

## The Oregonian

### Editorial: Portland Parks cuts show city government's own structural defect (Editorial Agenda 2019)

*By The Oregonian Editorial Board*

*Jun 2, 2019*

In the grand scheme of the city's budget, Portland Parks and Recreation's \$6.3 million deficit barely rates as a blip. City commissioners – if they wanted to – could fill that gap by making different spending choices that would prevent the closure of the Sellwood Community Center, next year's shuttering of Columbia Pool and dozens of layoffs.

But as a whole, the council didn't want to. As painful as that choice may be, it's the right one for the long-term health of the bureau, which has been increasingly needing general fund bailouts to cover personnel costs, expanding programs and basic upkeep. Maintaining a vibrant network of parks, community centers, swimming pools and recreational programs is essential to preserving the quality of life in Portland and is a central obligation that any city owes its residents -- current and future.

Such courage to make tough choices is long overdue. The city budget office has warned of threats to the bureau's fiscal sustainability since early 2016. Budget analysts noted then that the cost of providing aquatics programs, child care and other services was significantly increasing, due to a settlement of a union grievance over work performed by seasonal workers. The budget office again sounded the alarm in 2017 and 2018, noting the backlog of millions of dollars' worth of maintenance, insufficient revenue from fees and continuing increases in salaries and benefits for workers.

But it wasn't until this year that city commissioners appeared to grasp the defects built into the parks bureau's budget and recognize that patching together a one-year rescue only exacerbates the mismatch between revenue and spending needs. Under Commissioner Nick Fish, who took over management of the parks bureau last September, the bureau is closing three smaller community centers, all of which need substantial maintenance. The Columbia Pool will operate for another year as the city looks to build a long-planned aquatics facility at nearby Charles Jordan Community Center.

Such drastic measures in a booming economy rightly concern Portlanders. That most of the council was largely unaware of the severity of the bureau's financial problems, however, should concern them more. It shows once again how poorly Portland's commission form of government serves Portlanders who depend on city services to be run professionally and sustainably.

Unlike every other sizable city in the country, Portland's form of government empowers the mayor and four commissioners to serve as both legislators who set city policy as well as executives who manage assigned city bureaus. So instead of, for instance, an experienced city manager who ensures that the transportation, housing, police and other bureaus are delivering core services, elected commissioners fill that role. The quality of oversight of any particular bureau will depend on an individual commissioner's expertise in managing multimillion-dollar budgets, overseeing employees and familiarity with agency operations. Such experience is hardly a given.

Theoretically, city commissioners are supposed to make decisions with the good of city government as a whole in mind. But as past history shows, commissioners often stake out

positions protective of their own bureaus' budgets or interests. That's hardly surprising considering their actions as bureau heads are far more visible to voters than any individual vote on a city ordinance.

And while keeping the same commissioner in charge of a bureau can help provide stability, it also risks letting problems go unaddressed – such as declining revenue and lackadaisical oversight of the city's golf courses, as a recent audit found. Turns out the structural defects in the parks bureau that city budget analysts identified years ago weren't the only things ignored. While Commissioner Amanda Fritz, who was the commissioner in charge of parks from 2013 until last September, bears some of the blame for the lack of progress in addressing those defects, the responsibility belongs to the council as a whole. City leaders should not be caught unaware by financial problems threatening such core services.

Fish told The Oregonian/OregonLive Editorial Board that city leaders will look at alternative funding streams, such as a parks district similar to Multnomah County's library district or another revenue source to strengthen the parks bureau's financial footing. With its new director, Adena Long, the bureau is pushing community centers to adopt self-sustaining business models. And that will include evaluating whether programs and facilities uphold the parks bureau's core mission and are worth the investment. "The days of offering programs that are well intentioned but didn't generate revenue are over," he said.

In the meantime, while the bureau is closing some facilities, Fish said he is looking at "creative solutions" that will help maintain public access to these centers. For example, the bureau is working on an agreement with L'Etoile French Immersion school, which already rents part of the Fulton Community Center, to take on some of the maintenance burden and keep the center's dance space available for public use.

