

**From:** [Lane, Rob](#)  
**To:** [Commission-Public-Records](#)  
**Subject:** Written Comments - Community Forum to Discuss a Port Policing Assessment  
**Date:** Monday, June 29, 2020 10:55:14 AM

---

Port of Seattle Commissioners,

Thank you for reaching out to the Port staff for comments on the Port policing assessment motion. I am proud to work for an organization that seeks to be a model of diversity, inclusion and equity.

There are many sub-topics on which passionate and experienced employees will wish to share their thoughts and expertise. I have thoughts on many of these topics, but I will focus my brief comments on an area that I know fairly well. [The Port Policing Assessment must look at de-militarizing the Port of Seattle Police Department](#) to the extent possible and providing a model to other police forces regarding the equipment and tactics that that will be used in the course of their work.

I feel like I could speak for hours on this subject, but in an effort to keep my comments concise I will focus on two critical areas of insight.

1. Mindset of individual officers: When individual officers are provided military grade equipment and military style “tactics, techniques and procedures” training they are put in the mindset of combat against an enemy. I am an Army veteran and I have been deployed to combat operations and peace keeping operations. These situations were different because we had different “Rule of Engagement”. But these situations were similar because in both environments I was in a military force that was deployed to fight an enemy that could be anywhere and everywhere. Our police force must never be put in the mindset that are seeking out an enemy. Additionally, military operations have one set of rules of engagement, but we are asking police who switch back and fourth from assisting the public to conducting military style operations. We are asking them to change their mindset at a moment’s notice. Providing military grade equipment and training sets a dangerous and confusing mindset.
2. Mindset of the organization: The military grade equipment and training that police forces possess put the wrong tools in our officers hands. If those are the tools they have, then those are the tools they are going to use. The organizational action plans are built on a mindset that military style operations are standard operations rather than techniques that should be used in extreme circumstances by individuals who have specialized training. It is critical that these action plans show that the use of military grade equipment and training can not be used as part of a normal day’s work.

The Port of Seattle Police Department has the responsibility to keep the public safe. They are required to be prepared for some situations that, while rare, do require a tactical response, such as: responding to terrorist threats until relieved by federal partners or responding to an active shooter event. The Port should have plans in place to address these threats, however, the organization has an opportunity to move forward in a way that takes the wrong tools out of their hands and gives them the right tools and training for their work to keep the public safe. As a model of diversity, inclusion and equity, we must model a Police force where military grade equipment is not easily accessible and military style “tactics, techniques and procedures” are not standard practice. Analysis

of this subject must be part of the Port Policing Assessment.

Respectfully,  
Rob Lane  
Aviation Maintenance

**DATE:** June 30, 2020

**TO:** Peter Steinbrueck, Commission President  
Steve Metruck, Executive Director  
Michael Villa, Acting Chief of Police

**FROM:** Jessica Sanford, Aviation Operations

**SUBJECT:** Public Comment on Motion 2020-15

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important motion.

My name is Jessica Sanford and I currently work in Aviation Operations. Before moving back home to the Seattle area, I worked for the City of Charleston Police Department in South Carolina for 7 years. I managed the criminal intelligence and crime analysis units, as well as oversaw technology for the department. This included our dispatch software, records management system, body cameras, in-car cameras, and the city's public safety camera system. The topic of police reform is near and dear to my heart as Charleston's department went through this same process following Michael Brown's death in Ferguson, MO, in 2014. When the DOJ report was released in March of 2015, it outlined over 50 recommended changes to police practices within the Ferguson Police Department. The City of Charleston proactively took this report and did a full evaluation of its own policing practices. As manager of the technology systems, I oversaw the training of new reporting standards to over 400 officers. I had a front row seat to how this process affected everyone from Chief down to the patrol officers.

I want to thank the Commission, Blacks in Government, Port Police, and everyone else who has contributed to the effort thus far. There has clearly been a lot of thought and consideration put forth and I am proud the Port is proactively looking inward to better our organization.

