

PORTLAND, OREGON

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Mike Lindberg, Commissioner 1220 S.W. Fifth Ave. Portland, OR 97204 (503) 248-4145

May 1, 1989

Mr. Michael D. Schrunk District Attorney for Multnomah County 600 County Courthouse Portland, Oregon 97204

Dear Michael,

Thank you for your letter of April 7, 1989. I wholeheartedly support the Gang Prosecution Project. I urge you to keep the media informed of your success.

I also suggest that you or a representative visit community organizations and churches in gang afflicted areas. That kind of outreach from the criminal justice system can provide needed hope for neighborhoods beset by gang activity.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

MIKE LINDBERG Commissioner

Office of Public Affairs

MDL: aab

D009

mx_ aa_



MICHAEL D. SCHRUNK, District Attorney for Multnomah County

600 County Courthouse • Portland, Oregon 97204 • (503) 248-3162

AUG 28

August 28, 1989

Commissioner Mike Lindberg City of Portland 1220 S.W. Fifth Avenue Portland, OR 97204

Dear Commissioner Lindberg:

The Gang Prosecution Project has completed its first full year of operation. Enclosed for your information is a report covering that time period. I very much appreciate your help with the project. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL D. SCHRUNK District Attorney

MDS:cab



MICHAEL D. SCHRUNK, District Attorney for Multnomah County

600 County Courthouse • Portland, Oregon 97204 • (503) 248-3162

GANG PROSECUTION: YEAR ONE

The Gang Prosecution Project has completed its first full year of The project clearly demonstrates the kind of results that operation. can be achieved when several organizations collaborate on a problem. The accomplishments have been greater than any single organization could have achieved individually. All the participants in and supporters of the Gang Prosecution Project deserve recognition and commendation for their continuing effort and help in both the development and the implementation of successful anti-gang strategies.

While it is clear that law enforcement cannot solve the problem alone, it does have an important role. Aggressive law enforcement is an essential component to any long-term solution to the gang problem. It has a highly visible role in the community and is seen as "holding the line," ensuring that criminal gang elements do not acquire a strong foothold in the major metropolitan area in the state.

Background

The collaborative nature of the Gang Prosecution Project was clear from its beginning in July of 1988 when a Multnomah County Deputy District Attorney was assigned to the project. A month later, an Assistant Attorney General joined the prosecution team and both attorneys were cross-designated to prosecute cases in the Federal court system. The clerical support for the first year was provided by a grant from the Carl J. and Alma Johnson Fund of The Oregon Community Foundation and private donations from two Portland area law firms, Tonkon, Torp; and Stoel, Rives, Boley.

The Gang Prosecution Project is housed in space provided by the United States Attorney and has its office equipment from the Oregon State Police. A third attorney joined the project in February of 1989 as a result of a grant from the State Criminal Justice Coordinator's Office. In July, 1989, a fourth Deputy District Attorney and a clerical assistant funded by Multnomah County joined the project.

Throughout the year, the Gang Prosecution Project staff have worked closely with the State Gang Strike Force, Portland Police Bureau Gang Enforcement Team, and Portland Police Bureau Drug and Vice Division. This consolidation of investigation and prosecution resources has brought consistency and accountability in the investigation and prosecution of criminal gang activity in this community.

Statistical Highlights

A summary of the number of gang cases pending and those brought to conclusion in both the state and federal courts systems is attached. It covers a 13-month period from July of 1988 through July of 1989. One of the key advantages to the Gang Prosecution Project has been the ability to try cases in the federal court system.

There are a total of 47 defendants who have been indicted in the federal court system. Twenty-seven of those have been disposed of and 20 are pending disposition. Of the 47 federal indictments, 18 or 38% are defendants from California gangs. Of the 18, eight have been sentenced in the federal system for lengths of incarceration ranging from 14 months to 234 months, one was placed on 3 years probation, one has been dismissed, and eight are pending trial or sentencing.

Special attention has been given to conveying to the community the severity of the federal sentences. The message is: Criminal gang activity is taken seriously in this community, and there are strong sanctions for those who engage in such activity. While too early to draw definite conclusions, it appears that there has been a leveling off, not only of the dramatic and steep upward crime of criminal activity, but also of known California gang members arriving in Portland to establish drug-distribution operations.

Violent Crime

One of the chief community concerns about criminal gang activity has been due to the violent nature of the crimes. Several gang related homicides have occurred as well as other serious crimes. Investigation and prosecution of these cases has been swift. Some examples are:

<u>State v. Walker</u> - The defendant came to Portland from California and with Thomas Dickerson killed a 16 year-old woman. The motive was to protect the drug distribution operation that had been set up by gang members. He pled guilty to Aggravated Murder and was sentenced to life with a 30-year minimum.

