



Jim Band Investigations and Consulting LLC

CONFIDENTIAL INVESTIGATIVE REPORT

Date: January 22, 2025

To: Akin Blitz, St. Helens Labor & Employment Counsel

From: Jim Band, Investigator, Jim Band Investigations and Consulting LLC

Re: Investigation – Chief Brian Greenway

Investigation Scope:

On October 31, 2024, I was hired by the City of St. Helens to investigate the following claims:

Allegations of the St. Helens Police Employees' Association and current and former employees, and others, require investigation to determine whether, while employed as Chief of Police, Brian Greenway engaged in unprofessional and inappropriate conduct, including the following:

1a. *Failure to provide professional leadership to the department and City;*

1b. *Failure to establish, maintain, and foster positive and effective working relationships with those contacted in the course of work;*

1c. *Failure to contribute to the overall quality of the Police Department's service by:*

- *Allegedly withholding mutual aid, major crimes and necessary community wide law enforcement cooperation with other law enforcement partners.*
- *Allegedly stating to staff, "I hope we don't get any applicants..." during a police officer recruitment.*
- *Allegedly interfering with and undermining the City's police officer recruitment.*
- *Allegedly openly discrediting partner law enforcement agencies and their leadership and referring to partner law enforcement agency leadership derogatorily.*
- *Allegedly demanding an officer falsify range training records.*
- *Allegedly unprofessionally addressing a subordinate employee (detective) and pressuring the detective to not make any complaints regarding pay or filing of a grievance, on or about 9/2/2024.*
- *Allegedly being demeaning, disrespectful, bullying and abusive in behaviors directed at subordinates.*
- *Allegedly offering certain officers a "deal" where they didn't have to take or pass the required physical fitness test but would still receive incentive pay without meeting the fitness test requirements.*

2. *Alleged suspected theft of time and inappropriate use of City resources by not recording sick and vacation leave in accordance with City policy.*



3. *Alleged inappropriate use of City resources by using city-issued vehicle for personal use and encouraging others to do the same.*
4. *Alleged intentional disruption of a City of Scappoose City Council meeting by attending virtually and then intentionally removing a member of the media and other presenters from on-line attendance.*
5. *Alleged attendance and participation in a City of Scappoose City Council meeting and the Board of Directors meeting of Columbia River Fire and Rescue logging into the meeting as someone else and using that person's log-in credentials and identity without permission to conceal this activity.*
6. *Alleged deletions or requests of others to alter, conceal or destroy (delete) public records (body cam records of interactions).*
7. *Alleged admissions or boasting about your own misuse of emergency vehicle equipment during your commute to or from home.*
8. *Alleged falsification of training records and falsification of fitness testing and pay differential entitlement records.*
9. *Alleged falsification, deletion or elimination of a disciplinary or administrative record.*
10. *Allegedly providing false testimony under oath in civil litigation.*
11. *Allegedly meddling in collective bargaining in order to undermine the City's interests, and instigating labor strife by acts instigating subordinates to act in ways adverse to the City and being disloyal to the City.*
12. *Allegedly meddling in union affairs, orchestrating a union vote of no confidence, and influencing union officer statements which attacked City officials at City Council and otherwise.*

If the investigation leads to the discovery of concerns or potential job-related misconduct other than described above that warrant investigation, the scope should be expanded to include such matters.

*** Findings, Analysis, and Conclusion begin on Page 92.**

Interviewees:

During this investigation, I interviewed:

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

Witness Statements:

The statements attributed to others set forth in this report combine paraphrasing, consolidation, and exact quotes indicated by "...” to succinctly and accurately provide information ascertained by my interview. All interviews were audio recorded. The sentences in italics are quotes taken directly from transcriptions of the interviews. Transcription was done by Rev.com.

[REDACTED]

On November 18, 2024, I interviewed **** at the St. Helens Police Administration Office. **** had been a detective with SHPD but left to become a fireman with Columbia River Fire and Rescue. **** knew why I wanted to interview him, and I told him to just share what he had to tell me.

Mr. **** started by telling me about an incident involving the ORPAT fitness incentive at SHPD. This requires an employee to do the ORPAT test within a certain time period to receive a financial benefit from the City. Mr. **** said,

“We used to run the ORPAT yearly, and if you ran it in a certain time, I believe it was 4 minutes and 25 seconds, you got, I think it was 5% a month, physical fitness incentive, 5 or 10, somewhere in there, I don't remember, but it was a pretty decent incentive and it was a percentage, it wasn't a fixed rate. So it was a big deal to run that every year. The guys used to joke it was the worst day of the year every year because the ORPAT sucks.

But, I do remember it was in the squad room, and I can't remember what I was doing there, [inaudible 00:02:04] uniform or patrol shift, or what, but it was just Greenway and I, and he told me like, "Hey, look, I know these physical fitness incentives are bullshit, I know these tests suck. I'm going to make it so only I score these, and you don't really have to run it, I'll just say you did. Are you interested in doing that?"

And I said, "No, thanks. I don't want to do that." "Well, think about it, think about it." He says. "Just think about it. Nobody's going to watch, nobody will ever know. If you don't pass it in time, I'll just say you passed it in the time for the big money."

I was like, "Okay Chief." He's a pretty new Chief at that point and I was like..."

Mr. **** said Chief Greenway had volunteered this. I asked if the Chief had just said this to him or if he said this to others and Mr. **** replied,

*“No. So he says it to me, a couple of days later, I'm in the squad room, **** walks in, just him and I. I think he was getting ready for shift or leaving. I remember him wearing a T-shirt. And he*



says, "Hey, are you going to take Chief up on his ORPAT deal?" I said, "No, I'm not going to do that." And he says, "Oh, okay. All right. I might." And I said, "I, don't know if I would." Or the conversation was something like that. Like, hey, not a great idea. He goes, "Okay." And he walks out. I have no idea if he took him up on it or not. I don't know if anybody else did. [inaudible 00:03:34] to remember because I ran it a day or a couple days after and I failed it. And I ran it again right then and there to pass it.

And that's what makes it stick in my memory is that he said, "Hey, you want to do it for free?" And then I was like, "No." So I went and ran it, failed it, threw up because it sucks. And then ran it again and passed because I screwed up the course. And I remember in my head I was like, "That's really wrong." And we've been here a day. He has not worked there very long. And I thought to myself, "Where do I take this?" Because the City Council is thinks he's a god. The City hired him, and I don't know if you know, I won't dive into the history of the way he was hired, but he didn't score the highest. He did not. With the officer's panel, he didn't score the highest. The Council, because he was somebody else, I believe Lieutenant **** was number one until the Council got ahold of it. Suddenly he's number three and this guy's number one.

So we as officers were like, "I guess they think he's the best." And it was, you know how police departments are, it was, he's untouchable. And the City had had a history of not really having a real HR department, having nowhere to go, and he's brand new. And I thought to myself, man, I don't know what to do with this. I'm not running it. I'm not doing it. I'm not going to violate my ethics, but where do I go? Who do I tell this story to? There was nowhere to go. Because he had made it very clear since he got there that he'd got the City Council under his thumb. He's made statements all the time like, "They're all stupid. They'll do whatever I want." Telling all the officers that. And I was like, "Well, I mean, there's literally nowhere for me to go."

And my point was proven when I went to leave, they sat me down for an air quotes exit interview, and I told them like, "Hey, you've got a problem. This guy is an issue. He's unethical." And the City went, okay, sounds good. Two years later, here we are. So anyway, that's just one, I've got more."

Mr. **** said,

"Yeah, I think him and **** were pretty chummy there at the outset. He was coming in and putting a uniform on and doing ride-alongs with ****. Greenway had a way of promising people promotions to get, I guess some sort of loyalty. I seem to remember around that time **** was asking a lot of us, "Hey, would you guys support me for Sergeant?" We were like, "You've been a cop for like 15 minutes, dude. No." But it was the Chief, they were pretty chummy at the time. So he liked to kind of make an inner circle and get those people into inner circles. I mean, I can't tell you how many times that guy took me on drives and was like, "Hey, you're like my next sergeant." And I was like, "Yeah, no, I'm not, I'm not doing that. I don't want to." "Well, I can order you." "Yeah, that's nice. I'm not doing it." Knowing we'll go down my list, and that'll explain more why. Any questions about..."



I had the following back and forth with Mr. ****:

**** ****:

I know this from sitting in supervisors meetings, as a corporal there was a time, I was in detectives. I got promoted to corporal and there was a time that I went to supervisors meetings as a union corporal, which it ended up changing later. We had an open canine position, and Anthony Boswell, he now is a sergeant at the sheriff's office.

Jim Band:

You said Anthony Boswell?

**** ****:

Anthony Boswell. Great guy, a great cop, Patrol Officer of the Year. Very well respected, a hard-charging officer, put in for canine. And the Chief said out loud, because Boswell's a staff sergeant in the National Guard, he gets deployed. He said, "I'm not giving a canine to somebody who gets deployed in the military." And we said, "Hang on a second. We're 99% sure you can't do that. That's a big no-no as far as the government's concerned, you can't discriminate." Well then, I seem to remember a week or so later, Boswell and I are sitting in the briefing room and he says to me, "Hey, the Chief pulled me aside and told me to step down from the National Guard if I want the dog. And I'm not doing that, because I want my military retirement, I'm a staff sergeant. I've moved up in rank. I've been doing this for, gosh, 15 years now. I've been deployed multiple times. I'm not interested in leaving the military, but Chief told me I can't have it both ways. I can't have the dog and be in the military."

And I said, I said it, "Bozzy, I'm pretty sure that's illegal. I don't think he can tell you that." He's like, "Well, he told me that it's one or the other." Boswell allegedly was denied the dog. I'm not 100% sure how that worked. I wasn't involved. But he lateraled away like two months later, and he now has St. Helens PD's dog. They sold him and he's running it at the Sheriff's Office.

Jim Band:

So two questions. One, when he said, "I'm not putting someone in who's in the military." Where were you guys when the Chief said that to you?

**** ****:

We were in a supervisors meeting in the trailers at the PD.

Jim Band:

And who else was in the room?



**** **.*

Oh gosh. Standard supervisors meetings were me, ****, ****, ****, ****. **** may have been a sergeant then, I'm not sure.

Jim Band:

****. ****, ****, ****.

**** **.*

****.

Mr. **** moved on to another topic involving mutual aid with other departments. Mr. **** said,

"So this kind of, where the line staff felt that there really wasn't any support is the Chief made pretty early on a policy that says that you won't leave the City more or less ever. He, matter of fact told me to my face, "I don't give a shit about Susan Rottencrotch that lives out in the County. They don't pay City taxes, we're not going out there."

So the Chiefs out of town one time, he took a lot of vacations, and there was kind of a blow-up over this outside agency assist policy where the Sheriff's Office came in and said, "Hey, this is going to get an Officer killed." I'll back up. So when he implements this outside agency policy, he makes me the brand-new corporal drive over to the Sheriff's Office and tell them that we're not coming to help them anymore as a corporal. They were not happy. I said, "I'm sorry, I don't..." And we weren't allowed to go help an officer outside of the City unless they called for Code 3 cover. Code 1, we weren't doing it, not leaving. It doesn't matter if it's five feet outside. The rule was you're not going."

Mr. **** told me a former officer named Elijah Merkwon left the department because of this policy.

Mr. **** said,

"Elijah stopped an active shooter on Highway 30 a few years ago, he ended up in an officer involved, and he was very upset when this policy came out and the Chief told all of us in a staff meeting when he pushed this policy, "If you don't like it, you can work somewhere else." That was his, if you don't like this, if you don't follow it, you can work somewhere else. That was his favorite thing to say in a staff meeting when he put out a policy, "If you don't like it, go work somewhere else."

*So all of this to say that we had a conversation with the then Police Commissioner, Keith Locke, and the Mayor, it was Joe ****, **** and myself. And this all ties back to a lot of the stuff I'm going to tell you about there was nowhere to go is they came in and said, "Hey, we're getting blowback from this." And the then Lieutenant **** at the time, **** and I, all three told them, "This policy's not going to work. It's going to get people hurt." I wouldn't say it was a mutiny, but it's pretty dang close, when your Chief's bosses come in, approach you when he's out of town. They did that, and said, "We got problems here." And we said, "We laid them out. This policy's going to get somebody hurt." On and on, on and on and on. And they did absolutely nothing with*



it, just deaf ears. They said, "Well, he's a law enforcement expert from Vegas, so he must have a good reason for this."

And we said, "Okay, I guess that's the way it's going to be." We knew at that point that there was no, if that's the Police Commissioner and the Mayor, there was nowhere for an officer that has issues with this guy to go, there was literally nowhere to go when the top bosses of the City are just blindly supporting. So that outside agency assist policy was there to stay, then... I'm trying to go in chronological order, but it's not going to really work. So he starts to have a falling out with the Council, [inaudible 00:14:41] so I don't forget. Him and Rick start to lose their relationship. And I can't remember exactly why, I believe-

Mr. **** said Rick was the outgoing mayor and continued,

*"I believe it had to do with Greenway quit showing up to Council meetings, outside agencies were starting to complain to council about him. Other chiefs, sheriffs, oh that just reminded me, let me write something down. Outside agencies and chiefs started to complain. They had a falling out. So I'm a corporal. I'm working swing shift, it's during overlap. **** is there. He's a police officer. His wife was just now elected Mayor. **** ran for sheriff a while back. I don't know if that really matters, but Greenway was looking for an officer, he'd asked me multiple times to run for sheriff, because he hated hates Pixley with a burning passion and wanted a St. Helens officer to be Sheriff. So **** took him up on it."*

I asked Mr. **** why Chief Greenway hated Pixley and he said,

"Because Pixley went around him when the outside agency assist policy went to the Mayor directly and said, "Hey, look, as Sheriff, what are you doing? I'll still come help your guys." Which Pixley did. He always sent his guys into town to cover us, but we still were still not allowed to cover him. So Pixley went around him and went to the newspaper and that was it for Greenway. Greenway in the staff meeting in front of everybody said, "I don't give a shit what Sheriff Muffin Tits thinks, we're not helping him."

Mr. **** continued,

"That was in front of the entire staff. So him and the Mayor have a falling out. I'm working as police corporal on swing shift, and Greenway calls me. He was nice to me. I'd pissed him off a couple of times, but not terribly. And don't let me forget, I'll get to one where I really pissed him off, not terribly, made him mad.

*And he calls me, says, "Hey.. " Him and the Council were having a falling out. They were fighting. Rick had made some statement in a public meeting against Greenway like, "Hey, where's our Chief? I've got issues." So he calls me and he says, "Hey, the Council's fucking up. I need you to go to ****," who was, I believe he was running for sheriff or not yet running for sheriff. I can't remember if he was or wasn't. My timeline's not going to be very helpful on that. And he said, "I want you to have his wife write an anonymous letter to Council about our staffing and how much they suck," and so on and so on and so forth. And I went, "Okay." I hang up. And then I said, so in my brain, I'm this guy's supervisor, and my Chief of Police wants me to ask him to have his wife*



write an anonymous letter to the City Council? That is disgustingly unethical. Like, I'm not doing that."

I asked Mr. **** if the letter was about staffing and he said,

"Staffing and basically cutting the Council to pieces. They wanted them to be put on notice and have this letter read."

We had the following conversation about this letter:

**** **.*

*So I brought **** in to my office and I said, "Hey, I like I'm telling you this in case he goes around you and calls me." I said, "Hey man, look, the Chief asked me to have your wife write a letter to City Council." And I said, "****, I'm telling you this in case he goes around me." I said, "But that is a really bad idea." I said, "It's unethical for me to ask you as your supervisor to do this." I said, "If he calls you," I said, "I don't know. Tell him your wife's busy. Make an excuse." I said, "I don't want you to be in his crosshairs, but I'm not asking you to write that. Don't do it. This is a bad idea."*

Jim Band:

Do you know if he ever did write the letter or she did?

**** **.*

Yeah, she did.

Jim Band:

Oh, she did. Okay.