Leadership is key. True leadership. You will not be able to change a department's culture with policy alone, and you will not change it quickly. The vision and the expectation of excellence and professionalism needs to come top-down from command staff in a consistent, clear message. Officers may not be receptive to these new expectations; let's be honest, no one really likes change. This is why consistency and clear expectations over time are critical. Many officers in Charleston did not agree with the changes; they resented our Chief and quite a few quit. But over two to three years of consistent training, support, and accountability there was a clear difference in the culture and the officers were proud of their department and their profession.

Regarding the ban on dangerous restrain techniques and use of force. South Carolina does not teach these techniques in their state academy, and I didn't feel officers in Charleston were ever at a disadvantage for not knowing them. However, I would like to impress upon the future task force the importance of giving officers other intermediary tools and options, as you take some away. Officers can go through hours of de-escalation training, and at the end of the day there will still be situations where subjects resist arrest. You are setting officers up for failure if their only options are a baton or a gun. Give them intermediary options, require additional training, and set high expectations for when they are used.

Regarding budget reallocation. I will caution that increased expectations of our police department will likely lead to increased budgetary needs. Body cameras themselves are not expensive, but the storage and redaction capability are costly over time. If the existing records system is not set up to capture data points required for metric tracking, the vendor is unlikely to add the capability out of the goodness of their hearts. New or increased frequency of training also comes at a cost. It needs to be acknowledged that to have a police department with higher standards and better community outreach will likely require more money, not less.

I strongly suggest adding language that addresses the need for data collection, analysis, and transparency. I've heard many people say we have a great police force. What does our data show? Where are we starting from? What are we looking to change? The existing data may be full of holes and wildly misleading. That's ok. These hard questions haven't been asked before, so having missing or incomplete records is to be expected. We can commit to do better going forward. For instance, we should be looking at the demographics of non-criminal encounters. Do they differ between airport and seaport? Are certain officers more likely to show bias than others when all other factors are equal. What does the use of force data currently show, and how do we want it to change? I would hate to have so many people put this much effort and time into reforming a system only to make it 2 or 3 years down the road and not be able to quantify the progress.

Finally, transparency both in the reform process and findings over time is a huge olive branch to the community. If we are proud of our police force and the changes we are making, the information needs to be readily available. Use of force summary statistics and demographic reports may not be something we're proud of at the beginning, but we need to own our story and the journey.

I appreciate the Commission's time and look forward to the work ahead of us. Thank you.

Jessica Sanford

**From:** [Davich, Kati](#)  
**To:** [Commission-Public-Records](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Written comment for Jun. 30 meeting - edit  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 30, 2020 7:35:30 AM

---

Hi there!

Might I update my statement? I added one statement to the earlier draft I sent in.

Thank you!

Kati Davich  
Emergency Preparedness Planning & Program Mgr  
Aviation Security (Port-wide support)  
P.O. Box 68727 | Seattle, WA 98168  
P: 206-787-6099  
C: 206-475-1313  
E: [davich.k@portseattle.org](mailto:davich.k@portseattle.org)



---

**From:** Davich, Kati  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 4:13 PM  
**To:** Commission-Public-Records <[commission-public-records@portseattle.org](mailto:commission-public-records@portseattle.org)>  
**Subject:** Written comment for Jun. 30 meeting

Greetings!

I would like to submit the written comment below for inclusion in the June 30 Commission meeting.

Thank you!

---

My name is Kati Davich. I am the Emergency Preparedness Planning & Program Manager for the Port of Seattle. I've been in this role for a little over two years and I've been with the Port for a little over seven years. I'm also originally from the Minneapolis area, living there nearly 30 years prior to moving to Seattle. As I am submitting these comments via email: my perspective is that of a white woman.

One of the topics being discussed within the Port policing conversation is changing the culture of policing from being a warrior to being a guardian, and I wanted to add some life observations in support of changing the culture and of temperament/intent assessments to prevent aggressive and ill-meaning people from getting into the field in the first place. My observations are from my time in Minneapolis – not from Washington, Seattle, or the Port – and aren't a generalization of all police officers.

I grew-up being taught the police were here to help. When I was in my late-teens and early 20s, I started noticing some of the most aggressive/hot-headed people with the biggest problems with

authority I knew were going into policing and becoming prison guards. I couldn't understand why these people wanted to go into policing when my understanding was officers were there to help people; I couldn't imagine going to someone like that if I was in trouble. If you're not going into policing to help people, what is your intent?

