the police use of excessive force. He felt the latter offered an "interesting point of view."

Ms. Nelson also welcomed Mr. Brown to the Police Commission. She had been pleased that the commission had changed its decision and voted to send a representative to the CPA panel. She added that she would like staff to follow up on the issue raised during public comment in regard to why the meetings were not televised.

Ms. Miller recalled that the issue had come up in the past and they had been told it was a budget issue. She said Ms. Zimmer or Ms. Phelps would talk to City Manager Jon Ruiz about it.

Mr. Brown averred that it was a good idea to send a representative to the CPA meeting. He related that he had attended several of their meetings on different matters and he believed it was a good group of people. He noted that he had met with Willy Edewaard and Erik Humphrey, the EPEA representatives, over coffee. He said it had been a good meeting. He said he had, like a lot of people, held some negative views about the police union and meeting with them had corrected some of his "mis-assumptions" about the union. He called it a fruitful conversation.

Mr. Clark welcomed Mr. Brown. He said to let him know if he could be of any help. He added his congratulations to the Violent Crimes Team, which had been honored at the State of the City. He commented that he wished he could say he was surprised by the numbers but he was not. He related that he had served on the Child Advocacy Center (CAC) Board for seven years, which worked with the District Attorney's office on child abuse cases. He called the number of incidents "staggering." He appreciated the detectives' work in dealing with a "real tragedy."

Mr. Clark appreciated Ms. Berg-Caldwell's remarks. He said he tried to be open to seeing things and people from different perspectives, though he sometimes had a passionate response to an issue. He was willing to get to know someone and have a different opinion of them or to get different information and try to be open to learning with it. He respected this and wanted to convey his appreciation and respect for the comments Ms. Berg-Caldwell made during the public comment segment of the meeting.

Mr. Clark reminded the Police Commissioners of the upcoming Budget Committee schedule. He encouraged them to come and speak during the public comment time. He said he planned to ask for a council meeting in April to discuss the City's part in law enforcement given the challenges coming from the County's lack of funding.

Ms. Dodge welcomed Mr. Brown. She reported that she had gone on a ride-along on the day after Christmas. She had been amazed to see how much had happened in five hours.

Ms. Lemire also welcomed Mr. Brown. She had attended the State of the City and had felt proud to see the elected officials that the community had voted to represent it. She noted that she liked the optimism that the Mayor had shared in her address. She had also attended the first PAORC meeting. She felt that the representation on the committee was even. She added her feeling that a picture of the award to the Violent Crimes Team should be on the front page of the paper.

Ms. Lemire stated that the Civilian Review Board (CRB) had not met in December because of inclement weather. She said the CRB Chair, Munir Katul, had tendered his resignation but intended to remain on the CRB until a replacement had been appointed.

## **5. Information Session: EPD and the Media**

Public Information Director for the Eugene Police Department (EPD), Melinda Kletzok, provided an overview of the Public Information Office (PIO) function with power points. She related that not only do media members, but also members of the public called the public information office frequently, the two members of the team also work on projects and other more proactive items. She said the media had changed quite a lot in the past few years as a result of technological advances; news travels more quickly and media are cutting personnel as well as redirecting staff to online news production.

Ms. Kletzok discussed the spots the EPD ran on Working City, a city-wide program. She noted that one public service announcement (PSA) about the summer youth programs had been planned one year in advance in order to use footage from the programs for a public service announcement and it had cost \$200 to put it together. She said they completed the same type of project for the Citizens' Police Academy and for employee recruitment.

Ms. Kletzok stated that they followed Oregon Public Records laws when releasing information. She discussed the department's efforts to be proactive with crime prevention information and with notices to the public. She noted that public records requests had increased in the last year. She stated that the department had a Community Outreach Initiative as part of its strategic plan and had assembled a task force to work on this.

Ms. Kletzok outlined the interagency work done for crisis preparedness. She said the PIO was in a network between the County and the City made up of approximately 50 people from all sorts of agencies, such as the Red Cross, hospitals, utilities, governments, and news agencies. She underscored that if there were to be a crisis, each of the members would be able to coordinate the information more quickly and get it out to the public. She noted that the PIO had created a complete program for the Olympic Trials that can be used for crisis response in the future.

