IPR ASSESSMENT CALLS FOR CIVILIAN INVESTIGATORS, EMPOWERED BOARD

A long-awaited assessment report on the “Independent” Police Review Division (IPR)—Portland’s “Civilian Police Review Board”—was released on January 24. The report has led to some interesting developments, including IPR Director Leslie Stevens quitting her post to take a job inside the Portland Police Bureau at their new “Office of Professional Standards.” Mayor Tom Potter talked briefly about taking the IPR out of City Auditor Gary Blackmer’s hands, since Blackmer made it clear he was not supportive of making many of the changes proposed in the report. Mayor Potter later backed down.

The report contains a lot of amazing information, with some basic concerns about the IPR system that community members have been pointing out for years. For instance: The IPR doesn’t do independent investigations; its 9-member Citizen Review Committee (CRC) doesn’t have enough power; the public doesn’t know the system exists; and those who use it are far less satisfied than the officers who do. And, perhaps most clearly, it shows that the system is nearly impossible to understand and tends toward “behind the scenes” work, instead of being open and transparent to the public.

The 137-plus-page report by nationally recognized expert Eileen Luna-Firebaugh contains at least 3 dozen recommendations, many of which could immediately bring improvements. Most significantly, it suggests that the IPR should be doing independent investigations not only on its own, but when directed to do so by the CRC. The current ordinance allows such investigations, but the IPR never conducted one during its entire 6-year existence. For instance: The IPR doesn’t do independent investigations; its 9-member Citizen Review Committee (CRC) doesn’t have enough power; the public doesn’t know the system exists; and those who use it are far less satisfied than the officers who do. And, perhaps most clearly, it shows that the system is nearly impossible to understand and tends toward “behind the scenes” work, instead of being open and transparent to the public.
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In the weeks leading up to the hearing, PCW released an analysis of the report and a companion YouTube video, viewed over 250 times (http://www.youtube.com/peaceandjusticeworks). On March 12, the League of Women Voters (LWV) held a community forum about the IPR system at which PCW and Alejandro Queral, the former director of the Northwest Constitutional Rights Center, talked about the value of the report’s recommendations while Auditor Blackmer and newly elected CRC Chair Mike Bigham questioned its validity. However, Bigham also publically stated that (a) he felt the CRC should find a way to help after officer-involved shootings and deaths in custody, since now the CRC is held “at arm’s length” and the media puts the officers “on trial,” which is “not serving anyone”; (b) the IPR should consider putting appeal forms in with the disposition letters that go to complainants; and (c) the IPR should consider allowing citizens to appeal “Service Complaints” (what we call the “dirty fork finding”), in which an officer gets talked to for what IPR deems minor misconduct. Bigham repeated only this last proposal when he testified at Council a week later.

Meanwhile, Auditor Blackmer and Director Stevens released their own analyses of the report on the morning of February 28. The scathing memos appeared to be efforts to divert attention away from the shortcomings outlined in the report, as they omitted important recommendations and inadvertently affirmed the report’s suggestion that the IPR and the Auditor do not adequately value community input. The Oregonian’s January 26 editorial advised “when [Auditor Blackmer] does respond formally late in February, he should take care to model the nondefensive behavior he expects city agencies to show when he audits them.” The Auditor would have done well to heed that advice. Instead, he rejected nearly every recommendation as being vague, faulty or already being done, labelling the report’s conclusions as based on “errors, faulty assumptions, and inadequate research.” For her part, Director Stevens avoided discussion of the pros and cons of most of the actual recommendations, instead attacking the report’s conclusions—lending a further sense of defensiveness to the conversation.

Blackmer showed his contempt for the citizenry when he wrote his thoughts on Luna-Firebaugh’s suggestion that the CRC “direct the IPR Director to conduct an independent investigation” in certain circumstances. “I disagree on principle because I will not have my employees under the direction of a citizen body,” he wrote. “I think it is both a violation of our duties as officers and a violation of their expectation that the citizens not be allowed to direct their own investigation.” Blackmer showed his contempt for the citizenry when he wrote his thoughts on Luna-Firebaugh’s suggestion that the CRC “direct the IPR Director to conduct an independent investigation” in certain circumstances. “I disagree on principle because I will not have my employees under the direction of a citizen body,” he wrote. “I think it is both a violation of our duties as officers and a violation of their expectation that the citizens not be allowed to direct their own investigation.”

Blackmer showed his contempt for the citizenry when he wrote his thoughts on Luna-Firebaugh’s suggestion that the CRC “direct the IPR Director to conduct an independent investigation” in certain circumstances. “I disagree on principle because I will not have my employees under the direction of a citizen body,” he wrote. “I think it is both a violation of our duties as officers and a violation of their expectation that the citizens not be allowed to direct their own investigation.”

Blackmer voiced his contempt for the citizenry when he wrote his thoughts on Luna-Firebaugh’s suggestion that the CRC “direct the IPR Director to conduct an independent investigation” in certain circumstances. “I disagree on principle because I will not have my employees under the direction of a citizen body,” he wrote. “I think it is both a violation of our duties as officers and a violation of their expectation that the citizens not be allowed to direct their own investigation.”

During closing comments, Commissioner Sam Adams made it clear he wanted to find a way for the IPR to conduct independent investigations. Due to either confusion or deliberate efforts to distract, Auditor Blackmer and Chair Bigham implied that the recommendation means the CRC must screen all 700 complaints that come to IPR to determine who should investigate; in fact, the recommendation is to set criteria that would trigger such investigations. The report notes that in Boise, Albuquerque and Eugene, OR, such criteria are: high-profile shootings, deaths, use of force with serious bodily harm, racial profiling, illegal searches, and when there is “high emotion in the community,” or a conflict of interest.

Speaking of conflict of interest, Stevens’ departure to the Police Bureau could not have better illustrated that the IPR’s relationship with the police is far closer than its connection to the community. The Auditor posted a job description for a new IPR Director on March 24, which did not mention either the ability to conduct independent investigations (though it mentions conducting investigations as a required skill) nor the Citizen Review Committee (though it says the Director has to work with the public).
With a consultant’s report urging them to get more power, review more policies, and obtain their own staff person (see p. 1), the Citizen Review Committee (CRC) has recently taken action. In addition to presenting their policy review on police towings to City Council (the first ever), pushing the Transit Police to establish means for accountability, and speaking their minds on the consultant’s assessment of the “Independent” Police Review Division (IPR), the CRC voted to sustain a complaint at their February meeting. Unfortunately, it was for the wrong reason.