If a candidate answers the question "why do you want to be a police officer" with anything other than "to help people," there is a problem with their intent. If the candidate is aggressive, hot-headed, or has an issue with authority, there is a problem with their temperament. Either of these problems will create volatile situations down the line, adding to the risk Indigenous and People of Color (IPOC) live with every day.

When I watched George Floyd being murdered and the subsequent reactions by police officers to the peaceful protests, I couldn't help but think about the aggressive people I knew and wondered if they ever wrongfully hurt or killed anyone or were in the lines of officers that fired non-lethals into crowds of families peacefully protesting. Other police actions I have seen over time – toward IPOC in everyday situations and toward protestors – further damaged my view of "police as helpers," so much so I experienced a personal crisis over not being able to reconcile parts of my job (which I had considered my dream job) with my support of BLM. After seeking help from some wonderful Port staff on the subject, I am focusing on trying to create change in my spheres of influence and am lending my voice to these larger conversations about institutional racism, hoping our leaders will drive the change desperately needed in police departments and elsewhere.

I would also like to acknowledge my experiences pale in comparison to the trauma IPOC live every day. I share my experiences here in support of IPOC everywhere and the truth they speak, Blacks in Government's recommendations on policing – the Focus Group will be recommending language about the temperament assessments I alluded to in my comments, and any efforts the Port puts forward to address systemic racism. I am here to change and to hold-up IPOC with my support, comfort, and acknowledgement of their authority in making demands for change. I participated in the Working Sessions and I support the endeavors of the Focus Group and their draft motion.

Thank you.

Kati Davich  
Emergency Preparedness Planning & Program Mgr  
Aviation Security (Port-wide support)  
P.O. Box 68727 | Seattle, WA 98168  
P: 206-787-6099  
C: 206-475-1313  
E: [davich.k@portseattle.org](mailto:davich.k@portseattle.org)



**From:** [Franklin, Alicia](#)  
**To:** [Commission-Public-Records](#)  
**Subject:** Community Forum on Port Policing: Written Comment Request  
**Date:** Friday, June 26, 2020 12:03:59 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for creating this space for a community forum on Port policing.

As I watch and learn about numerous gut-wrenching police brutality incidents, often times the officer (s) have a history of targeting minorities unjustly. Officers quit, then move on to a different police department like nothing ever happened. I do agree that other officers should speak up when they witness other police officers treating citizens unfairly; however, that is rare and when officers do speak out against brutality, they are often terminated, blacklisted.

Is there a national database that holds all police office records and complaints? If not, that is truly unfortunate as this information should be available. Ideally, there should be one place to resource police officers records and complaints nationwide. Just as regular citizens have back ground checks, police officers should have an even more rigorous back ground check, including complaints and grievances held against them for review by potential employers.

How will the Port ensure they are hiring or have hired individuals who consistently demonstrate compassion, understanding and patience to resolve issues within black and brown communities?

Respectfully,

*Alicia M. Franklin*

Senior Administrative Assistant  
Aviation, Business and Properties  
[franklin.a@portseattle.org](mailto:franklin.a@portseattle.org) | [www.flySEA.org](http://www.flySEA.org)  
Desk: (206) 787-4984



Operated by the [Port of Seattle](#)

*E-mail to or from this account is public and may be subject to disclosure*

**From:** [JC Harris](#)  
**To:** [Commission-Public-Records](#); [Steinbrueck, Peter](#); [Cho, Sam](#); [Felleman, Fred](#); [Bowman, Stephanie](#); [Calkins, Ryan](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Comment For 30 June Special Meeting  
**Date:** Monday, June 29, 2020 3:28:58 PM  
**Attachments:** [Public Safety Public Comments-POS.doc](#)

---

WARNING: This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and expect the content of this email to be safe.

Commissioners,

WRT your special meeting on policing.

I applaud your efforts at self-reflection. I hope it becomes a model for action, but also for other communities to confront this issue head-on.

Attached find my public comment which outlines a very painful and personal experience in -my- family and a series of reforms that I would like to see.

