THE NORTH ALBINA AND KILLINGSWORTH COLLABORATION

HERMAN GOLDSTEIN AWARD APPLICATION

CHARLIE HALES, MAYOR
MICHAEL REESE, CHIEF OF POLICE
# Table of Contents

Summary ......................................................................................................... 3  
Figure One – Albina-Killingsworth Area ................................................. 4  
Scan ............................................................................................................... 5  
Analysis ...................................................................................................... 7  
Figure Two – The Wall ............................................................................. 8  
Figure Three – Problem Telephone Booth ........................................... 8  
Response .................................................................................................... 11  
Figure Four – The Wall before improvements ..................................... 12  
Figure Five – The Wall after improvements ......................................... 12  
Assessment .................................................................................................. 16  
Conclusion .................................................................................................. 21  
Appendix A ............................................................................................... 22  
Appendix B ............................................................................................... 23  
Appendix C ............................................................................................... 25  
Appendix D ............................................................................................... 27  
Appendix E ............................................................................................... 28  
.................................................................................................................... 28  
Appendix F ............................................................................................... 29  
Appendix g ............................................................................................... 30  
Appendix H ............................................................................................... 37  
Appendix I ............................................................................................... 38
Note: Due to a loss of support from the US Department of Justice the International Problem-Oriented Policing Conference and the Herman Goldstein Award will, unexpectedly, not be held in 2014. However, this award application was prepared in advance of this notification and represents a significant investment in time and energy documenting this project. It also represents a commitment by the PPB to document its efforts at Problem-Oriented Policing, as required in its proposed settlement with the Department of Justice. To meet these requirements it is being posted on the PPB website for public review.

SUMMARY

This award application details a problem-oriented policing initiative lead by the Albina Killingworth Safe Neighborhood Commission (AKSNC) in partnership with the Portland Police Bureau’s (PPB) North Precinct, residents, schools and business groups near the intersection of North Albina Street and North Killingworth Avenue in Portland Oregon. The AKSNC, established in 2006 by a group of neighborhood business people, residents, educators and other stakeholders, had worked for a number of years to improve the area surrounding Portland’s North Killingsworth Street and North Albina Avenue. Despite the presence of several schools and a vigorous neighborhood association, this intersection had experienced chronic disorder and violence for over twenty years.

To address the problems at this intersection, members of the AKSNC and North Precinct engaged in a classic problem-oriented policing approach, working in collaboration with community stakeholders, and using the SARA problem-solving approach to identify and address issues in the neighborhood. This partnership was named the North Albina and Killingsworth Collaboration (or simply the Collaboration). The initial survey of the area revealed that the area was plagued by gang violence, and drug dealing; as well as, quality of life issues such as street drinking and graffiti. Despite these problems, this phase also identified community resources such as: active neighborhood associations, a community college with a strong interest in improving the safety and sense of security in the area, as well as, local businesses willing to work with the police to improve livability in the neighborhood.

The analysis phase focused on long-term issues in the neighborhood. Analysis revealed that the area was among the most prolific in Portland for shootings and homicides (see Appendix A). Additionally, an independent risk analysis by Portland State University\(^1\) identified the area as being at exceptionally high risk for future street robberies.

In response to these findings, North Precinct worked pro-actively with neighborhood groups to address concerns around disorder and violence. This included partnering with Portland Community College’s Cascade Campus (a community college in the area) to use their video and security resource to increase surveillance and guardianship of the area, utilizing crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) to remove attractive nuisances which brought street drinking and drug use into the neighborhood, enforcement

\(^{1}\) “Forecasting Risk for Street Robbery in Portland, Oregon”, Graduate Project May, 2012, by Lauren Lyon Brown
of street drinking laws to discourage anti-social behavior and establish pro-social norms of behavior for the area (which included a community college, and two high-schools), and other activities.

Finally, the PPB’s Crime Analysis Unit (CAU) conducted a six-month assessment of the initiative, as well as a one-year follow-up. These assessments included examinations of both criminal incidents and possible negative outcomes; such as use of force by the police or complaints.

Figure one (see page 4) displays the area associated with the Collaboration.

FIGURE ONE – ALBINA-KILLINGSWORTH AREA
The area surrounding North Albina Avenue and North Killingsworth Street is a diverse neighborhood consisting of residential, business and educational facilities. It has several schools, a community college campus, and public library. The area also serves as a major Tri-Met transit hub serving the busy #72 and #4 bus lines. This area also contains an assortment of businesses such as: coffee shops, restaurants, and media outlets. Finally, the area is set in and surrounded by residential neighborhoods, including both houses and multi-unit dwellings.

Despite a vibrant and diverse community this area has been plagued with gang violence, drug dealing, and quality of life issues (i.e. street drinking and graffiti). A 2011 analysis by the Crime Analysis Unit (CAU) identified this area surrounding the Collaboration as a leader among those with the most shootings and homicides between 2006 and May of 2011 (see Appendix A).

The location is also within the geographic area designated by the Portland City Council as a “firearm free zone,” due to the prevalence of firearm violence in this section of the City (see Appendix B). A previous analysis identified the areas in Portland with the highest prevalence of firearms related crime and homicides. This analysis, while not conducted specifically for this location, revealed that concerns around gun violence were well founded. For instance, the analysis revealed that this area had experienced four of the forty (10%) homicides involving a firearm between July 1st, 2007 and October 20th, 2010. The same analysis revealed the area to be a “hot spot” for other firearms related violent crime (see Appendix B).

The firearm analysis had lead to the city instituting three “firearms free zones.” This allowed police, working with the courts and parole and probation officers to prohibit individuals with convictions for certain offenses involving firearms from entering these areas, without an approved reason (such as to access housing or social services). This area was in the center of the North/Northeast firearm free zone.