They also elected Mike Bigham, previously Vice Chair, to take over as Chair from Hank Miggins, who had held that position since December, 2003. Miggins is now the Vice Chair. Bigham, a former Port of Portland Police officer, has shown moderation in his approach to issues. While he praises the “behind-the-scenes” philosophy of Auditor Gary Blackmer, who oversees the IPR and thus its 9-member CRC, Bigham also is considering changes such as allowing citizens to appeal complaints which have not been fully investigated.

Meanwhile, as IPR Director Leslie Stevens took herself out of the “Independent” review process and into the Police Bureau’s new Office of Professional Standards, Assistant Director Pete Sandrock took over her duties while a new Director is sought. The IPR, for its part, quietly released its 2005-2006 annual reports, one and two years after they were due by City Ordinance.

Case #2007-x-0008: “I’m a concerned citizen, I’ll be waiting for my Christmas card in the mail.”

In February, the CRC heard case #2007-x-0008, in which off-duty Officer Kevin Wolf (#40799) pointed a gun at a contractor as she was working on the house next to his at 11 PM in Silverton, OR. After an investigation by the Bureau’s Internal Affairs Division (IAD), the officer’s commander and the Performance Review Board (PRB) found Wolf guilty of using profanity, intimidation, and failing to write a report on the incident. The appellant thinks Wolf also should not have pointed the gun at her, and failed to identify himself as an officer.

The PRB said the officer was within policy (“Exonerated”) but should be “debriefed” on the gun pointing because he should have called 911 and waited for police, instead of confronting the woman and her boyfriend by himself. They said he had the right to point a gun if he believed they were committing a crime. The CRC generally agreed, but voted 4-2 to recommend that the Bureau “Sustain” the use of force allegation—not because Wolf pointed a gun “in her face” when she was clearly unarmed and posed no threat, but because the use of force directive (1010.20) says an officer can only use the force “reasonably necessary” to accomplish their law enforcement purposes. The CRC said Officer Wolf took steps putting himself unnecessarily in the position of using his gun. Chair Bigham noted that the officer placed himself in considerable danger by not calling for backup, and if other officers were present he might not have “needed” the gun. This logic shows that CRC was more concerned for the officer’s safety than for what happened to the citizens. A member of Portland Copwatch raised the question, what would have happened if the officer had used his gun and shot someone? The CRC, IPR, Internal Affairs, and the Commander all supported the gun pointing; it is disturbing that such escalation of force is now considered commonplace and acceptable.

Regardless, this is the first time since 2005 that the CRC has voted to sustain a finding, and only the third time the Bureau has accepted the recommendation as made out of a total of seven efforts since 2002.

CRC member Mark Johnson mentioned directive 311.30, guiding the off-duty responsibility of officers. It includes factors to consider before taking action, which Officer Wolf seems to have ignored. Johnson also read into the record that the officer had consumed three beers in two hours, and had fallen asleep. The Silverton police allegedly did not smell alcohol on him so that was not considered relevant.

This was the first CRC case where police used the new “Unproven” finding, which combines the old “Unfounded” (incident did not occur as alleged) and “Insufficient Evidence” (he said/she said) findings. The Bureau applied “Unproven” to whether or not the officer identified himself. Wolf told investigators he said he was a police officer but “didn’t say it loud” so as not to alert others in the house of his presence. This makes no sense, especially since the appellant and her boyfriend agreed that the officer yelled just about everything else.

The appellant said she asked Wolf repeatedly to identify himself and he refused, including at the end, when she asked for and received names and information from the Silverton officers. Officer Wolf told her, “I’m a concerned citizen, I’ll be waiting for my Christmas card in the mail.”

IAD investigated whether Wolf ever identified himself as a police officer, but Commander Crebs said that he did not investigate whether Wolf violated directive 312.50, which would have required him to give his name and badge number upon request. CRC failed to fully address that allegation, instead voting to add a “debriefing” to the Bureau’s finding by a vote of 6-0, meaning Crebs will talk to Wolf about his actions.

In her March letter to the CRC accepting the proposed changes, Chief Sizer says she agrees with their recommendation, but says nothing about the directive on officer identification.

Stepping Up Under Pressure?

Those who regularly read the People’s Police Report have a long-term view of the IPR/CRC as a police oversight body that moves slowly and rarely takes initiative, in part because those CRC members who tried to do so in 2003 ultimately resigned in frustration as the Auditor and staff stopped them at every turn (PPR #30). However, in recent months, perhaps due to the scrutiny of the consultant examining their work, they have stepped up in a few areas.

For example, Vice Chair Hank Miggins has continued to pursue concerns about the Police Bureau’s Transit Division. In 2006, the CRC discovered that officers from outlying agencies around Portland do not have to comply with Portland’s Directives even while under control of a PPB commander, including that they can’t be compelled to testify at IAD. To follow up, Miggins brought in Transit Commander Vince Jarmer to the March meeting (also see Tri-Met article, p. 8). (continued on p. 4)
The CRC continues to review the recommendations made by the Police Assessment Resource Center (PARC) regarding shootings and deaths in custody (PPRs #31, 37 & 41). Even though the PARC work group agreed initially to review all 115 PARC recommendations, they have succumbed to the IPR Director’s suggestion of limiting the review to the 26 made in 2005 and 2006.

Some major issues raised by PARC have to do with the Use of Force and Performance Review Boards (UFRB/PRB). These bodies are made up mostly of police personnel, but involve one or two citizens from a pool of 20, including several members of CRC. When CRC called in the Bureau staff person for the UFRB/PRBs, she was unable to state how many times the boards had met or how many cases each has deliberated on.

The UFRB and PRB meetings are closed to the press and the public, and board members are sworn to secrecy. The PRB is primarily supposed to handle cases involving proposed “Sustained” findings where the discipline will be time off or greater. Sgt. Mitch Copp wrote in the February 2008 issue of the Portland Police Association’s Rap Sheet, “low level cases are being referred to the PRB by some precinct commanders. What our members don’t appreciate is the public scrutiny that accompanies board review.” We wonder what “public scrutiny” he’s worrying about, since we can’t even get raw statistics about the Boards’ meetings. Copp calls the process a “morale killer” and urges the Bureau to handle discipline “internally.” We hope the City Council will look at these boards and make them more integrated, public and transparent.

**Nobody Knows What Goes On Behind Closed Doors**

At April’s CRC meeting, Auditor Blackmer brought up some ideas regarding the consultant’s assessment report. He mentioned that he and the Mayor were going to split the costs of a new staff person who would work half time supporting the CRC and part of their other half time could include conducting investigations. This is a big step for Blackmer, who vehemently opposes IPR conducting investigations. He also suggested that he was willing to look at ways for citizens who are unhappy with their cases being dismissed to file some kind of appeal.