Most of the ideas I present will seem relatively 'minor' in comparison to all the recent discussions of wholesale reform. My family has given this a -lot- of thought over the years and these notions are what would make the greatest day to day difference for us. In one sentence: The black members of my family don't worry every day about being killed by a police officer, but they do worry about being -stopped-. They resent feeling like they have to be 'extra careful'. That extra bit of day to day tension is at the heart of the problem. And it's no way to live.

Sincerely,

---JC

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.  
<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>



FROM: JC Harris  
PO Box 13094  
Des Moines, WA 98198  
(206) 878-0578

TO: Commissioners Of The Port Of Seattle: Peter Steinbreuck, Fred Felleman,  
Stephanie Bowman, Ryan Calkins, Sam Cho

June 29, 2020

Commissioners,

I am writing to you in this context as a private citizen. I applaud the Port's efforts at self-reflection on matters of policing and specifically identifying and ending racism in policing. In light of recent events, I have heard many platitudes from various governments (including my own) and I am hoping to see these fine words translated into productive steps forward.

If my tone seem a bit cynical, perhaps this background information will be helpful. I am in a decidedly 'mixed' family. And the black people in my family have had experiences which are unfortunately common enough (and recent enough) that I believe they warrant investigation in today's Port Of Seattle. As one specific example, my decidedly black son and his cousin were stopped by a member of the Port PD in 2002 for a supposedly illegal right turn on red within the City Of Des Moines. They were not only stopped, but handcuffed. And then their car was towed, forcing them to walk back home to Burien—about six miles. (When they asked to get back into their now locked car to retrieve their cell phone to make an emergency call, their request was denied.) When they demanded to know why they were being treated so roughly, the officer explained that their car tabs had expired and this was standard procedure in such cases. (Their car tabs *were* expired. By one. single. day.)

Almost all the conversations I have heard thus far focus on preventing the most extreme cases, such as the deaths of George Floyd and Ahmaud Arbery. Of course, I welcome any solutions that might be put found to prevent such tragedies. **However, I believe that the vast majority of problems are actually 'minor' incidents where the police stop individuals and treat them differently based on their race.** These are the incidents we do not hear about. But in some ways they matter *more* than the headline events, because these incidents scar people and create an ongoing climate of tension, intimidation and fear. I think all of us are getting a sense of what that might feel like now with COVID-19. The risk of infection is low, but it's always in the back of your mind. And that constant sense of concern *wears* on people.

I'm also convinced that if we had better data on these more 'minor' types of incidents, we might prevent more serious problems by identifying the officers who show day to day biases.

What I am dancing around, and what everyone else tends to dance around so carefully is this: we cannot truthfully say that the problem of police racism is 'somewhere else' or 'back in the day'. It must be, to some extent *here* and *now*. Because we are small communities here in South King

County, we are reluctant to think that anyone working *here* might behave in this way. And the moment that possibility is mentioned a wall of defensiveness or resentment tends to come up. But to think that the Port's PD might be somehow 'special' or 'immune' is to ignore how baked in racism is into the culture of policing as well as in the broader culture. And we should be able to discuss it without pearl clutching.

**I believe that processes need to be put into place in every police department to not only prevent the types of situations I just mentioned, but just as importantly, to reassure the public that we take the issues seriously on a day to day basis.** To build real trust, it is not enough to say that we will not choke someone to death or shoot them in the back. That is far too low a bar. We must also take steps to *show* the public that when we stop someone for any reason, they will be treated fairly and with courtesy during *any* type of interaction.

To address this I would ask you to consider the following changes to police management:

1. The Port's web site should be updated with a prominently displayed Comment Form that *encourages* the public to provide feedback on their interactions with the police. Respondents should be followed up with by someone *not* connected with the police department. We need to tell the public that was *want* to hear from them and that we care about their comments. I'm sure there will be a certain amount of skepticism that this might help much. But policing seems to me to be, to a very large degree, a customer service job. Most interactions are not about force, they are transactional. And most people who feel mistreated in some way, think that the poor treatment they received must be condoned by management. Most people of colour are *extremely* reluctant to complain--unless the mistreatment rises to an outrageous level. We need to convey to the public (and particularly people of colour) that *any* mistreatment is *not* OK.
2. Every person who interacts with the police should be given a business card with that web address *and* a phone number to call to give voice feedback. This should **not** just be additional fine print on the back of a citation, but rather an attractive business card used only for that purpose. Again, we should reinforce that we are in the customer service business. We want officers to do that well and we want everyone who they meet to know that there is someone in management who *wants* to know how they are conducting themselves.
3. Any significant complaint should be immediately reported to the Commissioners or another independent body *outside* of the corporation. This is simply to allow the Commissioners to have a sense of the frequency and type of complaints coming in.
4. Summary Reporting (not detailed) of complaints should be made available to the Commissioners on a regular basis. Commissioners should be able to have an idea of the frequency and type of complaints that are being recorded. They should also get totals for each member of the force. And these totals should also include any complaints the employee may have received while working for *another* police department. (Eg. if an officer worked for another PD before coming to the Port, the Commission should be apprised that their 'complaint total' of '3' includes 2 complaints from their previous employment and 1 from working at the Port Of Seattle.

5. Racial coding of police stops--only for the purposes of complaint tracking. I have read that the efficacy of this sort of tracking is controversial. However I am only interested in the *complaints* not the stops themselves. We should be able to get a list of complaints that is broken down by race as well as type of incident. Again: this is not to track the incidents; only the ones where a *complaint* was logged.

6. Reports of stops should be transmitted to all State and Federal Agencies *and* to the [Stanford Open Policing Project](#), which contains the most thorough database of information on police stops. All police departments should be part of consistent national reporting so we can track improvement.

Part of this process is to insure fair treatment for the people that the police interact with. But part of it is also to demonstrate to the public that the PD takes these issues seriously enough to actually *welcome* more scrutiny from the outside. Currently, no one outside the government (not even the Commission) learns about complaints unless they rise to a very serious level. That must change.

I recognise that the job of policing is one of the most difficult imaginable. And most people, even in far less stressful jobs, are not inclined to having people 'look over their shoulder'. But that's where we're at in 2020. We will never get to a place of public comfort and trust with our policing until we can *prove* that our police departments *invite* comments and criticism; and that complaints are subject to the same kinds of oversight we expect from every business that deals with the public in such an intimate way.

Thank you for your consideration,

JC Harris

**From:** [Jensen, Kaitlyn](#)  
**To:** [Commission-Public-Records](#)  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT for June 30, 2020  
**Date:** Monday, June 29, 2020 4:42:35 PM

---

Dear Port Commissioners,

I am writing today as a Port employee and also as a constituent. I am writing to ask you hear, consider and adopt Motion 2020-15.

In light of the Black Lives Matter movement occurring in this country, it is critical the commission adopt the motion to direct a comprehensive assessment of the Port of Seattle Police Department and create a task force to lead the assessment and develop recommendations. It has become increasingly clear over the past decade+, and particularly in the last few months, that police brutality is an epidemic of its own right and that policing in this country needs to change. This is your opportunity to ensure the Port of Seattle Police Department is not a part of the problem and is a model for equitable, responsible policing.

Thank you for your action and Black Lives Matter!



Kaitlyn Jensen  
Assistant Project Management  
Seaport Project Management  
Tel: 206-787-5517 | Mobile: 206-351-3044  
*Pronouns: She/Her*

***The Port of Seattle is proud to celebrate Pride.***

A horizontal rainbow bar with colors transitioning from purple on the left to red on the right.

*All e-mail communications with the Port of Seattle are subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act and should be presumed to be public.*

**From:** [Jennifer Lee](#)  
**To:** [Commission-Public-Records](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Comment - June 30th Commission Meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 30, 2020 10:01:47 AM

---

**WARNING:** This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and expect the content of this email to be safe.

Hello, my name is Jennifer Lee, and I am the Technology and Liberty Manager at the ACLU of Washington. While a comprehensive assessment of the Port of Seattle Police Department is a step in the right direction towards police accountability, the recommendations in Motion 2020-15 should be expanded to ban the use of biometric technology by both the Port of Seattle police department as well as any privately contracted security personnel.

