



CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON



Bureau of Police

Ted Wheeler, Mayor

Danielle M. Outlaw, Chief of Police

1111 S.W. 2nd Avenue • Portland, OR 97204 • Phone: 503-823-0000

Integrity • Compassion • Accountability • Respect • Excellence • Service

Directive 311.40, Personal Use of Social Media Executive Summary

The Portland Police Bureau (PPB) believed it was necessary to develop a new directive that established guidelines for its members' use of personal social media accounts. In 2016, PPB introduced a proposed draft of Directive 311.40 to the community for public review and comment. Since that time, the Bureau has worked with the City Attorney's Office and collective bargaining unions to finalize a version that allows Bureau members to express themselves in a manner that does not affect their official position or unduly impact Bureau operations. The directive does not address how members use official PPB social media accounts because those guidelines will be governed in a separate directive.

This is a new directive and will become effective on September 15, 2018. It will be reviewed in one year in accordance with the procedures outlined in Directive 010.00, Directives Review and Development Process.

Published on 8/16/18

Community Policing: Making the Difference Together
An Equal Opportunity Employer

City Information Line: 503-823-4000, TTY (for hearing and speech impaired): 503-823-6868 Website: www.portlandpolice.com

311.40, Personal Use of Social Media

Refer:

- City of Portland Human Resources Administrative Rules, 4.08A, Social Media
- DIR 220.11, Confidential Information
- DIR 310.00, Professional Conduct and Courtesy
- DIR 310.70, Dissemination of Information
- DIR 1221.00, Smart Phone Issuance and Usage

Definitions:

- **Social Media:** Websites and other forms of Internet communication used to provide or share information, ideas, messages, photographs, videos and other content. Examples of social media sites include, but are not limited to, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, Snapchat, Reddit, Tumblr and LinkedIn.

Policy:

1. The Police Bureau recognizes the increasing use of social media both personally and in the workplace. This Directive addresses the personal use of social media by Bureau members, whether that use occurs on personal time or during work hours. It does not address the official use of social media by members for police business while on or off duty. Official use of social media for community outreach, crime prevention, problem solving, and general information exchanges will be governed by a separate directive.
2. Members have a right to engage in personal expression as private citizens. However, the Bureau may regulate such private expression when the members' private expression on social media unduly disrupts Bureau operations or violates other Bureau directives such as the prohibition against disclosing sensitive, confidential, or protected information. Personal use of social media may affect a member's official position with the Police Bureau and may impact the effective operations of the Bureau.
3. Social media communications that constitute protected union-related activities are not restricted by this directive.

Procedure:

1. When using personal social media, members may express themselves as private citizens, but shall not:
 - 1.1. Post or use any image of Police Bureau badges, identification, name tags or plates, logos, patches, marked vehicles, marked equipment or other marked materials without the express prior permission of the Chief of Police or a designee.
 - 1.1.1. Members may post or use photographs of themselves taken in uniform while:
 - 1.1.1.1. Appearing for official ceremonies or recognitions, promotions, awards or commendations; or
 - 1.1.1.2. Taking part in Bureau sponsored or approved events.
 - 1.1.2. This policy does not prohibit members from reposting information, photographs, videos or other materials that have been previously published or are otherwise available in the public domain (i.e., available to the public as a whole).

- 1.1.3. A social media platform's automatic assignment of such an image to a member will not alone violate this policy.
- 1.2. Post, publish, transmit, share or disseminate any documents, photographs, videos or information that they have access to solely as a result of their employment with the Bureau. This prohibition includes information that is confidential or investigative in nature (e.g., crime or accident scene images, Bureau training materials, etc.).
- 1.3. Post, publish, transmit, share or disseminate any comments or information that negatively impact or unduly disrupt the operations of the Bureau, or that unduly criticizes or mocks the official decisions or actions of the Bureau, and causes actual harm to Bureau operations as a result. The balancing test for protected free speech requires an analysis of whether actual harm to Bureau operations occurs as the result of a member's use of speech.
- 1.4. Post, publish, transmit, share or otherwise disseminate information pertaining to Bureau-related tactics or mission-specific strategies and objectives.
- 1.5. Post, publish, transmit, share or disseminate any comments or information that promotes or advocates a violation of City or Bureau directives or other policies or criminal activity.
- 1.6. Post, publish, transmit, share or disseminate any documents, comments or information regarding community member complaints about the Bureau or any of its members, administrative investigations, criminal investigations, criminal prosecutions, or legal claims or court cases involving the City, the Bureau or any City employees or Bureau members.
- 1.7. Post, publish, transmit, share, comment in support of, or disseminate any posting that is harassing or includes any threat of actual violence. Members should be aware that the Bureau may prohibit inflammatory posts that are directed to inciting or producing immediate lawless action and are likely to incite or produce such action.
- 1.8. Post, publish, transmit, share, comment in support of, or disseminate any posting that ridicules, disparages or negatively expresses bias or disrespect towards any race, religion, sex, gender, marital or familial status, sexual orientation, nationality, age, disability or any other legally protected classification as defined in City of Portland Human Resources Administrative Regulation (HRAR) 2.02 or PPB directives or policies.
 - 1.8.1. Members should be aware that such comments made outside of the workplace or outside of a work-related setting, as described in HRAR 2.02, may still be prohibited.
- 1.9. Post, publish, transmit or disseminate any statements, photographs, endorsements, information or materials that represent or purports to represent the official views or

position of the Police Bureau or the City of Portland, without the express prior approval of the Chief of Police or a designee.

2. Members are permitted to access social media accounts on Bureau-issued computers and Mobile Data Computers (MDCs) while on duty for the purpose of executing a specific work function.
 - 2.1. When using social media in an official capacity on an authorized Bureau-issued computer or MDC, members shall not accept any social media platform's invitation to determine or track the location of the device or the user.
 - 2.2. Members are prohibited from using Bureau-issued cell phones to access personal social media accounts.
 - 2.3. Members shall not use any Police Bureau or City of Portland email address to register for any personal social media account.

