

	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 #2

Jack Kerfoot	Did not respond	
Walter Wesley	Did not respond	
Diana Gutman	Did not respond	
Loretta Smith	Did not respond	
Terry Parker	Did not respond	

	1) Deadly force	2) Force at protests
<p>Alicea Maurseth</p>	<p>Primarily by keeping police out of the situation as much as possible. According to PPB, last year more than half of all 911 calls in Portland were "disorder calls" for "unwanted persons" and welfare checks. Commissioner Hardesty's "Street Response Team" that is being trialed in Lents dispatches a firefighter-EMT and a peer support specialist instead of police officers.</p>	<p>The police are meant to help keep the peace and I would hope they have the training and skills needed to do so. I would want to evaluate the existing staff and make sure they have the proper training in dealing with crowds and de-escalation. As well as tactics of de-escalation, Portland Police could benefit from further training on Oregon's laws about brandishing weapons, and other laws intended to prevent violence before it occurs. We should ensure that their rules of engagement can't be gamed by grifters who want to slander the city I love so they can get rich on GoFundMe.</p>
<p>Margot Black</p>	<p>The City needs to take a much stronger position on police accountability and use of lethal force, with concrete policies and metrics (not just rhetoric) to determine and assess desired outcomes, and a very visible public campaign to change the culture and practices of policing in Portland. A police officer should be trained to use force non-lethally, and know that if lethal force is used against an unarmed individual, there will be serious consequences -- if not criminal, then professional.</p> <p>An obvious first step is to have a truly independent body with real power to review such cases, and the ability to take action. The fact that no such body exists, in 2020, is an example of a generational failure, and should be considered a citywide humiliation. The city should also ensure that independent prosecutors handle all such cases, and that grand jury proceedings are transparent and accessible to the public.</p>	<p>Portland's use of force during protests is a profound and unconscionable waste of public resources, and a direct cause of rapidly increasing distrust in the police force and the institution of policing in general, and a national embarrassment. The disproportionate show of military grade strength in response to people exercising their constitutional right to assemble is counter to the values this country was founded on.</p> <p>I've personally witnessed police brutality at public protests, where police have purposefully escalated peaceful situations, resulting in more people being hurt by the police's tactics than whatever they were trying to protect against. Then, in addition to the huge expense of policing the protest, the city must allocate resources to defending itself against multiple personal injury lawsuits. We need much more decisive leadership from City Council about the police's role in peaceful public protests, and real consequences to the bureau for excessive force.</p>

	1) Deadly force	2) Force at protests
Julia DeGraw	<p>1) We need more accountability of police officers who use deadly force, 2) There needs to be stronger de-escalation training, 3) We need first responders who are not armed police officers for individuals experiencing mental health issues and struggling with drug addiction. This is why I support the Street Response pilot program and hope it is successful and expanded to cover the whole city.</p> <p>The mental health of officers should also be considered in these cases; if an officer has PTSD, they may not respond according to their training in an extreme situation, but instead may react on impulse or fear. So long as we have an armed police force, we need mentally stable officers that are highly trained in de-escalation tactics and have extensive implicit bias and anti-racism training. There also needs to be real, consistent, and transparent consequences for problem police officers.</p>	<p>At a protest in 2018, a dear friend of mine was standing on the sidewalk and, without hearing any warning from the police, she was hit with a flasbang grenade that gave her third degree burns on her forearm and chest.</p> <p>Police showing up to a protest in riot gear can innately escalate the situation, making peaceful protesters feel threatened and unsafe, and making it easier for officers feeling on edge or threatened to use excessive force when de-escalation tactics would have been optimal.</p> <p>I support demilitarization of the police. An entity tasked with serving and protecting the public shouldn't require military gear. I also question whether the City should be opening up our streets to known white supremacist groups seeking to instigate violence. Hate speech is not free speech, and it shouldn't be encouraged by granting protest/march permits to groups that espouse hate speech and violence.</p>