**** **.*

*Somebody did. They signed it anonymously. So he says, "Well, luckily, my wife's out of town, so there's the perfect excuse." I said, "Oh, sounds good, out of town, great. Can't do it." Because everybody, I was terrified to tell Greenway no, everybody was. Because next thing, he's coming after your job. So **** and I leave that conversation great. And I'm thinking to myself, yeah, this letter's not going to happen. No one's going to write it. I get it. I can't remember if I called Greenway back and said, "Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. His wife's out of town." I'm like, "He can't do it. Sorry." Whatever, I don't remember. But **** assured me he wasn't going to do it.*

That night, the letter gets read from, it's anonymously signed an officer's wife. It comes from some email called Scappoose300@gmail.com, which was apparently a spoof email that kept emailing the Council. 300, the number 300 was the Scappoose Police Chief's radio number that Greenway hated. He hated Norm Miller, the Scappoose Police Chief. matter of fact, he told people in a staff meeting one time that he would punch Norm in the face if he could, and he hated that guy. So when we all saw the email, it said Scappoose300@Gmail.com, we were like, "Really? I mean, that's the Chief you hate. You hate Scappoose



PD. You cuss Scappoose PD to us every single day." We all got in trouble for going to cover them one time. Come on, that email's from you, or somebody you know.

Jim Band:

Right.

***** ****.*

So anyhow, the letter gets read from an officer's wife and it just basically cuts the City Council down, cuts the Administrator down, cuts everybody down.

Jim Band:

And that was read at a commission meeting?

***** ****.*

*Yeah, the night that, he had requested me to have ****'s wife do it. I told ****, "No, I'm not doing that. It's unethical. If I were you, I wouldn't do it either." Well, the letter happened anyway. I don't know if she wrote it. I don't know if **** listened to me and said, "I'm not going to have her do that." And he just wrote it himself as an officer's wife. I wouldn't be surprised. I don't know if he found somebody else. I never followed up with ****. I never went back and said, "Dude, I told you that was a bad idea."*

Mr. **** moved on to another incident. He said,

"Okay, let's see here. There was an incident, I just wrote down things that make my stomach hurt. He used to tell us all the time, people in his circle, supervisors, detectives, "Give yourself the day off and don't put in for it. This place owes you." I never did that, but I don't think any of our bosses, I don't think any other supervisors were like, "No, I'm going to use my time." I'm not doing that. That doesn't feel safe. I suspected that he wanted to be able to have that over somebody. Like, "Hey, I know that you didn't use vacation." We all know from Police Academy Day 101, fudging hours on a timecard is a de-certifiable offense. So we don't play ball.

*I was in detectives. We had an incident on the Columbia River where a guy ran from day shift. He's got a warrant, jumps in the middle of the Columbia River. Well, we had an agreement with the Sheriff's Office that we could use their boat because I used to be a boat operator for the SO, so myself, Lieutenant **** and some other guys, we go down and we hop on the boat and we're trying to, this guy's swimming in the middle of the Columbia. That's pretty dangerous. So we want to be there in case he scoops himself up."*

We had the following back-and-forth regarding the boat incident:

***** ****.*

So I find this out when Greenway gets put on admin leave, it hits the newspapers. One of my former chiefs, Ben Davis told me, he was like, "Hey, did I ever tell you the story about the first time I met your



former Police Chief?" I said, "No." He goes, "You guys were out in the river doing your thing." He says, he's a brand-new lieutenant or battalion chief. He's standing there watching this so they can help. And he said, he looks at me-

Jim Band:

This is the Ben Davis we were just talking about.

**** **.*

Yeah. He goes, he looks at me and goes, "These guys are," and I quote, he says, "These guys are fucking stupid. I'm firing my lieutenant. I'm firing my detective." And he goes, "And I've known this guy for 30 seconds and he's saying this to all my firefighters. And I thought, that's professional." He goes, I just kind of slowly walked away from the guy and left because we didn't want to be any part of that. That leads-

Jim Band:

Did he say why he didn't like what you were doing?

**** **.*

Uh-uh. That leads to, long story short, we get the guy to shore. The guy gets away again, because the officers weren't comfortable handcuffing him on a boat, which I get, you don't want him to drown. Runs, ends up in a fight. Some officers go over ass over teakettle down in embankment with him. They're fighting. Greenway ends up...down fighting with him. And there's a point where he's got the suspect in a headlock and he's holding the guy's head underwater.

Jim Band:

Greenway is?

**** **.*

Yeah. Saying, "You're going to die motherfucker." This was on body cam. The reason I tell that story, and again, I didn't see this. I didn't witness it. I just saw the bodycam afterwards. I mean the whole freaking department did. The reason I tell this story is he sued, or the prosecution asked for it, and the body cam was gone.

Jim Band:

Whose bodycam would it have been?

**** **.*

*I don't... There was three officers down there with him and all three body cams got it. ****, maybe ****, I don't know who else.*



Jim Band:

So all three of those body cams were deleted?

**** **.

*We could never find them. Sergeant **** told me, he goes, "I don't know where these body cams are." Because the attorneys were requesting them and it was a, I can't find them.*

I asked Mr. **** if it showed who deletes videos. Mr. **** responded,

*"I don't know. I seem to remember asking him kind of like a one-on-one. Like, "Hey man, what the hell?" And he looked, he went, "I just don't know." He goes, "Nobody can figure it out. The officers swear they tagged it. The officers swear they uploaded it." I said, "****, I saw it. I watched it on their computers." When I came into work one day, they were watching the video. I said, "Where is it?" Again, I didn't follow up on it. I wasn't involved."*

Mr. **** said the suspect in the river incident filed a tort claim and wanted the video of the incident, but it had been deleted. I asked Mr. **** if he knew there was video because he had seen it. Mr. **** responded,

"Yeah, you're walking in, the officer's writing his report, the video's playing. You walk over and look over their shoulder and go, "What's that?" And he shows you. He was like, "Oh yeah. Wow. I didn't see that." And then he moves on to this day. So the officer's writing a report, I peek. I was like, "Oh yeah." And I seem to remember, I don't remember which officer was writing it because they wanted to make sure everything was correct with his body cam. So he's watching it. So I know it was there. It was uploaded. The video was captured certainly.

Okay, so we had, shortly before I left for another job, there was a incident out on Highway 30 by Dyno Nobel. OSP was somebody was involved in a pursuit ... County or OSP, I don't remember who. Long and short of this thing is that a Trooper Jeffries gets struck by a vehicle, suspect vehicle. I don't know if you remember this incident. He was on life support forever. Not a cop anymore. Really bad day. So my crew and I are on at St. Helens. They asked me, "Can we go?" I was like, "Of course we can go." Because you have to get approval to do those things. I'm swing shift corporal. Long story short, we go out there, I give medical aid, we do some things, blah, blah, blah. The Chief calls me or texts me that night and wants to know what happened. And I said, "This is what happened. Went out there to give medical aid, whatever." "Okay."

*The next morning, he comes into work and I get a text. I'm across the street or I'm across in our office. He's in his, I get a text that says, "Come to my office now." Okay. The Sheriff's Office had issued some press release about how the guy was avoiding spike strips when he struck the Trooper, whatever. And we had never deployed spikes. My guys had not done that. We just responded to the scene after it happened. I walk into the office, ****, union president, ****, corporal at the time, and detectives are sitting there, and Greenway's standing at the cubicle. I look in and his eyes are red and he's shaking. And he looks at me and he goes, and I quote, "If*



you fucking lie to me, I'm fucking firing you right now." I said, "Excuse me?" He said, "If you lie to me, I'm fucking firing you immediately."

*And I said, I got upset. I said, "About?" "The Sheriff's Office press release says there was spike strips. You told me you didn't deploy spike strips." And he looks at the union president and he says, "****, pull up the body camera right now. If you're lying to me and I see it on that camera right now, I'm firing you now." Screaming at me. And I said, I looked at ****. And he turns over and starts pulling up the body camera. And my brain's going, union president, union employee, administrator. You're pulling up the body camera? Are you kidding me? So he starts to pull it up.*

And I very calmly said, "Like I told you last night, we did not deploy spike strips. We didn't set up for spike strips. We went to the scene after the Trooper was struck, do you have any more questions?" Yell, yell, yell, yell, yell, yell. I said, "Is this disciplinary?" Yell, yell. "No, no. But look, I'm going to review that and if you're fucking lying to me, you're fucking fired." And I went, "Thanks Chief." Turn around and walked out of the office. Those two guys saw that exchange."

We had the following conversation:

Jim Band:

What was that all about you think?

***** ****.*

He had it in his head that he never wanted us on those things. He had it in his head that we went out there, set up spike strips, and we caused the crash into the Trooper, and he was not going to have it.

Jim Band:

Why do you think he was so dead set against working with other agencies? Because it sounds like an extension of that.

***** ****.*

*Yeah, it is. It's a running joke that have you ever been yelled at for something you got a life-saving award for? Because I got an award from the Oregon State Sheriffs' Association for this one. And it was really upsetting. And I think that it was a ... when Pixley got in his officer-involved shooting, and we went, I sent my whole crew, and I heard it third hand that he threw a giant fit that we were even on that. And I was the first uninvolved supervisor on scene on the Sheriff Pixley's OIS at Grumpy's Towing. First uninvolved supervisor. So I showed up, took command, asked him the public safety questions from the list, on and on and on and on and on. "No good. You sit over there, don't talk to anybody, directing traffic. And I got a phone call from Lieutenant **** when you guys got to clear as soon as you can, Chief is losing it. However you guys being there." And I said, "Hey, I'm going to be insubordinate. The suspect's still on the ground." And there's-*

Jim Band:



Did the suspect die in that?

**** **.*

*Yeah. Oh yeah. "The suspect's still on the ground. The officers that shot him still have blood on them. I'm not leaving. I'm sorry. I'm going to be insubordinate. I'm not doing it." "Okay. Well, as soon as you can clear." I was like, "That's not happening." Click. Knowing that if I was going to put my job on the line at some point, I'd kind of had enough, this is going to be the one. I'm not clearing when there's nobody on scene to take command. So I stayed there and stayed in command for a long time until Sergeant **** showed up and **** told me, "Hey, I'll go to bat for you." He's like, "You can't leave. You guys have to be here. You can't leave this. I'll go to bat."*

And the thing that bothered me the most about that is Pixley is screaming, "Shots fired. Shots fired. Shots fired. Code zero shots fired." And my officers are calling me on the phone asking me if they can respond, because that was the rule. And I remember, I think I told one of them, "Are you fucking kidding me?" And hung up the phone and just flew there. I beat both of them, even though I was further outside of town than them because they were so scared to go. They were like, "Ah, what do I do? What do I do?" And when we got on scene, one of the officers called the Chief, or called the Lieutenant and gave some haphazard brief report on the phone. "Just so you know, we're outside the City. This is what we're doing."

It should have come from me, as the corporal, because I was the one engaged in command. And that's what spun the Chief up because he got a call from an officer going, "We're outside the City." Because he had no idea we were in there because you were supposed to call dad and tell him you were outside the City if you went. So all that to say that after he chews me out for that, going to that call, not the shooting one, but the trooper Jeffreys one, sorry, I'm kind of over the board here. He wants me to go to lunch with him. Like five minutes later, "Let's go to lunch."

Jim Band:

The Chief does?

**** **.*

*Yeah. I said, "Okay." So we go to lunch, ****'s there, and his eyes are all red, almost like he's been crying and he's like, "Hey, I'm sorry, I got emotional. I get emotional. You want a new patrol car?" I said-*

Jim Band:

This is from the Chief?

**** **.*

Yeah. I said, "What?" He goes, "Whatever you want. Whatever you want."

Jim Band:



So let me just make sure. So this is not after Pixley's shooting, this is after the Trooper thing.

***** ****.*

Yes, it's after the Trooper thing.

Jim Band:

Okay.

***** ****.*

After he chews my ass for that.

Jim Band:

Gotcha.

***** ****.*

Him and I never talked about the shooting. He just ignored me for a week. Wouldn't talk to me. So after the Trooper thing, we're sitting in Sunshine Pizza, and he's doing the, "Do you want a new car?" I remember laughing because he's like, "Go get a rice crispy treat, on me. Go get a cookie." And I was thinking to myself, "What? What am I, five?" So I said, "No."

Mr. **** went on,

"Yeah. I said, "No, thank you. I'm okay." And the Jeffries one was really, that was the end of him and I's relationship. Because when he first got here, I liked the guy. I liked him all the way. I said, you know what? Outside guy can't be that bad. I was never against him being hired. I thought he brought some good things. I thought actually there's some good things that he did do. New cars, streamlining, more forms and accountability, and he brought some good stuff. But by the time the Trooper Jeffries thing hit, it was like, okay, this is getting out of hand here. It was out of hand with the physical fitness thing. But this is just, thinking to myself, okay, maybe he's not from here. Maybe he'll get it. No, he's not getting it. This is just the way the guy is.

*So we have a union meeting, I'll back up. The Chief wanted to implement the County Major Crimes Team wanted us to join. This is during ****'s election. And a big campaign thing for **** running for Sheriff was that there is no major crimes team. It doesn't exist. Well, we weren't allowed to be on the Major Crimes Team at St. Helens PD, it wasn't allowed. The Chief said, "Nope, you're not doing it. We'll do our own," which we did. We had something called the Special Investigations Unit when I was in detectives, and it was really successful on a couple of major cases where we put people away. They were just a bunch of patrol guys that would come in and help me when I was detective, I would lead the team, and we would go off and do things. It was great.*



So we, on the ground, most of us, wanted to help out the County Major Crimes Team. We wanted to be like, "Hey, this is ridiculous. We work together...can't we do this?" So the Chief had said, "No, no, not doing it. Nope. You're not doing it. Absolutely not. Never going to happen." So then he goes down, and so City Hall, the Mayor starts getting involved and says, "Hey, I'm getting requests from the Sheriff for you guys to help on the Major Crimes Team and the District Attorney. Why aren't you, the DA's like, I want you guys to all form one team. What's the deal?" So Greenway fires back and says, "Oh, the officers won't do it because they want on-call pay."

And we the bargaining unit said, "What are you talking about?" And so he goes down and tells our City leadership, "The officers say no, because if I'm going to have him join the Major Crimes Team, they need on-call pay." And we all said, "Well, that's bullshit. We never said that." Don't know if the union president at the time who was pretty chummy with him told him that, I don't know. The body sure didn't know about it. So that leads to me and a couple other guys saying, "Well, hang on a second. Why is the Chief downtown negotiating and saying that the union is making a statement that we don't want to play well with others?"

So we hold a union meeting, and in this union meeting, I said, "Hey, did we decide that we want on-call pay?" Well, no. The e-board says, "Okay, did we go down and tell the City that's why we won't join the Major Crimes team?" No. I said, "So why is the Chief of police going down and telling the DA, the City and all these other people that we, the officers." I said, "This is making us look bad, say we won't join the Major Crimes team unless we make more money. Am I missing something here?" And they said, "No, we haven't negotiated that." I said, "Okay." I said, "So I'm going to propose." I gave a speech, basically said, "This guy doesn't play well with others. It's time for us to make a stand. We can't do this anymore. He's blaming us because he doesn't want to play well with others."

There was some tension going on because a St. Helens Officer was running for Sheriff, ****. He was in the meeting. And I said, we're not playing well with the Sheriff's Office. We are saying they don't have a major crimes team and we refuse to join. And the Chief says, it's because of pay. I said, "Somebody's lying here." And I said, "I'm not going to have myself as a union member and the rest of you guys having the fact that he doesn't want us to play well with them because of politics."

I don't know if it had to do with the Sheriff's election or not. I don't want to say it did or didn't. I said, "But because of politics, I am not comfortable with saying, 'oh, SHPA won't join.'" I said, "So when I go see my family, they go, 'Hey, why isn't your union willing to help out the Sheriff's Office?'" I said, "That's not okay." I said, "So we need to set the record straight." I said, "We the union need to send a letter to the District Attorney, to the City Councilors and to the newspaper and say, 'We want to join the Major Crimes Team. We are not saying we don't.'" Because I think there was a newspaper article saying that it was because of the union or something like that. We were defending ourselves, on and on and on.

**** spoke up in favor of that. He was like, "Yep, we need to play well. ****'s right? This is getting out of hand." On and on and on and on. **** spoke up. "Yep, he's right. This is getting out of hand. We need to do something." The Union e-board said, "No." So we took a vote and we



overruled them that we're going to send this. But the board said, "No, we're not doing that. No way." I believe my gut tells me there was a political motivation. You know how unions work. There's a political motivation behind them not wanting that to happen. Some of those guys were pretty tight with the guy who was running for Sheriff that worked in our house, didn't want the current Sheriff to be elected. There was a political move. I think we'd even endorsed somebody, I don't remember.