In the year prior to the initiative, the area had experienced a homicide and multiple shootings, creating a climate of fear. In addition to these serious crime issues, neighborhood residents and business complained about an environment in which street drinking was tolerated directly across the street from a local high school. Business owners and customers felt harassed and the level of social disorder added to the concerns about serious violence. This discouraged active civic engagement in the area.

To gather this subjective data, North Precinct Sergeant Mark Friedman met with community groups, religious leaders, school officials, students, and local business owners. Sgt. Friedman also reviewed several years of meetings minutes provided by the Albina Killingworth Safe Neighborhood Commission, to gain historical perspective on these issues. While these concerns are more subjective than crime statistics, this thorough review of qualitative data helped provide invaluable context regarding the history of the area and concerns of community members.

Despite these issues, the scan (in particular the more qualitative review of minutes from various meetings and interview of stakeholders) revealed a number of potential strengths. Among these strengths were a diverse group of stakeholders committed to improving the
area. These stakeholders included: the Albina Killingsworth Safe Neighborhood Commission, the Humboldt Neighborhood Association, Portland Community College, Rosemary Anderson High School, Jefferson High School, the 11:45 initiative (a collation of churches who organize community outreach and mentoring often focused on gang activity), the Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC) and the Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI). When contacted these groups expressed a strong interest in collaborating with police to improve the area.
ANALYSIS

After the initial scan of the area, Sergeant Friedman and other officers in North Precinct began to gather both objective crime data; as well as, subject data from community members about their experiences in the area.

A review of criminal activity prior to January 2012 (the official start of the police involvement; although most of the scanning and some analysis have been complete prior to this period) revealed that the area was calling for police service frequently and reporting a significant volume of criminal activity (see Appendix C). The activity consisted of both serious crime (such as aggravated assaults involving firearms and sexual assaults) as well as less serious crimes (such as drinking in public and disorderly conduct). In all, over 30 Part I and 41 Part II crimes had been documented within 500’ of the intersection of N. Albina Avenue and N. Killingsworth Street, between August and November of 2011. Additionally, police responded to over 100 calls for service from citizens in the area and self-dispatched themselves on over 140 additional calls. This area appeared to be a classic “hot spot” for criminal activity and police involvement.

Officers initially identified a number of stakeholders in the area. The Collaboration partners can be found in Appendix G:

The officers then worked with stakeholders and identified several factors that the stakeholders believed contributed to the areas crime problems as well as concerns they had about how police would be involved in addressing these issues. The analysis revealed the following issues in the area:

1) The Wall

“The Wall” was an attractive nuisance which provided seating and a place to congregate for many of the chronic street drinkers in the neighborhood. This in turn created a sense of lawlessness which, in the opinion of Collaboration partners, provided cover for and facilitated other illegal activity.
“The Wall” Photograph Taken December, 2011:

FIGURE TWO – THE WALL

2) A telephone booth was used by narcotics traffickers to avoid having to use cell phones:

FIGURE THREE – PROBLEM TELEPHONE BOOTH
Not only did it facilitate the actual transactions, but also served as a landmark and meeting locations for both drug users and deals. This created opportunities for drug related violence to occur.

3) Businesses with poor lighting and/or other features which either failed to discourage criminal activity or even actively encouraged it.

4) Poor access control at some of the area schools that either allowed students to exit the premises at inappropriate times or allowed access to the schools by individuals who did not have a reason to be at the location.

5) Businesses with a profit model built on the sale of fortified wines and other low cost intoxicants which attracted street drinkers.

6) A “norm” of behavior for the area which accepted street drinking, narcotics use and sale, allowed gang members to actively recruit and operate in the area.

This issue was particularly troubling as the area housed the only large public high school in the State of Oregon where African-American/Black students represented the largest percentage of students. This created legitimacy issues for the PPB as some residents felt that this behavior would not be tolerated near other schools with a different racial make-up.

7) While the neighborhood had concerns about safety, stakeholders were not interested in a “stop and frisk” model of intensive police contact without “probable cause” of a crime occurring. Given the large number of young males (particularly minority males) the area was not interested in an enforcement approach based upon “reasonable suspicion” but instead wanted active enforcement of crimes that were occurring. Given the issues with street drinking and other illicit activity there was no shortage of actual crime.

The analysis phase revealed that the first four problem items on this list were largely due to the physical environment. Establishing long-term improvement to the area would require modifying the physical space. Items five and six involved expectations about behavior and would require working with area residents to establish more pro-social norms of behavior. The first six items would also require police enforcement of existing laws to re-establish order and foster a sense of safety in the neighborhood more conducive to the desired pro-social norms.

However, the types of enforcement acceptable to the Collaboration partners were constrained by item seven. The Collaboration partners wanted focused enforcement of the livability concerns identified, namely street drinking, drug activity, and gang violence. They did not want indiscriminate stops and searches, due to the fact that, they were concerned about reduced police legitimacy. The large number of students in the area made it more difficult to determine who had legitimate business in the neighborhood; creating the potential for unwarranted police contact.

To address this issue, the police decided to focus enforcement on the crimes identified by the Collaboration partners, and to use a probable cause based model of enforcement. This
resulted on less reliance more subjective standards of evidence, such as reasonable suspicion\(^2\). This did not mean that all the stops occurring in the area involved probable cause; however, this meant that the primary mechanism for enforcement would be based on probable cause arrests and citations.

\(^2\) Probably cause and reasonable suspicion are legal standards of evidence. Probable cause is generally considered to be “more likely than not” or while reasonable suspicion requires less evidence than probable cause. Because reasonable suspicion is a lower standard of evidence than probable cause it enables officers to stop individuals when it is less than 50% likely that they were involved in a crime. This is done to enable officers to determine if a crime has occurred and can be a valuable tool. In this instance the Collaboration did not want students regularly stopped while on their way to high school or community college.
The PPB, in conjunction with community partners had been involved attempts to restore order and improve livability to this area for over 15 years. These attempts occasionally resulted in temporary improvements, rarely lasting more than several months. The attempts were characterized by sporadic enforcement efforts aimed at temporarily reducing violence, however, these efforts often petered out and the public safety gains in the neighborhood were lost. Based on the above analysis and additional conversations with stakeholders, the Albina and Killingsworth Collaboration decided on the following philosophy:

**Collaboration Philosophy**

- Work with community members to identify acceptable behavior for the area surrounding North Albina Avenue and Killingsworth Street.
- Use probable cause arrests to discourage behaviors identified as problems by the community members.
- In partnership with community members engage in intensive problem solving to reduce the need for ongoing enforcement.
- Maintain ongoing partnerships with the community to ensure continued improvements in the area.