History:

- Originating Directive Date: 8/16/18
 - Effective Date: 9/15/18
- Next Review Date: 9/15/19

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

Directive	Date	Individual	Comment
311.40	1/2/16		<p>I believe section: 1.7 of this directive, "post, publish, transmit, share, disseminate or comment in support of any posting that ridicules, disparages or expresses bias or disrespect towards any race, religion, sex, gender, sexual orientation, nationality or any other legally protected classification" is too vague and could be considered too restrictive to pass constitutional muster. If a Bureau member posts, on social media, a personal view that someone else may feel is offensive for any reason, it could be interpreted as a violation of this policy. Even if that view was held due to religious or other valid reasons. Simply because a bureau member holds a view with which someone else may disagree, it shouldn't prohibit that member from being able exercise his constitutional right of expression. Encouraging or promoting illegal behavior is much different than expressing a personal belief with which someone might disagree or find offensive.</p> <p>The verbiage "expresses bias" is not specific. "Bias", in and of itself, simply means "preference". It should more accurately read "bias against...". But then we simply circle back around to the same argument I put forth in my above paragraph.</p>
311.40	1/2/16		<p>**This clarifies many issues--thank you for proposing this directive.</p> <p>**In addition, I suggest requiring members of the department to use their own public media communication devices (desktop/laptop/tablet computers, smart phones, etc.) for social media, NOT equipment purchased with taxpayer or grant funds.</p>
311.40	1/3/16		<p>This policy seems entirely too restrictive and encroaches upon an officers ability to express themselves outside of the department. Specifically section 1.1 and 1.7.</p> <p>1.1 - Not allowing an officer to post any media that shows them at work or in official capacity is too restrictive. This is their job, they spend a large portion of their life doing this job, it is unreasonable to disallow them to post mundane images from the job (i.e. flat tire on the cruiser = bad day at work, etc.). This section is only fair if the posted</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>content reflects poorly on the department. I suggest making this section less restrictive.</p> <p>1.7 - This section is far too restrictive and far too open to interpretation by different people. Essentially you are limiting the officers ability to post, comment, or like any content that could be even remotely considered offensive by someone. Personally, I have a high tolerance for offensive content, however I know some people who are extremely sensitive; these differences lead to vast differences in interpretation and I don't believe it is an officers responsibility to take into account all of these possible interpretations every time they decide to press like on a funny joke, meme, etc. I suggest this section be far less restrictive and broad.</p> <p>Lastly I would like to say I subscribe to PPB's Twitter and Instagram feeds and see fun, jovial, whimsical pictures depicting day-to-day life in the bureau on a daily basis. I find it contradictory that the bureau considers social media such a powerful tool, however does not entrust their officers to freely use the same social media tools themselves. We can all agree offensive, racist, hateful, or derogatory statements by an officer would be grounds for discipline/dismissal, but this directive goes way too far in restricting an officers ability to use social media in any satisfying way.</p>
311.40	1/5/16		<p>I understand the need to have policy regarding social media, but I am concerned that some provisions go too far in stifling the free speech of members who are acting as private individuals on their personal accounts or as on-duty members in a positive setting.</p> <p>Re 1.1: I believe that the blanket prohibition of posting any image that shows the uniform, marked cars etc to be overly restrictive. I am aware of many instances where members here and with other departments have posted images, while on duty, with other members and/or citizens that are very positive in nature and are nothing more than "scrapbook" type pictures. As social media can be considered the modern "scrapbook", I think that this prohibition is a detriment to esprit d'corp and will only contribute to the insular nature of our work and relationships. Furthermore, our friends and family are genuinely interested in our work and enjoy sharing moments from our work lives that are spontaneous and unscripted. I believe that as long as the image is in compliance with other subsections of the policy, the simple fact that</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>members appear in uniform and/or near a marked vehicle should be not only accommodated, but encouraged.</p> <p>Re 1.5: I understand and agree with the intent of 1.5 insofar as internal, non-public matters are concerned. However, if such an issue is a matter of public record and/or broadcast/published as a news article then I believe a prohibition about making comment on such matter to be overly restrictive of our members 1st Amendment rights. If an issue is in the public domain, then I believe we as members acting as individuals and not as spokespersons should not face discipline for making comment, pro or con on said issue. It is well understood that, as members, we are subject to certain restrictions on our behavior, but this provision quite literally strips us of our basic human right of freedom of expression even in it's most benign form.</p> <p>Re 1.7: Again, I believe this provision is overly broad and unfairly restricts members freedom of expression on important issues of the day for many of the same reasons listed above. Many members have issues of interest unrelated to our employment, that we care deeply about and engage in conversation about not only on social media but personally as well. This section effectively prevents a member, acting as an individual, from expressing a viewpoint on controversial issues for fear of discipline. I agree that personal attacks have no place, but who is to be the judge of what is "biased" or "disrespectful"? I have personally encountered too many people who simply cannot accept criticism or a contrary viewpoint and dismiss any with another opinion as being a racist, a bigot or any number of disparaging epithets. My fear is that unfounded complaints will be made against members by others who simply disagree and see this as an easy way to get "pay back" for honestly held beliefs. Again, it is an unjust restriction on members 1st Amendment rights of freedom of expression. As a matter of decency, personal attacks and overtly racist, etc epithets can be appropriately restricted, but these restrictions should be specific and targeted so as not to stifle the freedom to express an opinion on specific issues of law or public policy even if those opinions are unpopular or controversial.</p>
311.40	1/5/16		<p>Let's say four cops are at a coffee shop and one of them takes a "selfie" along with the other officers at the table. Am I correct to assume this picture could not then be posted</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>to the officers personal Facebook or Twitter account? Or any other social media account that they may have?</p> <p>From reading the first section, it appears only photos taken at a bureau event like a promotion ceremony is allowed.</p>
311.40	1/5/16		<p>Procedure 1.1. and 1.2 Is it ok to re-post stories from news sites like the Oregonian if there are pictures?</p>
311.40	1/5/16		<p>Elements of this directive appear to violate the employees First Amendment rights. If an employee is using a personal social media account, during their personal off-duty time, from their personal computer, and are not representing themselves as members of the police bureau or employees of the city, then what right does the employer have to infringe on their lawful conduct? And if that employee lives in the City of Portland, they should have the same right as any other resident to make comments about the effectiveness of their elected/appointed city officials and organizations. Aren't these officials/organizations supposed to be working for all city resident regardless of their employment status? If these officials/organizations are doing a poor job, every resident should have the right to let them know they are doing a poor job. This directive appears contrary to the community's expectation of transparency by potentially preventing unflattering information from coming to light only because the source is an employee.</p>
311.40	1/5/16		<p>It seems completely ridiculous that I would have to get permission from the Chief of Police to post any picture of myself in uniform outside the couple exemptions. So all those officers who posted pictures of themselves working during the snow/ice storm or just a group smiling picture would be in violation. I understand the spirit of it, but this policy seems completely extreme.</p>
311.40	1/5/16		<p>The prohibition on using Bureau badges, etc. is too restrictive. In addition to awards, we should allow members to post photos at community events or other postings that aren't detrimental to the organization. Posting a picture of yourself with a few of your shift-mates in uniform, standing next to a car, shouldn't be a violation.</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