Continuing, Ms. Kletzok related that other items the PIO is involved with include creating, reviewing and revising all of the EPD publications to give them a "standard look and feel," supporting recruiting efforts, website features, and organizing awards ceremonies, promotion ceremonies, and the Employee of the Month. She stated that a prior PIO had developed a historical timeline which would be placed on the Web site soon. She said the PIO also provided media training to all sworn officers and advanced training for new sergeants.

Ms. Kletzok stated that the PIO also coordinated the newsletter for the EPD. She noted that they clipped all of the media coverage of the EPD and had observed that 90 percent of it was either neutral or positive. She related that they were initiating a speakers bureau with the intent of sending representatives to speak to neighborhood groups. She closed her presentation by sharing two PSAs used for recruitment, one for 9-1-1 call-takers and one for police officers. She showed how to navigate the EPD Web site and access crime maps.

Mr. Mueller asked if the PIO network was used for things that were not crises. Ms. Kletzok replied that it did not get used all of the time. She noted that someone from the network had called her on a more informal basis recently to ask if she could recommend someone to contact who had experienced a situation the caller was currently facing. She related that there sometimes were limited crises that were incident-related.

Mr. Brown asked what non-media inquiries referred to. Ms. Kletzok responded that this referred to inquiries from the public and other entities.

Mr. Valle asked if Ms. Kletzok knew why the number of public records requests had increased and whether it

correlated with anything. Ms. Kletzok surmised that it could be one result of the enhanced visibility of the CRB and the cases they were reviewing.

Mr. Alsup asked Ms. Kletzok to provide an example of facilitating communication with diverse communities. Ms. Kletzok cited the Mano a Mano program which was utilized by the Crime Prevention Team, as one example, and distribution of an existing video that had been made to help officers conduct traffic stops with people from different cultures as another. She added that when the department makes its videos and brochures they will be ensuring they are accessible to people.

Ms. Miller said she was impressed by how the EPD and its PIO had changed and adapted with the changing technologies.

Mr. Clark said from the standpoint of being in the media business the videos that were made were “exceptionally good quality work” for a low dollar figure. He added that she should let the commission know if there was ever any work they could do to discuss policy issues related to the changing technology.

Mr. Valle asked what the most common request made of the PIO was. Ms. Kletzok replied that most often they were requests for copies of a report that had been made in the media. She said most of the requests she received were from the media.

Ms. Phelps asked for an example of this. Ms. Kletzok responded that the May 2008 Taser incident that was currently under review had generated requests from the media for relevant documents. She said another example would be a case discussed by the CRB that went out to the media causing a television station to request the report.

Mr. Mueller observed that the Crime Watch map designated what the crimes consisted of but there was no indication of whether the crimes were solved. He suggested that they find a way, such as changing the color of the designation, to indicate this. Ms. Kletzok thought this was a good idea and said she would look into it. She remarked that Eugene did an “extremely good job” of recovering stolen vehicles, as one example of something noteworthy.

Ms. Miller thanked Ms. Kletzok for her presentation. She called for a ten-minute break at 6:50 p.m.

## **6. Committee Reports**

### **Universal Access Committee**

Mr. Mueller reported that the committee had completed the information gathering and had begun working through the policy draft of 418, regarding persons with suspected mental illness. He noted that the title would likely be changed so that it referred to persons who are experiencing a suspected mental health crisis. He said the committee had discussed sections 418.1 through 418.3 and progress had been made. He underscored that they had much yet to do. He commented that he had been disappointed that some of the policy that he felt reflected public input was met with resistance. He hoped those issues could be resolved. He stated that they would continue working on the policy review at the next meeting, scheduled for January 14 at 5 p.m. in the McNutt Room.