Additionally, the vision for police involvement in the Collaboration precluded certain activities or assumptions. Specifically:

- The program is not a “stop and frisk” model.
  - Emphasis on probable cause arrests of problem behaviors identified by the community.
- The program is not a limited duration “operation/mission”.
  - Emphasis on ongoing partnerships.
- The program is not police directed.
  - The key to obtaining community support for ongoing partnerships.

In addition to reducing livability and crime, it was hoped that the process would build legitimacy and encourage cooperation between citizens and police officers. An intensive initial effort coupled with problem solving would encourage pro-social behavior allowing for reduced police involvement. This effort would further strengthen police legitimacy and allow for closer and more long-term partnerships.

Specifically the Collaboration addressed the points identified in the initial analysis by:

1) “The Wall”

Community members had identified the wall as an attractive nuisance, providing a space for drug deals and street drinkers to congregate. This causes issues by bringing individuals who behaved in an anti-social manner into the neighborhood. Solving this problem involved both strict enforcement of street drinking laws, (especially in the initial phases of the Collaboration) as well as, physically redesigning the space. A fence was added (see photographs below):
“The Wall” December 2011:

FIGURE FOUR – THE WALL BEFORE IMPROVEMENTS

“The Wall” August 2012:

FIGURE FIVE – THE WALL AFTER IMPROVEMENTS
2) The Problem Phone Booth

Other environmental redesign included removing the pay phone. This was also done in conjunction with increased enforcement of drug crime.

3) The Physical Environment

The Collaboration partnered with the Portland Development Commission (PDC) to address issues related to lighting, signage etc., which might attract criminal behavior. The Collaboration worked with the PDC to provide low interest loans to local business owners to address issues such as lighting, or to plant “green walls.” The later item involves planting vines or other greenery, which will grow vertically on a wall. It potentially helps eliminate graffiti by creating a barrier over the wall.

The first three initiatives (physical improvements to the area) were coupled with increased pro-active police enforcement, particularly of drug and alcohol offenses. These efforts included over 120 charges for alcohol related offenses and nearly 30 charges on drug related offenses (Appendix E provides the breakdown of arrests within the area from January to July, 2012).

Based upon conversations with stakeholders and analysis of past efforts the Collaboration realized that simply conducting increased enforcement, without also making changes to both the physical and social structure of the area, would result in only a temporary improvement in public safety. However, it was also realized that initially intensive enforcement would be required to help support the re-establishment of pro-social norms in the neighborhood.

4) Poor Access Control at Schools

The Collaboration worked with the area schools to improve physical security and ensure that entrances and exits were controlled. This helped improve the security of the schools themselves and also helped prevent truancy in the secondary schools.

5) Businesses Attracting Street Drinkers

Officers worked with the Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC) and local business owners to developed abetment agreements precluding the sales of certain types of fortified wines and malt liquors popular with street drinkers due to their low price and relatively high alcohol content. It was hoped that improvement to the area would increase business traffic and help mitigate the financial impact caused by the reduced sales of these kinds of products.

6) Behavioral Norms

This item was addressed by increased police presence. While North Precinct had a dedicated team of officers working on this project the precinct Commander also had each of the shifts (Day, Afternoon and Night) be responsible for conducting some activity aimed at improving the area. This was not necessarily enforcement based; although it did generate increased police activity (see the following items).
7) Community Sensitivity to Police Tactics

To address this concern, the enforcement efforts in the area relied on increased surveillance and guardianship, conducted primarily through increased police presence or the use of monitored CCTV. As mentioned above, the North Precinct Commander, Mike Leloff, had each shift be responsible for working in the area daily. The commitment from the shifts was not intense, simply conducting a 15-minute walking patrol would qualify, but did increase police visibility in the area. This approach (consistent with a micro-policing hot spot initiative) generated increased police surveillance of the area. In addition to this, the police officers partnered with security at Portland Community College to utilize their network of closed-circuit televisions. This allowed for low cost, but increased surveillance of the area, to ensure that behaviors in the area (particularly vandalism and street drinking) were within the bounds found acceptable by the area stakeholders.

This system was particularly powerful, in that, it eliminated the need for more subject, stop and frisk type, interventions. Officers enforced existing laws at the direction of the area stakeholders, in a manner consistent with how they would have been enforced, had the area been surrounded by a more affluent high school.

Importantly, while the initial police involvement relied heavily on enforcement, the volume of arrests decreased quickly. In fact, by the fifth month of the project charged offenses were beneath the five year average (see Appendix F); by July of 2012, the number arrests in the area had fallen to zero.

Oversight provided by groups such as the AKSNC, the Humbolt Neighborhood Association, Portland Community College and others helped ensure that the tactics used by police were effective for the neighborhood, but just as importantly, did not damage the legitimacy of police in the neighborhood. In fact, increasing legitimacy was necessary to ensure that improvements to the behavioral norms of the area persisted after intensive police presence ceased.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the area around N. Albina and N. Killingsworth had a constellation of issues that had to be addressed simultaneously. Previous efforts (addressing only some of these concerns) often failed to take hold in the longer term. The active response phase, which began in January of 2012, lasted six months. An initial evaluation was conducted in July to assess the impact of the effort, and a follow-up evaluation was conducted after one year (see Assessment section). Importantly, while the active enforcement ceased after six months, officers remained engaged in the area and maintained the partnerships that had developed during the initial phases of the intervention. These partnerships acted as guardians for the area and informed police when issues began to arise. This allowed for police to intervene earlier and in a less invasive manner to maintain the gains made by the Collaboration.