But we were like, "Hey, look, this is getting ridiculous." So we make this vote, and it happens, and I get a phone call 30 seconds after the union meeting ends from the Police Chief wanting to know what was said. And I said, "Nothing. All good. Just normal meeting." "Okay, thanks." Click. Letter goes out like, "Hey, look, this is SHPA. We're taking a stand." Dah, dah, dah, dah. I walk into work, the Chief is sitting in my office. I'm a corporal, and he says, "You're turning in your take-home car, effective today. You are no longer on any special assignments. You're done, Special Investigations unit done. You're not involved in investigations. You're done. And sometimes when people decide that they're going to make a stand or do things in directions, there's consequences for that stuff. Do you have any questions?" I said, "No, sir." He walks out.

Called my wife, "Hey, I need you to pick me up from work tonight at 11:30, with our new baby, because I just got my shit taken away because I took a union action against the Chief of Police." So I call the union lawyer, tell him the story."

Mr. **** went on,

"Yeah. And he says, "Oh my God. Oh, Jesus. Call in the Air Force. This is terrible. He can't do that." "Yeah, Dan, I know. So what are we going to do about it?" "Oh, we're going to... We're going to do this. We're going to do that. We're going to file a grievance." He's like, "All right, I'm ready." It makes it the Union e-board, it dies. They kill it deader than a doornail. Won't do nothing with it, won't touch it. Nothing.

*And so Dan's telling me this is retaliation. And then Dan just ghosts me, he's gone. I was like, okay. Well, clearly took a stand as a bargaining unit. The guys voted. I heard rumored later that ****, the Chief knew every word that **** said in that meeting, almost like he read a transcript and chewed his ass for it, and then took away a trip to a homicide conference that he was supposed to go to and made him stay home as punishment, because he spoke out against him at a union meeting. And so **** got tore to pieces for it too, for what he said."*

I asked Mr. **** if the Chief canceled the conference and he said,

"Yeah, that was paid for by the Imani Center. It wasn't even costing us any money. He told him he can't go, and told him it was because, "You don't play ball, I'm not sending you to trainings."

I asked Mr. **** about an incident at his current employer, Columbia River Fire and Rescue. Mr. **** replied,

*"Oh God, I forgot about that. Sorry. So when I had worked there, we shared an office with him, the Lieutenant, the Admin Sergeant with ****, myself and the Chief all shared an office because we had a trailer to work out of, and we're working out of this trailer, and he would tell stories*



about how dumb Scappoose is that he can log in to their meetings, and whoever logs in has admin privileges. So he said he'd log in as Mike Coxlong or fill in the blank. I mean, some of them were kind of funny. The names, the fake names used...from I.P. Freely from the Simpsons or whatever. He'd log in and they'd leave him there, and he said he discovered that he could kick people out. Because they gave everybody admin rights. So he would come in and joke about how he logged in to Scappoose's City Council meeting and started booting people on the Zoom platform, just constantly, boot them, boot them, boot them, boot them. We we're like, "This doesn't sound very legal." So he's recounting this thing. We're like, "Okay." So I leave, and our board was tumultuous."

I asked Mr. ****,

"So he's telling you he's doing this, logging into another city and he's the Chief of Police. When you think about job descriptions and what a chief's job is to do about sort of setting the tone potentially of professionalism and those sorts of things, does that impact how you as an employee think of the judgment and the professionalism of your Police Chief as he's telling you he's doing stuff like this?"

Mr. **** replied,

*"Absolutely. I thought he was unprofessional as all hell. But the problem was we had some younger officers who thought that stuff was funny and cool, and that set the tone for the younger officers that like, "Well, if dad's doing that kind of stuff, I can too." And I saw a deterioration in the performance and the ethics of the rest of the officers. Never in a million years did I think that you would have a, this is no offense to ****, because I think he's a wonderful person. In a million years did I think you would have a two-year patrol officer running for Sheriff against an agency right next door who, and getting endorsements from the union and endorsements from the Chief of Police who's backing his campaign and letting him take pictures in the St. Helens PD uniform and putting them on a billboard. I thought to myself, my brain is frying, because last I checked, we don't get involved in politics as public employees."*

Mr. **** went on,

"In a St Helens PD uniform, Greenway approved him to take a picture in full uniform and put it on a billboard that said, "Endorsed by SHPA, St. Helens City Council and Police Chief Brian Greenway," when he was running for Sheriff. I know, led to an ethics complaint, which didn't go anywhere. But I use that as an example of that type of conduct is what led to officers going, "That kind of stuff's okay." So we had officers getting in screaming matches at the back table over who they want for sheriff, we had guys hating each other over it. It was a disaster of epic proportion of officers who have their brother that works at the jail that likes the current Sheriff working a shift with the guy who's running for sheriff. You didn't dare, I had an officer tell me one time, "I don't dare openly support Pixley, because Greenway will come after me if I do it." He goes, "I love him. I want to support him, but I don't dare because he will come after me."

That was the perception, if you didn't tow the company line and support who that guy wanted you to, but you're done. It's over for you. Because officers have been screamed at, cussed out by



him on multiple occasions. I know I'm missing one or two or three cuss out sessions from the guy that I just don't remember. So it fostered this just house of cards type environment at the police department, which I got hired there in 2007. The place I wanted to work, always wanted to be there, good reputation throughout the state, ethical people, hard charging cops, and I remember in 2008, 2009, this would've been completely unheard of.

You would've thought to yourself, "There is no way that Officer A is going to run for sheriff right now and that we're going to let him put his picture up on a billboard." In those days, the Chief would've said, "Number one, bad idea. But number two, you don't even say you work here." But it was all, he thought that was great. It was all pushed by him, and it led to a lot of animosity. It led to a lot of guys jockeying for promotion. I do know that, I remember when I decided to resign, the union vice president came to me and said, "Hey, what do you think about me putting in for your spot when you leave?" I was like, "****, do you want my boots?"

I mean, there was some guys that wanted that job real, real bad as corporal, I assume that it wasn't personal. It's not personal that they didn't back me with the union after that. It was like, it kind of bred this environment of if that guy's gone, then I can go to that spot. If that sergeant's gone, then I can go to that spot. I mean, you've worked in public safety long enough. This happens all the time. But it was, well, there's going to be a corporal opening when he goes. So I think that's why it just kind of died, but it just didn't used to be that way, and it turned into this dog-eat-dog, who's top of the pecking order kind of disaster with a lot of yelling and screaming. And I remember I'd come home and tell my wife all the time, "I'm getting fired. This guy, he's going to come in and just lose it and he's going to fire me."

I remember as a corporal being so terrified to send somebody outside the City, because that was his hanging point. I did it anyway, but I was like, "I'm probably getting fired for this one." That guy needs cover. Yeah, it's Code 1. Yeah, the policy says Code 3. I don't really care. I'm sending him anyway. And anytime you sent somebody outside the City, you had to write it in a shift activity report and justify why you did it, every time. It doesn't matter if it was a mile or 10, if he's going to Code 1 cover OSP on a DUI stop, we had to write a paragraph in shift activity of why we let them go outside the City. It was ridiculous. So much so that OSP stopped calling for cover and was doing shit by themselves, like doing FSCs, putting handcuffs on people alone, bad. But he wouldn't change. He refused. Sergeants went to him and said it was a bad idea. Corporals went to him and said it. He just would not come off of it. Absolutely refused to help other people."

Mr. **** told me about someone logging in as him (****) on a Columbia River Fire and Rescue Board meeting. Mr. **** said,

"So they log in as me. And I thought, is it Medina doing that? No. Why would he do that? I barely know the guy. I wasn't involved in the union stuff, and parentheses, CRFR. So I'm like, I told my wife, I said, "Somebody's logged in as me." She was like, "Uh oh." So I'm texting a union guy who was at the board meeting. Because I don't know the board members. I wasn't friends with the Chiefs. I couldn't text Chief Smythe because I didn't have his number. And I was like, "Hey, if there's an open mic, or somebody makes a comment, that's not me." He goes, "It's not?" I go,



"No, it is not me dude. That is not me logged in. I don't know who it is, but it's not me." Board meeting starts to get contentious. People start getting kicked out. I get kicked out, log back in, get kicked out, getting kicked out, getting kicked out.

I'm getting text messages from union members saying, "Hey, the board has no idea what's going on. But somebody is in there and they're booting people." It ends up online as the whole thing. And I thought to myself, click. Who do I know that logs into public meetings under other names and boots people out of them because they think it's funny? That guy does. Do I have proof? I don't have proof. Did he ever admit it to me? No, because I haven't talked to him. But why else would he log in and do that? And I do know that he was involved in some of our stuff. Another, I just remembered, from Scappoose300, that email address. There was a time when our fire department was failing and we needed money and we were like, "We're screwed." So the board suggested, "Let's go to cities for loans. Let's go to the City of St. Helens, let's go to the county. Let's try to survive."

So we go to the City of St. Helens for a loan, start this process. The council gets an anonymous email from the Scappoose300@gmail.com account. And that email, the person calls it CCFR, right? We shouldn't loan CCFR any money. I know that was Greenway who wrote that from the Scappoose300 account, because that's what he always called Columbia River. He called us CCFR. He would never call us CRFR. He would never do it. He always called it, because it's Clark County Fire and Rescue, where he comes from. He was constantly calling them CCFR and I was like, "Hey, Chief it's CRFNR." "Okay, okay." Well CCFNR, he just would say that over and over and over again. So when I saw that text in the anonymous email to council from Scappoose300, I went, aha."

Sergeant ** (SHPD)**

On November 18, 2024, I interviewed Sgt. **** at the SHPD administration office. Sgt. **** told me that Interim Chief **** had informed him I would be doing an interview. Sgt. **** said Interim Chief **** instructed him to write a summary of workplace concerns related to Chief Greenway.

Sgt. **** began,

*"So Chief **** notified me that Chief Greenway's on leave, and there were some concerns about some conduct in the workplace, and he directed me to complete a written summary of that.*

*So the first incident that I can remember that was concerning, involved the intentional disruption of the City of Scappoose City Council meeting. I don't know if you've been talked to about this. So I was present when a discussion took place. I know I was there, I know Lieutenant **** was there. I believe Sergeant **** was there for this. I don't think anyone else was there.*

And essentially, as I remember it, Chief Greenway was watching the City of Scappoose meeting via Zoom and realized that he had administrator privileges in the meeting, which I'm not quite sure what that is or how you determine that. But one of the things apparently that he said during this discussion was he realized that he could bounce people out of the meeting. And so there was apparently, I believe, a reporter and a presenter, someone at the meeting who was



providing testimony or information to council, and what he was doing was just intentionally going in and removing them from the meeting and disrupting the City Council meeting.

At one point apparently, and this should ring a bell with the City of Scappoose, their IT director had to get involved to figure out what was going on. They realized there was a problem, but couldn't ascertain what it was.

*So probably about a couple days after that discussion, **** came over and we actually took a drive, and he and I were debating what our ethical responsibilities were on reporting this. And I didn't believe that computer crime fit because it didn't have a financial motivation to it. There has to be some sort of financial component, which this wasn't."*

I asked Sgt. **** if he knew the approximate year this took place and he said,

"I want to say it was around 2021. If you look between 2021 to 2022, that's an estimation. I do believe that if you can figure out who the City of Scappoose IT director was, it sounded like this was pretty disruptive, so somebody should remember that."

Sgt. **** did not remember any specific names that Chief Greenway claimed to have logged in under. I told Sgt. **** someone said Chief Greenway had logged in as Mike Coxlong. Sgt. **** said that was similar to what he remembered.

I asked Sgt. ****,

"So let me ask you just generally, your Chief is telling you you're doing this, do you think that that has an impact in a positive or negative way in terms of just the leader of the organization? They set the tone for professionalism and ethics and this sort of stuff. Do you have an opinion on how that impacts this department, or does it impact this department that you've got the Chief Executive doing behaviors like this with neighboring jurisdictions?"

Sgt. **** replied,

"I was shocked by it. I mean, I previously served as [REDACTED]. I would never conduct myself that way, let alone tell my subordinates that I was. So I was pretty shocked by it, but what I'm more concerned is that this person literally has the ability to bounce me out of my special assignment at will. And so yeah, it has a negative impact on your morale. It has a negative impact on... I have serious questions about his judgment, and that's something that is a theme that, as I go through a couple of these other incidents here, over the years, I developed some very serious concerns about that."

Sgt. **** continued,

*"So some of these are not going to be in chronological order, Mr. Band, if that's all right. So we have a computer lab in this building, and so I'm one of our Cellebrite examiners. So I was in the computer lab. This would've been, I think, within about three weeks of him being put on leave, three or four weeks. And he had come in and disclosed to me that there were some really embarrassing text messages that existed between him and Officer ****. **** was someone who... Well, you know better than anyone else. He was involved in an incident. He was*



terminated and made some untruthful statements allegedly. And he told me that because of what was going on, these messages he described as "highly embarrassing and damaging," and they were somehow related to a confidence vote of some sort between Walsh and the Mayor Scholl.

Now, he didn't go into detail what these messages were and what they consisted of, and he was just telling me about them. And I urged him that if they exist, you probably want to get in front of it, but that was the extent of that conversation. So I don't know what those text messages consisted of."

I clarified with Sgt. **** that this took place after Officer **** had been placed on administrative leave. I asked Sgt. ****,

*"And Greenway, did you get the impression that he's worried about now that ****'s in trouble, that maybe these text messages are going to come out?"*

Sgt. **** replied,

[REDACTED]

We then had this back-and-forth about this topic:

Jim Band:

Greenway said this to you?

Sgt. ****:

Yes, he said this to me.

Jim Band:

*So what was your impression? Did you feel like he was trying to get you to tell **** something or how did you take this?*

Sgt. ****:



Now, again, I'm offering my opinion here. I want to be able and make it very clear of that. I got the impression that that was an overture for me to intervene in some way, and I was absolutely not going to do that.

Jim Band:

*And if I'm understanding you, you mean to intervene in the sense that to get a message to **** that if he shared these text messages, that Greenway would somehow let ****'s wife know about [REDACTED] something like this?*

Sgt. ****:

*I got the impression that that comment was so specific that I believed there was an implicit message to me to say, "Hey, ****, you may want to dial that down. You may not want to disclose all those messages because you don't want [REDACTED]"*

Jim Band:

Gotcha.

Sgt. ****:

*But the moment I heard that, I'm like, "I'm absolutely not doing that." And then once Chief Greenway was put on leave, I notified Chief **** of that conversation.*

Sgt. **** went on and shared another concern related to an investigation he was told to start by Chief Greenway:

Sgt. ****:

*So something else that happened was that on April 15th of 2024, he got a hold of me. Chief did and notified me that I needed to report actually down to this building here. And he provided me a document, which was a letter that was completed by our Mayor-Elect Jennifer ****. And it outlined, I think, some fairly legitimate concerns regarding financial irregularities with the company that runs Halloweentown. I was directed to review it, interview them, and conduct an investigation into it.*

I ultimately met with the people with this referral. I brought down the documents and everything here for you to look at and you can see the letter that was presented to me. And it was pretty clear to me that the money they're talking about, which is the Halloweentown money that is generated from the Halloweentown event here in town, was allegedly being kept by this company in the Wauna Credit Union in town. It's in a private bank with, at the time, the current contractor in control of it. And she was not allowing the City access to the money. The contract was not renewed with her, and she didn't return the City funds.



Jim Band:

So what is Halloweentown?

Sgt. ****:

Halloweentown is this large-scale event here in St. Helens where I think during the months leading up to Halloween, there's almost like a festival that takes place on the weekends. And when I'm telling you that there's thousands of people that come here, it's a zoo during that period of time. There's thousands upon thousands of people that come into town. They pay to park, they pay admission tickets to come in, and then there's vendors that sell products, and you just kind of go on a tour down there in the downtown area.

Jim Band:

And so is this a person doing this as their business?

