Portland City Auditor
Archives & Records Management

City of Portland Oral History Program

Police Accountability and the Independent Police Review Oral History

---

Jason Renaud
Transcript
2023

CONTENT WARNING: This interview discusses sensitive subjects including police violence and death. Statements made in this interview are the recollections and views of the interviewee, not the City of Portland Archives.

Portland City Auditor
Archives & Records Management

City of Portland Oral History Program

Jason Renaud Oral History Transcript

Interviewee: Jason Renaud
Interviewer: Morgen Young
Date: February 16, 2023
Location: City of Portland Archives and Records Center, Portland, Oregon
Transcribed by: Teresa Bergen

Morgen Young: My name is Morgen Young. I'm with Devin Busby. We're interviewing Jason Renaud for the City of Portland Oral History Program. It is February 16, 2023. And we're in the Portland Archives and Record Center in downtown Portland. Jason, thanks for being with us today. And we're going to start by you reading a statement you had written.

Jason Renaud: Sure. And sometimes it helps me to organize my thoughts in writing.

MY: Great.

JR: So, I thought I'd just write and read through this. In 2003, some colleagues and I created the Mental Health Association of Portland. Now that's the first and only organization dedicated to just advocacy on behalf of people with mental illness and addiction. Our group has been interested in cases of institutional violence against people with mental illness and addiction since about 2003. In 2017, myself, and some colleagues created the Mental Health Alliance, a spinoff of the earlier organization. And that's to monitor federal litigation against the city of Portland on behalf of people with mental illness, and to inform the court of the progress of the settlement agreement of US DOJ versus city of Portland.

Over the years, we've created new data and tracked hundreds of cases both locally and nationwide. We've advised policy makers, attorneys on both sides of this issue and case, judges and legal bureaucrats, and we've hosted trainings and conferences. And we've written dozens of op-eds and articles about this institutional violence. We've sourced and facilitated an extensive legal representation of people with mental illness in this federal court. And we've contributed to federal and to state legislation. We've spoken to the media and in public forums. We've been an active party in this conversation all through the state.

The most dangerous institutions to people with mental illness in Oregon is law enforcement. Those are city police, county sheriffs, state patrol. Members of the Oregon State Patrol killed nine people in 2022. And that's an all-time high. Including the superintendent, the new, actually officially as of yesterday, the new superintendent of the Oregon State Patrol who killed someone himself in 2022, during a rural vehicle stop.

That danger is probably also true everywhere else in the United States, that danger of law enforcement. We estimate about eighty percent of the people police use deadly force against are people in some sort of mental health crisis. For comparison, about ten percent of those the Portland Police Bureau uses force against are Black men. That appears to be an overrepresentation until you know that most of those Black men who were harmed by police were also people in some sort of mental health crisis.

The most common denominator in police use of force is men, about ninety-five percent. And the second most common denominator is mental health crisis, about eighty percent. There's a lot of fudging and denial about this dangerousness from city leaders, county leaders. But there's also a lot of dead people and a lot of facts.

My perspective here is as a person in recovery from alcoholism and a person who comes from a long line of alcoholics. And the difference between me biologically and a skid row bum is mostly luck. I had a lot of luck and some assistance so I got better. But part of my getting better has been to continue to look at that world through the lens of a person with the same biology who is unlucky and doesn't have friends.

Now the city has been toying with police accountability on the civilian side here since about, since the mid-1990s. And I say toying because after thirty years of discussion, police in Portland have never held accountable community values on use of force. The process both legal and bureaucratic is jacked from top to bottom. No one, police or civilian, has confidence that the process influences positive reform or makes the city safer, either from crime or from the misuse of police force.

And just to note on the criminal accountability side, there's no record of any Oregon district attorney holding any law officer accountable for any criminal misuse of force since 1970.

My interest is in the perspective of people with mental illness and addiction. And that perspective is unique and complex and bound by law and by history as any religion or race or creed. Understanding that perspective requires specific experience, education, and consideration. The IPR has, as far as I know, never provided their staff with training about mental illness. IPR doesn't track clinical histories. They've not hired anyone with the perspective of a person who has experienced a disabling mental illness. And speaking to the leaders of IPR over the years, I've heard some simple sympathy, but never comprehension of the needs of people with mental illness.

