

JTTF REPORT

IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK TO CITY COUNCIL, **PRINT** YOUR NAME, ADDRESS, AND EMAIL.

NAME (print)

ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE

Email

✓ DAN HANDERMAN	PORTLAND COPWATCH	
✓ Mary Mc Williams DEBBIE ALBIES	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS	
✓ JIM KENNEDY	ARAB MUSLIM POLICE ADVISORY COUNCIL	
✓ ASHLEE ALBIES ^(NOT FEELING WELL) (OR SUBSTITUTE)	NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD	

NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD
PORTLAND, OREGON CHAPTER



POST OFFICE BOX 40723
PORTLAND, OREGON 97240-0723

February 29, 2012

To: Portland City Council Members

RE: Annual Report to Council regarding Portland Police Bureau participation with the JTTF

Dear Portland Commissioners:

The Portland Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild (NLG) opposed the prospect of the city joining the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Force (JTTF) last year for several reasons, including concerns about the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)'s history, both recent and past, of trampling civil liberties, engaging in racial and political profiling, and the FBI's self-given authority to engage in conduct that would otherwise violate Oregon law. While we appreciate the information contained in this Report, the efforts to clarify information based on community concerns, and the opportunity to comment on the Report, we continue to have serious concerns about the relationship between the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) and the FBI.

In his report, the Chief states he has reviewed each request to "ensure that PPB involvement in those inquiries would follow the Resolution" and Oregon law. The Chief also reports that for each inquiry from the FBI, he was given notice of the stage of the investigation and the "criminal nexus." It remains a concern that "criminal nexus" is not defined in the resolution or under Oregon law. We continue to urge the council to enshrine in the Resolution the legal standard of "reasonably suspects" under ORS 131.605(6) ("Reasonably suspects" means that a peace officer holds a belief that is reasonable under the totality of the circumstances existing at the time and place the peace officer acts as authorized in ORS 131.605 to 131.625"). Further, the Report fails to specify whether and how often the FBI's requests exceeded the scope of the Resolution.

In addition, as the ACLU has pointed out, that the Mayor has applied for security clearance, but it has not yet been granted such clearance is of concern. Thus, are members of the bureau are working with the JTTF before the Commissioner-in-Charge of the Bureau has the necessary authorizations to provide effective oversight? We also raise the question whether the Commissioner-in-Charge of the PPB can provide adequate oversight with a security clearance level lower than those under his authority working with the JTTF.

The nation is in turmoil due to the economic crisis and growing economic inequality.

The NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD is an association dedicated to the need for basic change in the structure of our political and economic system. We seek to unite the lawyers, law students, legal workers and jailhouse lawyers of America in an organization that shall function as an effective political and social force in the service of the people, to the end that human rights shall be regarded as more sacred than property interests.

The Occupy Movement has sought to draw attention to many factors of economic inequality, which are supported by federal, state and local government, through massive non-violent demonstrations, non-violent direct action and civil disobedience. It is crucial that peoples' constitutional rights are protected. The FBI has a well-documented history of targeting activists involved in peoples' movements as a way to squelch dissent and to protect an unjust system. We want to ensure that the JTTF cannot circumvent the rights protected under Oregon law and use the PPB to do so.

Finally, the resolution calls for a report with "appropriate public information" – this appears to be a subjective term, as the community and the City seem to disagree over what information is "appropriate" for the purposes of effective oversight. We appreciate the City's efforts to respond to community concerns regarding the Report, and it is our hope that we can continue to confer to clarify what is "appropriate."

For a Better World,

NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD
PORTLAND, OREGON CHAPTER



J. ASHLEE ALBIES
Co-Chair, Portland NLG Chapter
MARK KRAMER
Member, Portland NLG Chapter
Portlandchapter@nlg.org

PORTLAND COPWATCH TESTIMONY REGARDING JOINT TERRORISM TASK FORCE REPORT

February 29, 2012

To Mayor/Police Commissioner Sam Adams, Chief Mike Reese and members of Portland City Council:

Last week, Portland Copwatch and a number of community groups sent a letter outlining the ways in which the JTTF Reports from the Mayor and the Chief failed to bring clarity around the activities of the Portland Police working with the FBI. While a few changes were made since then, the reports are still too vague, and Portland Copwatch continues to oppose the renewed relationship between the Bureau and the JTTF, particularly while the meaningless "criminal nexus" language guides which cases our local officers work on.