The Collaboration itself consisted of large number of community stakeholders (see Appendix G). These groups worked directly with police officers in many cases. This activity included “walk and talks” in the area, helping determining the kinds of police activity in the
area and perhaps most importantly supplying a sense of legitimacy to the police presence in the area.

This direct support was supplemented by activities taken on by various stakeholders, independent of police, but consistent with the shared vision. This included outreach to juveniles in the area, work by Portland Office of Neighborhood Improvement (ONI) crime prevention specialists to improve the physical environment and/or business practices in the area, and community building activities, such as fairs and social events. These events occurred with direct police involvement and were necessary components to re-defining how the residents and stakeholders viewed the collaboration area.

Groups, such as 11:45 (see Appendix G), conducted gang outreach in the area. Members of the Multnomah County District Attorney’s Office partnered with the City of Portland, Multnomah County Health and Human Services and community members in the Gang Impacted Families Team (GIFT), to provided opportunities to former gang members and their families (see Appendix G). Portland Community College Security assisted police with resources and by helping monitor the area when police were not present. The Albina Killingsworth Safe Neighborhood commission help keep police informed of the issues in the neighborhood, worked with the police to improve the physical environment, and were also active in mobilizing neighborhood resources.
The Collaboration had several quantifiable metrics which needed to be assessed in order to determine if the intervention had the desired effects. Police and other stakeholders wanted to reduce calls for service and Part I crimes (murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft and arson); however, they did not want to accomplish this at the cost of increased use of force by the police or increased complaints against the police. The population of the area consisted of a disproportionate number of minorities, therefore arrests and other metrics may not be proportionate to the overall City population demographics. Thus, the hope was that increased use of more objective metrics, such as probable cause arrests, might reduce disparities in arrest rates.

January to July Assessment (2012):

An initial evaluation was conducted in August of 2012 using data through July, 2012. This assessment resulted in the following findings (see Appendix G for graphs):

**Part I Offenses**

Part I offenses consist of crimes such as Murder, Rape, Aggravated Assault, Robbery, Burglary, Larceny, Motor Vehicle Theft and Arson. Part I crimes near the Collaboration between January and July of 2012:

- Decreased 16.1% compared with 2011.
- Decreased 27.4% compared with a five-year average (2007 to 2011).
- Citywide crime Part I crimes were up 9% at the time of this evaluation.

**Radio Calls**

Consistent with other indicators there was a marked reduction in radio calls over the course of the collaboration. While initially high due to increased police presence, the number had fallen to about 1/3 of the historic average by July. Radio calls:

- Decreased 8.8% compared with 2011.
- Decreased 15.3% compared with the five-year average (2007 to 2011).
- Decreased to 22 in July compared with 58 calls in 2011 and 66 calls being the five-year average.

**Use of Force**

Force used during the Collaboration by police was minimal. To determine this, the Portland Police Bureau CAU examined custody cases with 500’ of North Albina Avenue and North

---

1 Reported as of August 4th, 2012.
Killingsworth Street to determine the percentage of cases where police used force of any type. There were three uses of force in the area during the period of the initiative (one more than in 2011), however, the ratio of force-to-arrests was reduced considerably (see Appendix H).

Use of Force Summaries

In addition to examining force in the area, the CAU examined force used specifically by officers assigned to work in the Collaboration (not all of these incidents occurred in the area of N. Albina and N. Killingsworth). Included is a summary of those incidents. This provides a qualitative examination of the reasons why officers used force and the types of force employed. The following cases are summaries of the force used by officers involved in the Collaboration and in (or near) the area of the Collaboration:

Use of Force Incident One

Officers observed a twenty-one-year old male selling narcotics. Officers attempted to contact the individual who fled. An officer pushed the suspect as he ran, knocking him to the ground. The suspect admitted to selling imitation crack cocaine.

Use of Force Incident Two

Officers received information that suspects from an earlier fight were looking for “revenge” and possibly armed with a handgun. Officers located the individuals and performed a traffic stop. During the course of the stop firearms were pointed at the individuals.

Use of Force Incident Three

Officers observed a vehicle parked at a market known at the time for selling narcotics paraphernalia (this issue subsequently addressed via an abetment agreement). Officers observe the vehicle which had multiple individuals getting in and out of the back seat. As many as six individuals entered the car and it left the area.

Officers attempted a traffic stop on the vehicle and two occupants fled the vehicle. One of the suspects, a nineteen-year-old male, attempted to run past two officers and was pushed down onto the grass. Officers recovered a 9mm handgun.

Use of Force Incident Four

A thirty-two-year-old male suspect in a domestic violence case, who was a designated gang member and allegedly armed, was arrested. During the arrest officers pointed a firearm at the suspect.

Complaints

Officers associated with the Collaboration did not received any complaints about their behavior during the period studied.

---

1 Police use of force can be confusing. The PPB captures actions such as strikes with fists, feet, baton, Tasers etc. but also categorizes action such as pointing a firearm at a suspect as force. In fact nearly half of all force used consists of pointing firearms.

2 Two cases were excluded because they occurred outside the area of the collaboration and one case was excluded because the reports were not available. The excluded case was classified as Force-firearm pointed, meaning they did not involve strikes, applications of the Taser or other more extreme uses of force.

3 Information obtained from reports and email correspondence with Sgt. Mark Friedman.
One-Year Assessment (2012)

The PPB’s CAU conducted an analysis of crime (Part I and II crimes) and calls for service for the full year of 2012 and well as the July through December time period (this was the stage at which police transitioned out of daily involvement in the area and instead focused on maintaining community contact and monitoring the area).