Cynthia Castro	Did not respond	
Dan Ryan	Did not respond	
Tera Hurst	Did not respond	
Sam Chase	Did not respond	
Ronault Polo Catalani	Did not respond	
Rachelle Dixon	Did not respond	
Jeff Lang	Did not respond	
James (Jas) Davis	Did not respond	
Aquiles Montas	Did not respond	
Ryan Farmer	Did not respond	

	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 #2

Jack Kerfoot	Did not respond	
Walter Wesley	Did not respond	
Diana Gutman	Did not respond	
Loretta Smith	Did not respond	
Terry Parker	Did not respond	

	3) Joint Terrorism Task Force	4) Houseless persons and police
<p>Alicea Maurseth</p>	<p>The JTTF disproportionately targets religious and ethnic minorities and political dissidents, then entraps them into crimes there is little evidence they would commit on their own. Based upon the ACLU's review of cases since 2008, they use illegal and unconstitutional methods to obtain evidence and then cover up their crime using parallel construction.</p> <p>That said, the JTTF also prevented the attack by the white supremacist militia against the Somali community in Kansas in 2016. Therefore, I believe that working with them on a case by case basis should continue, under civilian oversight.</p>	<p>I'm really excited about the Street Response Teams for wellness checks. Let's see the data first, but I anticipate the program being successful. I would like to expand this program to include more teams and service more neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Margot Black</p>	<p>Yes I support staying out of the JTTF, and will publicly oppose any efforts to rejoin it. The policy of allowing cooperation on a case by case basis is difficult to oppose, assuming that such cases are rare and emblematic of special cases, such as actual terrorism. I would listen to and follow the lead of police accountability organizations with respect to that cooperation.</p>	<p>In my opinion, police should only ever be used to (safely) apprehend individuals who are a danger to others. We should not be using police to sweep camps, or arrest or cite individuals for survival crimes, or harrass folks simply because someone thinks they look out of place in the neighborhood. That 52% of arrests are homeless individuals, likely being arrested for survival crimes, is not just an inexcusable use of public resources but also completely counter to the city's goals around equity and ending homelessness.</p> <p>We're still in the beginning phases of implementing the Portland Street Response, which is a positive development. Hopefully this project gets fully funded and expanded to the point that we can see real results, which will reduce the amount of arrests and unnecessarily traumatic confrontations with homeless individuals, but until we prioritize public and supportive housing, this will be an ongoing issue.</p>

	3) Joint Terrorism Task Force	4) Houseless persons and police
Julia DeGraw	<p>When I ran for this seat in 2018, one of my platforms included removing Portland from the Joint Terrorism Task Force. Thankfully, Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty has made good on her commitment to withdraw the City from the JTTF. I fully support staying out of the JTTF.</p> <p>As for the case by case basis: so long as there are ways for the City to get intel it needs regarding real potential terrorist threats without interacting with the JTTF, then, no, there's no reason the City should be cooperating with the JTTF under any circumstances.</p>	<p>Police aren't equipped to be first responders to people struggling with housing. I support the Portland Street Response program that provides an appropriate response to individuals struggling with houselessness without criminalizing them.</p> <p>I oppose sweeps: they're expensive, ineffective, and traumatizing to unhoused people. If people are camping in unsafe environments where they could cause harm to themselves or others, humanely moving them and their belongings to a safe place, with adequate sanitation and services (or taking them to a medical facility if they're having a drug or mental health crisis), needs to be the norm.</p> <p>People shouldn't be moved if there's no safe alternative location to provide, and they shouldn't have their property taken from them. I support the short term solution of creating temporary housing on public/private property with sanitation and health services until there are enough shelters, supportive housing, and affordable housing for all residents.</p>

Cynthia Castro	Did not respond	
----------------	-----------------	--

Dan Ryan	Did not respond	
----------	-----------------	--

Tera Hurst	Did not respond	
------------	-----------------	--

Sam Chase	Did not respond	
-----------	-----------------	--

Ronault Polo Catalani	Did not respond	
-----------------------	-----------------	--

