

	1) Deadly force	2) Force at protests
Background	Despite almost a decade of review from the US Department of Justice, Portland Police have continued to use deadly force against people of color and people experiencing mental health crises at disproportionate rates. Since the DOJ Agreement was proposed in 2012, Portland Police officers have shot, shot at, or led to the death in custody of 33 people, with a total of 18 deaths. At least half of the people were experiencing mental health crises, and 8 of them were people of color.	The Portland Police have made national news for their violent crackdowns on political protests. The PPB's Use of Force Reports separate force used on demonstrators from other types of force.
Questions	How do you see City Council taking steps to meaningfully reduce these disparities and move towards the reduction or elimination of deadly force as a tactic?	What is your position on police use of weapons including chemicals, mini-explosives and grenade launchers, particularly when they affect bystanders not suspected of any criminal activity?

COUNCIL SEAT #4 Note: Answers longer than 150 words were truncated.

Mingus Mapps	Did not respond	
--------------	-----------------	--

Robert MacKay	Did not respond	
---------------	-----------------	--

Keith Wilson	Ran out of time to answer questions due to issues related to the pandemic-driven economic crisis.	(did not respond to questions)
--------------	---	--------------------------------

Kevin McKay	Did not respond	
-------------	-----------------	--

Chloe Eudaly	Did not respond	
--------------	-----------------	--

Aaron Fancher	Did not respond	
---------------	-----------------	--

	1) Deadly force	2) Force at protests
<p>Seth Woolley</p>	<p>I've been a member of the Green Party since 1999 and a key pillar of ours is systemic nonviolence and diplomacy. City Council should begin the process of disarming police contacts with the public. The more recent escalation of police violence mirrored the rise of the failed War on Drugs. (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4800748/)</p> <p>With more focus on drug treatment as a physical health ailment requiring health management rather than arrests and confinement, we could divert police resources to investigating anti-consumer fraud, enforcing traffic violations (with income based fines), and ensuring a truly just and safe society. But we need to focus on the really impactful crimes which are perpetuated by politicians and businesses, not regular folk who are just trying to survive.</p>	<p>I am in favor of police disarmament, and I don't approve of the use of crowd control devices on demonstrations, or the encircling of any side of a protest/counterprotest. The goal should not be to maintain separation, but to foster dialogue to improve understanding.</p> <p>Violence initiated in protests were not followed up upon by police adequately in a way that lead to swift consequences for the few actually being violent. The actions of a few hotheads should not nullify the peaceful status of an action. The more demonstrations are considered safe, the more nonviolent people will attend, and the more swiftly violence can be prevented internally to demonstrations.</p> <p>But right now most demonstrators do not consider demonstrations with police presence to be safe because the police show up in a militarized and aggressive way.</p> <p>I'm also in favor of drug and alcohol testing and intervention of police forces.</p>
<p>Sam Adams</p>	<p>Decreasing the number of instances where people experiencing mental health crisis must interact with police officers is one step. We have to decriminalize drug addition and increase low/no-cost substance abuse treatment. Increase access to mental health treatment.</p> <p>There are many continuous improves required, but, for me, one reform I believe is a cornerstone to all other reform efforts. Foundationally, to address use of deadly force and disparities in enforcement, especially against those experiencing mental health crises, and people of color, the City of Portland must be local control over the conduct of its police officers. The current policies and procedures are overly advisory as long as arbitrators can overturn approved discipline of police officers. I know firsthand trying to fire and discipline police offers based on the merits. Then, time and time again, only to have my decisions overturned. As a candidate, I have publicly and strongly endorsed Oregon</p>	<p>As a rule, I do not support the use of mini-explosives and grenade launchers, particularly when they affect bystanders not suspected of any criminal activity. I did not allow them when I was police commissioner. I was Mayor during the Occupy encampment -- we dispersed camp with minimum use physical force and a common sense strategy.</p> <p>I also worked with Occupy organizers* when they were camping across the street from city hall. I made the choice not to evict them** by force when first, second, third...times called on to do so and did everything possible to avoid serious confrontation*** with the police officers when the camp finally had to be shut down. The way it was orchestrated, most occupy campers left the parks on their own.</p> <p>* https://www.opb.org/news/article/occupy-portland-and-mayor-adams-have-words/ ** https://www.wweek.com/portland/article-23447-nov-13-2011-occupy-portland-makes-its-last-stand.html *** https://www.oregonlive.com/portland/2011/11/occupy_portland_as_downtown_sq.html</p>

	3) Joint Terrorism Task Force	4) Houseless persons and police
Background	In 2019, the City voted for a second time to remove officers from the FBI's secretive Joint Terrorism Task Force. Oregon law restricts conducting investigations with no reasonable suspicion of criminal conduct, while the FBI can open investigations based on speculation.	Portland Police are frequently used to enforce anti-houseless policies and ordinances such as the Sidewalk Use (aka Sit/Lie) Ordinance, leading to use of force and loss of belongings. The City stopped publishing statistics about who is cited/warned/arrested under Sit/Lie in 2013. In 2017, the Oregonian reported people experiencing houselessness accounted for 52% of arrests. The City has responded in part by conducting sweeps of houseless camps, while also creating programs like the pilot "Portland Street Response" project.
Questions	Do you support staying out of the JTTF, and what are your thoughts on the City's current policy which allows cooperation on a case by case basis?	What policies do you support that will reduce the disparities in police attention?