Those are all good steps. But Fish and city leaders should not stop there. They must recognize the other structural problem threatening the city's livability and future and start the work now to change Portland's form of government.

## **Opinion: Portland moves backwards on public records with PortlandMaps change**

*By Christian Trejbal  
June 5, 2019*

Trejbal is the board chair of the Overlook Neighborhood Association. He also was the open government chair for the Association of Opinion Journalists for more than a decade.

On May 15, without any warning, Portland took a step backward on public records. The city turned off the ability to search PortlandMaps.com by people's and companies' names. Want to know what parcels someone owns? There's no longer a good way to find out.

Matthew Freid, who manages the city's corporate geographic information system team, is in charge of PortlandMaps. He unilaterally decided to turn off name searches after receiving a few complaints and reviewing a couple of decade-old city ombudsman annual reports, he told me, in response to my inquiries. He didn't consult anyone outside his team – not the council, not the public.

He should have. Any time government rolls back access to public records, it warrants a serious public conversation.

In many Oregon counties, this isn't an issue. Deschutes, Crook, Jefferson, Linn, Benton and others have allowed name searches for years because property records are public records and Oregon's public records law has a presumption of transparency.

Multnomah County maintains property records for assessment and taxation purposes. The county shares those records with the city to power PortlandMaps because it's such a helpful tool. In fact, PortlandMaps pops up on the terminal at the county records office.

The fact that city staff retains the ability to do name searches belies the usefulness of such searches.

Public access to property records helps guard against chicanery. Watchdogs and journalists can discover if the assessor's buddy is getting a break on his taxes or if elected officials own property in an area being rezoned to higher value.

In the Overlook neighborhood, we used PortlandMaps to find out what residential properties adidas had purchased around its North Portland campus before its major expansion began.

Maybe tenants in an apartment complex want to reach out to tenants in other properties the landlord owns. Neighbors might want to check how many Airbnbs the owner down the street is operating. Or they might want to look at other projects by the developer proposing an apartment building on their street. Now they can't. Their only hope is to get lucky wading through convoluted property records at the county building during limited business hours or online after paying a \$150 sign-up fee.

Not that the reason someone wants to look at property records really matters. Public records are public for everyone. Outside of a few narrowly prescribed limits, people don't have to justify wanting to see information that belongs to the public. That is the price of ensuring government is answerable to the people.

And privacy still isn't guaranteed, despite the change. Anyone can find out who owns a specific property by entering the address or clicking on a parcel on the map. The owners' names, how much they paid, assessed value, property taxes, square footage, etc. – it's all there.

Freid and his team do a great job with PortlandMaps, but this time they blew it. To his credit, he said he's willing to revisit the decision. "I'm always open to trying to find the right balance on these things," he said.

His superiors, all the way up to Mayor Ted Wheeler, should explain that the right balance is user-friendly transparency. Tell Freid that Portland should make public records more accessible, not less. Turn name searches back on.

## **The Portland Tribune**

### **Eudaly, Fritz split over MAX link to OHSU**

*By Bill Gallagher*

*June 04, 2019*

#### **Portland's Transportation Commissioner is on board but Amanda Fritz wants Marquam Hill Connector idea dropped**

Support for a funicular railway to carry thousands of riders to and from Marquam Hill in Southwest Portland if a new MAX line is ever built got a boost as Portland's Transportation Commissioner Chloe Eudaly indicated she'll back that kind of connector.

Her support for the funicular is important because she casts a vote on the Steering Committee that will decide among various connector options on Monday, June 10. Other members of the City Council advised her on their preferences during a two-hour, informational work session Tuesday.

Basically, if it can secure funding and voter approval, a new light rail line travelling 12 miles between Portland State University and Bridgeport Village in Tualatin would need a special connection to Marquam Hill. It's estimated that by 2035, 5,000 light rail riders would make 10,000 daily trips to and from OHSU, Dornbecher Childrens Hospital, the Veterans Admonistration and the other medical institutions via some kind of connector.

Two options are getting serious consideration at this point. A bridge and elevator combination bigger than the current one at South Waterfront and a funicular railway. Estimated cost range for the first option is \$15 to \$25 million while the estimated cost range for the funicular is \$35 to \$45 million.