Because the relationships between the PPB, AKSNC, PCC security and other partners had been strengthened by work on this project, the need for daily police involvement was diminished. This allowed police to shift resources to other areas (currently the initiative is being replicated in the Cully neighborhood) and for groups such as the AKSNC to act as guardians, in place of the police.

Part I Offenses

- Decreased 34.4% for 2012 compared with 2011.
- Decreased 32.2% for 2012 compared with an average for 2007 to 2011
- Part I violent crime fell by 70% for 2012 compared with 2011
- Part I violent crime fell by 67% for 2012 compared with an average for 2007 to 2011

Crime reductions remained strong after active enforcement efforts ceased (July of 2012). This is important as it demonstrates the potential for residual returns on the intensive police efforts during the initial stages of the Collaboration. This allowed the officers assigned to problem-solving efforts in this area to refocus on other problem locations and work with the community to monitor the Collaboration area.

Part II Offenses

- Increased 35.3% for 2012 compared with 2011
- Increased 84.7% for 2012 compared with an average for 2007 to 2011
- Part II offenses generally not associated with office-initiated calls\(^8\) fell by 9% for 2012 compared with 2011
- Part II offenses generally not associated with office-initiated calls fell by 37% for 2012 compared with an average of 2007 to 2011

The increase in Part II offenses was driven by officer-initiated arrest for warrants, drugs, firearms and most extensively alcohol offenses (see Appendix E). As with Part I crimes, the volume of these offenses decreased substantially after officers ceased the more active enforcement efforts associated with the first six months of the Collaboration. Furthermore, Part II crimes associated with citizen reports of crime fell both when compared with 2011 and with an average of 2007 to 2011.

\(^7\) Confirmed by Internal Affairs as of August 13th, 2012
\(^8\) This includes the offense groups of: simple assault, forgery/counterfeiting, fraud, stolen property, vandalism, sex crimes, kidnapping and trespass/threats.
Radio Calls

- Decreased 18.9% for 2012 compared with 2011.
- Decreased 31.4% for 2012 compared with an average for 2007 to 2011.
- Decreased 25.1% for 2012 after daily involvement in the area ended (July through December) when comparing 2012 to 2011.

As with the other metrics examined the benefits of the Collaboration were retained after active enforcement efforts ceased.

Conclusions
It appears that crime reductions realized during the intensive police-focused phase of the Collaboration persisted for the July to December period, despite a substantial reduction in police presence.

Two-Year Assessment (2013)

Part I Offenses

- Decreased 1.7% for 2013 compared with 2011 (this represents one Part I crime and should be interpreted as remaining flat).
- Was consistent for 2013 compared with an average for 2007 to 2011
- Part I violent crime decreased by 50% for 2013 compared with 2011
- Part I violent crime decreased by 44% for 2013 compared with an average of 2007 to 2011

For the 2012-2013 year, the benefits of heavy police enforcement on overall Part I crime appear to have largely dissipated. As will be discussing in the next section, police enforcement levels fell far below previous years. It would appear that heavy police presence may have suppressed Part I crime, and that this effect lasted for through 2012 and then Part I crime levels returned to long-term averages in 2013, after police left the area.

However, there appears to be a positive effect on the distribution of crime in the area. Crime shifted from violent person crime to larcenies. Furthermore, many of these larcenies were associated with construction and increased online reporting (both of which were less prevalent in 2011) and may be a function of increased opportunity for such crimes in the area and/or improved ability to report crime.

Part II Offenses

- Decreased by 65% for 2013 compared with 2011
- Decreased by 54% for 2012 compared with an average for 2007 to 2011
Part II offenses generally not associated with office-initiated calls\(^9\) fell by 33% for 2013 compared with 2011.

Part II offenses generally not associated with office-initiated calls fell by 54% for 2013 compared with an average of 2007 to 2011.

As mentioned above, it appears that in 2013 the area saw a dramatic reduction in police enforcement. Despite this reduction in enforcement Part II crimes, particularly crimes such as vandalism, liquor offenses, disorderly conduct, and trespass remained well below previously reported numbers. This is heartening, in that it, may represent a real shift in the area where quality of life gains made during the Collaboration have been maintained for over two years, despite a reduction in police resources to levels beneath those invested in the area pre-collaboration (2007 to 2011).

One goal of the Collaboration from the police perspective was to effect real change in the area by investing heavily on the front-end of the Collaboration. The hope was that by increasing community guardianship in the area, police could eventually move resources to other locations and repeat the process. This appears to have been the case, where police now dedicate substantially less time to active enforcement efforts (such as arrests for drugs or alcohol related crimes) to the area. As issues arise the Collaboration partners are able to notify police, who can intervene at an earlier stage in the problem. The effectiveness of the approach is demonstrated by a dramatically reduced need for civilians to call police over problems in the area (see the next section on Radio Calls).

**Radio Calls**

- Decreased 40% for 2013 compared with 2011.
- Decreased 35% for 2013 compared with an average for 2007 to 2011.

As with Part II crimes the area saw a large reduction in citizen-initiated radio calls when comparing both 2013 to 2011 and when comparing 2013 to the average for 2007 to 2011. This represents a substantial reduction in the need for police resources in the area and is consistent with the vision of the Collaboration.

**Conclusion**

While reduction in overall Part I crime appear to have returned to pre-Collaboration levels, the composition of this crime has shifted away from person crime and toward property crime. Additionally, some of this increase in reported property crime may be the result of increased reporting.

The need to police, as measured both by Part II crime and calls for service, has fallen dramatically. This represents a real ongoing savings for police, and allows police to shift these resources to other areas.

\(^9\) This includes the offense groups of: simple assault, forgery/counterfeiting, fraud, stolen property, vandalism, sex crimes, kidnapping and trespass/threats.
CONCLUSION

The North Albina and Killingsworth Collaboration was a community and police partnership aimed at improving the quality of life in the area surrounding the intersection of North Albina Avenue and North Killingsworth Street. This area had been subject to both serious violence and on-going quality of life issues for over two decades. The Collaboration was able to both improve the safety of the area, and the quality of life, without generating complaints or increasing the use of force.