For example, the Chief added to his report that he has examined each case to see whether the "criminal nexus" fit the terms of the resolution. What he doesn't say is whether each case involved reasonable suspicion of criminal activity as defined in ORS 181.575, or whether any of the cases were "assessments" or "preliminary investigations."

The Chief also revealed that he, the Assistant Chief of Investigation (Hendricks), the Lieutenant of the Criminal Intelligence Unit, and the two CIU officers all have "Secret" clearance. This gives the community different information from the previous report in which he only said he was applying for Top Secret clearance, but did not reveal that he already had Secret clearance. The Chief also updated the report to state that the City Attorney's training includes pointing out the difference between the FBI's guidelines to open investigations and the resolution and Oregon law.

This kind of specificity is what is seriously lacking elsewhere in the reports.

For example:

—They say that the City Attorney, who has not been asked to sign a non-disclosure agreement, has "received unfettered access to ample information... in order to assess compliance with Oregon law." They do not say how many consultations occurred or what kinds of issues were raised.

—The reports say the officers have been assigned on an "as-needed basis," but the Chief argues that "disclosure of the number of cases or hours worked would be likely to compromise ongoing investigations." It makes no sense that revealing how many cases or hours worked with the JTTF will jeopardize specific investigations, if the subjects of those investigations are not named. Given the tight budget constraints facing the City that could force as much as 8% cuts, the public has a right to know how many hours our officers have spent working on this task force.

—They say the City Attorney has been briefed but not asked to sign a confidentiality statement. Does that mean the City Attorney is assuming client-lawyer privilege, or can that office tell us more details?

—The Mayor states he has "been provided with status report [sic] on terrorist threats in the Portland Area," leaving only a vague idea of how much contact and influence the FBI's increased focus on terrorism is diverting our officers from solving local crimes. Similarly, the Mayor and Chief each report having received more than two briefings from the FBI, but refuse to be more specific about how many meetings they had.

This information is important because the event that re-launched the City's participation in the Task Force, the Holiday Tree bomb scare of 2010, was, in many community members' minds, a set-up orchestrated by the FBI. About a half-dozen similar sting operations have been executed in other cities since that time. These cases of entrapment serve to bolster the FBI and demonize Muslim Americans in the eyes of those who don't know the FBI's history of subterfuge, but do nothing to actually keep our country safe.

On that subject, we are curious why the Chief's report includes a definition of "act of war" when describing what the federal laws are around domestic and international terrorism.

(over)

The letter also asked whether the Portland Police were exposed to any of the biased training about Muslims that the FBI was giving as documented in September and updated on February 15th by Wired magazine. We would like an answer to that question.

The report that all CIU officers received training around the limits of Oregon law is welcome, but we all hope that they have been receiving this training on an ongoing basis regardless of the City's affiliation with the JTTF. In 1996, in the Squirrel v. City of Portland lawsuit, the City was ordered to review all files generated by the CIU for compliance with Oregon law every two months and again every two years.

We ask the Council: how is the vague information in this report supposed to make us feel that the Portland Police are working on arresting people who are actually involved in self-motivated attempts to harm human lives for political ends? How should we, as a group which has been spied on at least twice by the Bureau's Criminal Intelligence Unit, whose officers are again working with the JTTF, be reassured by the fact that Council and the Chief are allowed to interpret "criminal nexus" one way while the FBI can interpret it another way?

We still feel the entire relationship is very disconcerting and requires way too much secrecy in a state and city supposedly devoted to open public records. It is indicative of how secretive the entire relationship is that the names of the Assistant Chief, Deputy City Attorney, Lieutenant and Officers are not included in the report, even though officers' names were included in the ordinance on the JTTF in 2000; the Lieutenant of the CIU's name was even given on the cover sheet.