### **Policy Screening and Review Committee**

Mr. Valle said the committee was beginning its review of the policy regarding medical marijuana. He explained that the purpose of this was to provide EPD employees guidance on how to distinguish between claims of medical marijuana and criminal controlled substance violations. He related that the committee had not been able to look into the draft, but discussed what work needed to be done prior to this discussion such as potentially asking for a legal opinion. He understood that there was one legal opinion already and they may obtain a copy of it. He stated that the next step in regard to the policy was to identify issues of concern in the policy and then progress from there. He had been pleased to have a couple of members of the public provide testimony. He said the next meeting was scheduled for January 28. He added that the committee had determined that it would delegate the policy regarding service animals to the Universal Access Committee.

### **Police Auditor Ordinance Review Committee**

Mr. Ahlen reiterated that the first meeting had largely focused on process and the public comment periods. He said it was his intent to come back to the commission and summarize the information that was taking place in the committee and hear from the commissioners. He stated that the meetings would be accessible via Web cast on the city Web site. He remarked that the public would likely be very passionate about the issues that they would be addressing and had been encouraged to submit comments in writing.

Mr. Ahlen reported that the committee was in the process of setting up its timeline, considering whether to hold a public forum or public hearing, and determining whether to approve things by a two-thirds vote or a simple majority. He said the committee would look at the original 12 issues brought forward by Bonny Bettman as well as six additional issues that had come up later. He explained that they intended to go through them by addressing the ones that looked like they could be moved through fairly quickly first. He welcomed input from commissioners on items of concern for them. He asked Ms. Zimmer to bring up the Web site for the PAORC so that the commissioners could see where the meeting materials were available. He briefly highlighted some of the materials.

Mr. Clark said he originally had advocated for the formation of the committee in order to have a deeper discussion on Ms. Bettman's proposed changes to the ordinance language. He said Ms. Bettman's big fear had been that the work would not be completed by the set end date, March 11. He underscored that he would not advocate for extending this period of time.

Mr. Alsup assured Mr. Clark that the committee was very committed to its timeline.

Mr. Mueller wondered if the discussion of what was bargainable with the EPEA and what was not might slow the process down. Mr. Ahlen responded that his sense was that all of the conversations the committee would have would be translated and would be in direct relation to the motions. He explained that the committee would be engaging in an exercise in which people would be able to flag the different issues with a green light, meaning that the person thought the item could be moved forward to the City Attorney to draft into ordinance language, a yellow light, meaning that the person needed more information or had reservations, and a red light, which would mean that the person had a great deal of discomfort with an issue. Mr. Alsup added that the Chair had been concerned about the meetings with the Police Auditor and the union and whether or not that would be considered a binding agreement that would carry the same weight as the language in the contracts. He explained that there had been several pages of procedural protocols that they had met and discussed and signed off on.

Chief Kerns noted that when the material had been sent out it had been missing one signature page. He said the people at the table were a representative from the City Manager's Office and the union and the City Manager

had signed the protocols. He explained that this had been misleading; the protocols had been bargained in the same fashion in the same way other labor contracts for the City were bargained.

In response to a question from Ms. Miller, Mr. Ahlen stated that in addition to the election of Tim Laue as chair, the group had a paid facilitator. He said he had great confidence in Mr. Laue's abilities as he had participated greatly in the efforts to draft the original oversight proposals. He related that the group also had support from the City Attorneys and the City Manager's Office.

Mr. Brown related that he attended the first meeting and he felt the group was very committed to moving the process forward. He added that he was curious as to whether the Police Auditor's signature meant that she had read the protocols and approved of them. Chief Kerns clarified that she signed it as a party to the protocols because some of the processes described in them did not pertain to police processes. Mr. Brown added that he had read them twice and had not seen anything objectionable nor had he seen any glaring inconsistencies.