By working with community stakeholders, the police were able to help coordinate a community-centered, problem-oriented approach to neighborhood crime and disorder. This led to combination of responses including: changes to the physical environment, changes to behavioral norms in the neighborhood, and improved community police relations. Ultimately, crime was reduced and the need for police (as measured by calls for service) was reduced. This was accomplished without substantial increases in use of force by police or the generation of complaints.

Finally, since adopting this strategy, PPB’s North Precinct has reduced the need for police in this area. This has allowed officers to replicate the strategy (the strategy has been successfully deployed to address a strip mall which had a large number of legal gambling establishments and is now being replicated in an area which shares mobile homes and subsidized housing.
This analysis was conducted prior to the Collaboration and was used in the scanning phase. Approximate area of involvement (circle and arrow added for this document).
This analysis was conducted prior to the Collaboration and was used in the scanning phase. Approximate area of involvement (circle and arrow added for this document).
This analysis was conducted prior to the Collaboration and was used in the scanning phase. Approximate area of involvement (circle and arrow added for this document).
### APPENDIX C

**Police Calls within 500' of N. Albina and N. Killingsworth - August to November 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Calls for Service</th>
<th>Self-Dispatched Calls for Service only Aug-Nov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>911 HANGUP</td>
<td>AREA CHECK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCIDENT-HIT&amp;RUN-COLD</td>
<td>ASSIST CITIZEN OR AGENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCIDENT-INJURIES</td>
<td>COMMUNITY POLICING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCIDENT-NON INJURY</td>
<td>DETAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCIDENT-UNKNOWN INJURY</td>
<td>DISTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA CHECK</td>
<td>DRUGS, LIQUOR, PROSTITUTION, GAMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT WITH WEAPON</td>
<td>FLAGDOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT-PRIORITY</td>
<td>FOLLOWUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIST CITIZEN OR AGENCY</td>
<td>PERSON CONTACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTP</td>
<td>SHOTS FIRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTURBANCE W/ WEAPON</td>
<td>THEFT-COLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUGS, LIQUOR, PROSTITUTION, GAMB</td>
<td>TRAFFIC STOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAGDOWN</td>
<td>UNDESCRIBED INCIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRASSMENT</td>
<td>WARRANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRASSMENT-COLD</td>
<td>WELFARE CHECK-COLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL PROBLEM</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSING-PERSON ENDANGERED</td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSING-PERSON LOST, FOUND, RUNN</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE DISTURBANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREMISE CHECK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY LOST, FOUND, RECOVERED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOOTING-WITH WEAPON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOTS FIRED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUICIDE ATTEMPT OR THREAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPICIOUS SUBJ, VEH, CIRCUMSTAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPICIOUS WITH WEAPON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPICIOUS-PRIORITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEFT-COLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEFT-PRIORITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEFTS-COLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREATS-COLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREATS-PRIORITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREATS-WITH WEAPON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIMET INCIDENT-COLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIMET INCIDENT-PRIORITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNWANTED PERSON-COLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNWANTED PERSON-PRIORITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANDALISM-COLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE STOLEN-COLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE CHECK-COLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE CHECK-PRIORITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>141</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I Crime Aug-Nov</th>
<th>Part II Crime Aug-Nov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGGR ASLT-HANDGUN</td>
<td>CURFEW-JUVENILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGR ASLT-HANDS ETC</td>
<td>DISORDERLY CONDUCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGR ASLT-KNIFE</td>
<td>GAMBLING-ILLEGAL GAMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSON-CMRL. BLDG- NOT USED</td>
<td>GARBAGE/LITTERING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT/SIMPLE</td>
<td>LIQUOR-DRINKING IN PUBLIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARCENY-BICYCLES</td>
<td>LIQUOR-FURNISHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARCENY-FRM BUILDINGS</td>
<td>LIQUOR-MINOR IN POSSESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARCENY-FRM MOTOR VEHICLE</td>
<td>MARJ-LESS 1 OZ- POS/SALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARCENY-SHOPLIFT</td>
<td>NARC-COCAIN- POS/SALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARCENY-UNSPECFD</td>
<td>TERRORS/INTIMIDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARCENY-VEHICLE PARTS/ACC</td>
<td>TRESPASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPE</td>
<td>VANDALISM-VEHICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>WEAPONS-CARRY CONCEALED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand Total                   | 41                           |

Part I and II Crimes within 500' of N. Albina and N. Killingsworth - August to November 2011
APPENDIX E

Charges within 500' N. Albina/Killingsworth Jan. to July, 2012

- Alcohol Related: 125
- Drug Related: 28
- Weapons Related: 5
- Assault/Harrassment/Menacing: 6
- Vandalism/Littering/Trespass: 7
- Warrant/Fugitive/Res. Order Viol.: 27
- Theft/Car Prowl: 12
- Other Charges: 18
- Other: 12
Arrests w/in 500' N. Albina and N. Killingsworth

Average ('07 to '11) - Up 260.8%
2011 - Up 221.1%
2012 - Up 211.6%
Community Partners:

11:45

Mission: To mobilize people from Portland area churches to volunteer for one year - once a week for 45 minutes - to serve in strategic areas (There-Share-Care-Prayer) in order to aid existing city and community efforts to stop gang violence and the aftermath on our streets.

**THERE** - A visible presence to facilitate neighborhood outreach by mobilizing groups of people to walk in designated "Hot Spots".

**SHARE** - A connecting presence - mobilizing mentors for troubled and at risk youth.

**CARE** - A supporting presence to provide support for families in our community.

**PRAYER** - An interceding presence - mobilizing a network of people to pray for the peace, safety and welfare of the City of Portland.