Item 1f of the motion states that the Commission affirms its strong support for continuing the Port's moratorium on police use of facial recognition technology. However, as members of the Biometrics External Advisory Group, the ACLU and other organizations are also aware that during this moratorium the Port is currently recommending that biometrics, including facial recognition, be used by the Port of Seattle Police Department as well as by private security firms contracted by Port tenants. It is disingenuous to call for the continuation of a moratorium to further racial equity, while simultaneously recommending that the Port of Seattle and private security firms be allowed to use facial recognition as soon as the moratorium is lifted.

Last week, lawmakers introduced a federal ban on face surveillance technology, and Boston also became the 8th city in the U.S. to outright ban government use of face surveillance technology. Many civil rights and civil liberties organizations have been calling to end police use of facial recognition given that facial recognition will exacerbate racial inequity no what the technology's accuracy rates are. MediaJustice recently made a call to ban facial recognition as part of it's Agenda for Black Lives, noting that there is no level of regulation that will make facial recognition technology safe for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, immigrants, and other communities in the margins.

If the Port of Seattle Commission is truly committed to advancing racial justice, it must commit to banning the use of facial recognition by the Port of the Seattle Police Department and contracted private security firms.

**Jennifer Lee**  
Technology and Liberty Manager  
Pronouns: She, Her

American Civil Liberties Union of Washington  
PO Box 2728, Seattle, WA 98111-2728

206.624.2184 x208 | [jlee@aclu-wa.org](mailto:jlee@aclu-wa.org)  
[www.aclu-wa.org](http://www.aclu-wa.org)



**From:** [Mayo, Sofia](#)  
**To:** [commission-public-records@portseattle.org](mailto:commission-public-records@portseattle.org)  
**Cc:** [Commission-Public-Records](#)  
**Subject:** Sofia Mayo police motion written testimony  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 30, 2020 8:35:12 AM

---

Hello Commissioners:

I am a Port of Seattle employee for almost 10 years and a king county resident.

I'm writing in support of my black family And friends. I would have preferred to provide a verbal testimony however I have several working Port meetings preventing me from being on standby to speak. This is why I'm providing written testimony.

As you are considering this motion, I hope all of you recognize this is the first step of many to remove institutional racism here in our own house: the port of Seattle walls.

I understand it's not about our port police. It is about a system created to prevent black men, women, teenagers, young children and babies from thriving and LIVING.

All of you have your own interests and initiatives I support as a port employee. It's important however to fix "our" house too. And the first step is this motion.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Stanley Shikuma](#)  
**To:** [Commission-Public-Records](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] PUBLIC COMMENT for June 30, 2020  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 30, 2020 10:20:30 AM

---

**WARNING:** This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and expect the content of this email to be safe.

Dear Port of Seattle Commissioners,

Good morning! My name is Stanley Shikuma, and I am the President of the Japanese American Citizens League, Seattle Chapter. Seattle JACL is a member of the Tech Fairness Coalition, a network of over 70 grassroots organizations representing people of color, low-income, homeless, and other marginalized communities in the Seattle area. I have had the privilege of testifying before you at prior Port Commission hearings in person, but today I write to you per new COVID-19 protocols.

I write today to comment on the review of Port Police and relevant policies, including:

- 1A) A ban on chokeholds
- 2A) ensuring diversity in police hiring
- 1C) Not hiring racially biased people, or people with a history of excessive force use
- 1D) De-escalation and anti-discrimination training
- 1E) Reviewing “qualified immunity”
- 1F) Continuing the Port’s moratorium on police use of facial recognition**
- 1G) Transparency in policy
- 1H) Ensuring officers are visibly identifiable by name

Seattle JACL supports all of the above policies, especially in light of the murder of George Floyd and the subsequent uprisings, including here in Seattle, in protest of discriminatory and brutal police treatment of BIPOC and other marginalized people. Systemic racism clearly exists within all our major institutions but nowhere more obvious or deadly than in our police and justice system. Adoption and enactment of strong - even radical - reform measures are both necessary and urgent. I commend you for taking up these questions and hope your actions will be as strong and effective as they are swift.

In particular, I would urge you to strengthen the call in 1F from a moratorium to an outright ban on facial recognition. Recent stories in the news point to false arrest targeting a Black man “identified” by facial recognition. This is exactly the nightmare scenario we have warned of in our opposition to use of this technology — innocent people of color targeted by artificial intelligence. We do not want white supremacy automated and embedded at the Port of Seattle — not by Port Police, not by TSA, not by Airlines.