COUNCIL SEAT #4

Mingus Mapps	Did not respond	
Robert MacKay	Did not respond	
Keith Wilson	(did not respond to questions)	
Kevin McKay	Did not respond	
Chloe Eudaly	Did not respond	
Aaron Fancher	Did not respond	

	3) Joint Terrorism Task Force	4) Houseless persons and police
Seth Woolley	<p>I've always opposed cooperation with the federal government on investigations. I don't believe case by case support is justified either. If there is an issue where local police need to be informed, the FBI should provide information and let the local police deal with matters after having vetted the information independently. The Brandon Mayfield case as well as how the FBI entraps and pushes radicalization to meet quota should be reason enough to be skeptical of what the local FBI field office does when it comes to claims of terrorism.</p>	<p>I'm in favor of legalizing camping rather than decriminalizing it. I believe the city needs to involve the PP&R and OSP&R to establish formal modern campgrounds available to all income levels with reasonable fees.</p> <p>Such fees would be waived based on need, but with additional revenue from bike tourers, urban campers, and state funds allocated for parks from Lottery dollars, we could find places for all campers.</p> <p>The city should be supporting camps as recreational activity and as an adjunct to traditional housing and houselessness services. This would bring up cleanliness and it would enable enforcement that serves to protect natural areas from damaging camping.</p> <p>Further, it shouldn't be police making contact, but unarmed park rangers.</p>
Sam Adams	<p>Yes. As police commissioner, depending on the day, I had to deal with this issue with a City Council that leaned towards rejoining. I brokered a compromise that required oversight that Portland police officers could only be brought in on a case-by-case basis when there was reasonable suspicion of criminal conduct based on Portland standards. I was sad to see Portland rejoin the JTTF after I left. I was sure that Portland voted to restore a similar policy I had pursued.</p>	<p>I support Commissioner Hardesty's Portland Street Response pilot project to decrease the need for interaction with police. This occurs by sending teams staffed by civilians--usually a medic and people trained in crisis intervention --to answer calls dealing with non-emergency mental-health crises or houseless Portlanders. In 2012, I brokered a settlement to a three year lawsuit, "Under the agreement, Portland Police Officers will now provide additional notice to individuals before citing them for camping or removing campers' belongings from public property. Officers will also follow more specific procedures to ensure that campers can get their belongings back when removed." For life safety issues of the campers or those residents and workers surrounding the area, sometimes camping enforcement action is needed, when other less invasive efforts to address life safety efforts have failed.</p>

	5) Oversight	5b) Oversight
Background	The civilian oversight system, including the Independent Police Review, its Citizen Review Committee, and the Police Review Board, is not adequately holding officers accountable to community standards, and PRB hearings are closed to all but one or two community members uninvolved in the incident being considered.	
Questions	a) City Council heard an appeal in 2017 illustrating that the standard of review for the CRC which requires them to defer to the Bureau (the "reasonable person" standard asking them to consider whether the officer's commander made a reasonable decision) is not working. Would you support changing the standard to "preponderance of the evidence" (seeing if it is more likely than not that misconduct occurred, a standard used by most review boards, juries, and by the reviewing commander), which could result in more complaints being sustained? Why or why not?	b) What changes would you support to the PRB to help make the review process more transparent to the public?

COUNCIL SEAT #4

Mingus Mapps	Did not respond
Robert MacKay	Did not respond
Keith Wilson	(did not respond to questions)
Kevin McKay	Did not respond
Chloe Eudaly	Did not respond
Aaron Fancher	Did not respond

	5) Oversight	5b) Oversight
Seth Woolley	<p>There is no reason not to have consistent standards in this application. I'm not aware of any other form of legal appeal where the standards of review change when performing oversight.</p> <p>In the next section I talk about a process that can help find things that aren't subject to an active complaint.</p>	<p>I'm a proponent of the "blameless postmortem" processes for quality improvement. When there is a finding of no blame, I believe there should be an effort to analyze what could have been improved anyways.</p> <p>Perhaps this requires a different board that can help improve system processes without calling for blame so that officers feel free to be honest in their responses without being blamed. An officer who gives testimony to a blameless postmortem could be granted immunity for mistakes made because they are acknowledged as a problem that needs fixing. The city would still be on the hook for the liability incurred, but the officer would not lose their job over an honest admitted mistake.</p> <p>This is a kind of a radical proposal though because it means that the focus is upon restorative justice rather than punitive justice, and the current criminal justice system doesn't really work that way.</p>