Leaving out details only leads to speculation and mistrust in the community. If the cost of working with the FBI means turning our police force into a closed, cloak-and-dagger operation, which flies in the face of the idea of community policing, we continue to say it is not worth the price.

Thank you,

Dan Handelman
Portland Copwatch

And noting who the other organizations and individuals were who sent the original letter, though I am not here to represent them today:

Portland JACL
Martin Gonzalez, Portland School Board member
Portland National Lawyers Guild
Mary McWilliams, president, League of Women Voters of Portland
Madelyn Elder, president, CWA Local 7901
Arab Muslim Police Advisory Council (AMPAC)



The League of Women Voters of Portland

310 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 520, Portland, OR 97204

(503) 228-1675 • info@lwvpdx.org • www.lwvpdx.org

Board of Directors

Mary McWilliams
President

Carol Wilson
1st VP &
Outreach Services

Barbara Fredericks
2nd VP &
Voters Service

Ann Mulroney
3rd VP &
Member Education

Lynn Baker
Secretary &
Voter Editor

Mary Hepokoski
Treasurer

Debbie Aiona
Action

Jessica Aiona
Special Assignment

Pat Chor
Voters Service

Lainey Hakala
Special Assignment

Kathleen Hersh
Web Editor

Debbie Kaye
Membership &
Speakers' Bureau

Marnie Lonsdale
Special Assignment

Don MacGillivray
Publicity

Off Board Leaders

Peggy Bengry
Voters' Guide Editor

Pat Osborn
Nominating

Corinne Paulson
Endowment

Janine Settlemeyer
Naturalization
Ceremony

Barbara Stations
Budget

Commissioner-in-Charge and Portland Police Bureau FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force Annual Report City Council Testimony February 29, 2012

The League of Women Voters believes that democratic government depends on informed and active participation and that governmental bodies must protect the public's right to know. Over the years, we have supported transparency and accountability in the city's relationship with the FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force (JTTF).

As an organization that promotes an active and informed public, we value the protections afforded by Oregon law to individuals engaging in political and other non-criminal first amendment activities. Federal guidelines do not require reasonable suspicion of criminal activity before the initiation of preliminary investigations or assessments. It is for this reason that community organizations including the League have encouraged the city to work with the FBI JTTF on a case-by-case basis.

The resolution adopted last April was intended to build in safeguards for the reestablished relationship between the city and the FBI. The annual reports were an important provision and we appreciate the information added last night, but have outstanding questions. Have Portland Police Bureau (PPB) officers participated in any assessments or preliminary investigations? If so, what portion of the hours devoted to JTTF work were spent on those types of cases? How many hours have our officers devoted to their JTTF assignments? To what extent is that affecting work on local public safety? How many cases required their involvement and how many are closed? How did the Mayor participate effectively in the management and supervision of Bureau staff when he does not have security clearance?

Recent news stories about the detention in Tunisia of long-time Oregon residents who are U.S. citizens and members of the Portland Islamic Center bring to life the public's concerns. It appears from the reporting that the detentions were intended to pressure these men into spying on members of their religious community. We have no way to know if our local officers were involved in those cases at any level.

We ask Council to insist that the final reports answer these questions and others raised here today. The League also recommends requiring the City Attorney and Independent Police Review Director to regularly review all JTTF files created with Portland police officers' participation. Any files collected in violation of Oregon law should be purged. Periodic review by those independent parties would provide confirmation to the public that the protections we have in Oregon are being honored.



Testimony of David Fidanque
Executive Director

Before the Portland City Council
Annual Reports regarding Portland Police Bureau
Cooperation with the FBI (JTTF)

February 29, 2012

The ACLU of Oregon appeared before you last April in support of Council Resolution 36859 relating to the relationship between the Portland Police Bureau and the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Force. We supported the resolution despite a high degree of concern because the FBI operates under very different guidelines and policies than the City of Portland.