311.40	1/5/16		<p>is 1.5 specific to Portland Police cases? What happens for example if one decides to post a comment in regards to a SCOTUS decision?</p> <p>Policy para four strikes me as overly broad. "Can..., may..., cannot be detrimental to the effective and efficient operations of the Bureau, discredit the Bureau or bring the Bureau into disrepute. Who is the arbiter of can, may and cannot?"</p>
311.40	1/5/16		<p>I see positive photos of members in uniform all of the time. I have taken photos with Portland Citizens that show us as normal, fun, down-to earth people, with a sense of humor. Our friends and family love to see it and share it. As a matter of fact, PPB took one of my personal videos that "don't show me in uniform" but does show my children and used that in one of its own videos, without my permission. I have seen officers in other agencies who are not allowed to post pictures of their uniform, helping people, but blurring out the agency they work for. These officers are doing good work but can bring credit to the agency they work for because of these restrictions. Being free to post a photo of ourselves in uniform, outside of the parameters you have set, inhibit our ability to show this "normal" side to us. People post photos/video's of us all the time that reflect negatively and we should be able to counter that with the positive ones on our own, without bothering the Chief about it. We can do it, while also using the additional parameters that were noted and only things that portray a positive image of the Bureau.</p>
311.40	1/5/16		<p>I'm concerned about this section:</p> <p>"1.1. Post or use any image or likeness of Police Bureau badges, identification, name tags or plates, logos, patches, marked vehicles, marked equipment or other marked materials without the express permission of the Chief of Police, or his or her designee. An exception to this rule is members may post or use photographs of themselves in uniform taken while appearing for official ceremonies or recognition such as appointments, promotions, awards or commendations."</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

		<p>We (the Bureau) are encouraging officers to provide pictures of themselves on duty, in uniform, in the community, involved in positive activities as a way of sharing the good work that they do and to humanize them to the public - but this section expressly forbids them from doing the same thing on their personal accounts without permission.</p> <p>This section could have a chilling effect on officers willingness to do participate in official Bureau social media efforts if the images cannot be used personally by the officers on their own social media accounts.</p> <p>I understand the challenge of being the "photo police" and that without guidance it may be hard to hold someone accountable for a bad photo but this section seems far too restrictive to me.</p> <p>Perhaps saying this would be better:</p> <p>"1.1. Bureau members posting any images or likenesses of Police Bureau badges, identification, name tags or plates, logos, patches, marked vehicles, marked equipment or other marked materials shall be allowed to do so as long as these images or likenesses do not bring reproach or discredit upon the Police Bureau, consistent with Directive 310.00 Conduct."</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
311.40	1/5/16	No clear guidelines on what is detrimental...policy infringes on free speech rights and expression.
311.40	1/5/16	Regarding section 1.1, I would suggest adding community functions and events or bureau sponsored/approved events such as officers appearances at schools or community functions. Those appearances bring credit to the bureau, humanize

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			officers, and are also important events that many bureau members like sharing with their family and friends.
311.40	1/5/16		<p>I can see some good and bad points about this:</p> <p>Yes it does (hopefully) ensure professional standards . . .</p> <p>However, it is a restriction of personal freedom . . . and would it not be a good thing to see who the 'idiots' were who were posting garbage on their social media . . .</p> <p>(And personally I don't use Facebook as people don't need to get 'in touch'.)</p>
311.40	1/5/16		Please let all officers exercise their first amendment rights. This way the bigots within the police force can be separated from those that actually want to proudly uphold their duty to serve the public no matter the sex, color, race, etc., of their constituents.
311.40	1/5/16		There is nothing wrong with posting pictures on social media of Officers in uniform or their cars. Let us be proud of our profession. Lots of times we pose for pictures with people from the community's we serve whether that be an event or just a random call. This doesn't build ill will it builds bridges. To say no uniform, badge, vehicle etc etc is just wrong. As long as there are no demeaning/offensive remarks tagged along with the photos they should be allowed to be posted. Let us be proud of our profession and share that profession with our friends and family through social media.
311.40	1/5/16		<p>I understand the need for a social media policy and incidents that have caused problems locally and nationally regarding officer use of social media in a way that created controversy. That said, I believe there are three sections of this draft that are overly restrictive or may create issues, intended or unintended.</p> <p>1.1 essentially prohibits any and all photographs depicting PPB markings. This would include social photographs similar to those currently listed on the Intranet and regularly posted on PPB social media. I believe those types of photographs, which connect with the community as well as friends and family members, show officers as human beings and promote the great work that we do every day. This section would prohibit an officer from sharing these types of positive images, even with friends and family.</p>

			<p>It is fairly common for officers to take "buddy selfies", either with shift-mates or with officers they haven't seen for awhile that they encounter while working. These types of posts demonstrate and encourage camaraderie and help people feel connected even when they work assignments that limit their interaction with old friends.</p> <p>Photographs at parades, other social events, and even casual encounters while working that involve positive interaction with the public and each other are increasingly common and well received, especially by friends and family who live across the country.</p> <p>Linking news articles that include press photographs of PPB markings does not appear to be exempted.</p> <p>1.2 specifically includes training. Similar to the concerns with 1.1, it would prohibit positive, social photographs of people sharing their interactions with fellow bureau members when they come together for training. As an example, a photograph of officers at annual in-service shooting outdoors in the mud or snow has been a fun "share our pain" posting in the past.</p> <p>1.5 prohibits posting anything related to the categories listed. The language used would include linking news articles published regarding these categories. This may or may not be intentional.</p> <p>One potential outcome of this policy will be the judicious use of Photoshop to erase, blur, or paste alternative images over PPB markings. The potential creativity involved in this may create it's own issues.</p> <p>Nothing in this policy prohibits friends or family members from posting images of an officer in uniform and "tagging" the officer in the photograph, essentially by-passing the intent of the policy. Nothing in this policy prevents members of the public from posting images of an officer (at National Night Out, for example) and "tagging" the officer.</p> <p>Sections 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 and 1.9 adequately address the valid concerns about the impact of irresponsible use of social media and the negative impact on the City and the</p>
--	--	--	---