So as for people with mental illness seeking advice after being beaten or abused by police, or for their surviving family members after a death, I advise them to seek a skilled attorney and to sue for damages. Civil courts are much more successful in predicable form of accountability than the lengthy administrative process where the defendant gets to make up all the rules.

The point of administrative accountability is to circumvent civil courts and to reduce the financial impact of adverse court decisions. The lack of urgency or credibility for reform, both of police and the accountability system underscores, the cost to city administrators, is not too much to bear.

Several years ago, an acquaintance asked me for advice. He'd been beaten and tasered by police and he did not want to sue the city. He came from some wealth and so money was not a reward. He wanted a public forum to find an equitable solution. He was educated and in good mind and reasonably patient. So, we worked together to file a complaint in IPR. That complaint took over 400 days to conclude, including a final hearing at City Council where the council voted to not vote on the decision. The resolution was the same as all the others. That the police shown in video beating Matt Klug mercilessly were exonerated. I know of no other person with mental illness who found any resolution through the IPR.

MY: Thank you for sharing that statement. And I have some follow-up questions as we work through this. But I just want to go back to when you first got involved in mental health advocacy, social justice, police reform. When did that work start for you? Before 2003, I'm assuming?

JR: Well, I think people who are in a mental health crisis are people that the police beat. So, if you work with people in crisis, you're always also working with police and law enforcement in some sense. And when I started working on skid row in the early 1990s, it was not unusual at all to see police roust late-stage alcoholics, drug addicts, people with brain damage, brain disorders, people with mental illness, you know, and use physical violence on them to move them around or just to bully them. So, I started pretty early.

MY: Were you aware of the system the city had in place prior to IPR?

JR: The PIIAC?

MY: Yeah.

JR: Mm hmm.

MY: Any opinion on that system? Or were you ever—

JR: I knew people who were involved with it, but I don't know the history as well as others.

MY: Okay. Were you aware of when the Independent Police Review began?

JR: Mm hmm. Yes.

MY: And were you interacting with IPR through the Mental Health Association? Primarily?

JR: Yes. We came to talk to various commissioners and to staff at the IPR to see if they had any ability to listen to complaints from people with mental illness. And our conclusion was that they had no interest in that and no ability to do that.

MY: What about the Citizen Review Committee? Were you working in any capacity with members on that?

JR: The only time that I worked, presented or was part of the presentations to the CRC was with the case of Matt Klug. And he had, I think, two hearings at the CRC. Both of which were inconclusive. I think one of them, the police—the CRC didn't understand the particular law that they were trying to discuss. And actually, a citizen had to stand up and explain it to them. City attorney just stood neutral. So that caused a second hearing to occur.

MY: Well, let's talk about your mental health advocacy work. And you mentioned Mental Health Association and the Mental Health Alliance. Let's start with Mental Health Association. What led to its formation in 2003?

JR: We were interested in following cases of institutional violence. And we wanted to follow a case from its inception, its beginning, back in time and then follow it as time proceeded to understand

the complexity, the number of people involved, the timeline, the effect on the family or surviving friends. And so, we spent a couple of years talking to mostly surviving parents of police violence, not only in Portland but in surrounding counties. And we were really looking for a case where the family was able to, you know, be willing to participate or not opposed to our doing the work, our doing the advocacy. Somewhat on the behalf of the individual, but mostly on the behalf of the process and others that might come into similar situation.

In 2006, James Chasse was beaten to death by three law enforcement officers in downtown Portland. And I had gone to high school with James Chasse. And I knew, I knew his family a little bit and I knew a lot of his friends. And it was also that I had worked at the agency, the mental health treatment agency, where he was receiving services. So, I knew his case very well. So, we decided to follow the case of James Chasse from the beginning of his life through the end of his life, and past that. The case actually is continuing and is really the inspiration for US DOJ versus City of Portland. As we continue to try to figure out how to reduce force against people with mental illness. That case has been going on since 2012. And it's general purpose to reduce use of force against people with mental illness has not occurred.

Actually, we were able to, and this is the alliance group now, we were able to secure data from the Portland Police Bureau. And using our own data experts and our own database, look at that data in new ways. And found that the actual use of force against people with mental illness has increased since the data was collected by the case. And the severity of force has increased.

And interestingly, the use of force against almost every other category has flattened out or gone down. That doesn't include crowd control or crowd situations. The police were not able to keep data successfully during the 2020 crowd control instance, the crowd demonstrations. It doesn't include that. But there were hundreds of uses of force against people with mental illness in those demonstrations.