We considered this resolution the continuation, not the end, of an ongoing conversation regarding the appropriate boundaries and safeguards for the Bureau's task of protecting the safety of all Portland residents, workers and visitors while at the same time complying with and respecting the constitutional and statutory rights of individuals and organizations.

We will not repeat the well-documented (and ongoing) abuses by the FBI of the constitutionally protected activity of law-abiding American citizens and residents. We will however, note that we are most appreciative that Oregon is 3,000 miles away from New York. There, it has been the New York City Chief of Police and Mayor who have authorized widespread surveillance and collection of information on the lawful activities of Muslim Americans and Muslim student organizations not just in New York but also in New Jersey and Connecticut. We provide a copy of the AP article that broke the story.

Last year we set out very specific expectations that we had for the annual reports on the City's relationship with the JTTF and the FBI and urged the Mayor and Police Chief to put the systems in place that would ensure both that the terms of the resolution would be honored and that Portland would be a model of transparency.

We were not only very disappointed in the first set of draft reports that were placed on the City's web site on February 13, but alarmed by what those reports did and did not say. Last Thursday, we circulated a 20-page analysis of those drafts that led us to conclude that several important safeguards of the resolution were not being followed. We therefore, at that time, urged the Council to suspend its cooperation with the JTTF until our questions could be answered and the City's practices were made to conform to the resolution.

Since we released that analysis, a second draft of the Chief's report was released Friday afternoon that clarified some important points. And this week, Andrea Meyer and I had the opportunity to engage in extensive discussions with the Mayor regarding our concerns and questions.

As you know, additional revisions were made to both the Mayor's and the Chief's reports within the past 24 hours that have addressed many more of our concerns, although certainly not all. The current reports before you are much closer to what we had envisioned and we very much appreciate the responsiveness of the Mayor and Chief Reese to our concerns.

Before we raise our remaining concerns, we want to specifically identify our previous concerns and the additional information included in the final reports that address those concerns:

- While the initial drafts were silent on the City's process for review of the FBI requests and the role of the Mayor in conferring on those requests, the revised reports state clearly that the Chief personally reviewed each and every request for assistance and, in direct consultation with the Mayor (as Commissioner-in-Charge of the Police Bureau), ensured that each FBI request was consistent with the requirements of the Resolution and of Oregon law and city policies prior to authorizing any PPB involvement;
- While the initial drafts were silent on the investigative status of the FBI inquiries at the time the requests of PPB were made, the revised reports state that as part of the Chief's determination he reviewed the stage of the investigation and whether the inquiries were FBI "assessments," "preliminary investigations" or "full investigations." Knowing the stage of the FBI inquiry at the time of the request is a critical for the Chief, the Mayor and the City Attorney to be able to analyze whether PPB involvement is permissible under Oregon law and the Resolution;
- While the initial drafts were silent on the Chief's interaction with the City Attorney upon receiving and evaluating a request by the FBI for assistance, the revised reports state that the Chief will proactively consult with the City Attorney before accepting any request if he has any doubts whether the request complies with Oregon law and the Resolution;
- While the initial reports noted that neither the Chief nor the Mayor had yet obtained their required security clearance from the FBI, the revised reports clarify that each has still been able to access all necessary information needed to properly evaluate the FBI requests and maintain the proper chain of command within the Police Bureau;