Rather than lead a discussion on these ideas, Chair Bigham referenced a meeting coming up two days later, but refused to comment on that meeting when pressed by PCW. It turns out that four members of CRC—less than a quorum so they did not have to invite the public—agreed to meet Blackmer privately to discuss the upcoming changes. The CRC inadvertently proved the consultant was right about working too much “behind the scenes.”

**In other IPR/CRC News:**

—The Bias Based Policing work group, currently reviewing cases for Bureau policy and IPR/IAD process issues, finally made a presentation to the City’s Racial Profiling committee in March (also see p. 1).

—The CRC’s Outreach Committee and Director Stevens put their outreach efforts on hold, claiming they had hoped the consultant’s report would contain specific recommendations but did not. On the contrary, the report listed many specific ideas including creating a speakers’ bureau for the CRC.

**PARC Work Group and Performance/Use of Force Review Boards**

In March, CRC held a discussion regarding the consultant’s report and talked about making it possible to appeal Service Complaints—a good idea, since in 2002 the IPR Director changed the rule so citizens no longer had to sign off on the complaints. They also discussed reviewing at least five recent cases in which people objected to Service Complaints, and making mediation an alternative to an appeal for a Service Complaint.

CRC members Sherrelle Owens and Mark Johnson both suggested clarifying and strengthening CRC’s role in defining allegations, after several back-and-forths with staff about whether they are allowed to add allegations during their appeal hearings.

CRC presented its Tow Policy Report (PPR#43) to City Council in January. Although only their third policy recommendation about Bureau directives in six years of existence, it was the first to be accepted publicly by Council. Unfortunately, while some of the Commissioners agreed that it would be good to pursue collecting data on the race and other traits of those whose cars are towed, they did not vote to force Chief Sizer to accept that recommendation.

The IPR staff also did some stepping up, though behaving a little like students writing their homework in class. The annual reports for 2005-2006 were combined into one document and released quietly like students writing their homework in class. The annual reports for 2005-2006 were combined into one document and released quietly. Although only their third policy recommendation about Bureau directives in six years of existence, it was the first to be accepted publicly by Council. Unfortunately, while some of the Commissioners agreed that it would be good to pursue collecting data on the race and other traits of those whose cars are towed, they did not vote to force Chief Sizer to accept that recommendation.

The report shows IPR dismissed 63% of the complaints in 2006, an all-time high. Overall less than 10% of all complaints that citizens bring to the IPR ever get fully investigated.

The CRC received 90 appeals in 2002-2004, but only 15 in 2005-07, holding 31 hearings in ‘02-'04 and just 7 in ‘05-07. The number of complaints to IPR has been roughly 700 a year. Although the annual report includes charts on the lower number of use force complaints and proficiency complaints (and police shootings—see p. 9), there is no way to tell whether that means police are using less force or if people are avoiding the IPR system because of its shortcomings.

The report also says that of 508 tort claims reviewed by IPR, the Bureau sustained misconduct allegations in just 2 of 24 cases they investigated.

Also in March, Acting Director Sandrock presented the “Director’s Report,” and for the first time in the IPR’s history handed out a written version. Sandrock has always been better than Stevens and her predecessor, Richard Rosenthal, in making sure the public has information it needs.

**Other Ideas for Changes to IPR/CRC:**

—Change the “Reasonable Person” standard the CRC uses to decide if the Bureau’s findings are “supported by the evidence” to preponderance of the evidence, the standard used in most other review systems (consultant’s report, page 119).

—Have CRC accept appeal notices directly from complainants, because the Director has had several “bites of the apple,” from intake to overseeing the investigation at Internal Affairs, to signing off on the findings (consultant’s report, page 121).

—Add a specific staff person for the CRC to assist with hearings, policy review and outreach (consultant’s report, page 12).

—Change the City Charter and make the IPR, Ombudsman’s office and Human Relations Office truly independent of City Council.

Contact the IPR at 503-823-0146.
SHOOTINGS/DEATHS NEWS: OFFICER WHO SHOT UNARMED BLACK MOTORIST HIRED IN BEAVERTON

Perez Lawsuit Continues Despite Setback; Chasse Documentary in Works; Mandated County Board Meets

It’s a relief that the past four months bring no news of new Portland Police shootings or deaths in custody, though the same can’t be said for some of our neighboring communities (see below). In fact, on April 16 Portland Police passed a milestone: Their longest period of time since 1995 without a shooting or death (240 days). However, there are a few new developments in the March, 2004 shooting of James Jahar Perez—Officer Jason Sery, who shot and killed Perez, then resigned from the Bureau to pursue his faith (PPR #34), was hired in January by the Beaverton police. In addition, Perez’s family lawyer, Elden Rosenthal, received a decision from the 9th US Circuit Court of Appeals that Portland’s deadly force policy does not, in their opinion, violate the constitution, but the civil suit was allowed to move forward on other grounds (Oregonian, January 23). And the Mental Health Association of Portland announced plans for a documentary film on the September, 2006 in-custody death of James Chasse, Jr. (PPR # 40-43).

Sery’s being hired in Beaverton was a disappointment to some leaders of the African American community. Dr. T. Allen Bethel told the Oregonian (January 15), that it’s wrong: “We are opposed to him being an officer again.”

On the flip side, Officer Thomas Brennan wrote in the Portland Police Association (PPA)’s Rap Sheet (February issue) that he wished Sery had been back in Portland, but Brennan heard “It was made clear to [Sery] by Bureau management and local politicians that his services would not be welcome.” Brennan incorrectly stated that Sery was cleared of wrongdoing by the inquest jury—in fact, they found that there had been a homicide, but were restricted by the District Attorney from deciding whether there was any criminal element. Brennan says a majority, or “at least the ones who pay taxes” would have wanted Sery rehired in Portland. (Incidentally, Brennan said he learned about Sery being re-hired over the supposedly emergency-based Computer Aided Dispatch system.)

As for the Chasse documentary, the Mental Health Association is calling the film “Alien Boy,” referring to a song dedicated to Chasse in the late 1970s by the Wipers. Filmmaker Brian Lindstrom, whose “Finding Normal” about drug addiction recovery has been highly praised, is set to direct. Their “Alien Boy,” referring to a song dedicated to Chasse in the late 1970s by the Wipers.