Eudaly said her problems with a bridge and elevator combination are that it would be "visually intrusive and destructive of (Terwilliger) park landscape," and would involve a long walk exposed to the elements.

"Those factors have informed my leaning toward an inclined elevator," she said. "I do prefer the term 'funicular' but I understand that technically it's not one. I'm trying to figure out a way this could still get on (the list of) the top ten weirdest, cool, inclined elevators in the country. But I haven't figured it out yet."

As the SW Connection reported in June, "The so-called Green Ribbon Committee, an advisory panel of experts, which will recommend a method for moving all those people, is now leaning toward building an inclined elevator, which is also known as a funicular railway. Two subway-like cars, would alternately climb on tracks from a base on Barbur Boulevard at Gibbs Street next to the synagogue. The cars would stop at Terwilliger Boulevard and Campus Drive at the bottom of the last stretch of the hill to the hospitals and clinics.

Or they would keep going, under or over Terwilliger Boulevard, to get people up that last hill. That part of the funicular plan is still under study."

Another member of the 8-member SW Corridor Project Steering Committee, Metro Councilor Craig Dirksen, told the Southwest Community Connection that he prefers the bridge and elevator option.

"I think both in terms of functionality and cost that the elevator and bridge combination seems to make the most sense," he said.

The Steering Committee meets Monday, June 10 at Tigard City Hall. Asked if he was confident that a recommendation would be made for a Marquam Hill connector, he said, "Confident may be too strong a word. I'm hoping the Green Ribbon Committee will come to a consensus."

The Green Ribbon Committee was created to come up with a consensus recommendation on the best option for a connector. Originally considered besides the funicular railway and bridge and elevator were a second tram and a long, enclosed tunnel connecting to an elevator. That Committee meets Wednesday, June 4.

Mayor Ted Wheeler and Commissioner Nick Fish expressed support for a funicular railway while cautioning that early cost estimates could be unreliable. "I have low confidence in rough estimates," said Wheeler.

Commissioner JoAnn Hardesty was non-committal and Commissioner Amanda Fritz, the only Council member who lives anywhere near the proposed light rail line, was blunt.

"I don't like any of these options. I'm disappointed. I would suggest that we cut the whole thing (Marquam Hill Connector) and have people take MAX all the way downtown and improve service on the 8 Line to Marquam Hill. In fact," she said, "an OHSU shuttle that would be open to all users is a much better option."

While the Portland City Council won't take another vote on a new light rail line through Southwest Portland, it will have to approve Portland's share of the funding for the project at some point.

The current estimate of what it will cost to build such a line - 12-miles long with 13 stations and possibly seven park-and-ride structures - is between \$2.6 and \$2.8 billion. But TriMet is working on a new cost estimate that should be available later this year. It's expected that a funding measure for the light rail and other local transportation projects will be sent to voters in November 2020. If that passes the Federal Transportation Administration will be asked for half the project cost. The soonest construction could begin is 2021 with service underway by 2027, if federal funding and local voter support align.

## **Kafoury: Housing will fix homelessness**

*By Nick Budnick  
June 05, 2019*

### **County chair says solution should include 'four walls' but that local policies alone cannot solve the housing crisis**

Efforts by local government officials to address homelessness in greater Portland are working, according to Multnomah County Chair Deborah Kafoury, but the scope of the problem is more than they can solve

"Our strategies are working," she said at a May 31 event before an audience of more than 120 people at the Multnomah Athletic Club.

"When I say that these strategies are working, I mean they're preventing and ending people's homelessness. To be clear, our strategies do not and cannot end the housing crisis."

Kafoury's comments came at a recent forum on homelessness sponsored by the nonprofit Oregon Health Forum, called "Homelessness — Where Do We Go From Here?"

Her speech, along with remarks from several others, including a prominent homelessness researcher and advocate, Dr. Margot Kushel, provided a public window into the latest moves and rationale of how advocates are seeking to combat the problem in Portland, Oregon and nationally.

The answer, Kafoury said, is simple: more housing.