- While the initial reports only noted that the Mayor had sought but not yet received Secret Clearance, the revised reports affirm that the Mayor has been able to confer with both the Chief and the City Attorney and state the Mayor's expectation that all future Commissioners-in-Charge of the PPB will seek such clearance immediately upon appointment;
- While the initial reports identified that various members of the PPB were involved in JTTF activity or oversight, they failed to identify what type of FBI clearance they had. The revised reports provide the current level of FBI clearance for all personnel involved and clarify that the two CIU officers, the Assistant Chief of the Investigations Branch, and the Lieutenant of the CIU all have Secret security clearance and none hold Top Secret clearance, which some of them did have in the past;
- While the initial reports identified the availability of the City Attorney to answer any questions the CIU officers may have, the initial drafts did not indicate whether the City Attorney had or ever would be contacted. The revised reports make clear that the City Attorney will proactively approach the officers about their work and those officers will also be expected to proactively approach the City Attorney with questions;
- While the initial reports noted that the officers are aware they can report potential or actual violations to the Chief, the revised reports clarify that the officers have been able to freely share information and seek advice from the City Attorney and are expected to reach out to the City Attorney's office for ongoing consultation and legal advice;
- While the initial reports did not discuss how the City Attorney's office staffed its work related to the Resolution, the revised reports clarify that the Mayor, to ensure multiple levels of oversight, assigned two separate City Attorneys: one for day-to-day advice, and the second for purposes of training and oversight to ensure the terms of the resolution are being followed. In addition, the Chief, in preparation for this report, had that the City Attorney independently question the officers to verify their activities over the past ten months, and had the attorney provide that report to himself and the Mayor;
- While the initial draft reports were silent as to whether the training of the CIU officers by the City Attorney's office included relevant details on the FBI's guidelines and policies and the differences of those policies from Oregon law, the revised reports note that the training did include this critical information;
- While the initial reports were silent on what, if any, training the Mayor, Chief of Police and supervising officers had, the revised reports clarify that the Mayor, the

Chief of Police and the Assistant Chief of the Investigations Branch have all been trained;

- And finally, the revised reports also address our concern about attendance at the JTTF Executive Committee meetings, accurately note the minor delay in briefing the new U.S. Attorney, and provide the documentation that the City Attorney has taken all the steps it can to comply with the Resolution's requirement to confer annually with the Oregon Attorney General.

Nevertheless, we would not be doing our job if we failed to remind you that last April we called for the greatest level of transparency and detail so that the public could be assured that all of the intentions and expectations of the Resolution were followed. I want to emphasize that we did not request the City to disclose the content of any investigation.

However, still missing from the report is data indicating the number of investigations, the types of investigations, at what stage of the FBI inquiries the Police Bureau was asked to work with the JTTF, and the total number of hours the investigating CIU officers worked on terrorism inquiries.

While we believe all of this information is important, we believe the most critical is for the City to disclose the number and types of inquiries in which our officers have participated.

You may recall that last spring we had urged that the Resolution limit PPB involvement to only those inquiries designated as "full investigations" by the FBI. We had taken that position because the FBI's investigation guidelines and policies permit them to carry out "assessments" and "preliminary investigations" without a reason to believe that the target of the inquiry is or may be involved in terrorism activity.

As we noted in our memo distributed to you last week, the FBI itself has released data regarding the number of "assessments" it initiated between March 2009 and March 2011. A New York Times report published last August reported that the FBI launched 42,888 "assessments" somehow related to potential terrorism and of that total, more than 95 percent were closed without reaching even the "preliminary investigation" stage.

Based on other Freedom of Information Act requests and investigations by the Office of Inspector General, we know there is a greater likelihood that FBI "assessments" and "preliminary investigations" will result in surveillance and collection of information related to political, religious and social activities that are lawful and constitutionally protected.

Only inquiries at the "full investigation" stage require a factual predicate towards a specific individual, group or organization.

Thus, if the FBI request of the Police Bureau is made during either the "assessment" or "preliminary investigation" stage, it should automatically trigger heightened inquiry by the Chief, the Commissioner-in-Charge and the active involvement of the City Attorney to ensure that the City's involvement will not violate either the Resolution or Oregon law.

Thus it is *critical* for the public and the Council to know *how many* inquiries PPB officers have participated in and at *what* stage (as classified by the FBI). We can If we knew that few, if any, of our officers worked on either "assessments" or "preliminary investigations," it would go a long way toward public verification that the City is in compliance with the Resolution and Oregon law.

Conversely, if PPB officers were involved only in "assessments" and "preliminary investigations," it would indicate there was a much greater likelihood that the City was in violation of the Resolution and Oregon law. Having this data is really the only way for the public to "trust but verify."