Sgt. ****:

*Yes, yeah. There's a company called ****, which is run by a woman named ****. She's more commonly known as ****, and she was the contractor that the City pays to essentially run the event. And as Mayor Scholl has said, "She runs it, we own it," which I think is actually a pretty good analogy to simplify things. She's paid a salary to run this event, and this event generates a considerable amount of money for the City.*

Jim Band:

And that amount of money is supposed to come back to the City?

Sgt. ****:

It is, as I understand it, she is to administer the event. And as the letter articulates in here, there's a plan of where the funds are supposed to go to. But I think it's very clear when you review this, sir, that these are public monies. This is actually public money that is raised from a City event where they just pay a contractor to basically run the event.

Jim Band:

And how much money net are we talking, do you think's, in the bank account?

Sgt. ****:

Well, that depends, sir. I have no idea what's in the Wauna Credit Union account. I would imagine it's a rather large sum of money, and I don't want to speculate how much, but it wouldn't surprise me if there was a million dollars in the account, if not more.



Jim Band:

Oh, geez. Right.

Sgt. ****:

*But we don't know because the City's never been granted access to it. So with the documents that were presented to me, which are contained in here, I reviewed them, and some of it include statements that were made by ****, the former finance director for the City of St. Helens, who identified what he believed to be thousands of dollars in missing money. And I reviewed this and very quickly saw that I'm a City employee, I shouldn't be investigating this, there's a conflict of interest here. And by the scope of it, I believed the most appropriate organization to investigate it is the Internal Revenue Service because there's some tax issues that come into play with some of the allegations. And I've worked with the IRS Criminal Division before. They're a great organization.*

*So Chief Greenway was very adamant that I investigate it and I didn't want to be insubordinate to my Chief, so I wanted to be tactful where I took the initial report, I contacted this organization, the IRS, who quickly, when they reviewed everything, I gave them all the evidence, all the documents that Jennifer **** collected, and we ultimately met with the FBI, their Public Corruption Unit, along with the IRS. They reviewed everything that we had, including my report, and they decided to move forward with a criminal investigation. I don't know the status of that right now, but it's ongoing.*

The reason why that's important was, I believe it was on April 17th, Chief Greenway sent me a text message to me indicating the Councilman Sundeen was going to wait for... That Councilman Sundeen was aware of the complaint and concerns that were outlined with this investigation here. And-

Jim Band:

You said a last name there, how do you spell that?

Sgt. ****:

Sundeen, S-U-N-D-E-E-N.

Jim Band:

Okay. And the date you said again was April...

Sgt. ****:

I believe it was April 17th.

Jim Band:

Of 2024?



Sgt. ****:

Yeah. And this was a couple days after I was summoned down to... And I'm relying on text messages and notes here, I might have dates wrong, but he was telling me that at some point, the City needed to make a decision to place John Walsh on administrative leave, who's the City Administrator. And that's kind of a common theme as this investigation unfolded was the Chief was always talking about having to place a City Administrator on leave. And the only that appeared to me to be withholding the City's money is this woman, not Mr. Walsh. And so I was always kind of confused by that, and I don't have an explanation for you, Mr. Band, of why he was so laser-focused on that.

Some months later, Chief Greenway called me and notified me that Mr. Walsh needed to be placed on administrative leave. I don't have a firm date on that, but it was after this April discussion after I received all of this. And he told me he had briefed Councilman Sundeen and that a meeting was scheduled with two city attorneys, and he directed me to fully cooperate with them.

I brought my materials just, like I did today. We met with the attorneys. There was a female attorney that was here, and I think there was another gentleman that was on Zoom, if I remember correctly. I don't think he was actually present. I brought my materials, answered their questions. I briefed them on the information I was provided, but Mr. Walsh was never placed on leave. I felt that meeting was strange, and I never got a firm answer because it seemed, when I was summoned down here to share these materials, that the decision had already been made but Mr. Walsh was never put on leave.

So I don't have a really good answer for you, Mr. Band, about that, but something doesn't sit right with me.

Jim Band:

Okay.

Sgt. ****:

*My primary concern was that this whole thing has caused an enormous amount of stress for me professionally, and a lot of it has to do with the fact that I've had to tell Jennifer **** several times that we have to let the feds do their jobs and let's try to keep everything off social media. If the evidence is there, it's there. If it's not there, it's not there. We just have to let the investigators do their jobs. But I was constantly getting pressure that Mr. Walsh needed to be put on leave on those two different meetings that I was describing.*

Jim Band:

All from the Chief?

Sgt. ****:

*From the Chief. And my concern was that at one point, Ms. **** was running for Mayor of St. Helens, and I was concerned that any sort of public disclosure of the federal investigation could affect the*



election. And my feeling is that if the money's sitting in the Wauna Credit Union account, it's probably not going anywhere. And if it is, the feds will find it if it gets transferred out of the account. So I just wanted to keep everything off the radar and let the election play out. You see what I'm saying?

Jim Band:

Mm-hmm.

Sgt. ****:

I didn't want everything to be negatively affected, the investigation or the election.

Sgt. **** told me about another incident,

*"So the other incident that was kind of concerning was on September 2nd of this year, it was Detective ****'s first day as a detective. And so what had happened was I had a partner, ****, for a number of years. And because of staffing issues, he went back to patrol. And the problem was with the caseload that I have, I mean, I must have 50 or 60 pending cases just on my plate. It's far too many for me to work by myself. So I've been constantly saying, "I need at least one other guy to help me out." So what ended up happening was in September, it was decided they were going to rebid and then **** was going to come in and be my new detective.*

So September 2nd was his first day. So when he came in, we briefed him. I kind of laid out my expectations and I said, "We got some work to do, let's just jump on it." And so I sent him actually up to our Records Division to make some photocopies, and he didn't come back, which was kind of odd because it was a pretty simple task. So I ended up walking up there to see what was taking him so long, and I realized that he was standing up in Records and the Chief was there. And when I walked in, the Chief just looked at me and says, I could tell he was upset, he told me, "I'm going to need to talk to you two."

*So I don't know what happened between the two. I later learned from Detective **** the Chief dressed him down up in Records, demanded to know why he was dressed as a detective, and why he was wearing what he was wearing, which was strange because I thought it was pretty much public knowledge, he was coming in to be a detective, and he wasn't on the patrol schedule. So to me, that's a pretty big tell that he's... And he was selected as the next detective.*

*So anyway, Chief ended up bringing me in and **** into Sergeant ****'s office, told us that he was not a detective, instructed **** that he didn't want to see any grievances filed related to pay issues, and that... I forget how he described it. It was something to the effect of he was going to be in a mentoring program or something for a month.*

*And so we go back over and **** was pretty upset. He's like, "I don't understand what that was all about. I got in trouble from the Chief for showing up to work in an assignment that I was put into, and he's telling me that I can't receive my detective pay." And so I'm like, "****, here's the deal. I can't explain it either. I'm not going to look you in the eye and tell you I know what the hell that was because I don't." But I said, "Here's the reality on the ground. You can file a*



grievance with the union. As a former union guy, you're clearly a detective. You're not on the patrol schedule." All the reasons, Mr. Band, I just told you.

*But I also said, "I'm going to look you in the eye as **** to ****. If you do that, you're not going to be free of consequences and the likelihood that you're going to stay in here as a detective is minimal." I said, "I have every confidence you're going to get bounced out." So I said, "You're going to have to make a decision here how you want to play this." And I said, "It's going to be one month of not receiving your pay, and hopefully we can redress this in a month or two and figure out why you're not being paid as a detective or you can file your grievance. You're going to have to make a decision what to do."*

So he kind of cooled off for a little bit and said, "I want to be a detective. I've always wanted to be a detective. I won't file the grievance, and I guess I won't get my pay." But I thought that was one of the strangest, one of the strangest interactions I'd seen."

I asked if Chief Greenway ever gave them a reason why and Sgt. **** said,

*"No. And again, Mr. Band, I don't feel comfortable asking because my concern is, like I told ****, if I raise too much of an issue with this, if we go to the mat for this, and this is a phrase you're going to hear me that I've said before, retaliation can take many forms. Okay? We already have a staffing issue already. It'd be very easy to say, "God, we don't have the bodies. We need you to go out to patrol." And then you're out. For the time being, you're in here, you're doing detective work. Let's see if we can get this fixed later and let's just put our heads down and do our job.*

*And sincerely, the reason for that is I know that being a detective is something that's very important to Mr. ****. His father, ****, was the former [REDACTED] here at St. Helens. He's always wanted to be a detective. And I was worried that if we didn't play our cards right here, he'd get bounced right out."*

Sgt. **** moved on to another incident,

*"So probably the last at least major issue I can remember, it's a little out of chronological order here, but it also involved Detective ****. He was present during some of this.*

So this incident occurred back in September of '21, 2021. And what happened was that there was an infant death up in the City of Vernonia. I don't know if you've been to Vernonia or had a lot of interactions with their police department, but they're a challenge on a good day. And what happened was a friend of mine at the Sheriff's Office, Brent Thompson, he's also a deputy medical examiner. There had been an infant death, possibly like a SIDS death that occurred up there at this house. He had responded up there with a Vernonia officer. The Vernonia officer showed up, completely was incapable of assisting with the call for whatever reason. So it was just Brent up there by himself, and there was like 15 people in this house and this dead child and he was completely overwhelmed. And so he did the best job he could as his DME role and also as the investigator. But the scene investigation, from what I understand, didn't go well.

So I was summoned down to a meeting with Jeff Auxier at the time, who was the district attorney, and Brent Thompson. I've been on the Washington County Major Crimes Team for



many years, so sometimes Jeff would call me down there. And we knew that there was an issue with the Columbia County Major Crimes Team. It was essentially not really a functioning team. They had Columbia County members to it, but St. Helens had their own team. It was called our Special Investigations Unit, the SIU. So I kind of ran that when I came here, and it functioned very well. If we have a critical incident, we came out, we assigned roles. It functioned just like an MCT team with really good staff.

So Jeff Auxier was like, "How do we fix this?" Because things didn't go well up at the scene, and Sergeant Thompson was trying to fall on his sword a little bit here and saying, "I really screwed up. I should have done more." And I looked at him, I'm like, "Brent, why didn't you call me? I mean, I would've driven down to help you." He's like, "Well, with your outside agency response, I didn't feel comfortable calling you." And that really upset me because at the end of the day, it's really about that child that died. And we have a deputy on scene who needed help, he had my phone number, I would've come out, but he didn't feel comfortable calling me.

So we had a union meeting that was set up a short time after that. So I had talked to **** * ahead of time about my concerns. And so we went into this union meeting, and **** * made a speech, I hope he shared it with you, about what he said at this union meeting about Chief Greenway, about the fact that we can't be worried about retaliation or anything else anymore. We have to do the right thing.

So then when he was done speaking, I don't remember my exact words, but I'll paraphrase for you. I said, "I want to echo everything **** just said." And I brought up this death case in Vernonia, and I said, "You know, at the end of the day, guys, we have to do the right thing here. And if we have officers in our county who are on a scene where we have dead kids and they don't have the resources they need to properly investigate it, then we have to fix this. And I don't know what the answer is, whether we join the Major Crimes Team or we liaison with them, whatever form we pick, we have to do something. And I think we need to bring it up. And I think we, as an association, need to bring this up to the command staff because we got to fix this."

And so after the union meeting, I don't remember if it was the next day or within a few days, **** * had his take-home car taken away. That was removed. And then **** * was at this meeting too, and he piped up in support. He actually agreed. Chief called me and **** * into a meeting, and I remember he wasn't yelling, but he was dressing us down. He was upset, but he was repeating things that we had said in that union meeting to us. So I remember at the meeting, I'm like, "Okay, well, he knows everything that I said. He clearly knows everything **** * said," and he canceled some upcoming trainings that I really wanted to go to, a homicide course and I think a computer forensics course because I was trying to get our lab up and running at the time. So he canceled trainings that **** * and I were scheduled for, and that was it."

I asked Sgt. **** * if Chief Greenway gave him a reason for canceling his training; he replied that he was not certain whether Greenway gave him a reason. I asked Sgt. **** * if it was tied to the stuff that was said at the union meeting and he replied,



"To me, it clearly was because there was no other reason to call the meeting that we had. And he was mentioning things from the union meeting, and that's when I realized someone from the union meeting clearly was telling him what we said."

Sgt. **** said Chief Greenway was not yelling but was clearly upset. Sgt. **** said he did not know who was giving the information to Chief Greenway.

Sgt. **** also told me,

"Something that you may want to ask some questions about. I was not part of this, but I had heard about it was there was apparently a text thread where some questionable pornography was being shared back and forth amongst the guys and the Chief. I only caught wind of it one time, and I think I got froze out of it pretty quick.

*So I don't remember what officer showed this to me, but I was going into the report room, and I often just go in there before I go with the detective, sir, and just check in and make sure anyone needs anything, right? And someone's like, "Hey, check out what the Chief sent me." And they pulled up their cell phone and showed me a picture and it was a Photoshop picture of a former employee with the City. His name is ****. He used to work in [REDACTED], and it was a picture where his face had been superimposed on a naked person and their penis was hanging out.*

And I looked at this officer and I'm like, "Yeah, we can't be sharing that." But he told me he got it directly from the Chief. So it's like I just told him, "We can't be sharing that, not interested," and I left."

Sgt. **** did not remember who this officer was.

I had the following conversation with Sgt. ****:

Jim Band:

Anthony Boswell?

Sgt. ****:

Yeah.

Jim Band:

Did you hear anything about a canine officer in military, a canine position, and the Chief saying that he was not going to give a canine position to somebody who was in the military?

Sgt. ****:

I do independently recall an offhand comment. Something similar to that, yes.



Jim Band:

Okay. Do you remember what that was? My understanding is there was a panel about who was going to get selected.

Sgt. ****:

No, I don't think I heard it in a panel setting. I think I recall the Chief saying something similar to that as an offhand comment. I don't remember. But I remember hearing it, and I remember thinking to myself, "I wouldn't be saying that. He's got certain protections and I wouldn't do it," but that was an internal thought. I certainly didn't say that to Greenway, but I do have independent memory of that.

I asked Sgt. **** if he had any recollection of an incident with **** **** after the Trooper had been hit. I asked Sgt. **** what happened and he said,

*"So the way that our office was situated, I had a desk and there was a walkway in front of me, so I could hear and see people come in, and **** had come in. He was working. He had come in, I don't even think he was even in the trailer, sir, to talk to the Chief about this issue. But he came in. I remember I just started hearing yelling and that keyed me in. And then I remember I stood up and looked and the Chief was yelling at **** about spiking the car or doing something. But it was something that **** didn't do. He didn't do any of that. And he was trying to explain himself to the Chief, and the Chief just dressed him down, chewed his ass right there at the trailer. Very uncomfortable, but I was present for that."*

I asked Sgt. ****,

"Okay. Did you hear him say, the Chief, say anything like, "You're going to be fired. If you lied to me, you're going to be fired."

Sgt. **** replied,

*"Yes, he did say that. He did say that. "You lie to me, I'm going to fire you right now," or something to that effect. And part of it was it was so surprising because I don't know, there was something that was said before that, but I don't know what the hell was said, and I knew enough about the incident. I was actually working that day. I'd come in. I worked Saturdays too. And so when this incident had occurred, I was working and I knew that **** hadn't done any of that, and that he actually had gone there and provided, I think, some extraordinary medical first aid to the trooper. And I remember thinking to myself, "Why are you yelling at this guy? He probably instrumentally saved this man's life, and you're threatening to fire him?" And he didn't even do what he was being accused of doing. It was pretty shocking. But yeah, I was there for that."*

Detective ** (SHPD)**

On November 18, 2024, I interviewed Detective **** at the SHPD administration building.

Detective **** told me about the following,



*"Well, so this goes back. So I was promoted to detective, I believe in April of 2022. We were going to open a third spot. Due to staffing levels, some guys left. We didn't end up opening that third spot, but I was basically told, "You're going to be a detective. You're going to be a detective." Totally understandable. Policing is hard nowadays. Not having that spot, I get it. Fast forward to this year, I got a call from Lieutenant **** in July, maybe? Said, "Hey, you're not bidding on the next rotation. You're going to be a detective starting September one, September two," whatever the first business day is. That was my understanding and said, "Okay." September comes around, I start working for a couple weeks. Detective **** and I are busy working plain clothes. It was my understanding I was working with a supervisor in this capacity.*

Came to work one day, went to the main building, to the front office. I don't remember what I was doing, maybe making copies, getting copies, and Chief was there, Greenway. And Greenway stops me. He's like, "What are you doing?" And I don't remember the conversation verbatim, so this is just at the top of my head, just summarizing it, so don't exact quote me on this, but I just want to put that out there. He said, "What are you doing?" And I said, "Well, I'm working." He said, "Well, are you a detective?" "I think, yeah. Yes." And he was like, "Well." I don't remember the exact conversation, but it was something along the lines of, "Well, I didn't make you a detective, so why are you working in this capacity?" And I was like, "Well, I'd had a conversation with Joe and I was under the impression that I was going to be a detective or that I was promoted on September one."

