

# **The Portland Police Bureau: Officer-Involved Shootings and In-Custody Deaths**

## **First Follow-Up Report**

**Police Assessment Resource Center**  
520 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1070  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
(213) 623-5757  
[www.parc.info](http://www.parc.info)

**August 2005**

## About PARC

The **Police Assessment Resource Center (PARC)**, a non-profit organization, is dedicated to strengthening effective, respectful, and publicly accountable policing. PARC serves as an “honest broker,” working in cooperation with law enforcement executives, civic and government officials, civilian oversight professionals, and other interested constituencies to improve police performance. Based in Los Angeles and New York, PARC provides direct services to jurisdictions throughout the United States and serves as a national resource center specializing in the formulation and dissemination of model policies and procedures to manage and reduce the risk of police misconduct.

Through its direct services, PARC assists officials in individual jurisdictions as they develop and strengthen oversight systems. PARC conducts reviews of police policies and practices; evaluates external and internal oversight mechanisms; collects and analyzes relevant data; performs accountability audits; and helps police leaders develop and implement management strategies that promote accountability.

As a national resource center, PARC performs research on issues of concern among law enforcement professionals and community members, and provides guidance regarding policing practices and oversight of the police. PARC publishes a monthly newsletter, *Police Practices Review*, maintains an informational website; sponsors forums on issues and trends in the field of policing; conducts and publishes independent research on emerging issues and enduring challenges in policing; and catalogues model policies and procedures.

*A copy of this report is available on-line at [www.parc.info](http://www.parc.info).*

~~firearm is pointed. Every officer who points or draws a weapon should be required to report that use of force.~~

**F. Recommendation 3.2:** *The PPB should expand its written deadly force policy to provide that certain uses of force, such as strikes to the head or other vital areas with impact weapons, may not be used unless the officer is justified in using deadly force.*

To date, the PPB has not made the recommended addition to its policy on deadly force.

The use of deadly force is not limited to firearms. The PPB has a responsibility to provide adequate guidance to its members concerning all types of uses of deadly force. While Section 1010.10 (see Appendix page 12) appropriately identifies weapons and techniques that can constitute deadly force, the policy does not provide more specific guidance on when strikes with impact weapons amount to deadly force. Consistent with the agencies whose policies are discussed at PR 28-30, the PPB's policy should make clear that strikes with impact weapons to the head and other vital parts of the body constitute deadly force.

## **II. Other Substantive Policies**

**A. Recommendation 3.6:** *The PPB should require its officers to record their use of force on a separate Use of Force Report. The PPB should use the information from these reports to analyze and manage its officers' use of force. The PPB should also log and track information from such reports in its early warning system.*

As discussed above, the PPB introduced Use of Force Reports in August 2004 consistent with the PARC recommendation. The Bureau's planned early intervention system, which will allow it to analyze and manage officers' uses of force is not expected

to be operational for up to two more years. Because no department in 2005 can claim to be appropriately managing risk without an operational early warning system, we urge the Bureau to ensure that development of the system does not lag.

**Recommendation 2005.1: The PPB should set a firm deadline for making its early intervention system operational and should prioritize its resources so as to ensure meeting that deadline.**

**B. Recommendation 7.11:** *In order to effectively prevent the unnecessary exposure of its officers to the risks associated with foot pursuits, the PPB should adopt and enforce a policy mandating the use of sound foot pursuit tactics by its officers.*

The PPB is in the process of formulating a foot pursuit policy. An April 28, 2005 draft of such a policy is set forth at Appendix page 8. While the Bureau's decision to formulate a foot pursuit policy is an excellent one, the draft policy leaves room for substantial improvement, including the following:

- Creating a greater emphasis on the dangers of foot pursuits, consistent with the PPB's training documents that label foot pursuits as "one of the most dangerous police actions" officers can expect to perform in the course of routine patrol work. Supervisor In-Service Training, 1997-98.
- Making officer and public safety the prime consideration in determining whether to initiate or continue a foot pursuit.
- Providing more affirmative direction to officers, rather than leaving most pursuit decisions to officers' discretion, subject only to various considerations.
- Presumptively banning solo pursuits.
- Requiring two or more officers engaged in a pursuit to terminate that pursuit if they do not remain in sight of and in communication with all other pursuing officers.