MY: Well, speaking of Mr. Chasse's in-custody death, I know that there was, according to the 2010 IPR annual report, there was an independent investigation that happened. Do you recall if that report was publicly available?

JR: No, it wasn't. No, the report actually sat on Chief Rosie Sizer's desk for three years. She was looking at it. Interestingly, when we called that attention in the media, she released it fairly quickly. And Mayor Sam Adams fired her about two weeks later, for different reasons.

MY: There seemed to be certain instances of police violence against individuals: Kendra James, James Chasse, Aaron Campbell, that have led to community outcries.

JR: Yes.

MY: Can you speak to the timeline from when James Chasse was murdered to the DOJ investigation? Because that focused on individuals experiencing mental health crises, didn't it?

JR: Well, that's the idea. Though no one in court talks about that anymore. The lawyers for both parties do their best to not discuss it. They're discussing body-worn cameras or training division directors or something else. They don't talk about mental illness. And that's why the judge brought us in as friends of the court, to ring that bell at a recession. But tell me a little bit more about the timeline you're interested in.

MY: He was killed in 2006, I believe. And then the Department of Justice started investigating the Portland police in 20211?

JR: Late 2011. Right. And that was not about Chasse. That was about ministry from the Albina Minister Alliance, Dr. LeRoy Haynes and Dr. T. Allen Bethel asked, wrote a letter to Ron Wyden and Dan Saltzman, excuse me, no, Earl Blumenauer, who then wrote a letter to the Department of Justice asking for an investigation of the Portland Police Bureau. And that was cosigned by Dan Saltzman, who was police commissioner at that time. They were really frustrated with the police union and changes that Saltzman and Mayor Sam Adams wanted to do at the time. And they thought that perhaps if the DOJ came in, that the DOJ could cause through legal action what the city couldn't get through mediation. So, it wasn't really about mental illness; they just used that as a reason to—

Well, let me step back. Ron Wyden and Blumenauer both asked the DOJ to come in. And there was a review done of files from the Portland Police Bureau from deadly force incidents. And the result of those nine or ten files that were looked at was that the Portland Police Bureau had a pattern or practice of harming people with mental illness, which was quite a surprise to everyone. Except us, of course. But almost everyone else thought that they would be shown to have a pattern and practice of harming people who were people of color, specifically Black people.

And so, this was very frustrating to racial justice advocates because they suddenly had, they had all this expectation and then they found that the DOJ wouldn't cosign their concerns. So that's an important point here is that the issues around racial justice have not been addressed in this case. And really as this case has become the sole point of police reform in Portland over the last ten years or so, all those issues around racial justice have not been answered. And it keeps coming out in different ways. But unanswered, it causes a lot of doubt and concern by the community about the police.

MY: When was the Mental Health Alliance, was it the Mental Health Alliance or the association that was approached to be a friend of the court?

JR: We formed the alliance to join the court. And the alliance is actually four organizations. It's the Mental Health Association of Portland, it's Disabilities Rights Oregon, it's the Interfaith Clergy Resistance, and Oregon Justice Resource Center. So, it's four organizations all working in alliance.

MY: And this was 2017, I believe, is when—

JR: I think you started in 2017 and we joined the case in 2018.

MY: What does it mean in that role to be a friend of the court?

JR: Well, we think of it as we're there to advise the court about the progress of the case. Judge Michael Simon has really invited both the amici, which the other amici is the Albina Ministerial Alliance Coalition for Peace and Justice Reform. He's invited both of the amici to participate in, at a very enhanced level, we're involved in the mediation, but we're not parties. We testify at federal hearings as the parties do. We're not allowed to bring evidence or make motions. But it's quite a different role than most amici. Typically, amici write a letter and that's it. We've been in hundreds of hearings and thousands of emails. We meet weekly with our attorneys and have quite an elaborate process of decision making.

MY: The settlement is still ongoing.

JR: Yes. And for several years.

MY: We spoke with Constantin Severe last week, former IPR director. And he was discussing how the settlement impacted what IPR could and couldn't do.

JR: Yeah.

MY: And one thing he had commented on was that the settlement led to some changes that if excessive force was used, that it might have to trigger an IPR review.

JR: Right.

MY: Are there other things that happened during the settlement that you can comment on that were toward better police accountability?