*Then he asked me, he said, "Hey, are you being paid like a detective?" And up to that point, the documentation for my pay slip had not been completed. So I said, "Well, no it hasn't." And I said, "I was actually going to talk to you about that." And he's like, "You're right, because it hasn't been signed yet. I have not promoted you, so I don't know what you're doing." It was around that time that Detective ****, who's my supervisor, came in and he's like, "Great, your supervisor's here. We need to have a chat." So we went, Detective ****, me and Chief went into Sergeant ****'s office, which is right inside the building there and we had a conversation about employment and Chief acknowledged that there was a misunderstanding between himself and when I was going to start in capacity as a detective.*

*It was under his impression that I'd be starting October 1st. Detective **** and I explained that it was our understanding, it would be September 1st. It sounded like we got that ironed out. During the course of this meeting, I was informed however, that I would not be paid during the month of September as a detective. And the reason that I was given was because that ****, who was the previous detective, he got pulled out in January, December. He was already being paid as a detective and he couldn't pay both of us at the same time, which didn't quite make sense to me. I was working out of capacity. Or I was working in capacity, he was out of capacity, didn't really make sense. I've done this job long enough to know to not argue with your Chief.*

So I wasn't happy, didn't argue, and he kind of keyed into the fact that I wasn't happy. And he asked, "Are you mad at me?" I said, "Well, I guess I'm just confused here because I don't understand what's happening." And I don't remember the exact context or the exact way that he



worded it, but he basically told me he knew that I wouldn't be grieving it. And I got from that to not grieve it and that I shouldn't. I was pretty frustrated, but I kept my mouth shut. Went back-

I asked Detective **** why he took it that way and he replied,

"Yeah, so the way he said it was like, "Hey, I know you're not going to grieve this. I know that's not something you're going to do." I've been here long enough to know that when chiefs suggest... Chief always has a saying. Greenway always had a saying, and he would say something and then he'd go, "Most people would take that as a clue." So when he's telling me, "Hey, I know you're not going to grieve this. I know that you're not going to call your attorney." It's like, okay, he's telling me not to call my attorney and that if I do, he didn't provide any ramifications if I did, he didn't give any consequence, but it was my understanding that if I did, that I would be pulled.

*Now I went back to the same day, and these are text messages I had between me and my wife right after the meeting occurred. So I don't want revisionist history here where I'm making up now that Chief's gone. That is dated September. That is a conversation that I had had with my wife immediately prior or immediately ending that meeting. Go back to my office. I was frustrated. I told my boss, ****, that I was very frustrated and that is a conversation that I'd had with my wife, Tressa, about how I felt that meeting went and what I took from that meeting."*

Detective **** gave me three pages of a printout from what he said were texts between him and his wife.

Detective **** said,

"So I know that coming in here two months later, I can say whatever I want and I don't want it to look like that. That is my true feelings at the time, and that is what I wrote to her. And that right there is the best indication of how I felt that meeting went. I can't give you exact quotes or verbatim what he said. I remember being very frustrated during the meeting. I didn't understand why that was occurring. And it was weird because afterwards I met with Greenway again at some point, and he basically acknowledged that, "Yeah, it was a misunderstanding between me and Joe and that you were going to be a detective September one," but there was no conversation of like, "Hey, we're going to give you that pay." At the end of the day, it's like \$800, \$1200 bucks. It's not worth putting your career on the line or making waves over.

*But it didn't sit right with me, but my job is to do my job and not make waves. So that's where I went with that. And then that has been rectified since. But yeah, and there was one thing that was really weird during that meeting, I'm recalling. So **** said something, Detective ****, and basically they wanted to classify my time that month as a mentorship versus"*

We had the following back-and-forth about this:

Jim Band:

Why were they so worried about \$800?



****.

That's one thing that I was really in my mind. I don't know. I know that we were under the microscope a lot because we were coming away from 24-hour coverage and our funding, and we spend a lot of money on a lot of things here that may or may not make sense. I didn't think that an \$800...

One thing that was really frustrating is Chief was trying to get this 20-hour schedule done, which needed a lot of movement from the association. We had to get the association involved. So I really pushed and really worked with our guys on the association side to help get this done. The collective bargaining agreement, the MOU, I wrote that. I met with Chief. I met with our e-board because I did feel like it was important that if he wanted something done, that we work with him instead of against him because you can't have a department that's moving two different directions. You got to... And so I was hurt that I felt like I'd done all this stuff to get this done, and then it was like, "Hey, thanks for your help, but by the way, can't pay you this month." It was just weird to me.

*That's what I got from that. I mean, like I said, I wish I could give you exact quotes and stuff. It was a very unusual sequence of events that day, that morning. And I was frustrated. And I remember telling Sergeant **** that I felt like what was happening was illegal, but that I would not be pursuing legal action because I did not. I felt like if I did, I was going to get yanked from detectives.*

Jim Band:

That there would be retribution, and you'd get pulled from detectives.

****.

*Yep, and I did feel like that, that they would find... And I believe what I said was, "He's not going to yank me because of what I'm doing, but because of this funding issue, he's basically going to say that there is not enough money to have a second guy. ****'s already in here. Sorry dude, you got to go back to the road." And that's what I was worried about. And you can see that in there with my messages with my wife. Basically, I come to terms like, "Hey, this is what I want to do. I'm going to eat it this month." So yeah, that's that."*

I asked Detective **** if Chief Greenway had ever sent him anything via text that he thought was inappropriate. Detective **** answered,

"Yes. So I thought you were going to ask me that, so I went through last night and I looked and saw what I had from him, and I will bring this up and whatever you need, I can give you pictures or I can give you... Where is it at? I went through my phone last night to see if I have anything and I do. Now, what I will say with this is I never really... This is one of those weird ones because I never told him, "Don't send me these." I never... Law enforcement's one of those professions that you find humor in things that aren't great. Now, is it appropriate for Chief to send this stuff to a subordinate? Probably not. But I never told him to stop. You know what I mean?"

Detective **** showed me a picture that he said Chief Greenway sent him. It was a side-by-side picture of Sheriff Pixley next to an overweight wrestler. I took a picture of it with my camera.



Follow Up Interview with Detective ****

I called Detective **** to ask him one question. During subsequent interviews, I learned that Detective **** was one of the people thought to have potentially told Chief Greenway what occurred during the union meeting about the Major Crimes Team. I asked Detective **** about this and he replied,

"I had heard that Chief had found out regarding what we talked about in that meeting. I went to Chief at that point and said, "Hey, I don't know what you've heard. I was one of the people in this meeting who advocated to be a part of the major crime scene." I said, "I'm a young officer, I want more experience." I did not believe there'd be any issue with wanting to do more and help fellow agencies. So, I did go to Chief, and I told him what my role in that meeting was at that point, once I found out that he had heard about the discussions that were it had."

I asked Detective **** if he had told the Chief what anyone else had said, and specifically if he told Chief Greenway what **** or **** **** said during the meeting. Detective **** answered,

"I don't recall. I might have, but I don't think I would have. I don't think so. I have a belief that our association meetings are our association meetings and that needs to stay there. When I went to meet with him... Like I said, this was two years ago."

Detective **** went on,

"I did go meet with him, but it was more to explain why I did what I did, because there is... Full disclosure, Chief hold grudges in my opinion, so I didn't want him thinking that I was at this meeting trying to badmouth everybody. So, I went and explained my position and why I did and said what I said. I don't believe I threw anybody else under the bus or talked about what they said. And when I went to him, it was after this information was already out. It was known that Chief had learned what we said, which is why I went to him."

I asked Detective **** if Chief Greenway was asking what other people said and he said,

"No, I don't believe so. I'm trying to remember. I don't believe that that was a part of the conversation. I remember I had it with him at his desk in the portable, but I don't believe that he was asking or questioning anything. I think he just listened. But like I said, it was over... Probably August of 2022 maybe, so over two years ago. I can't remember the conversation exactly. I don't believe he was questioning or asking. I honestly believe at that point he had already known or had gotten a report what people had said. But yeah, that wasn't something that I went in there and brought up or anything like that."

Detective **** went on,

"Like I said, my purpose of speaking to him at that time was because I had heard that he was aware of what was said in that meeting and I... Sometimes people report things here and protect themselves in our association, so I wanted to make sure he knew exactly what I said and what my context was so that it wasn't misinterpreted. But I don't believe that things in association meetings should leave association meetings and that's usually where I'm at, so I can't see myself



reporting on what other people say. But like I said, it was two years ago. I just don't... I can't tell you a hundred percent. That's just not something that I would see myself doing."

I told Detective **** the Chief had apparently went after a couple people afterwards and he said,

"Yeah, I lost the training due to that incident. I was supposed to go to my examiner training, I believe... Oh, that October. And at that point I no longer was able to go because of this reason or that reason. Obviously, the major crime discussion wasn't part of that reason that I was given, but it was the same time. And then Chief Greenway has this thing where he'll get mad at you and then he'll calm down and so after a couple of weeks she sent me an email basically saying, "Hey, here's a really cool training program. Why don't you pick one of these trainings and go to this?" And that's what happened and that's how I went to my training in Idaho in January of '23."

Sgt. ** (SHPD)**

On November 18, 2024, I interviewed Sgt. **** at the SHPD administration building.

Sgt. **** and I had the following conversation:

****:

So what I've seen is early on at some point there was some City Council meeting that the Chief was letting LT and I know that he was logging people off. At first, how it was presented, I thought it was a joke and kind of funny, ha ha, okay. Because he does like to banter and make jokes. I said, "Okay, that's funny, ha ha." At some point, I realized maybe that wasn't a joke, but there wasn't any further discussion about it.

Jim Band:

Are we talking about the city of-

****:

This was Scappoose, I think that's the one. I heard later that he was signing into a different city, a different council meeting, I'm not sure who it was, under a different name. Which that I don't recall him telling me directly, but I heard that that had happened. So I'm not sure if that's hearsay or not. I don't know.

Jim Band:

But you did hear him talk about the Scappoose one?

****:

The Scappoose one, yes.



Jim Band:

Did you hear him saying something about logging in under any inappropriate names?

****.

Well, I think that's what kind of made it, I mean, hindsight probably not funny, but at the time it was funny. The name, Mike something, Coxlong, maybe something like that. Sophomoric, and that's why I'm kind of incredulous, because I've never had a Chief of Police that would do that. So I didn't know if that was just his way of making a funny with us trying to connect. I wasn't on the meeting so I didn't know, but still something that I put in the back of my head like, okay, interesting, but not finding out what I would do, but it's what was done.

I know that he had a lot of animosity with the City leadership. Those specific conversations I was not involved with directly, that was outside of my scope. But he did vent and I did allow room for venting and it was in nothing that I took to anybody else because he should have room to vent to some degree. Personality conflicts are going to happen. So I know that he had pretty significant personality conflict with John Walsh, our City Administrator. As a sergeant, some things, I don't need it here, but my role is a little bit different in our PD as far as what I do as sergeant because I do bleed off a lot onto more administrative functions. Again, given that bit, I just, okay, just a safe person to vent to or he's frustrated with. Where that kind of seemed like it was inappropriate was when we were having staff meetings and comments were being made during staff meetings.

Jim Band:

Give me some examples.

****.

So early on there was some issue with Pixley...Sheriff Pixley and I mean he called him muffin tits in front of the entire crowd. Not what I would do. And I think looking in hindsight, I really try to understand why he wouldn't say something like that. He came from Vegas and this is where it's me rationalizing irrational behavior. So I'm still having difficulty trying excuse something that wasn't excusable and it's hard for me because I like him. He did teach me good things, but also things you don't do. So it's hard for me to have to reconcile that. When I gave him a ride home, it was awkward. But things like that happen.

Jim Band:

When you say, am I summarizing, I can kind of infer what you're saying. Just like the thing with the muffin tits or whatever, just maybe something inappropriate for a Chief to share in terms of-

****.

In that setting.

Jim Band:



What tone you're setting with your department, that kind of stuff?

****.

Right. Because once you start to devalue and to a certain extent dehumanize another agency head and their culture, well then it makes it easier for you to then as a group to almost discredit them entirely, which is not comfortable with me entirely or in any way. I have worked with a lot of those guys, some of those guys that are now sergeants, there were my troops that I do take pride in training them to fulfill leadership somewhere else. And I know that not everybody is like that so it's hard for me to reconcile those two things.

When I look and see where Chief Greenway came from, he was a Captain at Las Vegas, and the way I understood it very little, if any contact with any of the line officers much less or the sergeants much less an officer, it would be in a room with other lieutenants and maybe a sergeant or two. But that audience is significantly different than your officer that's on the ground pounder that's going out there that's working every single day in that capacity. Two different maturity levels and two different understanding of, okay, so if he says this, it's venting or that's my personal feeling, not that you have to take action on that, but if you're an entry-level guy, you can't tell the difference. If I was a three-year year officer and somebody told me that, I'm not sure how I would respond because here's your leader that's telling you these things. So that was an example of something I wouldn't do.

I asked Sgt. ****,

"You mentioned driving him home and I had heard that you had, was his response to being put on admin leave, was he Introspective at all or was he, what was his sort of..."

Sgt. **** responded,

*"He was. When he came back from their meeting, he asked me if I could do him a favor and I said, "Of course." He asked if I can give him a ride home, which initially I think Chief **** asked me, "Hey, can you see if [inaudible 00:08:47] to give him ride home?" Just to kind of separate all stuff. But he didn't want that. He felt, I guess more comfortable with me taking him home, which I was fine with that. Hindsight, kind of glad it was me because if he did vent and say anything, it was just going to be me and it wasn't going to be anybody else and I can absorb any anger that he had without amping him up or doing something like that.*

He did tell me that he did make, have conversations and interactions with the union members that he regrets and that he lost his vision and he made a mistake. He didn't with me get into the weeds as to what those conversations were and I didn't ask him. He did have remorse for how he had handled incidents while he was here, especially in the last couple of years. So it was interesting to see that that was his perspective at that moment. And he had said that made those same statements in the past like, "Hey, I think I screwed up. I shouldn't have said some things." Didn't divulge details, but that's what he said.

There were things that he would say that don't sit well with me when he would tell me that he's fine with this place collapsing or going to the ground. Again, those were things that he was



venting though, what else was around except for maybe Chief **** or myself here, and usually it was when he was angry. So if he's angry, okay, say what you need to say."

I asked Sgt. **** why Chief Greenway would say something like that and he said,

"Was sometimes he was just all over the map so it's really hard to track. It didn't sit well with me because I've been here for a long time and I've had opportunity to leave and go work somewhere where the place where either it's going to be more financially beneficial or I can achieve rank faster or I can do whatever you name it. There's always opportunities someplace else. I stayed here because I have a connection to commitment and I've been treated very well by the City. And certain leaders that were here, some showed me what not to do, but others showed a great deal of empathy and leadership and support when I needed it personally so I have a lot of regard for our City and for my department. Not to over-invest because I take my time for myself and my family, but I do have, I see the St. Helens PD, I think of it highly.

So when he would say those things personally, I would always ponder, well, when you leave, I'm still going to be here and I don't want that to happen to the PD. I don't want that to happen so I had conflict with that.

I've had experience here with other Chiefs that never told you their plan. They just said, "These are your orders and go," and you had to try and figure out why you were told what to do. But at the end of the day, if that's the Chief's policy, you fulfill the Chief's policy and you answer questions as best you can if he's not going to tell you. I've experienced that. Then I have experienced where Chief Greenway's style, where he's more of an authoritarian type where what he says is how it's going to go.