Rachelle Dixon	Did not respond	
----------------	-----------------	--

Jeff Lang	Did not respond	
-----------	-----------------	--

James (Jas) Davis	Did not respond	
-------------------	-----------------	--

Aquiles Montas	Did not respond	
----------------	-----------------	--

Ryan Farmer	Did not respond	
-------------	-----------------	--

	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 #2

Jack Kerfoot	Did not respond
Walter Wesley	Did not respond
Diana Gutman	Did not respond
Loretta Smith	Did not respond
Terry Parker	Did not respond

	5) Oversight	5b) Oversight
<p>Alicea Maurseth</p>	<p>I was surprised by this question, I didn't realize that the CRC wasn't using the preponderance of evidence standard. I checked the DoJ's publication "Citizen Review of Police: Approaches and Implementation" on this subject and all of their example CRCs used the preponderance standard.</p> <p>Yes, we should move to the preponderance standard.. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/184430.pdf</p>	<p>I would seek out members of the community who have interacted with the PRB and support changes to resolve the issues they call out as much as possible.</p>
<p>Margot Black</p>	<p>Yes, I absolutely support changing the CRC standard to the preponderance of the evidence. The current standard essentially asks the CRC to assess the reasonableness of the bureau investigating its own officers, even if it disagrees with the bureau's findings. What is the point of the CRC even existing if it's only job is to subjectively assess the mindset of the commander, and not the facts of the complaint brought before it? In general, I think the CRC needs additional power to be more effective, and more visible public support from the City Council as a whole.</p>	<p>The composition of the Police Review Board makes it incapable of acting as a neutral/independent body capable of reviewing police misconduct. A whole new body that functions under different rules, oversight, and expectations is needed, since reforming the current Board seems unlikely to get us where we need to be in terms of transparency, accountability, and results that can earn the public's trust. If there is to be any public trust on the review process, then all meetings should be fully open to the public, with audio/video and transcripts posted afterwards.</p>

	5) Oversight	5b) Oversight
Julia DeGraw	Yes, if changing the standard to "preponderance of the evidence" will lead to more accountability and, hopefully, transparency.	For starters, the hearings held by the Police Review Board should be made public. The Independent Police Review and Citizen Review Committees also need to be able to hold hearings on cases involving deadly force. Given the incredible limitations placed on the IPR as it currently stands, a case could be made to completely rework the Independent and Citizen Review Committees so the oversight process has more teeth and leads to more accountability and increased transparency. We need to engage the communities and community groups that have been working on these issues for years to decide what that process should look like. We also need a Portland Police Contract that improves the system of civilian oversight. A civilian oversight commission should be able to evaluate whether an officer has violated bureau policies when using excessive or deadly force, as well as be able to recommend disciplinary actions.

Cynthia Castro	Did not respond
----------------	-----------------

Dan Ryan	Did not respond
----------	-----------------

Tera Hurst	Did not respond
------------	-----------------

Sam Chase	Did not respond
-----------	-----------------

Ronault Polo Catalani	Did not respond
-----------------------	-----------------

Rachelle Dixon	Did not respond
----------------	-----------------

Jeff Lang	Did not respond
-----------	-----------------

James (Jas) Davis	Did not respond
-------------------	-----------------

Aquiles Montas	Did not respond
----------------	-----------------

Ryan Farmer	Did not respond
-------------	-----------------

	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 #2

Jack Kerfoot	Did not respond	
Walter Wesley	Did not respond	
Diana Gutman	Did not respond	Did not respond
Loretta Smith	Did not respond	Did not respond
Terry Parker	Did not respond	Did not respond