JR: Well, the important part about the IPR is that the IPR is mentioned in the settlement agreement. So, the IPR cannot go away without the agreement of both parties. The city, which might agree that the IPR should go away, but the United States Department of Justice also has to agree that it go away. So right now, as we're preparing to transition from the current IPR to some future accountability board, the IPR, which could wink out with the vote of, and disappear with the vote of the commission, is secure because the DOJ is there and the settlement is in place.

MY: I want to talk about the new system that Portland—

JR: And I can actually talk about that finally.

MY: —Accountability Commission. But before that, I want to talk a little bit about, at the Mental Health Association, if someone approached the organization and said, "I had experienced violence at the hands of the Portland Police Bureau"—and you had mentioned Matthew Klug—would you recommend that they go to IPR?

JR: No

MY: So that was not a regular thing. And you had mentioned perhaps finding an attorney and working with an attorney.

JR: Right. Sometimes people would be interested in knowing about the IPR. But considering the results, we never proceeded with anyone. And if it's a real case, we can find an attorney. Now there are cases that IPR deals with that aren't deadly force. And that's completely different. If someone has a complaint and says, "Well, the officer looked at me wrong," or, "He wouldn't do what I asked him to do," then I can't help with that. That's not my area of interest.

MY: So, what I've been saying to several people we've been interviewing, and mainly to remind myself, 2020 seemed like all of a sudden, the average person became aware of police-related violence. Or it might be an average White person was suddenly aware that there's racism in this country. And it can be hard to forget what happened before 2020. But also, in 2020 in Portland, the

voters approved a new system for police accountability. The Police Accountability Commission. Were you involved in the drafting of that ballot measure in any capacity?

JR: Uh, a little bit. I was on the team to promote initiative 26217. And met with the committee to bring that forward many times. Raise money for it and raise awareness around it.

MY: What was the thought behind that system versus IPR? Similarities, differences?

JR: I think there's just a general frustration in the lack of, the lack of cases that are, I think the lack of confidence in the community that the IPR will find, will actually be independent and actually do a fulsome review. So, there's that doubt. There's also the lack of, the rules and tools that the IPR needs in order to do that work. And the hope is that this future version of IPR, this future board of accountability will have those tools. It's not certain at this point they will, but that's the hope.

MY: And you've served on the board?

JR: I did.

MY: For how long?

JR: For about a year.

MY: Did you have to apply? Were you appointed?

JR: I both applied and was appointed. I was encouraged to apply by Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty. And I was informed by her office in March of 2021 that I would be selected. The committee didn't meet for another nine or ten months. And then didn't do anything but figure out its own rules for another year. It was very slow, turgid, stifling process. But I was asked to resign a few months ago. So.

MY: How many people were on the commission with you?

JR: I think thirteen. Of which, really, in any commission that's formed like this, there's always a quick turnover of people who realize that they'd have to work. So, in the first few months, there's always quite a bit of turnover.

MY: And were they representative of different advocacy issues? Communities?

JR: Yeah. The idea is that there were four different aspects they were trying to represent. Things like small businesses or people of color or folks who were underrepresented or overpoliced. So, there were different categories that people sort of were slotted into. The fellow who represented small businesses ran a business of a thousand employees. So, it's a little hard to fit them all in the right slots.

MY: Do you think that the commission will be able to be successful?

JR: Uh, no. I don't think so. But I'm pretty cynical about it. I think the problem is, is that the defendant is creating the rules again. The city is actually creating an entity that should be critical of

the city. And that's very difficult to do. The city had a hard time hiring good staff to put together this initial commission. And they were very slow and confused about how, what their role was and how to do the work. Now it's kind of a race against time. They're meeting like eight hours a week in public now, to try to catch up.

MY: Is it underneath the umbrella of City Council?

JR: There's a strange part of the city called Community Services Division, which is operated by a fellow named Mike Myers, who at one time was the fire chief. And my understanding is that Mike doesn't answer to any one of the City Council. And we're really not sure what the chain of command is there.

MY: But IPR continues to exist underneath him.

JR: Right.

MY: Now it's in the Mayor's Office. It moved out of the Auditor's Office last summer.

JR: It should be under the Administrator's Office, not under the mayor's, per se, but under the city administrator.

MY: Yes. Which is our new system?