Thank you for your consideration. Please take the time and deliberation to do the right thing for all of us and Ban Facial Recognition from Sea-Tac International Airport.

Sincerely,

Stan Shikuma

~power-of-words-of-power-of-words-of-power-of-words-of-power~

**Stanley N. Shikuma, President**

**Seattle Chapter JACL**

[sktaiko1@mac.com](mailto:sktaiko1@mac.com)

206-919-1465

he / him / his

**From:** [cspiess@ieee.org](mailto:cspiess@ieee.org)  
**To:** [Commission-Public-Records](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public comment for June 30th meeting  
**Date:** Monday, June 29, 2020 12:40:54 PM

---

**WARNING:** This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and expect the content of this email to be safe.

Hi Port of Seattle Commission Clerk & Commissioners,

The following is my public comment for the meeting on June 30th, 2020, regarding agenda item 9a:

I commend the Port of Seattle and the Commissioners on heeding the voices of protesters; and planning critical self-reflection and change to the Port of Seattle Police Department.

Motion 2020-15 items 4g & 4h don't go far enough in two aspects.

First, the Port of Seattle Police Department is part of the Valley Civil Disturbance Unit (VCDU); and the VCDU provided officers to the Seattle Police Department (SPD) response to recent protests in Seattle. What if Port of Seattle police use excessive force at such protests? For example, there is video footage of a detained protester being held down on the ground by one officer while two other officers repeatedly punch the protester. How would bystanders or the victim know which police department's officers were involved? If they reasonably report the incident to SPD, would SPD themselves even be able to tell in the footage which jurisdiction the officers belong to? How would this Task Force even be made aware of such an incident considering the public is unlikely to figure out to report the incident to the Port of Seattle? The Task Force should specifically look at the history of Port of Seattle deployments via the VCDU and determine if the only functional purpose is unpaid-for-by-Seattle, backup cops for SPD; how that at all aligns with the purposes of the police at the Port; and how is it all possible to hold accountable any bad behavior in these mixed jurisdiction deployments.

Secondly, the Task Force's review of mutual aid should not be limited to one-way (outgoing support); but also a review and assessment of occurrences of assistance to the Port from other police departments, WA State Patrol, and/or federal agencies. What ensures that any outside departments abide by Port of Seattle policies? What ensures that Port police don't use outside agencies as a loophole around their own policy restrictions? For example, WA State Patrol and multiple federal agencies have aircraft and drones equipped with surveillance technology (such as Forward Looking Infrared cameras & stingray devices) that they either operate on behalf of a local police department's request or will loan to police departments. The Task Force should assess how outside agencies provide assistance to the Port; and consider not only their potential use of force by officers but also the systemic surveillance technologies that other agencies may use to assist the Port. More broadly the Task Force should assess the degree of militarization by the Port police.

While Motion 2020-15 states that the Commission affirms the Executive Director's reforms on continuing a moratorium on police use of facial recognition technology, the Port is concurrently working to propose the allowed use of biometric technology (including facial recognition software) by the Port of Seattle Police Department and private security firms



contracted by Port tenants. The Port of Seattle has not provided any evidence that any type of biometric technology would even accomplish any supposed purposes for law enforcement and security services. Saying you agree to a moratorium while behind the scenes working to enable its use seems duplicitous. If the Port of Seattle and the Commission truly believe in holding themselves to the highest nationwide standards, then you should ban the use of Biometrics for Public-Facing Law Enforcement & Security Functions.

I encourage Commissioners to expand the areas of review by the Task Force and to ban the use of biometric technology by both the Port of Seattle police department and any privately contracted security personnel. Thank you.

-Cynthia Spiess  
an independent security researcher and Seattle resident

**From:** [Brendalynn Taulelei](#)  
**To:** [Commission-Public-Records](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] June 30 Community Forum on Port Policing - written comments  
**Date:** Monday, June 29, 2020 6:51:48 PM

---

**WARNING:** This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and expect the content of this email to be safe.

Commissioners and Executive Director Metruck,

Thank you for the opportunity for us to share comments on this very important topic! It has been a little over a month since the tragic death of George Floyd which has had an enormous effect on our nation, the world, and most importantly the black community! The graphic nature of the viral video of how George died and the expression on the police officer's (Derek Chauvin) face as George was begging for his life, continues to shake me to my core as a person of color but most importantly as a human being. The notion that law enforcement is here to protect and serve the community is not necessarily true for black people, for brown people, or any person of color. Protection and service are not words I would describe law enforcement officers, which is really sad!