"Solving homelessness is not like trying to figure out how to get to Mars or to solve cancer. We don't actually need to look for new solutions because we know what they are," she said. "If, when you think of homelessness, you automatically go to mental health, PTSD or addiction, then yes, those are complex health issues that require careful treatment. But every single one of those solutions should always include four walls, a roof, a front door. Because the simple truth is that homelessness is solved with a home."

Kafoury said the passage of two housing bonds by city of Portland and Metro voters shows that the public supports the need for more housing. And she said a joint office setup with the City of Portland is bearing fruit.

"We now serve over 6,000 new households each year. We've nearly doubled the number of people who've moved out of homelessness and back into permanent housing each year to almost 6,000, and we've doubled the number of shelter beds. And the number of people reaching shelter each year rose to over 8,000.

"So last year here in Multnomah County, we served a total of 35,000 people through the joint office of homeless services," Kafoury said.

She said the city-county office has 600 units of "supportive housing" that features case managers and other services, completed or in the works, with 1,400 more on the way.

Kafoury said the region needs a new source of revenue to pay down rents of those who are in danger of losing their housing, and she promoted the work of a new homelessness coalition, Here Together, that is working toward that.

"The next challenge before us is to secure funding to pay down the rents for the lowest-income households and for essential services to keep people housed," she said. "It's a source of revenue that we don't currently have because the bond money can only pay for the buildings."

Kushel, who researches homelessness in California, said the federal government has slashed its affordable housing spending since 1980, fueling the issue. She said the problem is all the more pressing because the homeless population is aging — meaning a whole slew of new costs and problems among the homeless, such as dementia, have reached "humanitarian" proportions. She said people are increasingly losing housing after they turn 50, and have the health problems to match.

"It actually has huge public policy implications because we're seeing lots of what we call cognitive and functional disabilities, which place people at risk of nursing home placement," Kushel said. "And if we don't address this problem soon, if you think we have problems with the Medicaid system now, just wait."

## Willamette Week

# The Cost of Building New Schools and Affordable Housing Could Rise Under the Portland Clean Energy Fund

*By Rachel Monahan  
June 5, 2019*

**The city's attorneys and bureaucrats say the measure was clear. It did not exempt construction companies and they have no choice but to abide by the will of voters.**

Last November, Portland voters overwhelmingly passed a tax on large retail companies as part of an effort to reduce carbon emissions and increase energy efficiency for its most neglected residents.

Critics now say City Hall is picking its own pocket—and raiding social services—via the measure that several city officials championed.

At issue is whether large construction companies constitute "retail businesses." If they do, the new tax will increase the price of public works projects—including affordable housing, schools and a new water treatment plant.

"It would impact public works in a way that I don't think anyone anticipated this ever doing," Dan Drinkward, vice president of Hoffman Construction, tells WW. "We believe there are unintended consequences of a rule-making process that was not in line with what the measure said or what proponents of the measure said during the campaign and what was sold to the voters."

The city's attorneys and bureaucrats say the measure was clear. It did not exempt construction companies and they have no choice but to abide by the will of voters.

The city's Revenue Division has written draft administrative rules for the measure, and has decided construction companies will indeed be considered retail companies.

Ballot Measure 26-201, passed 65 to 35 percent in November, will add a 1 percent charge on the city business license tax for retail businesses with at least \$1 billion in sales nationally and \$500,000 in the city. Supporters of the measure said it would raise \$30 million a year.

The issue of whether construction companies would be subject to the tax came up during the campaign.

An analysis by the consultant ECONorthwest, paid for by an opponent of the measure before the election last fall, found the measure's revenues would depend on the way "retailer" was defined, and that if the definition was broadly construed, it would raise up to \$79 million.

Supporters told the Portland Tribune in October that the analysis was attempting to "scare voters however they can."

But the city's draft rules would indeed tax construction companies.

Drinkward says this defies the common understanding of what a retailer is. "It all comes back to the fact that we're not a retailer to begin with," he says.

In a May 16 letter to Drinkward, Portland Public Schools estimated the tax will add \$2 million to the renovation costs for Lincoln High School.