## **7. Chief's Report**

Chief Kerns stated that the department's primary law enforcement strategy was to reduce property crime, but it was not possible to conduct business in the traditional model because of the lack of jail time and reduced District Attorney staff. He said they would reduce property crime regardless of the conditions they had no control over. He underscored that property crime was increasing. He thought that although they had an understaffed department they could make a change in the way crimes occur. He said they would invest in crime analysis as they did not have real time analysis at present. He noted that they did not have online reporting at this point. He related that part of the strategy was included in the department's budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010. He related that there were two public safety stations that were underutilized, the downtown station and the Bethel station. He said they would take the Community Service Officers (CSOs), the crime prevention specialists, and the station managers and have them working proactively in the field using the same crime analysis that was directing the sworn efforts. He explained that if they saw a spike in crime in a certain neighborhood they would saturate the neighborhood with related information. He stressed that this was still just an outline of the department's plans over the coming year and they had just begun designing what it would look like and what it would cost.

Chief Kerns said they would also be working to increase staffing as the department was 11 below its authorized sworn staff including some command officers. He stated that they were finding efficiencies in how the department assigned overtime and they intended to invest the found savings in trying to over hire. He related that the 9-1-1 Communications Center was down 4.5 positions, which needed to be hired. He said when the dispatch center was having a good month it meant they were only down to three drafts, i.e. forced overtime, per month per employee. He declared that no one should have to experience this. He said if it came to a decision between sworn officers and staffing the dispatch center, they would work to staff the dispatch center first.

Continuing, Chief Kerns reported that the department was trying to establish a stop/loss standard. He said they would establish two numbers, so that when the department dropped below the first number due to retirements, injuries, and other reasons they would cease transferring or promoting people and when it dropped below the second number they would start bringing officers back from special assignments, such as the school resource team or the traffic team.

Chief Kerns noted that he was also sitting on the Police Auditor Oversight Review Committee. He agreed that the committee had shown a great deal of commitment to the task at hand and he believed they would complete the work by the deadline. He said he and Police Auditor Dawn Reynolds had worked well together over the past

few months. He related that when he had initially been appointed as Acting Interim Chief the City Manager had sent a memorandum directing him to do things related to implementation of the auditor's office. He remarked that though they had not done a perfect job of working together as the auditor was growing accustomed to her job and he was "getting [his] feet on the ground," progress was being made. He said Ms. Reynolds had been given proxy card access to the administrative office and access to the investigative files. He felt she had been respectful of the access. He related that they were just "putting the finishing touches" on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that he and Ms. Reynolds would sign. He found it coincidental that many of the items contained in the MOU were similar to the 18 items brought forward by former Councilor Bonny Bettman. He said they had recently decided to hold a weekly meeting with the Police Auditor and the IA investigators to pick through the cases that they think would be best for the auditors to participate in interviews. He was confident that very soon the two offices would be working together smoothly.

Ms. Miller asked what comprised Ms. Reynold's participation in interviews. Chief Kerns replied that the City Attorney's office had defined it for them; the Police Auditor and IA investigators would sit down before the interview and determine what they needed to accomplish with it. He stated that the investigator would be the only one to ask questions and then before the interview was completed the auditor and investigator would leave the room in order to provide the auditor opportunity to bring up anything that she felt had not been addressed.

Ms. Miller asked if this had been bargained with the EPEA. Chief Kerns responded that this was an item of considerable dispute. He said this was something the union had strong objections to. He related that the union had filed two Unfair Labor Practices (ULPs) in the past year, one having to do with the ordinance that the council had put before the voters in the past and the other had to do with the auditor's participation in interviews with represented employees. He stated that both ULPs had gone before the Employee Relations Board and the Hearings Official had decided to hear them. The hearing was scheduled for February 5 and 6.

In response to a question from Mr. Alsup, Chief Kerns stated that the parties could submit written arguments within 30 days after the hearing and then the administrative law judge would respond within 30 to 45 days after that. Mr. Alsup observed that this meant the ruling would be conveyed in mid-April.

Mr. Mueller was curious as to why the auditor could be in the room but could not ask questions during an IA interview. Chief Kerns replied that the union objected to the auditor being present at all. He stressed that they had strong feelings about it.

In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Mueller, Chief Kerns explained that an officer had liability in two arenas, the criminal and the administrative. He stated that if an officer committed a crime the officer would face criminal charges as in a wrongful shooting death. He said sometimes an officer would choose to resign rather than be fired in such a case because this could preserve some potential benefit in the future.