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			Bureau. I believe care should be used to not overly restrict the positive elements of social media use by officers as they express pride in their profession and the great work they do.
311.40	1/5/16		Officers should be prohibited from using crime scenes and official uniforms, badges or likenesses in personal account posts, but beyond that we should not attempt to infringe on their free speech rights. Being a police officer does not and should not mean you're prohibited from saying and doing unpopular things on your own time.
311.40	1/5/16		This is a gross over reach. You expect us to protect others' 1st Ammendment rights, while infringing upon ours. Our thought, beliefs, and opinions are not the Police Bureau's business to regulate while they are expressed off-duty and on non-city media accounts. I wonder if the ACLU has seen this policy yet? The fact that this city paid someone to come up with this policy is embarrassing in its own right.
311.40	1/5/16		This policy is a gross overreach and an infringement upon an officer's first amendment rights. It is understandable that the PPB needs to have some policy regarding social media, as officers do not speak for the entire Bureau. But posting pictures of officers and their friends in uniform should not be a violation of policy. Neither should their comments regarding certain political or social groups on social media. There is a difference between commenting on an issue and identifying yourself as a PPB member, and then commenting on an issue. This policy needs some serious work and I hope that these comments are taken to heart.
311.40	1/5/16		<p>This policy is far too wide open and open to the interpretation of whoever happens to be deciding at that moment. There is no guidelines, examples, or definitions. Based on my reading, this would essentially allow the bureau to punish a person if ANYONE was offended by what that member posted whether or not that member even claims on their social media account what their employment is or has their legal name.</p> <p>I think you need to define "discredit or bring into disrepute " to help alleviate some of this subjective language.</p> <p>In todays culture a post of "I love my job" could cause offense to someone because they may think your are saying you love when bad things happen and the bureau may say</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>that this discredits or brings it into disrepute.</p> <p>This pretty much means that no post is safe depending on who looks at it and the mood they are in.</p> <p>I understand and agree with not posting work photos or information. To me this is common sense but for a person not to be able to share a thought about someone on their private, non legal name, and non associated Facebook account seems to be reaching too far.</p>
311.40	1/6/16		<p>Absolutely! Bureau members represent the Bureau... On and off duty. Posting disparaging materials on social media would be inappropriate even for me, if it were somehow associated with my employer and I would rightfully be disciplined for doing it.</p>
311.40	1/6/16		<p>3. When speaking on matters pursuant to a member’s official duties for the Police Bureau, a member’s speech is not considered to be legally protected and the Bureau may regulate that speech. When speaking on matters not related to the member’s official duties, the Bureau may still regulate the member’s speech if the speech impairs the effective and efficient operations of the Bureau. Communications that constitute protected union-related activities are not restricted by this policy.</p> <p>This is the most vague paragraph I've ever seen. What defines pursuant to a member's official duties? What defines impairing the effective and efficient operations of the Bureau? The way this policy is written, the Chief or his Designee could essentially determine that anything short of a cat video could be related to our duties. Putting on the badge and risking our lives shouldn't cost us our 1st Amendment rights.</p>
311.40	1/6/16		<p>This policy is very, very Vague as to what the Bureau will allow. If I post a bible verse to give support to a fellow believers, while off duty and someone else see's it and is offended and feels that a Police Officer be sharing their believes then will I be punished? Talk around the roll calls is that the city is being to vague and this will lead to individual ofcs suing the bureau. Restricting what is posted as far as uniforms and PPB property, I understand, but silencing ones constitutional rights is another.</p>
311.40	1/6/16		<p>In 1.5....what is meant by "complaints"? Citizen complaints? Employee complaints?</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			Both?
311.40	1/6/16		Seems a little silly to say members have to right to comment but limit it to not include anything that might be considered negative in the eyes of the Police Bureau. How does that constitute free speech? If it's hate speech or threatening behavior it's limited like any other person's speech, but how does joining an organization mean you've given up your right to speak about it's flaws? If anything this seems like a way to zip up controversies and control whistleblowers.
311.40	1/6/16		<p>" on matters not related to the member’s official duties, the Bureau may still regulate the member’s speech if the speech impairs the effective and efficient operations of the Bureau. "</p> <p>Who defines which speech impairs effective and efficient operations? Other cops? The City Council? BLM?</p> <p>1.6. Post, publish, transmit, share, disseminate or comment in support of any posting that is harassing, discriminatory or includes any threat of violence, any proposed violation of law or any activity that would endanger public safety.</p> <p>Harassing or discriminatory as defined by who? According to some in society, everything I do is harassing and/or discriminatory.</p> <p>1.7. Post, publish, transmit, share, disseminate or comment in support of any posting that ridicules, disparages or expresses bias or disrespect towards any race, religion, sex, gender, sexual orientation, nationality or any other legally protected classification.</p> <p>Again, who defines this? I find many things expressed these days as disparaging, bias and/or disrespectful. Many of these things are what I hear on the main stream media and have been expressed by presidential candidates, celebrities and even the Portland City Council.</p> <p>This stuff is very subjective. My world view is generally not in line with that of the leadership or dominant culture in Portland. Therefore, I find this stuff to be concerning</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>because those reviewing my behavior/speech/thoughts will likely not share my world view. Will my behavior/speech/thoughts be subject to oversight based upon their world view or that of an objective and reasonable person?</p>
311.40	1/6/16		<p>Section 1.1 seems overly restrictive. Here are a couple hypothetical situations.</p> <p>1-I go to my kids school to meet the kids, show them the police car and talk about police officers, stranger danger etc. and I take pictures with the kids.</p> <p>2-I go to Catholic Charities to give a talk to new immigrants about US laws and how to interact with US police. I take pictures of them in the police car.</p> <p>Do I need to get permission from the CHO to post them to Facebook?</p> <p>If the answer is yes, that's seems a bit much.</p>
311.40	1/7/16		<p>Although I support the idea of crafting a policy in regards to how members should act with social media accounts, I have serious concerns with the wording and vague language used in this proposed policy.</p> <p>The first area of concern in the policy line 3 states that the Bureau may "regulate the member's speech if the speech impairs the effective and efficient operations of the Bureau" sounds like a gross breach of the members right to free speech and opinion in matters not directly associated to the members official duties. Also the words "effective and efficient operations" could be used to describe anything from one persons perception to another persons disagreement on one single topic. For example if a member posts they don't like cats, someone could interpret that a member of the Bureau hates cats and therefore would be biased against all cat related investigations in the future. Although my example is simplistic the point is with that type of vague wording, the policy is enforceable on any issue that has a different opinion to that of the member.</p> <p>Another issue I have is in the procedure section 1.1. As far as I know the badge, patch, police car etc, is not copyrighted materials and owned by the public. If the member takes a picture of themselves next to a patrol car, how is that different from a citizen</p>