In related news, Chasse’s death, which followed a beating by two Portland officers and a Multnomah County Deputy—and incarceration with a “spit sock” over his head in jail, figured into recent news items. Two deaths in the Multnomah County Detention Center raised more issues about the quality of health care by the Multnomah County Sheriff’s Office (MCSO) employees. Holly Jean Casey, 36, died of pneumonia January 4 when a nurse gave her an inhaler instead of treating her illness; Jody Gilbert Norman died in February, 2005 with a “spit sock” over his head in jail, figured into recent news items. Two deaths in the Multnomah County Detention Center raised more issues about the quality of health care by the Multnomah County Sheriff’s Office (MCSO) employees. Holly Jean Casey, 36, died of pneumonia January 4 when a nurse gave her an inhaler instead of treating her illness; Jody Gilbert Norman died in February, 2005 from complications of a heart condition, and a jail nurse allegedly falsified paperwork regarding his medication. This case only began being investigated in 2007. Another former jail nurse is also being prosecuted for “tampering with drug records” (Portland Tribune and Oregonian, March 14). In March, the Oregon State Appeals Court overturned the involuntary commitment of a woman who was sent to the psychiatric hospital to keep her safe from being “beaten to death” by police. The Portland Mercury (March 20) noted that the commitment court took “absolute judicial notice” of Chasse being “beaten to death,” implying that was an undisputed fact.

The Multnomah County task force charged with implementing SB 111, which mandates that each Oregon County have a plan for officer-involved shootings, has been meeting since last fall. Its members are Port of Portland Police, MCSO, the District Attorney’s office, the State Police, the PPA, and Sam Sachs, a former MCSO deputy who is now an anti-racism activist. Portland Copwatch (PCW) and a few other community groups were invited to a meeting of the task force in January to share our perspectives. The task force held three public hearings in mid-April, to which only a few citizens, including a PCW member, showed up. Several other counties have already finalised their plans.

SHOOTINGS OUTSIDE PORTLAND CONTINUE RAISING CONCERNS

—On February 16, Washington County Sheriff’s Deputies Jamison Goetz and Cade Edwards shot and killed Shane Miguel Grundmeyer, 38, when he allegedly rammed their patrol cars after they’d pulled him over following a short chase. A 17-year-old—On February 16, Washington County Sheriff’s Deputies Jamison Goetz and Cade Edwards shot and killed Shane Miguel Grundmeyer, 38, when he allegedly rammed their patrol cars after they’d pulled him over following a short chase. A 17-year-old

—On February 24, Jackson County Deputy Eric Henderson shot Dan Waggoner, who survived, was paralyzed, and was indicted for attempted murder. Waggoner allegedly fired a gun and threatened suicide while in a house with the mother of three of his children; she called 911, and Waggoner allegedly pointed a gun at Deputy Henderson (Oregonian, March 14).

—On April 13, five Oregon State Police troopers and a Roseburg officer shot and killed Donald Lowry at Roseburg’s Douglas Country Fairgrounds when they saw Lowry with two guns (Oregonian, April 15).

—On April 4, the family of Jordan Case, who was shot and killed by a Washington County Deputy and Tualatin and Sherwood officers in October, 2006 (PPR #40), held a vigil at Terry Schrunk Plaza in Portland to call attention to the lawsuit they filed in Federal Court regarding Jordan’s death. At least 60 people attended.
Chief Allows Public Input
But Does She Value It?

Use of Force, Crowd Control Policy
Changes Made Without Community;
Chief’s Forum All But Shut Down

I

n mid-March, the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) issued new directives on officer Use of Force and Crowd Control. Chief Rosie Sizer took a lot of heat from the rank-and-file over the Force policy (see “Rapping Back,” back page), with others applauding her call for the use of “only the force reasonably necessary” as a giant sea change. The Crowd Control policy also gives the impression of a more progressive, less violent Bureau, but still allows for the “full meal deal” to be unleashed upon demonstrators (see PPR #39). Neither of these policies were circulated to the general public for comment; along with Sizer cutting back her Chief’s Forum from twice to once a month and holding those meetings behind closed doors, it seems the community is being cut out of “community policing.”

Both of the new directives are, in their basic framing, apparent steps in the right direction. The Force policy talks about the Bureau’s desire to “resolve confrontation through the application of de-escalation tools and lower levels of force.” The Crowd policy reaffirms the First Amendment right to protest, and notes that “an unplanned/spontaneous event does not automatically mean it is an unlawful assembly.” However, the Force policy now lacks a specific chart, formerly used, that showed what levels of force are appropriate given the behavior of the suspect. This will undoubtedly lead to officers claiming they believe some force is necessary and, without guidelines, Internal Affairs investigations or civil lawsuits will not be able to prove an officer out of policy. The Crowd Control policy adds references to Tasers and “riot control agents” that will require “Bureau personnel to don protective breathing equipment or to evacuate.” Once again, the rewrite leaves out specific tactics and responses from the old policy. The new policy omits limitations under Oregon law on videotaping protesters (ORS 181.575, see PPR #36) and no longer requires officers to remain “neutral in word and action at all times.”

This is more of the pattern we noted when Sizer first became Chief, where on the surface it looks as if progress is being made, but underneath, her first loyalty is to her men and women in blue.

It should also be noted that the Use of Force Policy grew out of the April, 2007 Use of Force Report, written by members of the Bureau, the Independent Police Review Division and just two of the nine members of the IPR’s Citizen Review Committee (CRC). Despite the fact that two of their members helped recommend the rewrite, the CRC was not offered a look at the draft policy.

City Considers Billing Events for Cop Presence

When an audit (from City Auditor Gary Blackmer) revealed that the PPB spent $363,000 on overtime for events in 2006 but “recovered” only $48,000 from organizers, Sizer said she would consider making event planners pay for police protection. While currently capped at about $1200, the fees are proposed to go up to 35% and then 70% of police costs. This idea, proposed by Assistant Chief Berg in a 2007 memo, would be in addition to fees paid to the City for “event planning” (Oregonian, February 15). After a suggestion was made that fees only apply to for-profit events, those organizers complained. It may be only so long before First Amendment events will be requested to pay to have police corral, intimidate, arrest, and pepper spray them (see p. 7).
Sit/Lie Continues to Target Poor

Recent statistics seem to substantiate the perception of advocates for poor and homeless people that the “Sit/Lie” Ordinance targets those populations and is the “move along” tool it apparently was meant to be. The streetroots blog (March 27) reported that since enforcement began in August (PPR #43), 88 warnings and tickets were issued, and 69 of those affected were homeless or transient, while 10 had no address listed.