State v. Dickerson - This defendant, also from California, along with Al Walker, killed a 16 year-old woman to protect the drug distribution operation. He was convicted of Felony Murder and Kidnap I. He was sentenced to life with a 20-year minimum and given another 30 years because he was found to be a dangerous offender. He was also serving a 12 year-minimum on a a charge of Assault I with a Firearm.

State v. Randolph - Defendant was convicted of Murder with a firearm for a killing over the operation of a gang crack house. He was sentenced to life with a 20-year minimum.

State v. Williams - This defendant was found guilty of Murder and sentenced to life with a minimum of 10 years.

There were six defendants charged with Murder in the death of Joseph Ray Winston, the first gang homicide in Portland in August of 1988. Of the six, five of the defendants have either been found guilty of Manslaughter I or pled guilty to that charge. The sixth defendant was found guilty of Criminal Conspiracy to Commit Murder. Five of these defendants were sentenced to 20 years, and a sixth defendant was sentenced to 10 years.

Criminal gang activity is not limited to Crips and Bloods. The Southeast Asian community has been subjected to extortion by Asian gangs. The Portland Police Bureau and the Gang Prosecution Project have made special efforts to ensure the cooperation of witnesses in cases. Two cases involving the same defendant have been prominent in the Southeast Asian community. These are:

State v. Nghia Dam - There were 12 counts of Robbery I With a Firearm against this defendant as a result of a robbery in a dental office. Defendant was convicted on all 12 counts. Another case involved three counts of robbery in a restaurant. The alleged motivation stemmed from the restaurant owner's failing to pay extortion demanded by the defendant. Dam was sentenced to 30 years with a 10-year minimum on the one offense and to a 5-year minimum on the second offense, both sentences running concurrently.

Another gang element in the community that has aroused fear is the "Skinheads." Mr. Mulugeta Seraw, a black Ethiopian was killed. Indicted in his death are three individuals. The status of those cases are as follows:

State v. Mieske - Mieske, along with two other alleged "Skinheads," beat Mr. Seraw to death. He pled guilty to Murder along with two counts of Intimidation in the First Degree and has been sentenced to life with a 20-year minimum.

State v. Brewster and State v. Strasser - These two defendants are also charged with Mr. Seraw's murder. Both are set for trial in September and October, 1989.

<u>State v. Woodard</u> - Another recent shooting involved a high school athlete on a playground. Woodard, who is from California, was indicted on Assault I and Attempt Murder charges in that incident.

Federal Cases: The following three cases are examples of recent findings in federal court.

<u>United States v. Adrian Demry</u> - Demry is an LA Blood who was charged with Possession with Intent to Distribute and Using a Firearm During a Drug Trafficking offense. He received a 15 year minimum sentence.

United States v. David Van Ginkle - Van Ginkle is also an LA Blood who was chrged with Possession with Intent to Distribute. He received a sentence of 6-1/2 years.

<u>United States v. Franklin Harris</u> - Harris is a local Bloods gang member who was charged with Possession of a Sawed-Off Shotgun and sentenced to 14 months.

Summary

The concentrated effort on investigating and prosecuting gang criminal activity must continue. This requires the on-going cooperation of all the involved law enforcement agencies. support from the Governor's Office, the Attorney General's Office, the Oregon State Police, the Portland Police Bureau, The Oregon Community Foundation, and private law firms makes the Prosecution Project possible. It should be recognized that the prosecutions described in this report would not have been possible without the cooperation, support, and resources of the involved organizations.

There is some light at the end of the tunnel with what appears to be a start of a leveling in criminal gang activity and a clear disruption of the California connections. Every effort must be made to continue in that direction. We must also remain realistic about working toward long-term solutions and recognize that those solutions cannot be provided by law enforcement alone. The accomplishments to date are due to the full support and participation of every agency involved in this project. Continuation of the Gang Prosecution Project requires that that participation be maintained. The Gang Prosecution Project is a vital component of a comprehensive effort to eradicate criminal gang activity from this state.

GANG PROSECUTION PROJECT

July, 1988, to August, 1989

	Pending	Disposed	Total
Federal	20	27	47
State Prosecutions Felonies			•
Gang Unit	119	80	199
District Attorney	75	127	202
Misdemeanors	119	61	180

In addition, during this time period, there have been 246 gang cases involving juveniles.