"Under the Clean Energy Surcharge, as it's currently defined, millions of dollars will be diverted to a city tax program instead of where the public intend their tax revenue to go, which is to modernize our aging school buildings," wrote Erik Gerding, a senior project manager in the district's Office of School Modernization.

Construction contracts can pass along costs to buyers. And executives warn that small companies, which don't have to pay the surcharge, are not going to get the work instead of the big companies, because of the complex nature of public projects.

"Small companies can't do that work," says Drinkward. "You have to bond it. To bond a \$200 million project, you have to be a very substantial company. A mom-and-pop can't do it."

Mayor Ted Wheeler's office said May 21 that the mayor asked the Revenue Division, which is in charge of collecting the taxes, to consider excluding construction companies.

"The mayor asked the Revenue Division to review this issue and ensure that the administrative rules reflect the intent of the ballot measure and ensure that administrative rules do not adversely impact schools or affordable housing," spokeswoman Eileen Park told WW then.

But subsequently the Revenue Division was advised such a change could only be approved by the City Council.

A May 30 memo to city revenue director Thomas Lannom, from senior deputy city attorney Kenneth A. McGair, obtained by WW, says the Revenue Division does not have the authority to exempt sales to governmental entities from the tax or exempt "construction activity." (The memo also says construction equipment companies and insurance companies cannot be exempted.)

"The administrative rules drafted by the Revenue Division did not 'include' (or exclude) construction companies," Lannom tells WW. He says the ballot measure clearly included any company with sufficient sales—unless it was specifically mentioned on a list of exemptions. "That list," he adds, "does not include construction."

The mayor's office says it is still determining what the next step might be.

The office of City Commissioner Chloe Eudaly, who supported the measure, briefly weighed supporting an exemption to the clean-energy surcharge for sales to public agencies and nonprofit housing developers, but then when asked why the exemption was limited to public-works projects, decided it supported keeping the rules the way they are.

"The language in the measure is clear that construction is included," says Marshall Runkel, Eudaly's chief of staff. "After further consideration, I'm not sure if the public agency and affordable housing safe harbor makes sense."

## **Portland Begg for Bond Money to Finish Park Work It Started**

*By Rachel Monahan  
June 5, 2019*

Portland's push for more funding in the Metro bond comes after the City Council voted to lay off as many as 50 employees at Portland Parks and Recreation to address budget shortfalls.

On June 6, the regional government Metro is expected to refer a \$475 million bond measure to voters, the largest chunk of which is aimed at protecting and restoring land as natural areas and parks.

Portland's cash-strapped parks bureau wants a slice.

Behind closed doors, the city of Portland has been lobbying for more money—because the last Metro parks bond, in 2006, helped buy properties for Portland, but City Hall lacks the money to finish restoring or improving them.

The properties include Butte Natural Area, River View Natural Area, and Wilkes Creek Headwaters.

"The last bond purchased natural areas across our community—today some are managed by Metro, some by the city," says Sonia Schmanski, chief of staff to Commissioner Nick Fish, who oversees parks. "Portlanders would contribute close to a third of the money for this bond, and it should help fund restoration at all those sites."

Portland's push for more funding in the Metro bond comes after the City Council voted to lay off as many as 50 employees at Portland Parks and Recreation to address budget shortfalls in its ongoing operations. But the city is also short the money to complete buildings and upgrades at city parks.

Other cities in the region are also agitating for a larger share of the bond, and Metro has, so far, increased it a fraction. Metro spokesman Jim Middaugh says the regional government wants to help municipalities "that need that last commitment to finish that playground or trail."

## **The Portland Mercury**

### **Portland Police Explain Why They Fired Munitions at Protesters on August 4**

*By Alex Zielinski*

*Jun 4, 2019*

**Third-degree chemical burns. A traumatic head injury. Soft tissue damage.**

The casualty reports came in hours after the volatile August 4, 2018 clash between protesting members of Vancouver, Washington's alt-right group Patriot Prayer and counter-protesting locals who identify as anti-fascist (or, antifa). All of these injuries were said to have come from the loud explosives that Portland police officers shot into crowds of protesters that afternoon.

Now, nearly a year after the tense confrontation, police records obtained by the Mercury detail officers' justification for firing these so-called "less lethal" munitions at demonstrators.