A February 14 Portland Mercury article reported that the ordinance has been targeting a distinct group of homeless youth. The article further indicated that at the February 7 meeting of the SAFE (Street Access For Everyone) oversight committee, an associate executive director of New Avenues for Youth noted that 8 of the 10 citations to date were for persons younger than 26. Most of the citations in question were written between noon and 2 pm, when New Avenues is closed. Three individuals in their

Police Accountability vs. Police Violence

On March 19th, in an ironic convergence of events, a hearing was taking place at City Hall regarding the consultant’s report on the “Independent” Police Review Division (p. 1) while just up the street PPB officers were interacting with a group of young people participating in an anti-war demonstration. This group had marched to the Wells Fargo Center in order to expose the bank as a war profiteer. A large number of bike cops were arrayed in a line on 5th Avenue opposite the demonstrators. A police loudspeaker proclaimed that the demonstrators needed to get out of the street and onto the sidewalk. A police officer picked up his bike and jammed it into a young man.

As the police began pushing demonstrators out of the street and onto the sidewalk, people were massed together with no place to go. At that time, at least one officer chose to start pepper spraying the crowd. At least four or five young men suffered the result of the pepper spray and, while there were several medics attempting to assist, pain had clearly been inflicted upon the eyes and faces of those sprayed. A man videotaping the incident was also hit in the face by the spray which was flying about.

The officer who was pepper spraying the crowd had a blank where his name should have been displayed on his outermost garment (directive 312.50) and, when asked his name, he refused to answer. Assistant City Attorney Dave Woboril was standing on the sidewalk and, according to the March 20 Oregonian, “provided on-the-ground advice to police commanders.” One can only wonder what advice was in that the pepper spraying was not necessary and occurred when the police had people massed up to the extent they could not move. This is particularly disturbing in light of a new crowd control directive that was issued that day, restricting broad use of pepper spray to situations where a crowd is about to break through police lines.

A few minutes later, four officers from the riot squad (Rapid Response Team) were on a corner a block away “gear up.” One complained that “There used to be 11 of us and now there are only 4.” A citizen witness pointed out to them that they were the ones with the weapons, and during a brief discussion about what their fellow officers had just done to the group of young protestors, one of them stated that he had children of his own. He did not respond to the question as to whether or not he would like to have them sprayed in the face and eyes with pepper spray.

20’s were convicted and fined $347 (the maximum fine) for sitting outside of the downtown RiteAid; a woman was cited who indicated her feet were swollen from standing all day. Rather a sad note from a supposedly civilized society.

In April, advocates for the homeless provided training for Portland Patrol, Inc. (PPI, aka rent-a-cop) officers, who patrol downtown streets on contract with the Portland Business Alliance (PBA) in coordination with Portland Police. The training focused on issues of homelessness and how PPI officers can effectively and humanely communicate with homeless individuals on the streets.

On February 15, the PBA submitted the Citizen Complaint Summary Report for the last quarter of 2007. The PBA received four complaints about security guards and there was one “self-initiated review.” Two complaints were investigated; one was about a different security company; and two were pending as “the potential complainants had not responded to contacts.” The self-initiated complaint involved a person who allegedly was “very negative and hostile” and using profanity when challenging a PPI officer’s behavior. The officer made a “verbal response” for which PPI Chief Executive John Hren reprimanded the officer. Roll call training stressed the maintenance of “professional demeanor.” Another complaint involved an exclusion from a parking garage and “the manner in which the PPI officer had spoken” to the complainant. The exclusion was lifted and the PPI officer was spoken to “and now better understands PPI expectations and how to address such incidents in the future.”

Public Defender Takes Commissioner Leonard to Task on Drug-Free Zone Alternative Plan

Commissioner Randy Leonard and Old Town/Chinatown officer Jeff Myers have instituted a plan (“Project 57”) whereby Myers’ “Dirty 30” list of suspects will be diverted from community court, where drug cases are normally heard, into drug and/or mental health treatment. This scheme is to replace the Drug Free Zones, which expired in September, 2007 (PPR #43). It involves charging people with felonies instead of misdemeanors.

In the January 24 Portland Mercury, public defender Chris O’Connor said, “It’s a sad state of affairs when you force someone to commit a felony in order to get mental health or drug treatment that should be available to them without it. Not to mention that the fundamental lesson of the 20th century seems to me to be that we shouldn’t put people’s names on lists, and then target them for special treatment.” Portland Copwatch has noted previously that Myers, who stops and questions people with no “reasonable suspicion,” does not appear to know or understand that there is a Fourth Amendment when he is patrolling his beat (also PPR #43).

Subsequently, O’Connor subpoenaed Leonard to appear in court to explain why his client wasn’t offered the drug treatment program after his arrest last year (Mercury, February 14). O’Connor argued that everyone should be treated equally under the law, and that his client’s exception was unconstitutional. The case was to be heard on March 3, and Leonard, who stated that O’Connor “may be trying to yank my chain,” indicated he would appear. The man never showed, so the trial may never happen.
Giusto to Resign, County Board Takes Some Responsibility for Jails (continued from p. 1)

ballot initiatives giving control of the jails to the County Commission (see PPR #43). In late January, the two worked out a deal that gives the Commission temporary authority over jail spending and disciplinary matters, to be re-examined in six months (Oregonian, January 31). Complaints and discipline are being handled by the County’s Human Resources department, but perhaps with Portland focusing on independent review (see p. 1), it is time to look at a civilian review board at the Sheriff’s office.

The DPSST still has one more, new allegation to investigate—whether Giusto lied in 2004 when he told the Oregonian he had not been confronted about his affair with Governor Neil Goldschmidt’s wife in the 1980’s. President King opined in the March Rap Sheet that the DPSST should not have the ability to trump employee bargaining rights, as he claims they have by de-certifying officers who regained their jobs after arbitration. “It’s not that I support misconduct, it’s that I have not believed the facts presented rose to the level of decertification.”

Meanwhile, the state ethics commission decided to open a full investigation into Giusto’s use of a county-owned vehicle for personal trips (including some with Lee Doss, the former wife of the Citizens Crime Commission chair who Giusto forced into rehab—PPRs #37 & #41). Giusto lifted the restriction on using vehicles outside the Portland/Vancouver area after his abuse came to light (Oregonian, March 1).

In other bad news for Bernie:

—Giusto intervened to keep on the force the deputy accused of asking women to pull down their pants, looking for a non-existent tattoo (PPR #40). As punishment, the deputy lost 10 vacation days. The number of investigations into misconduct dropped from over 50 under Sheriff Noelle in 2002 to an average of 19 per year under Giusto (“Giusto ignored discipline code, record suggests,” Oregonian, January 30).

—Jail suicides, which had gone down to zero in 1999, were back up in 2003 (1) and ’04 (2); another man died just after being released last year (Oregonian, January 16). The County settled with the family of Berta Lee, one of the people who committed suicide in 2004 for roughly $60,000 for failure to adequately monitor Lee (Oregonian, March 14).