JR: Maybe. If we ever put it together. Under the new charter, we should have a city manager. And maybe the IPR will be under that. But what we don't know right now is whether, the danger to IPR right now is can it hold it together for the long period of time it's going to—because once the commission figures out what the city ought to do, then it goes to City Council. And City Council will say we like this or we don't like this. We don't like this, they'll have the city attorney rewrite whatever they don't like. And then that has to be agreed upon by City Council. And then they have to implement it. And that could take from today a couple of years, at minimum. So, we're quite a ways out. So IPR sort of needs to hold it together for quite a long time in this sort of free, sort of free-floating state, administrative state.

MY: Right. Because it's not as though concerns about police issues have gone away during this period as we're figuring things out. Citizens still need to be able to go somewhere.

JR: Well, you talked about 2020. And it's interesting that the interest that people had around police reform in the summer and fall of 2020 has just evaporated completely. A Black man was killed in Albany, Oregon, a city about sixty miles south of here a week ago. Maybe eight, nine days ago now. Has yet to reach the newspapers. There's been no statements by any social justice organization or legal organization or church group or community leaders about that case. His name is really unknown outside of some police reports.

MY: What is his name?

JR: Julius Hamilton. And he was sitting in his car, holding a gun to his head, when he was shot by police. He was in a mental health crisis.

MY: And you still are involved with Mental Health Association?

JR: I am.

MY: And how are you continuing to be involved in advocating for people having mental health crises as they deal with institutions who might not understand?

JR: Well, we do a lot of things. We run a national conference on the law and mental illness, and on alternatives to police. I run a national association of alternatives to mobile crisis providers, like Portland Street Response, but all over the country. We've just entered through State Senator Chris Gorsek, we've just entered his three bills in the Oregon State Legislature around police reform. Really not around this civil accountability that we see with IPR, which is really just administrative accountability, but this is the criminal accountability. I mentioned in my statement that we don't think there's been any police officer in Oregon held criminally responsible for use of force since 1970. Well, there's a reason for that. It's because district attorneys don't have the tools to do it. And are unwilling to do it. So, we're moving, our bills are to move the investigations and prosecutions away from local control and to the state, where there will be a little bit more independence and a little more interest in justice.

MY: How do you think the city of Portland has served the community regarding police accountability, and how has it not?

JR: Well, I think the city has sort of evaded the responsibility and thought, their basic strategy is that we drag our heels and do as little as possible, one, the police department and the police union won't get angry at us; and two, advocates for justice will get tired and go away. So the real strategy is to stay in the game. To have, as Reverend Doctor Haynes always says, this is a marathon, not a sprint. And you need to get people who want to do this work who can think in many years, not in many days.

MY: Are there younger people who are grabbing onto this work to continue?

JR: There's almost been no transition from the protests of 2020. The people who are in the streets have not come into the police reform conversation at all. We have gone to those people and grabbed a few and brought them in. But it was, it takes a lot of mentoring and a lot of sifting through their anger to get to advocacy. Because angry doesn't work. Persistent works. Patient works. Compassion works. Compassion is a very revolutionary concept. It's hard to maintain. But there's some spiritual aspects to this work. And if a young person can get interested in that, they can stick around. They will tend to stick around.

MY: In an ideal scenario, what would the city's role be with police accountability? Or would the city have a role in police accountability?

JR: Well, you know, it goes back to Plato. Who watches the guardians? How do you create a system that is self-aware and self-policing? It's very complicated and very difficult. And the more you unpeel the onion, the more it sort of starts to disappear, get smaller and smaller. And suddenly you don't have anything.

At the same time, you want a good police force that is well-trained and well able to serve. People with mental illness don't have a medical system or social service system they can turn to in a crisis. When I'm up on the roof and howling at the moon, my psychologist is not going to come and

help me off the roof. That's going to be a police officer. So, I can't afford to be an abolitionist. I can't afford to say, you know, we don't need police. We need the police. Especially people with mental illness. But we need police who are knowledgeable about our experience and have that same compassion to help and not hurt. I'm not sure that answered your question.

MY: No. It did.

JR: What could the city do?

MY: I'm thinking, what we're trying to do with this collection of oral histories is document the history through memory, multiple perspectives, about the Independent Police Review during the twenty-plus years it was underneath the auditor's office. And I think about, there was PIIAC, there was IPR, and now there's potentially Police Accountability Commission. And there's a lot of time and resources that have gone into how the city has tried to address police accountability. And is the city better off for doing that?