		<p>taking a picture of themselves next to that same patrol car? Now if the member uses those images in a way that is to gain something a normal citizen wouldn't be able to obtain, then I see an issue, but that is covered in a different policy anyway. The idea that a member could promote the Bureau in a positive light, showing friends, family, and even strangers that they too are just like every other regular person is a good tool and shouldn't be controlled.</p> <p>I agree with procedures 1.2-1.4, 1.6, and 1.9.</p> <p>Procedure 1.5 is only fine with open and ongoing cases. Once cases are closed and no longer influenced by outside factors, I don't see how the interest in the Bureau is needed.</p> <p>Procedure 1.7 uses the word "disrespects" which I feel is not the same as the other words which proceed it. For example some Christians believe that the Bible teaches that unrepentant homosexual activity is sin and cannot be celebrated or respected any more than an affair committed during a marriage, or murder of another person. There is no doubt that some members of the homosexual community would be disrespected by that belief. With this wording, the Bureau would effectively be trampling one set of moral beliefs for the more popular beliefs of one protected class. This is outside the scope of the employee/employer relationship and is subjective to those who are feeling disrespected. In this case both parties could feel disrespected because neither of them can agree on this moral issue. The Bureau does not police moral rights. They police criminal and civil rights.</p> <p>Procedure 1.8 reads even more redundant and vague than all the language before it. This procedure appears to be an all encompassing set of words to discourage any type of communication that would even hint at having an opinion or thought that would be contrary to what "reasonably" related to the city, or Bureau without permission from the Chief. My question is who decides what is reasonable? Is it the chief? Mayor? City Council? the homeless man on the corner? An angry uncle? An anti-government citizen? The list is endless. The more vague and all encompassing this language becomes, the more control and restrictions the Bureau is placing on its members during time that is not owned by the Bureau or City. Employees are not property and should</p>
--	--	---

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			not be treated as such. Human opinion and thought are what make us different and unique. Controlling that makes us robots who have no emotion or ability to think for ourselves.
311.40	1/7/16		Hello, with limited knowledge of the issue, I would like to state that I believe that anyone, ANYONE may post whatever they want to a social media site. If someone wants to complain about their job, what they do, excreta, let them. So long as the rights of others are not infringed on (names, alleged crimes, etc...). I agree with limiting the use of branded items as that doesn't belong to the individual posting. No limiting an individuals rights will also allows for better vetting of potential hires as you can clearly see their moral values. Just my two cents.....
311.40	1/7/16		section 1.1 means an officer's spouse couldn't take a picture of their smiling loved one in uniform and post/share it? I find that offensive. Also, 1.7 is so broad and subjective that it's reasonable to believe that if anyone at all is offended, the officer posting the material would be automatically guilty of violating policy. Very Orwellian.
311.40	1/7/16		I understand the need for a social media policy and I wholeheartedly support this except for 1.1. I think a total social media blackout is a little extreme. There are a lot of us that are proud to work in uniform and would like to be able to put photos of ourselves and friend in uniform (e.g. at parades, Timbers games etc) on our social media pages with out getting disciplined for it. I think that the policy could be worded to say something like "any picture or post that could be perceived as a negative image is prohibited." I can't see why a picture of myself with children at a parade or some other public function that shows good community relations must be prohibited from my page. I take pictures with the public often in these situations and the public posts them, why can't I?
311.40	1/7/16		Feedback for social media use: I think we need to be very clear in the specific procedure sections that this material must relate to the Portland police bureau. As a private citizen, as stated in procedure - when using personal social media, members may express themselves as private citizens, but shall not:

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>Then all the sections 1.1 through 1.9 have absolutes. They should be specific and say that has reference to current work activities that directly relate to the PPB.</p> <p>For instance, if I see a court case across the county, or a there is a criminal investigation going on in the news, I may want to comment on that. This would technically prohibit any comments about current events anywhere. It just leaves it very ambiguous and I believe the intent of this is to be specific for officers who work here to not comment about activities in the PPB.</p>
311.40	1/7/16		<p>It is unfortunate but apparently necessary to spell out what should be good common sense: if you are a public servant, don't embarrass your employer on social media. John Hurlman apparently didn't learn the first time around. Law enforcement should be held to the same standards as those of us in public servant roles or even in the private sector - say something stupid, get a formal reprimand or worse.</p>
311.40	1/7/16		<p>3. "When speaking on matters pursuant to a member's official duties for the Police Bureau, a member's speech is not considered to be legally protected and the Bureau may regulate that speech. When speaking on matters not related to the member's official duties, the Bureau may still regulate the member's speech if the speech impairs the effective and efficient operations of the Bureau."</p> <p>We as police officers took an oath to uphold the United States Constitution. This proposed policy is no doubt a blatant violation of Bureau members' 1st Ammendment rights. The Supreme Court has upheld that criticism of the government (in this case the Police Bureau) and advocacy of unpopular ideas that people may find distasteful or castigates public policy are almost always permitted. There are exceptions to these general protections, none of which however include a government employer unreasonably regulating an employee's speech. Time, place, and manner restrictions clearly do not apply in this case either.</p> <p>Furthermore, the US Supreme Court's decision in Legal Services Corp. v. Velazquez (2001) held that government subsidies cannot be used to discriminate against a specific instance of viewpoint advocacy.</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>Additionally, government retaliation (discipline, termination, failure to promote, etc.) against government employee speech violates the First Amendment if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the speech is on a matter of public concern, and 2. the speech is not said by the employee as part of the employee's job duties, (<i>Garcetti v. Ceballos</i> 2006) and 3. the damage caused by the speech to the efficiency of the government agency's operation does not outweigh the value of the speech to the employee and the public (<i>Connick v. Myers</i> 1983.) <p>I believe these cases make it abundantly clear that this policy as it's proposed is Unconstitutional.</p>
311.40		News Article...	<p><i>Oregonlive-Portland police seek public comment on first proposed policy regulating officers' use of social media</i> http://www.oregonlive.com/portland/index.ssf/2016/01/portland_police_seek_public_co.html</p>
311.40		News Editorial...	<p>http://www.oregonlive.com/opinion/index.ssf/2016/01/a_social_media_rulebook_for_co.html</p>
311.40	1/8/16		<p>Generally, the policy needs to be better explained. Members need to understand in clear terms why these measures are necessary. For example, policy item 4 references "the effective and efficient operations of the Bureau" -- this can be explained in such a way that provides members guidance as to what this actually means, while also preserving the Bureau's flexibility. The Bureau should be clear in describing the considerations members should make when using social media; these considerations could include ensuring that members' speech doesn't impair working relationships; impair discipline and harmony among coworkers; or negatively affect public perception of the Bureau.</p> <p>Policy item 3 currently reads: "When speaking on matters pursuant to a member's</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>official duties, a member's speech is not considered to be legally protected..." This should be amended to read that such speech is not legally protected. There is no need to equivocate here; Supreme Court precedent has been clear on this matter.</p> <p>Procedure item 1.1 seems draconian, and we question the necessity of such a prohibition. As it currently reads, members are not permitted to post or use any image or likeness of Bureau badges, uniforms, etc. without the express permission of the Chief of Police, or his designee. Then it notes as an exception images of members in uniform captured while appearing for official ceremonies or recognition. While the intent of this measure is understood, we believe it overreaches. There are a number of officers who bring positive and much needed attention to their good works in the community by posting photos on their Facebook and Instagram accounts. While the Bureau does maintain its own Facebook page, there is no guarantee that a majority of community members with Facebook accounts (for example) are visiting the Bureau's page in earnest. The power of social media rests in its ability to centralize the networks of hundreds of people. Social media's productive use among members is a boon for the Bureau - when members post a positive image, that image is disseminated to their individual communities, which are able to encounter examples of good police work (eg, community engagement). Given the national climate, this should be a welcome thing. We believe the exception should be expanded to include images of members in uniform taken while engaged in official business including community engagement and events; such official business shall not include investigative or confidential work.</p>
311.40	1/8/16		<p>I believe 1.7 is too broad and exceeds the scope of an employer's oversight of an employee's off duty activities. If I were to "like" a post that offends someone then, in theory, I could be in violation of this directive as it is currently written. I feel I should be able to express my personal beliefs as a citizen, which includes supporting or commenting on some posts which differs from the beliefs of others. For example, if a non-bureau member were to post something describing a group of protesters using demeaning adjectives (eg. "stupid" "childish" "needing babysitters") and a Bureau member were to "like" or "favorite" that comment then they would be in violation of this directive. Every citizen, including members of the police bureau, should not have to worry about being disciplined for expressing their views as a CITIZEN on their personal time.</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			I feel City is within its right as an employer on the other aspects of this directive.
311.40	1/8/16		<p>While I understand the intent of this policy is to prevent a negative image of PPB, and I understand that in todays time, rules and regulations are necessary, I do disagree with 1.1. Here is why.</p> <p>There are many officers who have family members visit them during a quick lunch break or at other times. Kids love to take pictures with their dad or mom in uniform or standing beside a police car. Or a quick picture with some coworkers on a coffee break. A respectful picture of a badge as a profile picture. At Christmas time, officers sometimes decorate their patrol car with lights or a wreath to show their Christmas spirit then post a picture.</p> <p>Honestly, there are probably quite a few other examples of pictures being posted on social media of officers where it is not detrimental to PPB. Why restrict things like this when it promotes PPB, shows the good things we do, shows that we are human and improves moral?</p> <p>I understand not posting pictures of accident or crime scenes, but again, why restrict the positive and fun pictures?</p> <p>My recommendation is to strike 1.1</p>
311.40	1/10/16		<p>Under procedure, 1.1, the prohibited use of the PPB badge, name tags, plates, logos, patches, etc...</p> <p>I believe this is too restrictive. 99 percent of the posts by officers on Facebook and other social media accounts are positive. The vast majority of officers within PPB are proud of where they work and the job they do. Daily I see photos of inspiration of officers and citizens, PPB officers smiling in uniform, showing the bureau in a positive light. This boosts morale. Requiring officers to get the approval from the Chief is over the top. At a time when the bureau is going through a staffing crisis and is sending out surveys on how to better recruit officers, this does not help with recruiting. I think this</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>new policy is really detrimental to the recruitment of officers through positive social networks.</p> <p>I support having restriction on what is posted such as anything that relates to an investigation, is negative or brings discredit to the bureau, etc. I just think cutting out all the positive is not necessary.</p>
311.40	1/12/16		<p>1.7 is far too broad. This proposed directive has already generated a lot of angst with my coworkers. With morale so low and other agencies being so attractive, is this directive really needed?</p>
311.40	1/12/16		<p>After reviewing the newly drafted policy governing PPB member’s use of Social Media, I find several points to be inconsistent with current US Supreme Court case law and in violation of PPB members protected constitutional rights.</p> <p>The policy is correct in stating, “when speaking on matters not related to the member’s official duties, the Bureau may still regulate the member’s speech if the speech impairs the effective and efficient operations of the Bureau.” The ‘effective and efficient’ language is correctly drawn from current U.S. Supreme Court case law. The proposed policy then deviates from the case law in point 1.1 through 1.9 as the policy attempts to restrain a gamut of member speech. The most recent case law regarding these issues is within the US Supreme Court’s decision under Garcetti et. al. v. Ceballos. The findings conclude a specific case but also outline the Court’s decision making process derived from a litany and long history of case law involving public employers restricting employees First Amendments rights.</p> <p>US Supreme Court Justice White in Connick v. Myers 461 U.S. 138 (1983), states, “For at least 15 years, it has been settled that a state cannot condition public employment on a basis that infringes the employee’s constitutionally protected interest in freedom of expression.” Judge White later comments, “The First Amendment ‘was fashioned to assure unfettered interchange of ideas for the bringing about of political and social changes desired by the people.’ Roth v. United States, 354 U.S. 476, 354 U.S. 484 (1957).”</p>