PANIC ON THE RAILS: Militarizing Public Transportation in the Name of Public Safety

While there were some attacks on passengers at several Tri-Met light rail (MAX) stops in the past several months, police from various jurisdictions reacted by going into crisis mode and arranging for greatly increased security on MAX trains. Concerns were initially raised about the downtown area’s Fareless Square being one of the causes of criminal activity and assaults on the trains, although the attacks happened in outlying areas. This was reminiscent of the time, several years ago, when there was talk of doing away with Fareless Square in an effort to stop terrorism. Cooler heads prevailed when it became apparent that any terrorist planning to ride the MAX may have had the means to purchase a $1.75 ticket (PPR #36).

Patrolling of public transportation falls under the Transit Division, which is part of the Portland Police Bureau, but made up of officers from multiple jurisdictions and funded by Tri-Met. Fare inspectors have been on both buses and MAX trains in order to check for tickets. The new plans contain measures for more severe crackdowns on fare evaders, although the public frequently responds to the citations given out by complaining that Tri-Met’s ticket machines are often inoperable.

Representatives of Gresham, Hillsboro, Beaverton and Washington County met in order to plan for the resolution of what they saw as a problem. In mid-March, Tri-Met’s westside precinct opened, and 5 new officers were to begin spending 70% of their time patrolling trains and buses in the area between Beaverton and Hillsboro. The patrol will initially start with two Beaverton police officers, an officer and sergeant from the Hillsboro Police, and a Washington County deputy. The east side precinct began patrols in Gresham on April 1, with plans to increase the number from 6 to 10 officers by July 1 (Oregonian, March 12).

In a 2006 appeal hearing at Portland’s Citizen Review Committee (CRC), a civilian complained he was roughed up by Transit Police at a MAX Station (PPR #40). One of the officers involved was from another jurisdiction. He refused to be interviewed, even though he essentially worked for the Portland Police Bureau. Nothing could be done regarding his refusal. At the March meeting of the CRC, members indicated they wanted to find appropriate ways to hold these Tri-Met officers accountable to the Bureau’s directives. The Tri-Met Commander, Vince Jarmer, told CRC members that he would discuss these concerns with the other agencies and report back to the CRC within 90 days (see p. 3). Generally speaking, officers accused of misconduct have to be investigated by their employers, and witness officers can only be compelled by their own supervisors. Only by having all officers involved in Tri-Met related incidents accountable and available for interviews, can the complaint process be thorough and meaningful.

Tasers Go Commercial: Music Players, Designer Colors and Tupperware-Style Parties

We swear, we are not making any of this up.

• At the 2008 Consumer Electronics show in Las Vegas, Taser International introduced a personal “Taser C2” which can hold one gigabyte of MP3 music files in its holster; they are available in “red-hot,” “fashion pink” and leopard print (Associated Press, January 9).

• After the “Don’t Tase Me, Bro” video circulated on the internet (PPR #43), Taser sales went up 56% (Weekly Dig, January 30).

• In Arizona, Taser parties are held at which women take turns firing off the C2 (Portland Mercury Blog, January 25).

• In January, a 29-year-old man died in Minnesota after being hit with a Taser by state troopers (Associated Press, January 17).

• A Toronto City Council member proposed postponing purchasing more of the devices until more safety studies are done (Canadian Press, Feb. 29).

• A Canadian report included this explanation for an officer not issuing a warning: “Subject would not have understood the command, as subject was a dog.” The same report does not include previously available information such as “related injuries, duration of shocks...[and] precise dates of firings” (Canadian Press, March 24).

• A Gresham woman is suing because an officer zapped her while she was slumped over with her insulin needle, in a diabetic episode (Oregonian, December 12).

• Chicago researchers say all the animals on which they tested Tasers ended up with heart rhythm problems (CBC News, January 30).

Two inmates deaths due to misconduct by jail health care workers were also in the news—see p. 5

The Transit Police have one of the highest rates of use of force of any Portland precinct or Division.

The Oregonian’s January 30 cover story was just one of many contributing to the hysteria of the “danger” of public transportation.

A female Multnomah County deputy fired for taking time off to care for her ailing parent won a $1.8 million award in a civil trial (Associated Press, March 29).

The same story ran in the Oregonian (May 29).
**Bush Administration Appeals Ruling on Constitutionality of Patriot Act in Mayfield Case**

This February, the Bush administration appealed a decision by Oregon U.S. District Judge Ann Aiken, who ruled in the Brandon Mayfield case that a central provision of the Patriot Act is unconstitutional. Mayfield is the Portland-area attorney who was arrested and held for two weeks in 2004 because the FBI mistook a fingerprint in the Madrid train bombing case for Mayfield’s. In September, Aiken ruled that the Patriot Act violates the Fourth Amendment’s protections against unreasonable search and seizure (PPR #43). Under the Patriot Act, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Court was given broader powers to issue warrants without probable cause when “foreign intelligence information” is involved.

The FBI obtained FISA warrants allowing electronic surveillance and searches of Mayfield’s home and office, but released Mayfield after the fingerprint matched a suspected Algerian terrorist. The Bush administration claims that “the constitutional rule that [Aiken’s ruling] adopts has damaging implications for national security.” Mayfield’s $2 million settlement is not affected by the appeal. The Ninth Circuit Court now takes up the case (wired.com, February 8).

**Cops Slam Man Found Not Guilty By Federal Court**

Bennie Washington, a 40-year-old African American man from Portland whose conviction was thrown out because he consented to a search for fear of retaliation from police (PPR #42), has decided to sue the City for $3 million in damages. This provoked sarcasm and name-calling from Detective Peter Simpson, the editor of the Portland Police Association’s newsletter, the Rap Sheet. In Simpson’s January 2008 column, he cites Bishop A.A. Wells, who told the court that African American leaders tell the community to comply so they do not “contribute to the volatility of the scene... Not try to advance any rights other than to stay alive relative to complying with the officer.” The 9th Circuit Court’s finding described a “unique situation in Portland” following the Kendra James and James Jahan Perez shootings, singling out a pamphlet published by the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) that calls on people to “comply with the procedures for a search.” Washington told the court he had read the PPB pamphlet—Simpson adds, “Yeah, sure he did.”

Because Washington’s firearms charge was overturned, Simpson complains that he is now “free to roam the streets of Portland once again. Great. Let’s have a parade for this felonious, gun-toting criminal who probably lied his way to a reversal.” Simpson wants the City to appeal to a higher court. In the meantime, he thinks they need to pull the “Understanding Police Procedures” pamphlets and destroy them. The pamphlets, he says, have done nothing to improve relations. He suggests as an alternative: small cards that read “Obey the law. Courtesy of the Portland Police.”

