--- On **Sun**, **5/27/12**, **Ann Brayfield** wrote:

From: Ann Brayfield

Subject: Comments on Less-Lethal Force Recommendations February 2012

To: crc@portlandoregon.gov

Cc:

Date: Sunday, May 27, 2012, 3:13 PM

Recommendation 2012.2: including "unless exigent (pressing, demanding) circumstances exist" will most likely lead to policy breakdown which is already a problem. Using this phrase without specific examples of circumstances in which going beyond three cycles is warranted/acceptable won't improve current use of tasers. NYPD policy (p. 13) would serve our community better as it encourages officers to review all of the options they have including use of interpersonal skills which seem to have been stronger prior to the introduction of the taser. All instances of taser use without regard to number of cycles need to be reviewed.

Recommendation 2012.6: "consider additional, similar revisions" without giving Bureau clear, overarching principles and specifics of what else needs revision seems like a set up for not addressing what needs addressing. Working through this with representatives of workgroup and Bureau might get us to a better result.

Recommendation 2012.7: scenarios need to be real situations that have happened in this jurisdiction and include situations with poor outcomes. In other words this could be an opportunity to train what actions would more likely result in positive outcomes.

Recommendation 2012.9: this recommendation needs to be more specific and more thoroughly detailed in the narrative (p. 19-20) because as it stands it doesn't have much meaning or direction. Give IPR an example of what enhanced documentation of case-handling decisions looks like. This recommendation as written is an example of what the workgroup wants IPR to do better.

Recommendation 2012.10: for the case study (p. 20-21) it would be useful to include checklist(s) for this case so folks can see process in action, i.e. how got to conclusion. In the sentence (p.21) "He did flee....." something seems to be missing.

Recommendation 2012.11: Some specific details in the recommendation and accompanying narrative need to be provided. As it is the narrative speaks about use of force reports not being reviewed as closely as they should have been. The recommendation seems like a huge leap without a specific connection to the behavior that comes before it. Again if a change is to happen with managers accepting greater responsibility for officers' use of force decisions the connection between reports and decisions needs to be laid out here with a path of specifics. Managers need some clear understanding of how they are responsible for officers' decisions.

Narrative comments:

- p. 10: Make clear the point of having policies, standards and laws if officers are granted immunity.
- p. 11: Are arrests for traffic violations lawful police actions?
- p. 12: In describing the seeming inconsistency between policy and procedure in use of tasers, stronger words than conflict and confusing need to be used. Call out loudly what you see here as it is one of the most important findings you have made. Physical injury and death are resulting from this conflict!!
- p. 12: Does ECW=CED?
- p. 12: Define active vs passive resistance.
- p. 12: Name the five comparable agencies.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Ann Brayfield Concerned Citizen