**Executive Committee:**
Pastor Dr. Mark Strong
Bishop Marcus Pollard
Pastor George Merriweather
Dr. Franklin Alvey
Bishop C.T. Wells
Bishop Steven Holt
Rev. Dr. W.G. Hardy
Marci Jackson
Marcie Spruill

**Participants in the Collaboration:**
Dwight Minnieweather
Johnnie Johnson
Johnny Bradford
Jeff Gamble
Warner Davis
Michael Martin
Craig Parks
Kiah Gravel
Albina Killingsworth Safe Neighborhood Commission

Gang Impacted Families Team (GIFT)

GIFT Program Goal

The goal of GIFT is to implement gang suppression, intervention, prevention and reentry for youth and adults impacted by gang involvement and violence. The focus of the GIFT program is to provide services to individuals who are the most entrenched in the gang lifestyle and pose high risk to the community and to provide services to their family members in an effort to break the inter-generational cycle associated the gang lifestyle.

Concept Development History

In February 2012, the Gang Impacted Family Team (GIFT) program was created through the leadership of Portland Police Bureau (Chief Mike Reese) and the Multnomah County District Attorney’s Office (Mike Shrunk and Rod Underhill). GIFT was structured as a non-funded collaborative City and County services multi-disciplinary team, created to provide support for youth and families to break intergenerational ties that perpetuate gang involvement and violence within the community.

GIFT is comprised of member representatives from the Portland Police Bureau, Office of Youth Violence Prevention, Multnomah County District Attorney’s Office, Multnomah County Department of Criminal Justice, Multnomah County Public Health Department, Multnomah County Department of Human Services, and private non-profit service organizations.

---

### Albina Killingsworth Safe Neighborhood Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ricky</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Jefferson High School</td>
<td>Vice Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Humboldt Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>Jefferson High School</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste</td>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>City of Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Desmond</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Dortmund</td>
<td>McMenamin's</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrick</td>
<td>Foxworth</td>
<td>PCC Public Safety</td>
<td>Lieutenant, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Garner</td>
<td>PCC Parking &amp; Transportation Manager</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td>PCC Public Safety Director</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Hayden</td>
<td>Multnomah County District Attorney's Office</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Kidins</td>
<td>Cascade Campus Interim President, Co-Chair</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lellof</td>
<td>Portland Police Bureau</td>
<td>Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Lim</td>
<td>Asian Reporter</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Magers</td>
<td>Cascade Campus Safety Committee</td>
<td>Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>McFerrin</td>
<td>PCC-Rosemary Anderson High School</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>McKay</td>
<td>Hoffman Construction</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Ocken</td>
<td>Cascade Bond Projects Manager</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Parkvold</td>
<td>PCC Cascade Facilities Manager</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>POIC/Rosemary Anderson</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>PCC Cascade Community Relations</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Sims</td>
<td>Cascade Associated Students of PCC</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Stavenjord</td>
<td>Multnomah County Health</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Cascade Campus Public Safety</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>North Portland Library</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Cascade Campus President's Office</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In March 2013, the City Council approved the application to the State of Oregon, Youth Development Council created by GIFT stakeholder services for grant funding to provide a full time GIFT Coordinator. In May of 2013 the City was selected to receive a grant award supporting the GIFT Coordinator position.

Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center Inc. (POIC) was selected to received grant funding for the hiring of 1 full time employee to serve as the GIFT Coordinator. POIC is a local private non-profit organization currently offering prevention and intervention services to gang impacted youth and families, while working collaboratively with GIFT stakeholder service agencies in a number of programs to include: Community Healing Initiative (CHI) receiving funding through Multnomah County and the Street Level Gang Outreach Program receiving funding through the City of Portland.

The GIFT Coordinator position was fully activated on June 1, 2013 and is funded through May 31, 2014.

Coordinator:
Siyonna Webb

Other programs that interacted with the Collaboration either directly or indirectly via GIFT:

Gang Violence Task Force (GVFT)
Chair by the Mayor's Office, Office of Youth Violence Prevention. Facilitated in collaboration with the Portland Police Bureau and Multnomah County Dept. of Community Justice Services. The mission of the Gang Violence Task Force is to affect positively the youth, families, and residents whose lives have been impacted by gang violence and to promote public safety by incorporating the best and most innovative practices of community partnership to reduce gang influence, violence, and crime. Meetings are open to the public.

Street Level Gang Outreach Program (SLGO)
Based upon National ‘Best Practice” models: Boston's Streetworker Program has been hailed as one of the most effective youth prevention and early intervention services provided to Boston's youth. The goal of the program is to connect "hard-to-reach" youth to needed services and resources through direct, targeted street outreach; and Ceasefire Chicago model which uses outreach workers, or violence interrupters, to mitigate conflict on the street before it turns violent. Outreach workers are oftentimes former gang members, who use their street credibility to show community members better ways of communicating with each other and how to resolve conflicts peacefully.

The City of Portland supplies grant funding to 3 private non-profit services (Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization, Native American Youth Family Center and Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center) to provide a total 10 full time and 2 part time SLGO workers. SLGO workers provide intervention outreach services to city areas considered hotspots for gang-related activity, while working in coordination with law enforcement and other service providers during hours of highest activity probability. SLGO workers build relationships with programs in the community for the purposes of connecting gang
members/associates and/or their families to educational, social, medical, and employment-related services.

**The Service Coordination Team (SCT)**
Managed by the Portland Police Bureau in collaboration with law enforcement and social service agencies. It is designed to reduce the incidence of drug related property crimes and stop the cycle of criminality and drug addiction by providing treatment opportunities for chronic offenders who have not succeeded using traditional treatment methods. Program success is achieved by coordinating jail sentences, probation and parole oversight and housing and treatment services for the City’s most chronic offenders.

**Gang Service Coordination Team**
The purpose of this team is to coordinate information and to form strategies for the deployment of resources to best serve at risk gang affected populations. Additional to law enforcement action plans strategies involve intervention, prevention and referral services.