Simpson relates a case he worked on in which an “active gangster” had a suspended license said police could search his car. Simpson pried open the glove box and found a gun and 3.5 ounces of crack (how convenient!). The guy said he “figured I’d say yes since it was going to happen anyway.” The judge called it involuntary. Now Simpson is convinced that when people refuse a search it is because they have weapons or drugs on them, a frightening reaction to citizens exercising their Constitutional rights. But Simpson takes it in stride. “Being denied consent is the price of doing business, just like getting sued.” As with his previous advice on racial profiling, Simpson implores his fellow officers not to do anything different.

For his part, PPB Public Information Officer Brian Schmautz “scoffed at Washington’s argument,” summarizing it as “He said yes but didn’t want to consent” (Oregonian, January 4).

**65-Year-Old Man Wins $100,000 for Portland Police Manhandling Him**

In July, 2003, Dan Thomas, then 65 years old, wasroughed up by Portland Police officers who came to his house after a dispute Thomas had with a neighbor. In March, 2008, federal Judge Ancer Hagerty imposed a judgment of $100,000 on the City of Portland for damages in the incident. According to the Willamette Week’s blog (March 14), “Thomas was on the witness stand telling jurors how he was allegedly kicked, stomped, kneed and driven into the ground” by Officers Peter Taylor (#34354), Christopher Gjovik(#38946) and Michele Michaels (#40400) when the City Attorneys asked to settle.

Steven Sherlag, Thomas’ lawyer, told Portland Copwatch that Thomas had been showing a friend a replica firearm prior to the original confrontation with the neighbor. By the time police arrived, he was in his undershirt and came out of the house clearly unarmored.

This settlement ties for the 12th highest since 1993, underscoring the fact that the creation of Portland’s Independent Police Review Division in 2002 has done little to reduce police brutality. In fact, payouts have roughly doubled since 2002, about the same time frame that Auditor Gary Blackmer uses as a bellwether to show Portland Police shootings have gone down on average. The average payout in the years 1993 to 2001 was $365,400; the average from 2002-2005 was $704,300, or a 93% increase (see chart—too few incidents after 2005 have made it to court to add 2006-2008 yet).

An updated list of the top 25 settlements, which alone have cost the city nearly $4.5 million in the past 15 years*, is on our website (www.portlandcopwatch.org/top25settlements.html). In addition to several new settlements, we have also obtained more detailed information since we last published the list in 2006 (PPR #37). Thanks to the Portland Mercury for help in obtaining the new info. * Totals payouts exceeded $6.1 million
Sometimes change is not good and serves no purpose.

"driver who screamed at the cops, twice for not having his headlights on (due to technical issues ran in the December issue. Sowell says he's been pulled over American columnist for the conservative Hoover Institution, two articles on the issue from right-wing think tanks.

In Portland (see p. 1), the Situation?

To Disprove Racial Profiling, You Must Do Better Than This

In addition to the “expert” study the PPA commissioned to “prove” racial profiling does not exist in Portland (see p. 1), the Rap Sheet recently featured two articles on the issue from right-wing think tanks.

The first, by Thomas Sowell, an African American columnist for the conservative Hoover Institution, ran in the December issue. Sowell says he’s been pulled over twice for not having his headlights on due to technical issues with his car. He thanked the officer each time for saving his life, and received no ticket or warning. He talks about another driver who screamed at the cops, “You only pulled me over because I’m black,” even though a black journalist was with the officer (like that makes a difference). That driver got a ticket.

The cops say African American suspects use the defense “you pulled me over because of my skin color” 80% of the time with white cops, and 30% of the time with black cops. We wonder, couldn’t that also indicate that black officers are pulling over African American motorists more often for legitimate reasons?

In the March Rap Sheet, an article by the Force Science Research Center (FSRC) reports on a study about police use of deadly force. They talk about how it is a “staple of TV news” when an officer shoots an unarmed “minority subject...protests explode, and the familiar litany is again asserted: racial bias by the cops.”

The study, by FSRC’s advisory board member Tom Aveni of the Police Policy Studies Council (www.theppsc.org), claims that “When you confront an officer in what appears to be a felonious context, it is the way you act that will get you shot—not your race.” Aveni reports that body language, clothing and age affected them more than race. “The implication has been that the police are racist and that negative stereotyping causes them to overreact in circumstances where, in fact, no lethal threat exists.” Of course, the fact that this study was partly funded by insurance companies for law enforcement had nothing to do with the outcome.

The study was based on an analysis of 307 cops in simulated confrontations, using 6 agencies in Michigan. Actors performed 80 scenarios on video, which were then plugged into an interactive system. They gave the officers no information on the suspect or whether there was a weapon. There were people of various races and genders involved in three simulated “crimes”: Robbery-in-progress, burglary alarm, mugging. Each one had three possible outcomes—surrender empty-handed, surrender holding an item that was not a weapon, and shooting at the officer with a weapon (with a paintball gun hitting the officers to simulate realism). The subjects stood with their backs to the cops, hands at waist level, then looked over their shoulder as a “target glance,” turned to the left suddenly, and raised their hands slightly.

28% of the time, officers shot unarmed suspects; some shot more than one. Aveni says there is “No correlation between actions and race,” or the officers’ gender/race experience. Though not statistically significant, he says the black cops (of 307 total—how scientific is that?) shot more unarmed suspects.

The officers were more likely to shoot in the robbery, then the mugging, then the burglary scenario. Also, “more chose to shoot when the subject was young and wearing ‘business’ attire” (March Rap Sheet).

Using Less Force “Not Acceptable” to Police

Unfortunately, in a questionable reference to Zylawy, PPA President Robert King decided to take a swipe at the new proposed Use of Force Policy (see p. 6) that requires officers to use the least amount of force reasonably necessary. King claims that it was one of the concerns Zylawy had expressed before his death. Specifically, King asserts that Zylawy was worried about part of the directive that restricted “precipitation” because “getting out of your car could be viewed as ‘precipitating’ use of force” (March Rap Sheet).

Rap Sheet editor Peter Simpson, in his December column, called the policy “not acceptable to PPA members” but acknowledged the Chief has the final say and they might just agree to disagree. In January’s issue, PPA Vice President Daryl Turner wondered who was pushing for the change in policy—the Mayor (a former Police Chief), Council, “community leaders or...those organizations that believe that Portland Police Officers are a bunch of knuckle-dragging, red meat eating thugs.”

Turner says the first draft was a “disaster” and the revised one hadn’t “passed the smell test of the Executive Board... Who is going to determine the ‘least amount of force needed to control a situation?’ People think the police are “resistant to change because we don’t like it,” but one of the biggest offenses is when the officers have no input.