CITY OF

PORTLAND, OREGON

BUREAU OF POLICE

J.E. BUD CLARK, MAYOR Richard D. Walker, Chief of Police 1111 S.W. 2nd Avenue Portland, OR 97204

MEMORANDUM

December 7, 1989

DEC 8 1989

TO: Commissioner Mike Lindberg

RE: Automated Fingerprint Identification System

The City of Portland Police Bureau's Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) is now on-line and fully operational, thanks to the unanimous support and funding by the Portland City Council.

Previous methods of identification of criminal suspects through latent fingerprints found at crime scenes involved time consuming and tedious one-to-one visual comparisons by the Criminalists. This method of manual and visual fingerprint search could entail hundreds of hours of labor over a single latent fingerprint, and many times the effort was met with a frustrating lack of success. With over 200,000 fingerprint cards in our files, the rate of identifications, although much higher than the national average, could not reach the level which we desired.

The formation of the eight-state Western Identification Network, Inc. gave us the opportunity to join with the Oregon State Police Criminal Identification Bureau to enter our finger-print card files along with those of all the other participating states into a combined computerized data base. This affords us the capability of accessing approximately 13,000,000 individual fingerprints for comparison with suspect latent fingerprints and for verification of the identification of persons being processed through the Booking Facility in the Multnomah County Detention Center.

The new AFIS requires an average of one hour of preparatory work before entry of a suspect's latent print into the system,

and the system responds with a candidate list including a probability scoring, usually within minutes. The Criminalist then can verify or eliminate the candidates as suspects by visual comparison between the latent print and the candidate's original fingerprint card.

In 1988, a total of 247 crimes were solved by latent finger-print identification using the old system which has been the standard for over fifty years. In Portland, using AFIS between November 16 and December 5, 1989, forty-one suspects' latent fingerprints have been identified, with subsequent comparisons leading to identification of some of those suspects' further involvement in thirty-four additional crimes, for a total of 75 potential case clearances.

I want to express my appreciation for your support in making this giant stride forward. By furnishing us with this state-of-the-art technology, you have given the Police Bureau a tool that will greatly enhance our ability to identify and apprehend criminal suspects. If the experiences of other agencies who have obtained AFIS is any predictor, this system will also contribute to a reduction in crime in our community.

Thank you for your assistance and support in our endeavors.

RICHARD D. WALKER Chief of Police

Richard D. Walker

RDW/RAH/vah



Earl Blumenauer, Commissioner 1220 S.W. 5th Avenue, Room 407 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 248-5577

MEMORANDUM

Date:

5 January 1989

JAN 5 **19**9

To:

Art Alexander

Dave Cook
David Hedges
Dave White

From:

Ted Leybold

Re:

Vehicle Forfeiture Citizens Oversight Committee

Now that the City has begun seizing vehicles under the new ordinance, it is time to convene a citizens oversight committee to begin evaluating the program. As you know, each office is responsible to appoint two citizens to the committee. The committee will meet as often as is necessary over the next six months to evaluate and report to City Council on the vehicle forfeiture program.

The committee will be staffed jointly by myself and the vehicle forfeiture office in the Police Bureau.

Commissioner Blumenauer has named Nancy Wolfe, former director of Multnomah County MADD and Krista Fischer, insurance agent and Chair of the Multnomah County DUII Advisory Board to the committee. I am enclosing a list of other individuals who have contacted our office interested in serving on the committee. Please feel free to contact any of these people directly if you are interested in nominating them.

It would be desirable to have the committee named by Wednesday, January 17, so that a meeting could be held by the first week of February.

Thank you for your help. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 243-7994.

c: Paul Elsner
Sgt. Jeannie Bradley
Lt. Bruce Prunk
Dennis Nelson/John Hamilton
Al Elkins

When for your carried period fere's a speech I wrote for your in March of 1988. I can reprovibe you are gave this opposed.

THOUGHTS ON PUBLIC SAFETY

To be frank, there is good reason for all of us to be nervous about the status of public safety in the City of Portland. While I, as a city official, must accept part of the blame, it may be the case that city government took a wrong turn several years ago.

What we have now is a situation where the city has become almost totally uninvolved in the causes and the punishment for crime. All we do is chase people, arrest people, and attempt to educate people on how to avoid victimization. We have turned everything else over to the county, and I don't know if we ever asked you, the citizens, if that's the way you want it.

Think about it. There is not a single city bureau which has a direct impact on the factors which might take someone likely to turn to crime. The closest we come is the Park Bureau which attempts to offer youth some alternatives to the streets. On the other end, once we've arrested someone, we have little or no participation in the disposition of the convicted or of the victims.