From vague "movements [that] appeared similar to attempts to break the windows [of patrol cars]" to more direct "lit pyrotechnics thrown toward officers," the reasonings given offer some insight into when—and why—officers within the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) decide to shoot munitions into crowds of protesters.

The August 4 protest has drawn particular scrutiny from the public and elected officials in the months since it took place for a number of reasons, mostly surrounding the way the PBB conducted itself during the tense confrontation.

Two months after the protest, the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) casually mentioned that the morning of August 4, officers had discovered a “cache” of weapons in a car belonging to members of Patriot Prayer and parked in a garage overlooking the planned location of the afternoon protest. In February 2019, a record request returned to the Mercury revealed friendly, protective text messages sent between a PPB officer and Patriot Prayer leader Joey Gibson during the August 4 meet-up.

But the most immediate questions regarding police conduct came just days after the summer protest, when several Portlanders reported serious injuries sustained from PPB officers’ use of crowd-control munitions.

One man who only identified himself in an Oregonian interview by his first name, Anthony, suffered a traumatic brain injury when he was hit in the head with a flash-bang grenade—a loud pyrotechnic police use to disperse crowds. The grenade lodged itself in his bike helmet and split open his skull. A nurse allegedly told Anthony the injury would have been lethal if he hadn’t been wearing the helmet.

Another flash-bang grenade hit a documentary filmmaker named Michelle Fawcett, who suffered third-degree chemical burns on her arm and chest, according to an interview with the Guardian. Others reported less-severe injuries, like bruises or scrapes, from being pushed or dragged by police officers attempting to break up the crowds.

But in the 13 use-of-force reports filed by PPB officers who shot flash-bangs, rubber bullets, and pepper balls—non-lethal bullets filled with pepper spray—at protesters on August 4, officers claim none of their projectiles injured members of the public.

Officer Derek Harris, for instance, wrote that despite firing five flash-bangs into a crowd of counter-protesters, “No injuries were ever reported to me. I did not see any injuries after launching the [grenade].”

Another officer, Zachary Flippo, describes shooting flash-bangs into a crowd of counter-protesters that happened to be standing between a line of PPB officers and two abandoned police cars. Flippo writes that the crowd “started shaking” the cars. This was concerning, he said, because he was unsure if there were officers inside the parked cars and knew the vehicles contained weapons protesters could easily grab. Only after Flippo said he sees people “smashing the windows of police cars” did he fire two flash-bangs at the group.

A video taken of this particular incident shows Flippo firing the munitions into a crowd easily made up of more than 50 protesters.

“I was not told of any injury to any one nor saw any injury,” Flippo wrote in his report.

Another officer, John Young, reported shooting nine flash-bangs into a crowd of antifa protesters, some of which appeared to be throwing bricks, bottles, and rocks. “No one was injured with the deployment of the ADDs,” Young decisively concludes in his report.

Other cops on the scene also say they saw protesters throw bricks, glass bottles, rocks, chunks of concrete, and Molotov cocktails at officers. Most officers cite these projectiles—and the perceived damage of police cars—as justification for shooting munitions at the public.

Officer Andrew Kofoed said he saw a man standing 20 yards away throw a construction cone in Kofoed’s direction. After the man bent down and appeared to pick something up from the ground, Kofoed fired pepper balls at him.

In his report, Kofoed explained: “I felt it was necessary to use the [weapon] as the subjects had armed themselves or were preparing to arm themselves with rocks.”

Not all of the damage is verifiable. Officer Zachary Domka, who also observed protesters surrounding the empty police cars, wrote that, “The movements of those individuals appeared similar to attempts to break the windows, slash the tires, spray-paint the side of the vehicle, etc.”

Domka does not confirm if vandalism was actually taking place. Yet, this was enough evidence to prompt Domka to shoot rubber bullets at the legs of protesters holding a banner and standing between Domka and the police vehicles.

“None of the targeted individuals appeared injured nor did any of them claim injury to me or others squad members,” Domka writes.

Many officers cite protesters' "anti-law enforcement" attitudes in explaining why they chose to shoot into the crowd.