“Many members believe this entire policy change may just be a farce used to discipline officers to appease a small segment of the community (this includes the Mayor) that believe police officers use too much force in dealing with criminals and those who pose potential risks to the community... Sometimes change is not good and serves no purpose.”
that people can turn around faster than a speeding bullet (PPR #15), said that by the time the bullet strikes, the person is in a different position than when the officer made the decision to shoot. Half of one agency’s members shot at unarmed people in the videos, another had only 24%. Both were from urban agencies; the difference was in training.

**Contempt, Name-Calling, Conservative Thinking**

Despite how this column started, it would be reminis of us to leave you with the impression that the Rap Sheet’s right-wing slant has somehow turned itself around to be more open to the views and concerns of the public at large, as we’ve already shown the concerns of people of color are not a top priority.

Again, not all these articles are written by Portland Police, but by choosing to print these articles from among all these out there, Det. Simpson is sending a message to the rank-and-file, and to the public.

Here’s a sampling of name-calling and conservative views:

John Wills, former Chicago officer and FBI agent, explaining why he thinks shootings of officers by citizens are on the rise for the first time in 15 years (front page, February Rap Sheet):

• “There are and will always be cretins among us that want what we have but are not willing to acquire those things in a lawful manner. These knuckle drags feel no remorse for their crimes; they have no conscience. These types need to be permanently removed from society.”

• On rules forcing officers to ask permission to use Tasers: “Why are we adopting policies that cause our first responders to hold back, rather than go in and take care of business?”

• About police management: “Instead of backing a cop for subduing or shooting a thug, they abdicate their responsibility to fellow cops, and try to assuage the phoney and trumped up outrage that some innocuous, self-proclaimed community spokesmen spout.”

• Criminal suspects are “hooded” by the courts and social services, who give “imbecile” reasons to do so. “The community has handcuffed the police rather than the bad guys.” Society treats crime victims badly “while ensuring that the criminal... has enough to eat, is warm, and has a proper defense.”

• Police should “speak up about the ridiculous PC classes that we are forced to attend on how to talk to certain segments of society and not hurt their feelings.”

• “We have to create and spread the mindset that our street cops are modern day warriors.... they have to be allowed to err on the side of a little too much force.”

Doug Giles, a conservative talk show host, in his article “God and Glock: Why Churches Shouldn’t Be Gun Free Zones,” which reads like satire but appears to be serious (January Rap Sheet):

• “Seems like the whiny babies among us have decided to lethally arm themselves and take out their post-pubescent ‘nobody likes me’ rage on innocent people in schools, shopping malls and now...churches.”

• On the incident at the New Life Church in Colorado, Giles refers to the “pathetic toad” who shot at worshippers until he was shot by a security guard. “Thank god the media isn’t giving this turd too much attention.” It should be a wake up call to “kum-be-yah pastors... who haven’t woken up to the violent reality of the 21st century. Ministers had better morph PDQ from Mr. Rogers to mimicking Clint Eastwood.”

• “I think if Jesus were placed in a similar situation, he would whip out his Glock and double tap the center mass of any wannabe killer.”

Sgt. Richard Valdemar, retired from the LA Sheriff’s Dept, weighed in against gun laws in the February Rap Sheet:

• “Politicians who would take guns from law-abiding citizens [are giving] gangs an undue advantage.” They also “want to give felons the right to vote, support the illegal aliens and the terrorists in their claim for U.S. constitutional ‘rights.’”

The Portland Police Association does not set policy. However, some PPA leadership and officers express negative attitudes toward citizens and civilian oversight in their newspaper. We worry these ideas may spread throughout Portland’s ranks.

The Portland Police Association, 1313 NW 19th, Portland, OR 97209. The PPA’s website is www.ppavigil.org.

---

**If police want to search you,** they may put you down to check for weapons. Make it clear you do not consent to any further search. If they say they have a search warrant, ask to see it. If they are searching your home or your car with “probable cause,” make it clear you do not consent to a search.

**If you are arrested,** you do not have to answer any questions, other than identifying yourself. Don’t offer excuses or explanations. Anything you say can be used against you. Just say, “I want to talk to a lawyer.” If you don’t have a lawyer, ask the police how to contact one.

**If you are Copwatching,** be sure to let officers know you don’t intend to interfere with the arrest. This means staying ten feet or more away from the action and not trying to distract the officers or the arrestee’s attention.

**If you are the victim of police misconduct,** be sure to get the names of all officers involved and supervisors names if possible. Get names and numbers of any witnesses to the action.

**If you are the victim of police misuse of force,** document injuries right away. You may wish to pursue any number of routes, from filing a complaint with the Independent Police Review Division (IPR) to pursuing a lawsuit.

---

**CLIP AND SAVE THIS “YOUR RIGHTS AND THE POLICE” CARD**

We have cards available in English (left), Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Vietnamese and Spanish. If you can translate and/or typeset into other languages, want more copies or can print more copies for us on card stock, contact Portland Copwatch at (503) 236-3065.
Cops Say Community Policing Defined by Officer Killed in Accident

S

ting aside the usual sarcastic tone of this column, I want to acknowledge the Bureau’s loss of Officer Mark Zylawy, who was killed in a traffic accident in late January. This is not the space or time to debate issues on which we disagreed with “Z-Man,” but I interacted with him at least twice and felt saddened at his death, as I would with anyone but more having actually met them.

The Portland Police Association, which regularly mocks and ridicules both criminal suspects and the general population, embraced more community policing ideals after Zylawy’s death. Some are admirable and worth repeating here. The Albina Ministerial Alliance, a group which has demonstrated against several police shootings of unarmed civilians, organized a march in “Z-Man”’s memory at which members of the African American community, including many who were busted by Zylawy, came out to honor him. These quotes all come from the March Rap Sheet, which was mostly devoted to Zylawy’s memory.

• Sgt. Chris Uehara: Zylawy was well respected by suspects because he was “always willing to give them a chance so long as they were willing to meet him halfway. Mark’s kindness wasn’t a reflection or sign of weakness, but rather a testament to how you could be tough but fair while doing your job... Mark knew that all citizens have the same human needs for respect, compassion and dignity and he gave them that... citizens he was helping were not bad people but good people who were making bad choices.”

• Det. Peter Simpson: Believes the City should invest in patrol officers like Zylawy. He always knew where to find people. "Mark never talked about ‘community policing,’ he just did it.”

• Sgt. John Anderson: “He was the ‘poster boy’ of community policing, not because he had an agenda or wanted anything, it’s just who he was.” On the March: “I have never seen, let alone participated in, such an event—it was a truly amazing experience.”

Anderson spoke to Zylawy’s brother, an officer with the highway patrol in Montana, asking about his...