In light of the situation, it is obviously difficult to come to grips with the problems of crime. From where you sit we seem to be responsible for the whole thing, yet we know we only have the middle third.

Three years ago a lot of time and energy went into an in-depth analysis of the criminal justice "system." Frankly, I don't think any of you could

tell me what came out of that study. As a public official I am embarrassed to state that the multiple agencies involved in the study have failed to put together a coherent strategy of cooperation and present it to you. I am committed to working with the Mayor to revive that effort and to keep a spotlight on the process.

From parents to teachers, from juvenile caseworker to the Board of Parole, it will take heat from you to fuse a strategy which will allow for some greater measure of certainty in combating crime and short circuiting juvenile inclinations toward criminality.

Unless I miss my guess, most Portlanders on a gut level want a situation where the professional ciminal is totally intimidated by the police/crime prevention methods and the novice crook is effectively steered away from continuing in crime. The average citizen believes that the current level of taxes should cover the costs and that citizens shouldn't have to put a lot of personal energy into fighting criminals.

That may be a valid desire. In fact, if we were starting from a situation of no crime, I think we could hold the line with existing resources. But, the reality is that a number of things have gotten out of hand, the city is bigger and the dollars available to provide a wide range of services are fewer than they were some seven or eight years ago.

Citizens will have to become more involved because in the long run it creates a stronger community, it saves money and it works.

Our first line of defense against crime is parents, schools, religious institutions, community based organizations, the Park Bureau and anyone else who can have a direct impact on our children. Many of the young hoodlums and prostitutes are not imports, they are our children.

I propose that the city begin by targeting small blighted sections of high crime, low income and high unemployment areas all over the city (perhaps with an elementary school at the core). By this I mean take three to four square blocks and proceed to account for all of the youth in that section, (one each in North, Northeast, Southeast). Make a commitment that all the kids in that section receive a decent diet, extra schooling when needed, supervised activities which allow for little aimless street roaming (get them all signed up for something).

For those who own their own homes in such sections: maximum assistance in energy conservation, youth volunteers to help maintain yards and make repairs, a thorough locks program including barred windows if necessary, private sector help with painting (and other materials). (Elimination rather than expansion of our locks program was another recent City Council mistake. One thousand new locks cost less than one new police officer.)

What we want is to get every adult committed to being part of an anticrime, pro-neighborhood mentality. Certainly there will be those who don't
want to participate. That is all right. We just have to be certain that
those who do participate are intolerant of criminal activity and are
willing to call everything in to the police. Folks will have to be

prepared to report strange license plates and for awhile maybe even accept criminals being out on bail.

The trick is to make it uncomfortable for someone to do business. If drug house customers know that their license plate numbers will be turned in, that perhaps their vehicle might be towed in a police sweep, that the police may have reason to consider their vehicle part of suspicious activity...well it might make business bad for the crack house operator.

Meanwhile the city and the courts must make it easier to evict demonstrably dangerous tenants. We have to channel all the muscle we have into the Specified Crime Ordinance.

Additionally, we must stretch the civil rights envelope when it comes to repeat offenders and parolees. Frankly, I believe surveillance of known burglars is effective. I believe that neighborhoods have a right to know when career criminals and parolees are in the vicinity.

At the same time, we must scrap for dollars to provide assistance to victims and provide rehab (including drug and alcohol) programs for those who want to reform themselves. Personally, I feel that a neighborhood could be surprisingly supportive of ex-felons who visibly reform themselves and contribute to the community they once harmed.

But returning to our "targeted" area, and another significant ounce of prevention can be focused on the idle adult population.

Unemployment. In these targeted areas we have to go door to door and find out who is unemployed and able to work. We must then put every effort into getting basic skills training for anyone who needs it. I anticipate a need for counseling and drug rehab. (Let's be real. Adults who have become fond of watching television through the haze of a crack pipe or cheap wine are not going to be easily motivated to do much of anything.)

If jobs are not readily available we must attempt to channel the unemployed into vounteer neighborhood improvement activity coordinated by contracted churches or other community based organizations.

As to irresponsible, uncooperative absentee landlords, I am in favor of the city taking the most hostile stance allowable by law. I support legally seizing neglected housing stock and making it available to aspiring home owners. I invite all socially conscious attorneys and planners to work with City Hall to contruct a workabele strategy. If suburban communities can legislate minimum standards of upkeep we should be able to do the same.

I would be delighted to work with the Commissioner in charge of Buildings to develop a swift • no-nonsense approach to property owners who maintain nuisances. I think we need to spend a little less time on people who build illegal garages or home extensions and a little more time on slumlords.