*And so I never experienced any rage or anger directly to me. I found out that he did have that with some of the other officers after he was gone. And I know that he had an issue and know meaning I heard that he had an issue with ****, something about the range, about some kind of a training record. I've known **** for a long time and **** would never falsify a training record for somebody else. That's not the man he is."*

Sgt. **** said he had heard through the grapevine that Chief Greenway had asked **** to mark off his (Greenway's) training record that he had completed firearms. Sgt. **** said,

*"I think I heard there may have been some like a, well, if you do this, I'll do this kind of thing. I don't know. That's just my understanding of how that went with **** in particular. I know that they had some kind of blowing out or falling out. **** ended up leaving and then now he's at the fire department. I don't know if those were personal reasons. I never really discussed it in depth with him other than he just told me it was just time for me to make a move, do something different. Okay.*

*I do remember that Chief Greenway got mad at **** as for being dressed as a detective before his time, I'm not sure. But that just what I had, I think I remember him saying, "Well, you're not detective. Why are you dressed like that?" But that's as far as it got with what I heard.*



*I do know that **** went back to the road. **** was a detective. He went back to the road, but he was still pseudo detective in some way, doing some kind of detective work, doing some 307s. And my understood is he was still a detective, but working the road to cover the shift because we were really short, but kind of doing a dual role and said okay, I kind of did something similar to that a long time ago, but never as much time on patrol. It was maybe a day or two of the week and that was a disaster. That doesn't work ever. But so in my mind I'm like, okay, something similar to what I did, just more time on the road. But then the more I thought about, well that's weird. Why's he still getting detective pay if he's not really doing detective work anymore and now it's mostly all patrol? Just seemed odd. I couldn't really place my finger on it. I didn't have any further, I never had a conversation with the Chief of that. Just an observation."*

I asked Sgt. **** if there was anything else I needed to know. He said something about comments being made in mixed company. I asked him for an example and Sgt. **** said,

"For example, like the muffin tits or disparaging the Sheriff by saying that he was incompetent, didn't know what he was doing. Comments like that would be best suited for a much smaller audience, even if it was just the sergeants instead of the entire PD. It always feels kind of, it's dissettling because there were parts that he was a good mentor that he did teach me how to do certain things that were good. But then you start throwing these other things in and then I start hearing things that it is not the man that I thought that I knew so it's very dis-settling.

It's upsetting and it makes me angry because now he's putting me in a position where I'm not going to lie for anybody and I'm not going to cover up what anybody did. But now he's put me in a situation to where it feels like, not that he ever said or did anything, but it's just not okay because his behavior and his actions, I'm not going to sugarcoat for them. But at the same time, he should never put me in that position to where I have to even be where I'm at. That's not leadership to me and it makes me angry. That makes me angry.

As a man and as a person, I like him. As a professional, what he did was not okay. And I'm not here to stab anybody in the back or push anybody out for any games that I have. I'm perfectly content with where I'm at, but it's not okay to put me in this situation.

For 30 years since I started with the Air Force and then this career had there and then the 20 years that I've been doing this here, I've seen a lot of that happen. I've seen a lot of good people go sideways in their career for whatever the reason was. Whatever reason he chose or felt that he became disgruntled and angry, maybe at that point would've been a better time to just say, "Okay, I'm done," and just walk away.

It seems to me that that moment came when he and the Mayor became at odds with one another and it just kind of kept going. Both of them were just kind of constantly going at each other publicly and just certain things that you don't do. If you have disagreements with someone that's public place is not the place to air those out. You can do that. There's other ways to do that on any side. And once that started coming public, now I'm having to answer to some of my other friends that work in law enforcement other place say, "Hey, what's going on over there at St. Helens?"



There's only so much you can say about what's going on and you got to find that fine balance."

**** **

On December 13, 2024, I interviewed Mr. **** at the SHPD administration building. His attorney, Julio Vidrio was present.

I told Mr. **** I had heard something about Chief Greenway potentially offering to give some people credit for having run the fitness incentive test without doing it. Mr. **** said that Chief Greenway had done that and I asked him to explain. Mr. **** said,

"Yeah, so at the time we were still required to run the state ORPAT, the utility test with the obstacles and all that. And he was the proctor, for whatever reason. We went out to the garage at the police department building, which is where we used to run it, all the equipment was set up. And when I got out there, he said that he was going to write down my time, and I was not going to run it. And I kind of looked at him a little weird, and he said, "Is that a problem?" And I said, "Guess not." So we waited out in the garage for a period of time, and then he wrote a score down."

I asked Mr. **** what he thought of that and he replied,

"I thought it was strange. I'd never been in a situation like that. But the way that he said it, and his tone of voice and look on his face, made it sound like there wasn't really an option for me at that point. So I didn't know what to do."

I asked Mr. **** what the result of this score was, whether there was a financial incentive. Mr. **** responded,

"It's 5%, I think. And if you're in a certain category, it's 5% plus \$40, or something. I know the 5%, for sure. I don't know what the score is to get the extra \$40, but I got both."

I clarified with Mr. **** that he had not run the test at all and that he received 5% of his monthly salary because of the test result Chief Greenway submitted.

I asked Mr. **** about whether he had ever received a message from Chief Greenway about not sharing certain texts or the Chief would

Mr. **** told me he had received inappropriate text messages from Chief Greenway. I asked him to describe them. Mr. **** responded,

"I have some texts from him that I've sent to my attorney, but I don't have the sexually explicit texts anymore. They were various memes or GIFFs. And I know one of them was during Christmastime, a couple of years ago, and it was pretty common meme, I think. I don't know the difference between meme and a GIFF. GIFF is the moving ones, I think. Anyway, so it was a picture of a Christmas tree, and then behind the Christmas tree was a TV, and on the TV was pornographic images. And then the meme says, "Do you like my Christmas tree?" Or something



like that. And he sent that out to several guys at the agency. And then the other one, the other sexually explicit one is one that I was told about, but I never received."

I asked Mr. **** whether he thought this was appropriate for a Chief to be sending to subordinates and he said,

"I find it very inappropriate. And in those texts, because it was usually a group of people in the texts, I never once responded, I didn't say anything back. It was very odd to me, for one. And then I just didn't think it was appropriate for the Chief to be sending that to a group of officers."

I asked Mr. **** about a vote of no confidence they had done on their City Manager and Mayor. I asked Mr. **** about whether Chief Greenway was aware they were doing this or if he had any involvement. Mr. **** responded,

*"So he had texted me, and it might've been me and **** in the same text, saying that we should. And I don't recall if it was either right before or right after, but it was already in my mind, and as far as I know, it was in ****'s mind, without the Chief putting it there. And we had talked about it, as he's the president and I was the vice president. We talked about what we could do, what the next steps were. And we'd had this conversation with Dan Thenell as well. And so before the Chief ever said anything to me about doing a vote of no confidence, the thought was already there. And I just can't recall whether the Chief told us we should do it, before or after we had the vote."*

Mr. **** also said,

"So I have some of the texts right here, if I can find them. But he said a lot of things. He was frequently trying to insert himself in the association's business, into our negotiations, into our tactics on what we should and shouldn't do, as far as negotiating with the city. I didn't find that to be appropriate either. He frequently tried to sway us into what he thought we wanted. One example of that was when we started to negotiate for on-call. We started to speak to the City about possibly going to an on-call schedule. Because we were getting low on officers, officers getting tired, and we were going to go away from 24-hour service. And if we did that, there would have to be some kind of negotiation or contract talk about what it would look like, as far as compensation.

So he tried to sway us into taking a percentage versus taking a flat dollar amount for that on-call period. I told him several times that I've talked to the association, they don't want to do a percentage, they want X amount, whatever it was. He didn't like that answer. He got frustrated. I know that he stopped talking to me at some point about that aspect of it and just was not thrilled. I think this is the wrong text though."

I asked Mr. **** if he had ever heard Chief Greenway say something about hoping they did not get any applicants during a police officer recruitment. Mr. **** said yes and explained,

"He said it several times, over several different interview periods. Because he felt like the City wasn't doing enough, or the mayor wasn't, well, I don't know, one of the two wasn't doing enough to provide us funding for better staffing. At one point he said that he hoped we didn't get



any good applicants to hire, so that the City could feel the strain of us not working 24 hours. And they finally understand that our cries for help for the last couple of years were legitimate.”

We had the following back and forth:

Jim Band:

Okay. And I realize he said this, maybe you have context, maybe you don't. Why would he want the City to feel a strain? You're trying to hire more cops so that it doesn't.

**** **.*

Yeah, I agree. I, personally, I don't like a lot of these things he said, but he said them. Sometimes he would say them in staff meetings, that he wants the City to feel the strain. He would frequently tell me to tell our officers not to sign up for overtime. And said that, "We can't mandate you guys to work overtime." Despite our contract actually saying they can. Our contract says that it's per departmental need, and obviously in emergency overtime situation, that is departmental need. So I never told anybody not to work overtime. I'm not going to tell people, "Don't build your bank account for you and your family." And I explained to him that we have several families that work here, that are single income families. I'm not going to tell them to not work overtime.

But he would frequently tell me to tell them, "Hey, don't work overtime. Let the City feel the pain of not hiring more people." And then when our guys wouldn't sign up for overtime, which is what the Chief wanted, then the sergeants would fill that over time anyway. So now the money just wasn't going to the association. So I don't know what his intent was, but he would say that.

Jim Band:

Was his end game of what...? I realize it's his, it's not yours. But did he want the City to pay you guys more or did he think that they needed to increase your budget so you could hire more staff? Or all of those things?

**** **.*

As far as I know, it was, he wanted a bigger budget to increase staffing, and the City wouldn't fully commit to a number. I don't know what number he had in mind. I expressed the number that I had in mind, as far as officers goes. But I also expressed to him that the way that he structured this department didn't make any sense either. You can't have five sergeants for five officers. That makes no sense. Why do you do that? But I mean, it fell on deaf ears, so I don't really know.

I asked Mr. **** about whether Chief Greenway liked working with partner agencies and he said no. I asked for details and Mr. **** said,

“Well, he frequently referred to Sheriff Pixley as, muffin tits, in staff meetings. Him and Pixley didn't get along, for the longest time. My understanding is they started to, within the last year, they started to get along better. But he changed the policy to where we could not assist outside



agency. The exception was at an officer in duress, we could obviously go for that. Once I became the canine handler, he changed the canine policy to where I could no longer, as a canine officer, go respond to a canine call outside of the City, without that agency first calling the lieutenant and getting the approval from the lieutenant, then passed down to me. So he built walls between us and other agencies. And that started, I would guess, within a year of him being here, he took away that policy that we can't assist outside agencies."

We had the following conversation about this:

Jim Band:

So what if, say you guys had one or two people on, and you had a hot domestic or something, and you needed somebody from an outside organization to help you?

**** **

He would expect them to help you. Yeah.

Jim Band:

So don't help anyone else, but we'll...? Okay. That put you guys kind of a weird spot, huh?

**** **

A terrible spot, yeah. I had deputies tell me directly that they don't want to come help us because we're not going to help them. I also found that to be petty, but I explained to them, "I didn't make this policy. It's not my choice. If I could lead the City, I would lead the City to help you. But I also don't want to get fired."

Mr. **** and I discussed some different issues that had come up with the City, where he was involved as a member of their union. I asked Mr. **** for his impression whether the Chief was solving problems or stoking up fires. Mr. **** replied,

"I always got the impression that he was stoking fires, playing both sides. Telling us he supports us, as an association. That he would do things to fight for us, to get us better equipment, better staffing, better everything. And then as soon as we go to the City and try to fight for it, he would turn around, go to Walsh and say, "I don't know what they're talking about." And that was a frequent thing. He would tell us that, "I support you. Go do what you got to do." And then tell the City, "I don't know why they're doing that."

We had the following back and forth:

Jim Band:

Two different things could be happening? You could say, just hypothetically, you've got a Chief who's doing what they can and they're being shot down. And then you've got a union who has their own perspective about what's going on in the City, and representing that to the Commission. And then you



could have a Chief doing whatever they're doing, through normal channels, with the City Manager and electeds, and then potentially using the union as a pawn or as a tool. So those two scenarios, do you think either of those things was happening with you guys and him?

**** **.*

Yeah, I think he was definitely trying to use the association as a pawn, but when it didn't work, because I didn't agree with everything he's saying, so I wouldn't fight for the same things. We just didn't view what this department needed the same. He wanted a new building more than he wanted anything. He just wanted that new building, and we wanted better staffing, we wanted better wages, we want better hours. But he valued the station over what we needed, and he made that clear several times. But I continued to tell him, "We would rather have staffing because we don't get days off. We want to have more days off." And I don't know how to express this, but I was told several times by several different sergeants that I was in the doghouse. And a lot of that is because I didn't see eye to eye with him on different things that he wanted at this police department.

And as the vice president, I felt it was my job to express to him, "Hey, that's not what the association wants." Well, to him it was, "Well, it's not what I want." It wasn't me saying this. I mean, yeah, me, personally, didn't agree with a lot of what he was saying either, but I don't take my view, I take the association's view. It's my job, as the vice president, to gather what everybody wants and bring that to the City, not what Chief Greenway wants and bring it to the City. But we had several opportunities to speak to City administrators, the full Council. We had a roundtable session with them. I expressed very clearly, and probably not very nicely, to the City that we want XYZ. The Chief had a chance to express what he wanted, to the City, and he sat silent. So I don't believe that he fought as hard as he tried to convey that he was fighting.

Jim Band:

So when he would talk to you guys, so obviously there's conversations going on where he's working with the City in his way, and you guys are working toward an end with the City, do you think that...? And maybe it's neither of these two, and if it's neither, then tell me. Was he sort of from the perspective of, "Hey, guys, we're all trying to get the same thing, work with the City, let's come to a resolution."? Or more of a positive collaborative, work with the City sort of perspective, versus somebody could be kind of like stoking the fire, stirring people up. Was he trying to get everybody to get along and work together, or was he trying to get you guys mad and riled up? What would you-?

**** **.*

I would say that he was trying to rile people up. And I'm actually trying to find that text right now. But I don't think, at any point, I would consider him as the peacekeeper, or trying to get us to settle something with the City in a peaceful manner. And as soon as I can find the text, I will read it. But at no point did I think he was peacekeeper in this.



I asked Mr. **** if he had ever heard Chief Greenway say anything about ****, an officer who had left for Hillsboro PD. I told him I had been told Chief Greenway might have said something like, *"That's why you don't hire women in law enforcement."* Mr. **** said yes and then told me,

"That's pretty much his exact quote."

Mr. **** said,

"When he first started, I don't remember dates, times of this, but we were in the back office of the police department, and that's where the briefing room was. At that time you had a briefing room set up, kind of like the table was in the middle, and then you had the report writing computers over here, and then over there would be the hallway that goes down to the bathroom, and then the Chief's office. So he came walking from the hallway. He stopped at the corner, and was sitting at the computer here."

Mr. **** said Ms. **** was sitting at a computer, writing a report. He said **** was also present. Mr. **** said,

*"And then I was in and out of the locker room, getting my gear on. And so he came around the corner, and when I heard his voice, I poked my head out to see who was talking. And the Chief was talking to ****, and said, "Do you work for IT?" And she turns around, she's confused, and she said, "No." And he goes, "Oh, because you're on that computer a lot." And so she says, "Well, it's called reports." And he goes, "What? Are you writing reports for the whole department? Why aren't you on the road?" And then she left, crying. She shut the computer down, packed up all her stuff, left crying, went and spoke to **** and Luedke. And she was distraught, crying. And so Chief had found out that she was crying about that incident, and that's when he said, "That's why you don't hire women in law enforcement."*

Mr. **** said Chief Greenway would get involved in their union negotiations with the City. Mr. **** said,

"And that happened more than once. One of the last big meetings we had about on-call, we were having, I want to say, there was a legal brief from the DA's office, was some kind of training in the trailer at the PD. And so I was in there and he called me that morning, and we had a meeting scheduled with the City's attorney and City administrators later that day, so he called me while I was in that, whatever class that was, and I stepped out, talked to him. And he said, "Hey, don't tell anybody, but the City, this is what they're going to propose to you. I don't think you should take it. It's a bullshit deal. I'm just giving you a heads-up before you go to that meeting." And I said, "Okay, thank you, I guess." But he frequently did that, he wanted to insert himself into our negotiations."