JR: You know, cities all over the country are trying to figure this out. And there are some basic components to accountability that Portland hasn't done that the new commission has looked out and is sort of sifting through and figuring out if there's other better practices to take on. Whether in the grand scheme of things we're better off, it's hard to tell. Because what would it be like without? But in general, the issue is of impunity. Do police officers change their behavior based on the administrative accountability? Probably not. Because it's so ineffective. There's probably accountability measures that are much more effective, such as peer pressure, officer-to-officer communication, sergeant-to-officer communication. Individual discipline. That's probably much more effective at changing overall behavior.

We also have, in the time of IPR, created a state training facility down in Salem, the Department of Public Safety and Standards, DPSST. And we've also created a new training academy here in Portland. That's probably changed police behavior a lot.

In the past, most police training came from one officer sitting next to another officer in a patrol car for twenty-five years. And that they would teach each other. And that sort of reinforces biases. But it also gives practical skills. And that's probably changed a lot in the last five years since there's so few patrol officers driving around with each other. It's almost everyone's alone in a car.

MY: Are there other cities or towns in the US that have a better model of police accountability that you're aware of?

JR: Yeah.

MY: Or have officers who are trained in mental health crises awareness.

JR: Yeah. There's actually a national association of accountability programs that brings together the city leadership of those accountability offices. And IPR is a member of that. But every major city has an accountability function of some sort or another. And over the last, I'd say five or six years, there's become a great interest in what to do about people in a mental health crisis. And this recognition that police officers are encountering people with mental illness a lot more than they used to. Or that they're just recognizing that they're doing that. And everyone's sort of recognizing that that's not a good outcome. That that's not what anybody wants. And so, there's a lot of different training programs for police officers to understand mental illness and to understand how to interact with

people with mental illness. And those have had a strong impact both here in Portland and nationwide. And have probably reduced the amount of use of force overall.

The dilemma is, we really don't know what's causing the use of force. Is it the police that's causing it? Maybe. But maybe not. Maybe it's the crisis themselves. Maybe it's mental illness. Which in Oregon we're probably one of the worst states in providing access to mental health services. And we have a very high prevalence of mental illness in this state. We also have deregulated, for the most part, both drugs and alcohol to the point where it's a major problem. Almost everyone who commits their crime commits it while they're drunk or loaded or mentally ill. It's pretty rare that somebody commits a crime stone cold sober. So, this is a real effect that police are encountering. And understanding how to manage people who are in these states is very important.

So, Portland started, I don't know, Karl McDade who was, I think at that time, the North Precinct commander, brought crisis intervention team training to Portland from Memphis. It started in Memphis. I think he did that in, like '89, '90. So, we've had crisis team training here in Portland for a long time.

After Chasse, Mayor Tom Potter decided that he would expand that training to all police officers and hired a psychologist to implement a whole new program of training. So now all Portland police officers receive at least forty hours of training, a lot more than most cities, in how to help people with mental health crisis. We also have the Behavioral Health Unit, which is a group of officers who have more training and more resources to deal with people with mental illness. We have the, in the district attorney's office, there's the LEAD program, which is outreach to people with mental illness who are in the criminal justice system. We have a mental health team and patrol in parole and probation. We have Project Respond, that works with police. It's a part of the Cascadia Behavioral Healthcare system. And we have Portland Street Response, part of the Fire Department, of all things, of all administrative structures, that's now also doing outreach to people in crisis. So, we're changing how we do this a lot in the last few years. We're in such a whirlwind of the mental health system changing, it's hard to tell whether it's ultimately beneficial or not.

MY: Have you noticed a change in the public's awareness at all of perhaps people calling 911 less frequently and calling the mental health crisis team, for example?

JR: Yes. And that's one of the best things that Portland Street Response has done is that they have a budget for promoting their services. Yet all those services still come through 911. So, it's really not the Portland Street Response who decides whether they go out on a call, it's the 911 operators. And they are not, as far as I know, trained on how to make that decision about Portland Street Response or city police or ambulance services. We're still growing and changing. But that first call to 911 is super problematic. Services like that should be self-dispatched or dispatched through an independent number.

MY: Those are the questions I had. Were there other things that you wanted to make sure we discussed?

JR: I'm glad you're doing this. This is a dark area in Portland city history. There's a lot of dark areas. But it's good to get this all down on tape.

MY: Well, thank you for being with us today.

JR: Glad to do it.