The overall idea is to wage war on crime breeding situations and slum induced mentalities a bit at a time, to build on that three to four block section by adding another block every six to nine months.

There are three things I'd ask of the Police Bureau:

- Design patrol car patterns to have a slightly higher visibility in and mostly around the target area. (This may be unnecessary if there has been effective home security work. Criminals aren't interested in tackling fortified homes.)
- Use specified reserve officers (so that they get to know the neighbors and vice versa) to do random foot patrols in and mostly around the target area.
- Try the establishment of experimental storefront mini-stations. One on Union and one wherever appropriate in Southeast.

The feasibility of this idea depends on a few factors yet to be explored including: can current police time be better used, can we get donated labor and material from area businesses for the mini-stations, can community members overcome years of hostility toward "invader" style policing and develop some information sharing trust with the regularly seen officers? Are officers willing to become part of a neighborhood?

A note about business districts. I am certainly willing to look at some small tax breaks for business districts which invest in private security. I cannot accept a situation wherein persistent criminals endanger the stability of business districts, as Hawthorne or Lombard.

And, to borrow a cliche, it is unacceptable to me that we have three to four major colleges, thousands of highly trained urban development oriented professionals and we still don't have an intelligent plan for revitalizing Union Avenue and Alberta Street. I wish we even had a workable neighborhood plan for which we had to find money. As it stands, even if we had the money we wouldn't know what to do. I'm waiting to hear why PDC's efforts in NE have been such a colossal flop.

I will not dodge the obvious. The money for all of this has got to come from somewhere. I, for one, am willing to risk our reserves or consider a special city/county crime prevention levy (some of the money for additional officers but most of it for early intervention, home security, staffing for neighborhood self-improvement projects, monitoring of ex-convicts and parolees) for a couple more years in order to begin rolling back crime. If we can start the rollback, we may be able to contain costs.

At the same time we must have our hands hammering on legislative and executive doors in Salem for funding to get at the causes of crime (or at least for monitoring of the criminals released into the community).

We must particularly make our voices heard in Washington D.C., especially when we get a crack at any of the candidates for president. Tell me who presents more of a danger to you, a career burglar/rapist who should be in prison or the Soviet military establishment?

I'm going to digress just a bit here. The sad truth is that most of us have been played for royal saps. Every time the defense industry wants more money they scream "commie, commie, commie" and sadly many of us run right up to the barn door to get fleeced or slaughtered. We have a federal government which took back all of the revenue sharing and caused the revenue crisis in cities across the country. The Republicans took the money and poured it into defense companies owned by their friends to build weapons which don't work or, at best, delay nuclear annihilation for a couple hours.

They wanted to fund the Contras but won't give cities money to fight crime, build prisons, or engage in preventive programs. Is that really what you want? They build tanks that don't work and jets that crash rather than create jobs which could take people off of welfare. Is that really what you want? Think about it. A lot of people howled about boondoggle CETA jobs. Which is worse to you, an employed, tax paying citizen or a fat defense company turning out defective material and not paying taxes?

Think about it, really think about it. It is well documented that the vast majority of criminals come from abusive homes, that the vast majority of criminals have been alcohol/drug abusers since childhood, that the vast majority of criminals absorbed little education and are generally unemployable, that the vast majority of burglaries are committed by career criminals.

Page Nine

Instead of putting more money into childcare, education, creating jobs, drug rehab., counseling, and law enforcement, we, the prize saps, let them spend it on Star Wars. Think about it...we sit here worried about the burglars coming through our back doors and the federal government would rather spend your money on incoming Russian missiles. I feel so much safer knowing that only 100 MIRV's rather than 600 will rain in on us in case of a nuclear war.

It that what you really want? Not me. I want some of that money back and I think it's time to tell our congressman so.

My points are these:

- We have been jerked around by the Feds. and we need to kick 'em in the shins. Spend our taxes on babies, not bombs.
- As a city we have abandoned responsibility for attacking the causes of crime and we must take a high profile role in working with the county and the state to get at those causes.
- If your pipes are leaking you don't just mop or you'll mop forever. You've got to plug the leak first. We must spend more on crime prevention including more on early intervention with at-risk youth and home security. (Case workers and locks are still cheaper than cops or prisions.)

Page Ten

- We must closely monitor the courts
- We must approach the problem by demonstrating success in a few specific areas.
- We must help find the funds for technically assisted, community based organizations to begin healing crime ridden neighborhoods four or five blocks at a time.