I asked Mr. **** if there was anything he thought I should know that I had not asked. Mr. **** said,

"Yeah, I think there's several. But here's another text. "We need the guys to stop working the overtime to do that with everyone filling the overtime slots, it's hard to go to a 20-hour shift." I said, "I can't ask the guys that are single family incomes to stop signing up for overtime. That's a tough sell." "We will have to, in November, when we lose additional to retirement."



I took a picture of this text to have with the case file. Mr. **** also said,

*"Here's the conversation with ****. I would say a lot of the issue that we had with the Chief were very related to the hostile work environment. The incident that happened with ****. At one point he had told **** that he was obese and couldn't handle working, something along those lines. You'd have to ask **** for the exact quotes of that. At one point when he was still fairly new, at that time, we had an issue with how the detective, his case load was managed. And that was **** at the time. And we would try to refer reports to **** from patrol to detectives and get told frequently that he's not going to work that case. So we would then get it back and have to do all this follow up, a ton of follow-up. And it boiled over to a point where I just wondered, "Why do we have detectives? What's the point of having a detective if I have to go do all this follow up? I don't have time to keep up with my reports and handle calls, and all this other stuff."*

*And so that boiled over to the point where **** stepped down and out of detectives. And I don't know, you have to ask **** how that whole thing went down, but once he had come out of detectives, they made him a corporal, which we didn't have before. And soon after that, he called a meeting, Chief did, with the E-Board, and that was me, ****, **** and ****. And in that meeting, he sat there and screamed at us across the table, told us that we are so worthless, the Sheriff's office wouldn't hire us. Told me that I was willfully violating policy. He said to all of us that at least two of us should app out that day, because he couldn't trust us anymore. He told us that he wouldn't support us if we asked him for a letter of recommendation. Just all kinds of stuff just exploded. And it was all boiled over from--"*

I asked Mr. **** if this was the Chief's temper and he said,

*"Yeah, would scream at us. He'd fly off the handle just like that. And that was not an abnormal thing for him. And then after that, later I talked to **** and ****. He had turned around, apologized, apparently to everybody but me. I didn't care. But he admitted it several times after that, to several people, that he had a temper. He was working on controlling it, and he would just explode sometimes. And I guess that was his way of making it okay. But in that setting, it was just hostile to be around him. And like I said earlier, I was told by several sergeants that I'm in the doghouse. And because of that, I was denied trainings, I was denied special positions. I was denied just those two things, trainings and any specialty spots, because I was in the doghouse."*

Mr. **** showed me a text and read what it said,

"Yep. I think this is more of Chief trying to stir the pot. "And Rick and Walsh don't do ride along. SHPD can ask why not. They claim they support the police, yet don't demonstrate it. Same with the police station. Rick hasn't been inside the station since I've been here, and Walsh was last here in 2021. Make Rick admit he can't pass criminal history." Rick's the mayor. That's the bottom."

We had the following back and forth:

Jim Band:



In general, would you say that the people trusted him?

**** **.*

No.

Jim Band:

So every police department has a culture, whether they sort of declare a culture and try to have a certain culture, or they don't declare one and they just end up with one. Do you think that these things you're describing about, everything from how he would talk to people from other organizations to the hotheadedness that you're describing, do you think those had an impact on the culture of this police department?

**** **.*

Yes.

Jim Band:

In what way?

**** **.*

I would say it turned a lot of people, it shut them up, for one. So nobody was speaking up for what they felt was right, or what they felt we needed, because they felt if they were saying anything that they would just get smashed. And when you do something like that, it just absolutely destroys morale. And I would say our morale, over the last five years, if it wasn't for bad morale, we'd have no morale. And when you get to that point, people don't want to come to work. People are miserable when they're at work. People get lazy. People stop being proactive. And part of that was, they felt like if they were proactive, went out and got into something, that they were going to get written up, that they were going to have something put in their file, get a counseling, get denied trainings, get denied special opportunities for assignment.

So when you have a Chief that is like this, so hostile and negative, and just beating people down on a regular basis, and your morale gets to be that point, it's not fun to show up to work anymore. And I think if you could go back in time and just watch how people worked five years ago, and watch how they showed up to work, watch how they did their job, and then you look at it how it is now, or if you just ask them about how they work now, most of them are going to tell you, "Yeah, I'm not proactive. People run from me all the time and I just wave at them. I'm not going to chase them, get myself in trouble for this agency. I'm not going to do that." And that is the culture we had. Nobody wanted to be proactive for a chief that's like this.

Jim Band:

Why do you think, like that ORPAT thing, why do you think that he would do something like that?



**** **.*

I think in his mind he can lash out, be angry, be hostile, but now look at me, I did this nice thing, so you can't hate me anymore. Now I'm going to lash out again. And then maybe try to find something nice to do over here.

Julio Vidrio (attorney):

It's like you guys are DV victims.

**** **.*

Yeah, that's how it felt sometimes. There's a cycle of violence and hostility. I wouldn't say violence because he wasn't physical or anything like that, he was just hostile.

Jim Band:

So that ORPAT thing, whatever you felt about him in terms of his ethics and honesty before that, did that change how you thought about his ethics afterward?

**** **.*

No. At that point, I had already put him at the bottom of the barrel, so to speak. I didn't think too highly of him. I didn't like him. I was hoping that he'd be gone already. He had just proven to me that, one, he doesn't care about the officers, and two, that he throws baby temper tantrums and that's how he's going to be. So I didn't feel like I trust him. Some of the stuff that he'd say in staff meetings, the way he would berate officers, the way he'd berate other members of other agencies, I don't know how you trust a guy like that, that's talking all this stuff behind somebody's back.

Jim Band:

So just to clarify, so even before the ORPAT thing, you already didn't trust him?

**** **.*

I did not, no. And I was terrified after that ORPAT thing that at some point he was going to bring this up, and say, "Well, I'm going to dock you down because you told me a score to write down and you didn't even run the ORPAT that time." But when that ORPAT thing happened, the way he was looking at me, and the way he said, "You're not going to run the ORPAT, I'm going to write down a score." Okay. I didn't feel that was an option for me.

Mr. **** read to me a text, which I photographed,

*"Yeah, I did send them to him. So I want to say this was, I think it was after a City Council meeting, and right before we were scheduled to have a roundtable session with the Mayor, Walsh, and the Council. And it's a conversation, it's a text thread with Chief, ****, and myself, and it starts off with, it says, "Your mayor is alluding to us mismanaging our budget, but again,*



he's a moron." And then he's talking about reworking some notes, and then it goes into some conversation that he has, trying to give us pointers to argue with the City. It says, "Food for thought. On some closing points for tonight, failure to keep our residents safe through properly..." He's basically trying to tell us what to say to the Council, in that session we were going to have, where we were calling the City out for not supporting us and not funding us. And this is..."

Officer ** (SHPD)**

On December 13, 2024, I interviewed Officer **** at the SHPD administration building. His attorney Julio Vidrio was present.

I asked Officer **** about an incident where I heard he had pulled someone over at the post office and asked about Chief Greenway's involvement. Officer **** said,

*"Yeah, so I don't know if... I think somebody else stopped the truck, from what I remember. But it was our call, so me and **** went there. I can't remember if Chief was already there or if he had gotten there after. But I got the guy in cuffs and I think he was standing up against the side of the truck or something, just getting ready to put him in the car or something. And he's kind of chipping at us. And I forgot what he was saying, just kind of being... I don't want to say annoying, but just being chippy.*

And Chief said something... He was talking to me about what he had witnessed, from what I recall. And he said something like, "Excuse me." And then he goes over to the guy and he's like, "Hey..." I'm not quoting him, but it was something similar to, "Hey, shut the fuck up, or I'll kick your teeth in." Yeah, and after that he just stepped away and we just kept processing the scene."

We then had the following back and forth about this incident:

Jim Band:

Did you think that was appropriate to tell the guy to shut the fuck up or I'm going to kick your teeth in?

****:

No, I knew it was something you don't say.

Jim Band:

Were you surprised to hear the Chief say that?

****:

Honestly, at the time when it happened, I just was like, "Oh..." I don't know if I was surprised. I wasn't ready for that. I'd never heard it before, so I was a fairly young cop. I thought it was like... I kind of



chuckled at it and I had gotten... But yeah, I thought it was... I know that if I was like, "Hey, shut the fuck up or kick your teeth in," it's probably wouldn't be viewed very great.

Jim Band:

Yeah.

****:

*And I know afterwards we had gotten back to the PD and I think night shift was coming in and ****'s like, "Hey, he's going to have to face up to that," or something. What did he say? Something like he said, "That's not appropriate," or something. Again, I'm not quoting the guy, I'm just summarizing. It was like, "That's not appropriate. He has his bosses that he'll have to deal with," or something. Basically saying, just because he's the Chief... How I perceive it, just 'cause he's the Chief, doesn't mean that that just flies.*

Jim Band:

*So just to clarify, **** is essentially telling you that what the Chief just said is not appropriate?*

****:

That's how I perceived it when that was said.

I asked Officer **** if there was anything else he thought I should know and we had the following conversation:

****:

Yeah, I'm sure it's probably come up. I'm trying to think. He'd send these spoof text messages, does this ring a bell at all? It's like meme, kind of, I think. I'm not really good with technology so I'll try and explain it, but I'm not going to do it any justice. It's like a thing where you'd get it in text and it would look like it's a news article, and it was like Sanfranchronicle.org or some weird news agency never heard before. And it'd be like something random, "Oh my goodness. I can't believe what Biden said."

That's just an example. I don't know what actually the ads would say. So you'd go, "Oh crap," crazy news and you'd click on it. And it'd be like a dude, very large muscular African-American male that was sitting on the edge of a bed, and his penis would be out semi-hard, semi-erect. It was like a joking thing.

Jim Band:

And so he sent you that?

****:

Yeah. I don't have them. It's been years. I can't even tell you a timeframe. And then this summer... I think it was this summer, there was one where I think it was a meme based on a presidential debate and it was like... I'm not good with politics, but it was a meme of an elephant mounting a donkey like they were



going to mate. And it said something like how last night's presidential debate went. But then he quickly recanted and said, "Hey, I didn't mean to send that to you guys. It was supposed to go to somebody else."

Jim Band:

On the recant thing, the one of the guy where you could see his penis, did he say the recant thing on that? Like, "Oh, sorry, I shouldn't have sent that to you."?

****.

Not that I recall, but like I said, it's been years.

Jim Band:

So is that appropriate, you think, for a Police Chief to be sending to his subordinates?

****.

No, probably not.

Officer ** (SHPD)**

On December 13, 2024, I interviewed Officer **** at the SHPD administration building. His attorney Julio Vidrio was present.

I asked Officer **** about a number of emails that I had on my computer, which had been provided by Dan Thenell to Akin Blitz. Officer **** said,

"Yeah. I mean, there was ongoing talks of the City's budget I guess, for one. It seemed like this constant battle for better staffing and to increase staffing that's been going on for a couple years, so that was talked about regularly. And then how the City allocates their money and making promises for officers and not following through and all that stuff, so I think that's kind of the context."

Officer **** said he and former Officer **** had been involved with a vote of no confidence against the City Administrator and Mayor. I asked Officer **** if Chief Greenway was encouraging them to file the vote of no confidence and he said,

*"Yeah, I mean, he said it was a good idea. I don't know if that's where it originated, because **** **** and I had had those discussions also. And I don't know for certain whether Greenway and I had that conversation first or **** and I, because it was kind of ongoing. But yeah, Greenway had those conversations with myself and **** on multiple occasions."*

We had the following back and forth:



Jim Band:

Did Greenway ever just kind of... I'm going to give two sort of maybe polar opposites and maybe the answer was somewhere in the middle, but a chief could be saying if a union association's got some issues or concerns or they want some things, a chief could say, "Hey guys, let's kind of work together collaboratively with the City, let's sit down with them sort of positive. Lets at least try and do this in a way that's respectful." That sort of take. And then there's the other take is more of a combative, "Go get those bastards." Does that make sense?

****:

Yeah.

Jim Band:

What was Greenway's approach to you, was he saying, "Go at them collaboratively." Or, "Go get their ass."?

****:

I mean, certainly the latter in this scenario, we're talking about vote of no confidence, it was definitely the latter. It was more the, "I'm tired of them." It was more suggesting a vote of no confidence and that was a good idea.

Other times, I mean, it very much depended on the topic. There was other times where it's like he would give us some insight as to the city standing on something like cost of living raises, for example, right? Like, "Hey, here's where the City's at on these, you might want to go sit down and ask for this, you could probably get it." So there was times that that was the case, but when it came to the vote of confidence, it was a more adversarial approach, I think. Does that make sense?

Jim Band:

Yeah. Yeah, do you think he was trying to get everybody to get along in a positive way? Or do you think that he was stoking up hate and discontent?

****:

I would lean towards the latter.

Jim Band:

And why is that?

****:

I think when he would be frustrated or unhappy with the City, that was the approach he would take and he would solicit the association to assist in that goal, I guess.



Jim Band:

So did you ever feel like he was using you guys to sort of-

*****.*

Yeah, I think that's fair.

Jim Band:

Okay.

*****.*

Yeah.

Jim Band:

How do you feel about that now?

*****.*

*Yeah, I don't like that we were put in that position now. At the time, that would cross my mind from time to time, "Hey, why does he want us to do this?" He would encourage us to... **** **** and I spoke at numerous different City Council sessions and things like that, and some of those were encouraged by Chief Greenway, and it crossed your mind at the time, "Why are we being solicited to do this?" As opposed to him going down there and say, "Hey, here's where we're at with staffing." So I realized that to a lesser extent at the time, I guess, and more so now which I mean, it sucks we were put in that position.*

I asked Officer **** about the comment I had heard about Chief Greenway saying he hoped they did not get any applicants. Officer **** replied,

"Not that I remember specifically, I'm trying to think. I remember, "I hope people will leave." Something to that effect, but not specifically. "I hope people won't apply."

I asked Officer **** why Greenway would say this and he said,

"The whole staffing back and forth on like, we need more staffing. And then the City's like, "We don't want to spend the money. We don't want to spend the money." So he was like, "All right, well I hope just people leave and they can deal with that with no staffing." That was kind of the context."

We had the following conversation about the City of Scappoose:

Jim Band:



Did he ever say anything to you about disrupting a City of Scappoose council meeting online?

*****.*

Yeah, I think I know what you're talking about.

Jim Band:

Tell me about that?

*****.*

So, he'd regularly log into city councils, and county councils, and all kinds of meetings he would log into online. And there was one Scappoose I think it was a city council, whatever it was that he logged into and apparently it was inadvertently given admin permissions or something and was kicking people out of it.

Jim Band:

Do you remember him saying anything about the name he logged in under?

*****.*

I couldn't tell you what it was, but he did reference it.

Jim Band:

Was it something like Mike Coxlong?

*****.*

Something like that. It was something intended to be funny, but sexual.

Jim Band:

Okay.

*****.*

Yeah.

Jim Band:

And was he just talking about you with this or to other people? How did the conversation come up?

*****.*

I was in the trailer next to the main police department when I remember hearing about it, I don't for sure remember if someone else was in there. If I remember correctly, the only people working in there at the



time were **** and I...I don't specifically remember whether he was in there or not so I would be guessing whether he was in there or not. But if someone else was in there, it probably would've been ****.

I asked Officer **** if he remembered a meeting where Chief Greenway was angry with him and others and said they were worthless and could not be trusted. Officer **** told me he knew what meeting I was talking about. I asked Officer **** what Chief Greenway was mad about and he said,

*"So I think how it originated is, all right, so **** was detective at the time, we had one detective and **** essentially said, "I don't have time to do the DHS cross reports. There's one of me, and I don't have time to do that." That didn't go over well because historically detectives had done that, so that upset some people, so they got pushed back to patrol. **** **** was Association President at the time, and had went and sent an email, I'm guessing to Greenway, I don't know, maybe Greenway and ****, I don't know who all the emails sent. I believe to Greenway though, something to the effect of like, "Hey, not every person on patrol knows how to take these complicated sex abuses alone. So divvying those up and just assigning them all to patrol, not everyone's ready for that." Because we had some newer people at the time.*

So there was some email that conveyed that message and that upset Greenway very much. So he pulled in the E-board and it was like, "You guys should go look for other jobs. You guys shouldn't work here." And he was very escalated during the meeting and it was, "You guys might as well go fill out applications, but I don't know that it'll matter because nowhere else should hire you."