I can personally attest to being anxious and scared whenever a police car is behind me while driving. Even though I've been a law abiding citizen my whole life, and worked at the Port for close to 20 years, the fear of Police is deeply rooted in me and my family. There have been too many incidents to count amongst my family members, and my community where someone gets pulled over, for no apparent reason other than being racially profiled as "they look like trouble". I have in my lifetime also experienced the unfortunate situation Breonna Taylor found herself in; it is still to this day, THE most terrifying experience of my life! I am just so grateful that me and my family survived that day! I can not and will never forget these experiences, but they help explain my fear of an entity that is supposed to protect and serve the community. My stories are just a few examples of what black and brown people are subjected to their entire lives in encounters with the police!

Being a police officer and having a law enforcement badge, I can imagine is a great honor for anyone that has a career in law enforcement. However, does that mean you are above everyone else? Does that mean you can treat black people and other people of color like secondhand citizens? Does that mean you won't be held accountable? Does that mean you can ignore human decency? The answers to these questions should all be NO! But my reality, my experience tells me differently. I do not doubt that there are many good police officers, some of which work for the Port Police department. However, I can't deny that there are also very bad police officers like Derek Chauvin and the ones that stood by while he murdered George Floyd in the street, in broad daylight, in front of an audience of people. Unfortunately, there are many examples of bad police officers that somehow always get away with an illegal act, or a murderous act under the protection of the law. What about the victims? What about

their families? I say enough is enough!!

I felt compelled to respond to the call for comments on this topic, especially since it hits close to home for me. Therefore, I wanted to state that I am in full agreement with the direction the Port Commission and Mr. Metruck is taking to call for a comprehensive assessment of our Port Police department policies and procedures. I would request transparency throughout this assessment as the assigned task force evaluates current practices related the use of excessive force, recruitment and hiring practices, social inequities in the system, racism against the black community, investigations related to excessive use of force on a member of the public, etc. This positive step forward aligns us with the rest of the country to ensure transparency and accountability in law enforcement entities, including our Port Police department. Most importantly, this will go a long way in restoring the community's (and quite frankly my own) faith in the role that law enforcement plays in our society.

Faafetai tele ("Thank You" in Samoan)

Brendalynn Taulelei

**From:** [lh00tb+4he9a6yzzg16o@guerrillamail.com](mailto:lh00tb+4he9a6yzzg16o@guerrillamail.com)  
**To:** [Commission-Public-Records](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Commission  
**Date:** Friday, June 26, 2020 12:58:36 PM

---

WARNING: This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and expect the content of this email to be safe.

Hi folks! I've been invited to leave a public comment on the topic of police practice assessment within the Port of Seattle, ensuring alignment with the highest national standards and best practices related to policing.

As industry specialists, I trust the Port of Seattle police department to select and apply the most appropriate standards to guide police action. As such, please ensure that the Commission and other interested parties act as advisors on this matter and not assume a position of authority to modify police standards.

I do believe that the recent actions taken by the City of Seattle on riot response protocol were emotionally- and politically-driven; as a result, I believe that the courses of action were improper and short-sighted. Please take care to consider that police officers do not operate in an office environment. Police officers operate everywhere John Q Public doesn't want to. In the event that police officers are confronted by malevolence, they must respond with the means necessary to maintain public safety.

C

----

Sent using Guerrillamail.com

Block or report abuse: <https://www.guerrillamail.com//abuse/?>

[a=Qk55CAQTUL0ahkOk5XwTexeKX8%2BT3cVU1IRSc83iGAE%2FTXOxxc0h8x4%3D](https://www.guerrillamail.com//abuse/?a=Qk55CAQTUL0ahkOk5XwTexeKX8%2BT3cVU1IRSc83iGAE%2FTXOxxc0h8x4%3D)