Hosted by Portland Police Bureau Tactical Operations Division Gang Enforcement Team. Member services include, Portland Police Bureau, Portland Parks and Recreation Park Rangers, Multnomah County Department of Community Justice Adult and Juvenile Parole and Probation services, Oregon Youth Authority, Portland's Street Level Gang Outreach Program, Gang Impacted Family Team Coordinator and Office of Youth Violence Prevention.

**Court Bench Probation Mentoring Program**
Description of the Program: To supply legal measures low level criminal offenders who are gang involved through the assigning as a condition of probation to meet with a community mentor to counteract an emerging problem with gang recruitment and serious gang violence. Implemented in February 2011 as an expansion to the Multnomah County District Attorney Office Neighborhood Gang Violence Reduction Program. Partner services involved in this project are the Multnomah County District Attorney’s Office, Office of Youth Violence Prevention, faith based community program entitled 11 – 45 and other citizen business and community leaders.

**Gang Impacted Human Trafficking / Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC)**
Multnomah County is nationally recognized for designing & implementing a unique coordinated interagency/intersystem Continuum of Care for providing services to child victims of sex trafficking. This system was developed in 2010-11 through a community planning process that was initiated by the CSEC Steering Committee. Janus Youth Programs, a nonprofit organization with extensive history of working on collaborative projects serving at-risk and homeless youth in Multnomah County.

**Community Healing Initiative**
A grant funded collaborative program conducting outreach to gang involved youth and families, providing mental health assessment and addictions treatment; school retrieval and retention; pro-social skill building activities; employment readiness and placement; basic needs; case management; linkage to support services; and flexible client service funds. Stakeholder services include Multnomah County Department of Community Human Services and the Department of Community Justice. Grant funded private non-profit
partner services are Portland Opportunities and Industrialization Center (POIC) and Latino Network.

**Black Male Achievement (BMA) Technical Services Grant**

In April 2013 National League of Cities Institute for Youth, Education, and Families selected 11 cities to receive assistance as they work to reduce disparities between black males and their peers. Project cities will include: Charlottesville, Va.; Chicago, Ill.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Louisville, Ky.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Oakland, Calif.; Omaha, Neb.; Orlando, Fla.; Philadelphia, Pa.; and Portland, Ore. Portland's BMA program is sponsored directly through the Mayor's Office, and facilitated by Office of Youth Violence Prevention. BMA stakeholders include City and County services, private for profit, private non-profit organizations and community.

**Multnomah County District Attorney’s Office:**

**District Attorney:**
Rod Underhill

**Deputy District Attorneys:**
Chuck Sparks
Wayne Pearson
James Hayden
Eric Zimmerman

**Multnomah County Circuit Court**

**Judges:**
Judge Julie Franz
Judge Nan Waller
Judge Jean Maurer
Judge Kenneth Walker

**Court Bench Probation Mentoring Program:**

Description of the Program: To supply legal measures low level criminal offenders who are gang involved through the assigning as a condition of probation to meet with a community mentor to counteract an emerging problem with gang recruitment and serious gang violence. The program was implemented in February 2011 as an expansion to the Multnomah County District Attorney Office Neighborhood Gang Violence Reduction Program. Partner services involved in this project are the Multnomah County District Attorney’s Office, Office of Youth Violence Prevention, faith based community program entitled 11 – 45 and other citizen business and community leaders.

**Office of Neighborhood Involvement**

**Crime Prevention Specialist**
Celeste Carey
Portland Community College

Cascade Campus President:
Dr. Algie Gatewood

Portland Community College Security:
Director Ken Goodwin
Lt. Derrick Foxworth
Acting Sergeant John Thompson
Officer Lyle Brown
Officer Wally Chow
Officer Bob Dunn
Officer Steve Feather
Officer Erik Hargrove
Officer Todd Johnson

Portland Development Commission

Denise McGriff

Portland Opportunities and Investment Center

Val Polk
Joe McFerrin
Elmer Yarborough
Julia Mitchell

Portland Police Bureau

North Precinct Commander:
Michael Leloff

Sergeant Street Crimes Unit:
Mark Friedman

Sergeant Gang Enforcement Team:
Donald Livingston
Ken Duilio

Officer Gang Enforcement Team:
Charles Asheim
John Billard
Christopher Burley
Brian Dale
James Defrain
Patrick Murphy
Andrew Polas

Officers Street Crime Unit:
Rob Simon
Jim Townley
Ty Garrison
Chris McDonald
Ryan Porath

Traffic Division
The entire division ran ongoing traffic enforcement around the schools during the Collaboration period led by Sergeant Robert Vopel (with the assistance of the entire division).

Crime Analysis Unit
Sergeant Greg Stewart
Officer Wayne Alderman
Crime Analyst Jenny Melius

City of Portland Office of Office of Neighborhood Improvement

Crime Prevention Program Coordinator:
Celeste Carey

City of Portland Office of Youth Violence Prevention

Director:
Antoinette Edwards

Gift Coordinator/Grant Manager:
Tom Peavey

Gang Outreach Workers (Contracted from Community Organizations):
Cuauhtemo Alverado Native American Youth and Family Center
Robert Blake Portland Opportunities and Industrialization Center
Hiag Brown Portland Opportunities and Industrialization Center
Adrian Galvez Portland Opportunities and Industrialization Center
Nelson Gonzalez Portland Opportunities and Industrialization Center
Israel Hill Portland Opportunities and Industrialization Center
Kamille Irwin-Cordero Portland Opportunities and Industrialization Center
Glenn Lamotte Native American Youth and Family Center
Michael Mangum Portland Opportunities and Industrialization Center
Tiffany Morris Native American Youth and Family Center
Force was examined from 2008 to 2011 (as opposed from 2007 to 2011 in the case of other analyses) due to a change in policy on what the PPB defined as force that occurred in 2007. This makes comparison prior to 2008 less meaningful.