			<p>Justice Kennedy in 2006 at <i>Garcetti et al. v. Ceballas</i> opens the opinion of the Court with Justice White’s words, “It is well settled that “a State cannot condition public employment on a basis that infringes the employee’s constitutionally protected interest in freedom of expression.’ <i>Connick v. Meyers</i>, 461 U.S. 138, 142 (1983).” The court does offer the time and place public employees do not have protection under the First Amendment. Justice Kennedy continues;</p> <p>“When public employees make statements pursuant to their official duties, they are not speaking as citizens for First Amendment purposes, and the Constitution does not insulate their communications from employer discipline. (a)Two inquiries guide interpretation of the constitutional protections accorded public employee speech. The first requires determining whether the employee spoke as a citizen on a matter of public concern. See <i>Pickering</i>, supra, at 568. If the answer is no, the employee has no First Amendment cause of action based on the employer’s reaction to the speech. See <i>Connick</i>, supra, at 147. If the answer is yes, the possibility of a First Amendment claim arises. The question becomes whether the government employer had an adequate justification for treating the employee differently from any other member of the general public.” “The First Amendment limits a public employer’s ability to leverage the employment relationship to restrict, incidentally or intentionally, the liberties employees enjoy in their capacities as private citizens. So long as employees are speaking as citizens about matters of public concern, they must face only those speech restrictions that are necessary for their employers to operate efficiently and effectively.”</p> <p>I believe the proposed PPB policy in question is arrogant to assert that a PPB member posting anything falling under point 1.7, and the subjective “harassing, discriminatory” of point 1.6, would affect the “efficient and effective” operations of the Bureau. Under point four the policy says, “Use of personal social media can relate to a member’s official position with the Police Bureau and may affect the effective operations of the Bureau.” The natural question flowing from this statement is how can my personal social media use relate to a members official position and again how would</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>it affect the Bureau’s effective and efficient operations. The policy does not answer the how but instead tells the member that any word falling under sub points 1.1 through 1.9 automatically assumes a breach of the bureau’s efficiency and effectiveness. If this were to be true the Bureau is appropriate in it’s ‘members shall not.’ It however is not true. Countless comments could be made that would not affect the Bureau’s efficiency and effectiveness but still, for instance, express bias towards a protected classification. Let us assume a bureau member has a Facebook account which contains no nexus to the Bureau. The account has no comments asserting affiliation to the Bureau, nor employment as a law enforcement officer. There are as well no pictures associating the member to the Bureau. If a person were to view the page there would be no clue the Facebook page is that of a Bureau member. Let us assume on that site are posted the following comments;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “I am tired of driving by lazy homeless people, this city should do something.” 2. “[Facebook Friend] did you read this article [hotlink] John Hopkins Prof says transgender is a mental disorder, I agree with the guy!” 3. “We need to take out those ISIS murderers, they are committing the most heinous crimes.” <p>All of these comments contain some aspect of disrespect, bias, ridicule, etc., towards a protected class; in this case homelessness, sexual orientation, political affiliation/religion. They could easily be viewed as discriminatory. The proposed policy would view these comments as a violation under the assumption they “may affect the effective operations of the Bureau.” Creating an objective and reasonable finding on how those comments affect operations would be an incredible feat. A read through of the case law surrounding this issue would provide ample evidence throughout the 20th century on what content, context, and format the courts have already declared as protected. See <i>Connick v. Myers</i>, 461 U.S. 138, <i>Pickering v. Board of Ed. Of Township High School Dist. 205, Will Cty.</i>, 391 U.S. 563, <i>Garcetti v. Ceballos</i> 547 U.S. 410, and the other cases referenced therein.</p> <p>In <i>Pickering v. Board of Education</i> the goal was “a balance between the interests of the</p>
--	--	--	---

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>[employee], as a citizen, in commenting upon matters of public concern and the interest of the State, as an employer, in promoting the efficiency of the public services it performs through its employees.” This same intention of balancing police bureau member’s rights and managing the Bureau’s efficiency should be the interest of this policy, yet I find the policy unconstitutionally tipping the scale to the interests of the Bureau.</p> <p>"[T]he theory that public employment which may be denied altogether may be subjected to any conditions, regardless of how unreasonable, has been uniformly rejected." <i>Keyishian v. Board of Regents</i>, supra, at 605-606.</p> <p>In the dissenting opinion of <i>Connick v. Myers</i>, Justice Brennan, speaking for three other justices reminds the country of the already established truth, “when public employees engage in expression unrelated to their employment while away from the workplace, their First Amendment rights are, of course, no different from those of the general public.”</p> <p>I conclude with the words of Justice White, “The First Amendment ‘was fashioned to assure unfettered interchange of ideas for the bringing about of political and social changes desired by the people.’” <i>Roth v. United States</i>, 354 U.S. 476. I believe the proposed policy needs to reflect the current case law and established Constitutional rights Bureau members hold.</p>
311.40	1/12/16		<p>Does the news media have permission to use he image of the badge? So photos officers may have of themselves in uniform at parades etc have to be taken down? Thought you wanted the public to see they are human. Is the PIO going to obtain permission from the officers to post their images? What if an officer "likes" a post that someone could find offensive or disrespectful? Ever heard of the First Amendment?</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

311.40	1/17/16		<p>Policy Item #2 - Last sentence needs to be re-written. I have had four other people read it and the response has universally been "Huh?".</p> <p>Item #3 and #4 - include some examples</p> <p>Procedure - #1.1 - the vast majority of photos I have seen on PPB members personal social media have projected a positive image for the Bureau. Examples - photos from Sunshine Division food box deliveries, interactions with kids (usually centered around a police vehicle), pictures with citizens at parades and events, new Bureau vehicles and so on, ironically these are the same types of images the Bureau requests members to provide and promotes on it's social media.</p> <p>There is also a commonly used image of a PPB badge with a black mourning band that is used to show support for fallen officers which would be prohibited under this policy.</p> <p>-By expressly prohibiting these types of images the Bureau loses a positive community relations outlet and alienates the members who are proud of their careers and agency. I would suggest rephrasing 1.1 to prohibit the use of images that are controversial or bring discredit to the Bureau or its members.</p> <p>1.5 Court cases - how far does this reach? The way this section is worded, members are prohibited from mentioning anything to do with any kind of court, including - court cases the member is involved in, court cases in the national spotlight (Casey Anthony or OJ Simpson for example), Supreme Court Rulings, Court of Appeals rulings, etc.</p> <p>In all - this policy can be summed up as -"Members are prohibited from talking about work or anything work related on social media", because this is exactly what it does. I did a test by looking at several members social media and found violations of this proposed policy on every one, all of the violations were minor and technical, but would count as violations and be investigated if someone were to complain, subjecting the posting member to potential discipline. This policy walks the fine line of what is and isn't free speech and needs to be crystal clear to avoid inadvertent violations.</p>
311.40	1/18/16		<p>As a board member of the Portland Police Historical Society, will this directive apply to our use of both current and historical images on both our web sites, and on our</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>Facebook page?</p> <p>The groups that this would effect would be the Portland Police Museum, the Highland Guard, and the Portland Police Memorial.</p> <p>Also, if this does apply to us will it apply to historical photos that we either have in our archive or are available on the internet?</p>
311.40	1/19/16		<p>This policy is too far reaching, especially when there has never been a social media policy before. How about we start out small along the lines of not posting anything that would bring negative attention to the Bureau or hamper the operation of the Bureau. We as a Bureau have a social media webpage that we are asked to submit pictures to all the time. Where do you think these pictures come from? They come from the members personal social media accounts. You want us to get out in the public and build relationships, show people that we are human and not robots, then you go and take away the ability to use social media as a means to do that. Do I need to deny all photo requests at events like the Starlight Parade for fear that someone might post them of facebook? I have posed for many pictures over my 20 plus year career when asked by the public. I'm proud to be a member of the Portland Police Bureau. I would like to be able to continue being proud. I'd like to be able to share pictures with friends and family of me at my job doing what I do best.</p> <p>This policy is overkill!!!!</p>
311.40	1/20/16		<p>The Bureau asks the employees to post photos of them with the public, volunteering etc. However with this new directive none of those photos could be displayed. The officers are suppose to be invested in the community but can no longer post photos of themselves with local children, at parades and other civic events.</p>
311.40	1/20/16		<p>Far to broad. Let officers post images of them at community events, passing out stickers, parades, with horses. All the positive things the Bureau wants them to do the community policing stuff. 99% of Officers are proud of what they do and want their</p>