	6) Profiling	7) Collective Bargaining and Accountability
<p>Alicea Maurseth</p>	<p>First, I agree with Commissioner Hardesty that the GVRT is an inefficient use of limited resources. Whatever funds the GVRT is allocated should be used to expand the Street Response Team.</p> <p>That said, I think the driver accident rate is a reasonable proxy for appropriate search. The crime victimization rate is inappropriate as increased police presence increases the rate of reporting, leading to a feedback loop. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/666614</p>	<p>Yes, absolutely. I read the Unite Oregon community letters and agree with all of the changes suggested. Fundamentally I think that the police department is an expensive instrument that is appropriate to use in some situations, but is widely utilized to sweep societal issues under the rug. I would like to find ways to involve the police less in our city.</p>
<p>Margot Black</p>	<p>Stops should be compared to the population, not gang/crime victimization rates. Crime victimization data that produce these rates is heavily biased by systematic racism, respondent error, and undercoverage (not all victims of crimes contribute data, those who do are not all accurate reporters). These biases will cause victimization rates to skew higher for Black folks. Ultimately, if we believe that race is independent of the likelihood to commit a crime or participate in gang activity, then stop rates of Black Portlanders should be proportional to the Black population in Portland. If we believe otherwise, then we are adopting and/or acknowledging a policy framework which fully justifies racial profiling--a policy that is already prohibited.</p> <p>To prevent profiling, we must ensure there is a transparent, accessible, and independent process for victims to report their experience, and consequences to the bureau that are effective in sustainably changing policing practices.</p>	<p>Yes, I strongly support PMPC's goals regarding PPA contract negotiations.</p> <p>We have a long way to go on police accountability, especially when District Attorneys continue to use the Grand Jury process to quickly and non-transparently clear an officer of misconduct. While I favor a wholesale overhaul of our criminal justice and policing systems, I am excited that public engagement in DA races is starting to grow and compelling candidates to take progressive positions on criminal justice and police accountability. This is a positive development in the framework of our current system, and one that I support.</p> <p>Union arbitration process remains the wrong place to decide whether a police officer acted wrongly, since a pro-police arbitrator should not have the power to reverse discipline cases when there is a much larger public interest involved. In general, I support and will fight for an oversight system that is completely independent and transparent.</p>

	6) Profiling	7) Collective Bargaining and Accountability
Julia DeGraw	<p>The City Auditor's March 2018 report strongly indicates that racial profiling is occurring. The lack of adequate reporting on traffic stops is the reason there isn't definitive proof. By classifying 38% of their interactions from these traffic stops as "mere conversations," the Gun Violence Reduction Team officers were able to avoid listing the race of the individual they pulled over. It appears the GVRT is trying to hide racial profiling. The GVRT should be required to report the full information of all their traffic stops, given that they can pull over people based on the mere suspicion that the driver may be a gang member.</p> <p>I'm most interested in exploring a restorative justice approach to gang and gun violence, in which specially trained parole and probation officers support at-risk youth to keep them out of the criminal justice system and give them the support they need to succeed in life.</p>	<p>I fully support the goals laid out by the Portland-Metro People's Coalition and everything from this op-ed from Jobs With Justice Executive Director Will Layng and Reverend LeRoy Haynes: https://www.oregonlive.com/opinion/2020/01/opinion-portland-needs-a-community-centered-police-contract.html</p> <p>According to the Portland Police Association, over 70% of Portlanders don't trust the police. That is unacceptable--rebuilding that trust must start with increasing accountability and transparency, which can begin with getting a more community-centered PPA contract. The Portland Police need to be held accountable for racist behavior, for use of excessive force, and for killing people. It needs to be easier for the City to fire problem police officers, officers must be drug tested after use of deadly force, and we need real citizen oversight.</p> <p>Lastly: I will do all I can to support restorative justice practices in the local criminal justice system.</p>

Cynthia Castro	Did not respond	Did not respond
Dan Ryan	Did not respond	Did not respond
Tera Hurst	Did not respond	Did not respond
Sam Chase	Did not respond	Did not respond
Ronault Polo Catalani	Did not respond	Did not respond
Rachelle Dixon	Did not respond	Did not respond
Jeff Lang	Did not respond	Did not respond
James (Jas) Davis	Did not respond	Did not respond
Aquiles Montas	Did not respond	Did not respond
Ryan Farmer	Did not respond	Did not respond