"This group was anti-police from the start of the protest. I could hear some of them yell out, 'Pigs' and other derogatory terms at us," wrote Officer Jose Jimenez, who used his baton to push protesters onto the sidewalk. Others say members of antifa flipped them off, called them "bastards," and one woman "exposed her buttocks."

A few officers tucked their preconceived beliefs about antifa into their report.

"Antifa members were acting as an anonymous crowd and failed to follow lawful orders after being warned, that failing those lawful orders, force could be used against them," writes Sergeant Jim Mooney. "It is standard practice for avowed anarchists (Antifa) to resist authority they do not recognize as legitimate."

A note: While they may share some ideals, antifa and anarchists are distinctly different groups.

None of the people targeted by PPB munitions mentioned in the use-of-force reports appear to be affiliated with Patriot Prayer—only antifa.

Fawcett, the woman who was burned by a flash-bang, told the Guardian she never heard a warning from police before officers fired the grenades.

PPB officers' reports corroborate this. All of the officers who fired munitions said they did not give a warning, because loudspeakers attached to PPB's "sound trucks" were already telling protesters that "riot control agents" may be used against them if they don't follow police orders. Others said the scene was too loud, and a warning wouldn't have been heard anyway.

There's one significant piece of officers' use-of-force reports that remain redacted: Details about Tracy Molina, a protester who was pushed to the ground by an officer attempting to pull a sign out of her hands. A video of the incident shows several other officers piling on top of Molina after she hits the ground. Molina, who sustained bruises and an elbow injury, filed a tort claim in January, signaling her intent to sue PPB over the incident—which explains why all mentions of her interaction with officers is blacked out.

Just last month, the City of Portland hired an outside contractor, National Police Foundation (NPF), to investigate the crowd control tactics PPB officers used during the August 4 protest. According to the city's \$200,000 contract with the NPF, the group has until January 31, 2020 to finish its investigation.

This means that any lessons from officer's conduct won't be made public until after another wave of summer protests hit Portland.

Days after the August 4 clash, PPB Chief Outlaw told reporters she had directed PPB staff to begin an internal review of officers' actions during the protest. It's unknown when that review will be made public.

At the same press conference, Outlaw defended her officers' decision to use force against the public.

"It was going to be a very rowdy, physically violent ruckus, and it was not that because of the actions that the officers took," Outlaw said. "Though the worst was avoided, some individuals sustained injuries."

Outlaw was more candid a week later during an interview conservative talk show host Lars Larson, where she compared officers' interactions with counter-protesters to a schoolyard fight.

"I come with the intention to fight," she told Larson. "And then you get mad because I kicked your butt."

## **The Daily Journal of Commerce**

### **More affordable housing units on the way**

*By Josh Kulla*

*June 4, 2019*

#### **A ceremonial ground-breaking event took place Thursday on a new affordable housing project in Portland's Eliot neighborhood.**

The five-story, approximately 72,455-square-foot North Williams will occupy a 1.15-acre parcel fronting North Williams Avenue between Tillamook and Thompson streets. It will feature 61 apartments, including 40 for persons earning 30 percent of the regional median income or less (\$24,420 for a family of four) and 20 for persons earning 60 percent of the regional median income or less (\$48,840 for a family of four). Ten of the deeply affordable units will come with support services intended for people emerging from homelessness.

"Including these homes for our most vulnerable community members in a mixed-income project is exactly what affordable housing should look like in 2019," Multnomah County Commission Chairwoman Deborah Kafoury said at the ground-breaking event. "We just need to keep doing more of it."

A consortium of parties including nonprofit BRIDGE Housing, Home Forward and the city of Portland are funding the project or providing other incentives including Section 8 housing vouchers. More than \$20 million in public and private funding is being used for the project, according to the county.

Ankrom Moisan Architects designed the apartment complex, and general contractor Colas Construction will build it. Plans call for a mix of one-, two- and three-bedroom apartments, ground-floor community space, bicycle parking, an exterior courtyard and a parking lot.

The wood-framed building will have a façade covered with a combination of fiber-cement panels, fiber-cement lap siding and storefront glazing for the first floor.