Before the Council accepts these reports, you should ensure that a means for addressing this important issue is put in place for next year and future years' reports. One important step would be to ensure that the Police Chief keeps a log of all terrorism requests made by the FBI and the stage of the inquiry at the time of the request. If such a record were not maintained, it would be impossible in future years to release cumulative data covering a number of years.

In just a few months, we will have different Council members, a different Commissioner-in-Charge, and a different Mayor. In future years, we will have different Chiefs of Police and City Attorneys as well as different City Councils. The ACLU wants to ensure that no matter how many layers of oversight are implemented internally, the public and other interested parties will be provided enough independent factual information to leave no doubt that the Resolution, Oregon law and the Constitution are being adhered to and honored.

02/22/2012

NYPD built secret files on mosques outside NY

ADAM GOLDMAN and MATT APUZZO

Associated Press

NEWARK, N.J. (AP) — Americans living and working in New Jersey's largest city were subjected to surveillance as part of the New York Police Department's effort to build databases of where Muslims work, shop and pray. The operation in Newark was so secretive even the city's mayor says he was kept in the dark.

For months in mid-2007, plainclothes officers from the NYPD's Demographics Units fanned out across Newark, taking pictures and eavesdropping on conversations inside businesses owned or frequented by Muslims.

The result was a 60-page report, obtained by The Associated Press, containing brief summaries of businesses and their clientele. Police also photographed and mapped 16 mosques, listing them as "Islamic Religious Institutions."

The report cited no evidence of terrorism or criminal behavior. It was a guide to Newark's Muslims. According to the report, the operation was carried out in collaboration with the Newark Police Department, which at the time was run by a former high-ranking NYPD official. But Newark's mayor, Cory Booker, said he never authorized the spying and was never told about it.

"Wow," he said as the AP laid out the details of the report. "This raises a number of concerns. It's just very, very sobering."

Police conducted similar operations outside their jurisdiction in New York's Suffolk and Nassau counties on suburban Long Island, according to police records.

Such surveillance has become commonplace in New York City in the decade since the 2001 terrorist attacks. Police have built databases showing where Muslims live, where they buy groceries, even what Internet cafes they use and where they watch sports. Dozens of mosques and student groups have been infiltrated and police have built detailed profiles of ethnic communities, from Moroccans to Egyptians to Albanians.

The documents obtained by the AP show, for the first time in any detail, how those efforts stretched outside the NYPD's jurisdiction. New Jersey and Long Island residents had no reason to suspect the NYPD was watching them. And since the NYPD isn't accountable to their votes or tax dollars, those non-New Yorkers had little recourse to stop it.

"All of these are innocent people," Nagiba el-Sioufi of Newark said while her husband, Mohammed, flipped through the NYPD report, looking at photos of mosques and storefronts frequented by their friends.

Egyptian immigrants and American citizens, the couple raised two daughters in the United States. Mohammed works as an accountant and is vice president of the Islamic Culture Center, a mosque a few blocks from Newark City Hall.

"If you have an accusation on us, then spend the money on doing this to us," Nagiba said. "But you have no accusation."

The Newark chief at the time, Chief Garry McCarthy, is now in charge of the Chicago Police Department. Reached on his cell phone Wednesday and asked about the report, McCarthy responded, "There's nothing to comment on," and hung up.

NYPD spokesman Paul Browne did not return a message seeking comment about the report. The goal of the report, like others the Demographics Unit compiled, was to give police at-their-fingertips access to information about Muslim neighborhoods. If police got a tip about an Egyptian terrorist in the area, for instance, they wanted to immediately know where he was likely to find a cheap room to rent, where he might buy his lunch and at what mosque he probably would attend Friday prayers.

"These locations provide the maximum ability to assess the general opinions and general activity of these communities," the Newark report said.

The effect of the program was that hundreds of American citizens were cataloged — sometimes by name, sometimes simply by their businesses and their ethnicity — in secret police files that spanned hundreds of pages:

— "A Black Muslim male named Mussa was working in the rear of store," an NYPD detective wrote after a clandestine visit to a dollar store in Shirley, N.Y., on Long Island.