Sam Adams	<p>I am open to it. During the time I have been away from City Hall, I would want to review what, if any, new court precedents have occurred before committing to it.</p>	
-----------	---	--

	6) Profiling	7) Collective Bargaining and Accountability
Background	State law prohibits profiling based on a number of characteristics including but not limited to race, gender identity and housing status. Of all agencies reporting to the state, analysts found the Police Bureau's stops and searches of African Americans to be the most disproportionate. While the PPB acknowledges some disparity in searches, they insist the stops of African American Portlanders should be compared to crime victimization rates (18.4%) rather than either population (6%) or driver accident rates (11%). The Gun Violence Reduction Team, formerly known as the Gang Enforcement Team, has even higher stop rates of over 60%, which the Bureau compares to gang crime victimization (63% in the 2017 report).	We will be referencing answers to the Portland Metro People's Coalition question regarding the Portland Police Association Contract,* as the City is in the process of negotiating a new contract with the PPA. Community organizations have emphasized this as one opportunity to enhance accountability, transparency, and justice with respect to the Police Bureau. *-Question 2: "For a Fair Police Contract that Serves the Public" at https://www.portlandpeoplescoalition.org/pmpc-2020-platform-candidates-survey
Questions	What guidelines do you believe the Gun Violence Reduction Team and the Bureau as a whole should use to determine whether police are disproportionately targeting the black community?	Will you support these goals in the current contract and what other strategies will you pursue to advance these values in our city's criminal justice system?*** **- See the two community letters sent to the Council about the Police Association Contract at: https://www.uniteoregon.org/ppa_contract_letter and https://www.uniteoregon.org/ppa_side_letter

COUNCIL SEAT #4

Mingus Mapps	Did not respond	
Robert MacKay	Did not respond	
Keith Wilson	(did not respond to questions)	(did not respond to questions)
Kevin McKay	Did not respond	Did not respond
Chloe Eudaly	Did not respond	Did not respond
Aaron Fancher	Did not respond	Did not respond

	6) Profiling	7) Collective Bargaining and Accountability
Seth Woolley	<p>I would question the use of victimization statistics because policing itself would increase the observation of victimization. It also ignores that many if not most stops are likely truly victimless crimes. It also ignores that incarceration tends to not reduce victimization, it perpetuates it and can itself be considered part of the cause. Stripping families apart by incarceration creates vulnerable families and that itself creates victims of the system as well.</p> <p>I would measure activities based on recidivism rates, or even victimization rates. If they aren't bringing victimization rates down by extra policing, it calls into question the mechanisms of policing as being ineffective. I believe they are thinking about the problem in an entirely backwards fashion. If the police force finds that they succeed more by training their staff to actually help people in root cause ways (such as feeding houseless persons and providing support equipment), then everybody wins.</p>	<p>I will support these goals.</p> <p>As noted above, I would pursue a strategy of restorative justice, truth and reconciliation. I think the reform of the criminal justice system requires much deeper philosophical rethinking that many progressive countries have done. Other countries have effectively legalized all drugs, sex work, and other victimless crimes, and they focus on restoration and social reintegration.</p> <p>I think focusing on the police contract is important, but at the same time we need to be working to dramatically rethink how we build a restorative justice system.</p> <p>"Criminal" as the lead adjective confuses justice as if crime is common and normal and just needs "justice" to be fixed. When crime happens we need to ask "why" and then "how" to prevent it instead of re-enforcing a culture of punishment and abuse. That is why many police officers batter their spouses and cities sometimes devolve into violence zones</p>
Sam Adams	<p>I like the change of name to Gun Violence Reduction Team, and found chairing the associated public weekly oversight meetings* to be an important component of equitable community policy. I want the work of this initiative to be done with racial parity. As I have previously on City Council, I would meet with community leaders to find balanced measurements and operational protocols to help achieve that parity. I would actively monitor the results and stay in active in-person dialogue with the leaders of the African American community.</p> <p>*</p> <p>https://www.portlandmercury.com/BlogtownPDX/archives/2012/12/07/gang-task-force-says-goodbye-to-mayor-sam-adams</p>	<p>Yes. For accountability, I fought successfully to open up police labor negotiations to the public. If elected, I will work work to implement these goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Improve Portland's System of Civilian Oversight * Hold Officers Accountable for Excessive Force and Bias-Based Policing * Institute More Comprehensive Mandatory Drug Testing * Fix the Public Complaint Process