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>friends and family to see what they do.</p> <p>The public wants to see cops hanging out with kids and at schools and having fun at parades. PIO was asking for officers to send pictures of cops eating donuts during Nation donut day; because it's fun. Let cops use it for the right reasons. The bureau is getting younger and more tech savvy.</p>
311.40	1/21/16		<p>Officers have a freedom of speech as well. As long as they don't identify that this is the bureaus position, they should be able to post just about anything. Lastly, I do agree with not showing the image of the department as their page main image. But if they don't agree with something, say for example President Obama, they should be able to state that in any way, shape or form when OFFDUTY....</p>
311.40	1/26/16		<p>I realize that the police bureau and the city of Portland have an interest to protect themselves from liability, I feel that the city and the bureau have no right to tell me what I can and cannot say about anything on my personal time. Your proposed social media policy is too restrictive and is too far reaching bordering on unconstitutional. I understand that as police officers we have an obligation to the public but how far does that go? We are not robots who draw a paycheck. My views on my time are my business whether I post them on social media or not. What is the difference if I post them or say them to a friend or family member? Will the city try to punish me if they find out that I said something that they disagree with to a friend or family member on my own time in my own home? Please understand that I mean no disrespect and I do appreciate my job but you are way out of line with this proposed policy. Free speech is free speech. You can't have it both ways. Either we are police officers 24/7 in the State and we have no freedom of speech or we are police officers for 4/10 hour shifts and we are free to say whatever we want on our own time.</p>
311.40	1/19/16		<p>The sentence in Policy paragraph 3 "Communications that constitute protected union-related activities are not restricted by this policy" is troubling. It is overly broad and may be used to discourage or harm the union's and its members' rights. While we appreciate the inclusion of paragraph 1.7, we believe that some of the other categories of excluded information could border on infringing collective bargaining agreement areas and should be narrowly tailored to not do so.</p>

			We also support the comments by Portland Copwatch.
311.40	1/29/16		<p>DIRECTIVE 311.40 PERSONAL USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA</p> <p>This Directive was prompted into existence by the three officers who posted "I am Darren Wilson" on their Facebook pages, along with the image of the PPB badge. In general, the exception to the rules for "protected union-related activities" (Policy Section 2) creates many questions.</p> <p>Though far fewer officers than in past years offer postings to the Portland Police Association's newsletter, the Rap Sheet, it is curious how the PPB plans to reconcile the officers' ability to express their concerns about management in this public forum and the restrictions put on their personal use of the internet. (Also, the Directive doesn't seem to address what happens if officers use good old-fashioned paper to express their opinions.) While we're all for holding officers accountable for misconduct and (we hope) coming under scrutiny for racist, sexist, homophobic or other remarks they make while on or off duty, we also understand the members' need to vent publicly about working conditions. If this is included in the undefined term "protected union-related activities" it should be clear.</p> <p>It is also not clear whether the Bureau's policy on using social media for official purposes (Policy Section 2) is guided by a separate Directive.</p> <p>Whether or not there is a separate listing, it is important to caution that "general information exchanges" over the internet could constitute "collecting or maintaining information about the political, religious or social views, associations or activities [of people] unless such information directly relates to an investigation of criminal activities, and there are reasonable grounds to suspect the suspect... may be involved in criminal conduct" (ORS 181.575). We urge the Bureau to reconcile its social media program with the state law, which was the main reason Portland withdrew from the Joint Terrorism Task Force for 6-10 years.</p>
311.40	1/30/16		<p>My concern is the language used in subsection 1.7 of 311.40. In short, this section seems overreaching and impractical. I will try and give a few concise examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Many people engage in religious dialogue or debate on social media. If one were to comment in support of an article that ridiculed Scientology's doctrines on aliens, even

Directive 311.40 – Website comments as of 1/30/16, close of Universal Review

			<p>in the context of a friendly debate, it would be a policy violation.</p> <p>2. The proposed policy prohibits anything that expresses bias towards any race, religion, sex etc. "Bias" can be either in favor of or in opposition to something. And frequently, a bias in favor of something has an implicit bias in opposition to something, and vice versa. Following this, simple posts showing support of anything having to do with race, religion, sex etc. etc. would be a policy violation.</p> <p>3. My third point is regarding the subjective perceptions of citizens toward issues (political, religious, scientific etc.) and how support of or opposition to many issues may be seen as prima facie discriminatory. Civic dialogue is frequently reduced to simple categorizing of opponents (racist, sexist, xenophobe etc.) My concern is the lack of objective standards in the discernment of potential violations of this proposed policy.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and service to our city. Tom</p>
311.40	2/4/16		<p>Becoming a police officer does not diminish anyone's First Amendment right to free speech - even speech that pointy-headed liberals don't like. That's oppressive, unconstitutional behavior. Try sticking to policing the city. That should be enough for you.</p>