— "The manager of this restaurant is an Indian Muslim male named Vicky Amin" was the report back from an Indian restaurant in Lindenhurst, N.Y., also on Long Island.

— "Owned and operated by an African Muslim (possibly Sudanese) male named Abdullah Ddita" was the summary from another dollar store in Shirley, N.Y., just off the highway on the way to the Hamptons, the wealthy Long Island getaway.

In one report, an officer describes how he put people at ease by speaking in Punjabi and Urdu, languages commonly spoken in Pakistan.

Last summer, when the AP first began reporting about the NYPD's surveillance efforts, New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg said his police do not consider religion in their policing.

On Tuesday, following an AP story that showed the NYPD monitored Muslim student groups around the Northeast, school leaders including Yale president Richard Levin expressed outrage over the tactics. Bloomberg fired back in what was the most vigorous defense yet of his department.

"The police department goes where there are allegations. And they look to see whether those allegations are true," he told reporters. "That's what you'd expect them to do. That's what you'd want them to do. Remind yourself when you turn out the light tonight."

There are no allegations of terrorism in the Demographics Unit reports and the documents make clear that police were only interested in locations frequented by Muslims. The canvas of businesses in Newark mentions Islam and Muslims 27 times. In one section of the report, police wrote that the largest immigrant groups in Newark were from Portugal and Brazil. But they did not photograph businesses or churches for those groups.

"No Muslim component within these communities was identified," police wrote, except for one business owned by a Brazilian Muslim of Palestinian descent.

Polls show that most New Yorkers strongly support the NYPD's counterterrorism efforts and don't believe police unfairly target Muslims. The Muslim community, however, has called for Police Commissioner Ray Kelly's resignation over the spying and the department's screening of a video that portrays Muslims as wanting to dominate the United States.

In Newark, the report was met with a mixture of confusion and anger.

"Come, look at yourself on film," Abdul Kareem Abdullah called to his wife as he flipped through the NYPD files at the lunch counter of their restaurant, Hamidah's Cafe.

An American-born citizen who converted to Islam decades ago, Abdullah said he understands why, after the 9/11 terror attacks, people are afraid of Muslims. But he said he wishes the police would stop by, say hello, meet him and his customers and get to know them. The documents show police have no interest in that, he said.

"They just want to keep tabs on us," he said. "If they really wanted to understand, they'd come talk to us." After the AP approached Booker, he said the mayor's office had launched an investigation. "We're going to get to the bottom of this," he said.

Booker met with Islamic leaders while campaigning for mayor. Those interviewed by the AP said they wanted to believe he didn't authorize the spying but wanted to hear from him directly.

"I have to look in his eyes," Mohammed el-Sioufi said at his mosque. "I know him. I met him. He was here."

Ironically, because officers conducted the operation covertly, the reports contain mistakes that could have been easily corrected had the officers talked to store owners or imams. If police ever had to rely on the database during an unfolding terrorism emergency as they had planned, those errors would have hindered their efforts.

For instance, locals said several businesses identified as belonging to African-American Muslims actually were owned by Afghans or Pakistanis. El-Sioufi's mosque is listed as an African-American mosque, but he said the imam is from Egypt and the congregation is a roughly even mix of black converts and people of foreign ancestries.

"We're not trying to hide anything. We are out in the open," said Abdul A. Muhammad, the imam of the Masjid Ali Muslim mosque in Newark. "You want to come in? We have an open door policy." By choosing instead to conduct such widespread surveillance, Mohammed el-Sioufi said, police send the message that the whole community is suspect.

"When you spy on someone, you are kind of accusing them. You are not accepting them for choosing Islam," Nagiba el-Sioufi said. "This doesn't say, 'This guy did something wrong.' This says, 'Everyone here is a Muslim.'"

"It makes you feel uncomfortable, like this is not your country," she added. "This is our country."

Read the documents online:

Newark, N.J.: <http://apne.ws/wBk7Hg>

Nassau County: <http://apne.ws/xhHxNx>

Suffolk County: <http://apne.ws/zmCvMU>