Mr. Clark observed that the timeline for the PAORC was shorter than the timeline for the ULPs. He asked what would happen if the administrative law judge found for the union. Chief Kerns responded that he was not a lawyer, but his understanding was that if an administrative law judge decided that this was an area that was required to be bargained with the union then the City would have to bargain with the union in that regard. He stated that the ordinance authorized the auditor to participate in the interviews.

Mr. Brown thought it would be a good idea for the auditor to be able to ask questions in interviews. He asked if the auditor and IA investigator would return to the room for the second round of questions immediately or whether another meeting would be scheduled. Chief Kerns clarified that the entire process happened in one sitting.

Mr. Valle ascertained from the Chief that the auditor could take notes to refer to later. He asked where the liability to the City would stop in the case where an officer was accused of a homicide and had resigned from the force. Chief Kerns replied that if an employee committed a crime the City could be sued. He clarified that the question was whether the employee was fulfilling his or her City duty at the time the crime was committed. He stressed that the department had the responsibility to notify the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training to let them know that an employee, whether resigned or not, had committed a felony.

Continuing, Chief Kerns stated that the City was facing an \$8 million budget gap. He said the City Manager had directed that no one be laid off, that all of the expenses equal the revenues, and that the City would not cut services. He felt the experience of finding ways to do business differently to be remarkable. He related that they had found cost savings by sharing available resources, collaborating with other governments, or discovering ways to do the same work in a more cost effective way. He noted that they had discovered that a person with an assigned cell phone could have a "virtual phone" on their desk and eliminate the land line phone, at a savings of \$50 per phone. He related that the department had over 70 take-home vehicles, assigned mostly to detectives and emergency response personnel, and this presented an opportunity to analyze the costs. He said they were also doing an analysis of school resource teams to see if the policing services could be provided to the schools at a lower cost to both the school districts and the department. Other areas that were being analyzed included the airport assignment and the possible use of voluntary furloughs instead of vacation time.

Chief Kerns briefly reviewed recent police activity. He stated that the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) and the EPD were working together on the recent bomb threats. He reported that the community had seen a spike in robberies during October and November. He noted that this used to be an annual occurrence many years ago and now without local jail capacity it was spiking again. He commended the good work of patrol officers in making arrests related to quite a few property thefts in the campus area. He said a few more people had been arrested in the past two days. He added that local explosives experts had gone to Woodburn to help with the investigation after the bombing incident.

Chief Kerns announced that he would be speaking before the Rubicon Society on January 22 on a panel with Springfield Police Chief Jerry Smith about current crime trends and the shortages in capacity in the criminal justice system. He said he also would be speaking before the City Club on January 30 and he would be attending the Neighborhood Leaders Council (NLC) in the next week. He said he wanted to hear from the NLC regarding a program that was being developed to have police employees attend at the same neighborhood association meeting every month. He thought that if they opened it up to the department, employees would step forward to volunteer to do so.

## **8. Closing Comments**

Mr. Valle thanked the members, and especially Ms. Nelson, of the Policy Screening and Review Committee for supporting the effort to review policies. He also wished to acknowledge that the department was behind in hiring but he thought this presented a great opportunity to be involved and to help with recruitment.

Mr. Mueller noted that when he had gone on a ride-along the officer he was with had suggested that all officers have a take-home care because it took nearly an hour to transfer everything from his locker to the vehicle. He also pointed out that his neighborhood had an "e-list" to let everyone know about crimes, prowlers, lost dogs, etc.

Mr. Brown said he was happy to be at the commission meeting. He noted that he attended meetings of the Downtown Neighbors Association. He said several times an officer had stopped by and he had always

appreciated the opportunity to get to know them.

Mr. Clark said he had not had a ride-along yet but he intended to. He stated that he checked the *Register Guard* site and the Crime Report Map daily. He encouraged everyone to do so. He related that it had opened his eyes to some of the events that had happened in his neighborhood.

Ms. Miller adjourned the meeting at 7:56 p.m.

*(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)*