Officer **** described Chief Greenway as hostile and said after this meeting, he had applied to two different agencies within 24 hours.

I asked Officer **** if Chief Greenway sent inappropriate text messages. Officer **** said Chief Greenway would describe memes and described one of an African-American man sitting naked on the side of a bed. This was similar to what had been described by Officer ****. I asked Officer **** whether he thought that was appropriate or inappropriate for a chief to be sending to his troops. Officer **** replied,

"Yeah, I'd say that's inappropriate, I think that's [inaudible 00:21:41]."

I asked Officer **** about the photograph of Sheriff Pixley next to the wrestler, and whether he had ever seen that in a text from Chief Greenway. Officer **** said yes and also said he did not think it was an appropriate thing for the Chief to be sending him.

Officer ** (SHPD)**

On December 13, 2024, I interviewed Officer **** at the SHPD administration building. His attorney, Julio Vidrio was present.

I asked Officer **** if Chief Greenway ever asked him to have his wife write an anonymous letter to the Council and he said no. I asked him if Chief Greenway asked his (****'s) wife to write an anonymous letter and he said he was not sure.

I had the following conversation with Officer ****:



Jim Band:

Okay. Did you ever hear him talk about using his emergency vehicle lights and sirens? Lights and or sirens when he was commuting home from work?

****:

I think there was one time he mentioned there's construction on the bridge, and I don't think he used sirens. I think he said he flipped his lights on and then they waved him through. I don't think it was like he was running code or something.

Jim Band:

So my understanding is you said he turned his lights on just to get through construction?

****:

He flipped his lights on so they'd see them and then they let him go through because they realized it was a police vehicle.

Jim Band:

Was he going to a call?

****:

No, he was either coming to or from work. I don't remember.

Jim Band:

Okay. So your perception when he's telling you this, is he telling you about, is this an authorized like him using the lights? Was that something that he's describing as he's just using the lights because he doesn't want to wait in traffic or was there a business reason?

****:

No. Yeah, he was saying if they could get them through without waiting in line for traffic.

Jim Band:

Okay. And did he say this to you in front of other people?

****:

Me and him didn't have a whole lot of one-on-one conversations. So I think it was just like they were doing construction on the Longview Bridge and the traffic was horrible and he flipped the lights on and then the construction guys waved him through like, "Oh, you can go, you can go." And then, I don't think



he was driving in a manner that was endangering anybody or reckless or anything like that. It was just a matter of trying to get around the traffic once they realized it was a police vehicle.

I asked Officer **** about the MCT union meeting that was discussed by several employees. I asked Officer **** if he had told Chief Greenway what was said during the meeting and he said no. Officer **** told me that inappropriate in a church setting versus a locker room setting were two different things.

I asked Officer **** whether Chief Greenway sent him any inappropriate text messages. He told me no and said that was a broad word.

Officer **** and I had the following back and forth:

Jim Band:

All right, let me just go through this. So is there anything else that I haven't asked you about you think I should know in relation to Chief Greenway?

****:

No, not really. I mean, I kind of come from a different background. I was an athlete growing up. I'm a business owner. I own seven Meineke Car Care Centers. I do this because I started as a reserve and fell in love with it. And I just enjoy the heck out of it. And it keeps me motivated and excited about life.

So I mean, I just have a different perspective than a lot of guys, and I can understand where some of this frustrations could have come from with some guys. But he was always the type of guy that he never really lit me up, but I heard that he had yelled at a couple guys in the garage and stuff like that, justifiably, but they just thought he was over the top. But he always came back to them a day or two later and was like, "Listen, you understand why I had that conversation, why I was so pissed off. Right? I don't want you getting hurt. I don't want you getting killed. I got to protect this community and this police department, and I don't want you to do stupid shit like that."

And it was like after they had the conversations, everybody was always fine. So from a leadership, I would say I've done that to my employees too. In the heat of the battle, you are frustrated, you're upset, you don't understand why somebody did something, you think they knew better and you kind of go off on them. And then a couple days later you have another conversation like, "Listen, you understand why? You're putting us...City huge liability."

And I consider this, like I said earlier about the means. I mean, this isn't a bank setting, this isn't an office job. I mean, per se, like a secretary job or something like that. It's like these guys in this department are professionals, type A personalities. And if you go to everybody just going like, "Hey, now you got to be a little more careful," they're going to slough it off. They're not going to take you serious. And I don't think he ever said anything around anybody that the same guys weren't saying at the back table. You know, you're a chief. You got the briefing room, it's kind of your locker room, your safe haven. And yeah, we have conversations back there. We see things, we hear things. We do things that normal people don't do and they don't see and they don't hear. So you kind of got to vent and get out your frustrations and talk



things out. And a lot of the stuff we talk about is not stuff that normal people in the community would be able to handle. That's why we do this job. Am I making sense?

Jim Band:

Yeah. There are things that I would joke about with my coworkers when we were officers that it was different when I was a Chief because I had a different position. And at times as a Chief, you're making decisions about people's employment, making ethical decisions, you're creating a culture that has to work for everybody. And so I do think it's a little bit different officer to officer than I do think it is officer to chief. And mainly because chiefs make decisions about hiring people, about firing people, about discipline. And so I always felt if I'm going to ever discipline somebody, people need to trust my judgment.

And so, I do think there's a difference. I felt there was a difference for me personally as a Chief because of that. Because people look at you different. Does that make sense?

****:

Yeah. Yeah. And you set a standard.

Jim Band:

Yep. You set the tone.

****:

Yeah.

Sgt. ** (SHPD)**

On December 19, 2024, I spoke with Sgt. **** over the telephone.

I had the following conversation with Sgt. ****:

Jim Band:

*Another topic, do you remember a DUI call that **** had been called to that Chief Greenway had apparently seeing somebody at the post office?*

**** ****:

That one does not ring a bell.

Jim Band:

***** had stopped, I think it was **** had gone, arrested a guy and the guy was, I don't know if he was chipping it, you guys or **** or what, but the Chief had said something to the guy.*



**** **.*

*Yes, I do remember. If it's the one I'm thinking, I can't remember if it was for DUI or what the context, but I remember being on a call with Officer **** and having the Chief stop by.*

Jim Band:

And what do you recall the Chief, if anything, saying?

**** **.*

*I believe, and I think this was quite a few years ago, but I believe the guy either was barking at us or wasn't being super nice and Chief... I can't remember if I heard it or I heard it on body camera or if Officer **** told me later, but was something along the effects of he walked up to the guy and told him, I want to say, "Shut the fuck up," or something along those lines, "Or I'll break your teeth or kick your teeth," or something.*

*I don't know exactly how I know that, if I heard it or if **** told me about it, or if at some point we were reviewing it if it got picked up on body camera. But I think that was kind of the context of it. Chief had stopped, he was covering us, and if it's the one that I'm thinking about, I want to say the guy slipped his cuffs and was able to get out of the patrol car. He went through the middle cage and got out of the car, I think if it's the right one. But yeah, it was a comment, so along those lines of, "Be quiet or I'm going to do X, Y, or Z."*

Jim Band:

*Yeah. So what **** said is the Chief had said, "Shut the up, or I'll kick your teeth in." And then he said, when you guys got back to the station, that you had pulled **** aside and said, "Hey, the Chief answers to who the Chief answers, but we answer to who we answer, and that what he said was not appropriate."*

**** **.*

Yep. That sounds like a conversation we would've had.

Jim Band:

Okay. So I'm assuming, did you think that was something that was appropriate for the Chief to be saying to somebody?

**** **.*

No, not at all.

Jim Band:



Okay. Do you think that having the Chief say things like that in front of the troops, do you think that's good for your culture or bad for your culture?

**** **.

No, it doesn't set the right example. That's where, at least in my role as a sergeant, I was kind of that that's what **** told the conversation that we had afterwards. That was kind of my role saying, like I said, "Hey, the Chief is the Chief and he has his own boss. I'm your guys' boss and this is how things are going to go when I'm running it like a shift. We're not going to say stuff like that. It's not appropriate." And I think the guys, at least on my shift, for the most part, kind of understood that.

I asked Sgt. **** if he was present for an incident involving Chief Greenway, some boats, and a guy in the water. Sgt. **** replied,

"I was not, but because force was used during that incident, I did review the body camera footage of the incident. I think I had just stepped into my role as the lead defensive tactics instructor. So as part of that, we... So now, currently, I review every single use of force that happens at our department. I watch body camera, I'll read the reports, and I'll usually document what I did and to make sure it was within policy and all that kind of stuff."

*So on what I heard about that incident, I started reviewing body camera footage as part of my normal duties. I wasn't searching for anything, but that was just part of my duties. And then I did run across some stuff that was said by Chief during that, one of the body camera footages. And I stopped after I heard it, and then immediately called Joe ****, who was our Lieutenant and reported it to him, saying, "Hey, here's what I got. What do you want me to do?"*

I asked Sgt. **** what he remembered hearing and he said,

"I don't remember him actually holding the guy under the water, but I want to say the comment that was made was like, "You're going to drown, motherfucker." Something along those lines. I don't have the specific quote, but it was something along those lines."

I asked Sgt. **** if he thought this was appropriate and he said no.

I asked Sgt. **** if the body camera videos from that incident were still around. Sgt. **** said he had looked for them before when there was a public records request. Sgt. **** said he found they had been deleted. Sgt. **** researched the deletion of these records at my request. He followed up with me and said the videos had not been tagged by the officers properly, so they were automatically deleted by the system in accordance with policy.

I asked Sgt. **** what kind of value Chief Greenway put on working with other agencies like the County, OSP, and partner agencies. Sgt. **** replied,

"Yeah, I think it definitely fluctuated throughout the time when he was acting Chief. There would be times when we would have a decent working relationship with other agencies. And then there were times that we had very, very poor working relationships with outside agencies."



And I think that there was multiple discussions had. I don't know if they were specifically had with Greenway, but among the supervisors, I remember having conversations being like, "Hey, guys, I understand where he's coming from because if all you did was worked at a huge metropolitan agency with 1,000 cops, you don't need help from the outside because you can do it all in house." So if he has that philosophy coming over here, then I think it's maybe a flawed way of thinking because we're so small out here where we do have to work with our partner agencies because not one agency in the county has all the resources to manage what's going on in their city.

So I think it was less of... It's not how I would've done it, but I understood where he was coming from. It just my thought was like, "Well, we're not Portland or Beaverton or Gresham. We can't just be on an island by ourselves. We need help from other agencies." And fairly frequently too, it's not... I know that OSP and CCSO, they're always in our city, and they'll always come and help us. And we weren't reciprocating that, which...it felt bad at times.

And as the sergeants, we did a lot of trying to mend those fences. I had several conversations with partnering agencies being like, "Hey, guys, I'm not the boss. I don't make the rules, so this is what we can and can't do. Just know that if you scream for help or you're calling for code three cover, we are coming. But on other calls that may not be as high a priority, my hands are tied and it's nothing personal, it's just I have a boss and I have to follow his rules."

I asked Sgt. **** if there was anything else I had not asked him about and he said,

*"No. There was one other inappropriate comment that rings a bell that I remember because I was there, I believe it was Officer **** and I, we were doing a death investigation. And I want to say Chief Greenway, I want to say even Lieutenant **** came there and talked to us. And during the course of that conversation, the comment got brought up. I think it was a male that passed away, and I want to say that Greenway had asked, "Is the wife hot?" Or, "Is the wife attractive?" Or something along those lines.*

I didn't take it as anything. I think it was just making light of the situation, that inappropriate cop humor, but also a way to lighten the mood. Because how many times have we seen cops are on death notifications are doing something that's tragic, but they're smiling. And I think it's just a way of us trying to navigate through that emotional situation by not, because obviously we can't break down and cry on every call that we go on.

*So I didn't take it as something too off, but I might've had a conversation with **** being like, "Hey, dude, that's not something that we would say to family members or anybody outside of this community." But that was kind of the one other one that I thought you might ask about. But no, all the other ones are kind of what I had in mind that I thought you would ask."*

Officer ** (SHPD)**

On December 20, 2024, I interviewed Officer **** over the phone.



We had the following conversation:

Jim Band:

*So the first random thing I'm going to ask you about is, there was an incident I was told about with ... You know an Officer *****, she ended up going to [REDACTED]?*

Yes.

Jim Band:

And I was told about an incident where the Chief had said some things and potentially upset her. And then some stuff that he had said afterwards. Do you have any memory of that?

I think I know which incident that was. I'm sure he upset her a few times, but-

Jim Band:

What do you remember specifically about that?

*I remember a time he came into the ... Let's see, our general briefing room, and she was sitting at a computer taking reports. And he came back and said, "Officer *****, are you the report writer for the department?" Something along those lines. If she looked back at him, and I don't remember what the reply was. That's what I remember about that incident. And then he said something like, "That's a clue." And, "It seems like you type reports for every officer here for the last few hours." Or something like that. I can't remember exactly how it went.*

Jim Band:

And did she get upset about that? Or what is your memory of that?

Yeah, she didn't reply. I saw her get red in the face, and she just stood up and walked outside, and went to her patrol car, and then cried while a different officer was holding her, at a call we had at the transfer station.

Jim Band:

And who was that officer?



I believe it was ... He's currently Corporal Seann Luedke at the Sheriff's Office... our Sheriff's Office.

I asked Officer **** if he heard Chief Greenway say anything about not hiring women in law enforcement and he said no. I asked Officer ****,

"So you were sitting there, is that an appropriate thing you think? Is that the way the Chief should be admonishing her about that? Or is that something that should happen in private, or what was your impression? Even if it's true that she shouldn't be in there doing that, is that the right way a supervisor should go about that, do you think?"

Officer **** responded,

"That's a great question. I've learned every supervisor has their own style. His at times is severely direct. In this circumstance, I actually don't know. I know that generally you don't reprimand in front of other people, but also being called out sometimes, just make it quick and move on with your day, and then it's over. You have the supervisor yell at a group of you. Typically it's a group, you got three guys, "What are you guys doing here? Why did you do that? You should have stayed in the City instead of going to that call." You get reprimanded and then you move on. But the fact that it was an individual officer in front of everybody. Yeah, I didn't like that, but I don't know if that answers your question."

I asked Officer **** about whether Chief Greenway had offered him the fitness incentive without running it and he said no. Officer **** said he had heard about Chief Greenway saying that to somebody but had never heard about him offering it to anybody else.

I told Officer **** I had heard about members of the union meeting with Chief Greenway and the Chief being angry. Officer **** said,

*"Greenway have asked ... Our Association President was ****. Our Vice President was ****. And the other two people in there, it was me and Officer ****, recently been terminated as you know.*

*So we were in there, we were the Association E-board. Chief had asked us to send him an email. He said, "I know things aren't good right now and there's a lot of tension between patrol and the Association and admin. Write me a letter about things that you want to see improved, and just issues you have, something that we can sit and talk about it. It will just be you guys and me, the lieutenant, nobody else." We're like, "Okay." So we sent him an email with things we had issues with and then he called us into the admin trailer at the PD. And **** was there with him and brought a laptop. He called us in there and he just gets red in the face and starts yelling at us and saying how unprofessional we are. And he looked at ****'s tattoos and says, "Those are outside of policy."*

*And then he said, "Officer ****, you chew tobacco, that's outside of policy, and you guys did this, that's outside of policy, pretty much threats regarding things that have been going on for a very,*



very, very long time. And then he said, "You're the worst cops I've ever worked with. You are the cause of all the issues at the department. I hope you're looking for other work. I don't have a reason to fire you, but I will not write you a letter of recommendation if you apply elsewhere. The sheriff's office won't take you, no office will take you." What else? I think that's what I can remember."

Officer **** described this as weird and I asked if Chief Greenway had a temper or what had happened here. Officer **** replied,

"I don't like using this word. I got the vibe that somebody had manipulated what we had said, but it was in an email. And there was some feeling behind our email. I'm sure we could find it somewhere, but it wasn't anything unprofessional. It was just this is an issue we have. This is an issue we have. And I don't know, I'm guessing somebody just manipulated it and made it sound worse and got in his ear and told him something. But I don't know, it was just a very strange blow up. And I've seen them before from him, but that one was frightening. It was just on a different level."

I asked Officer **** about whether he had seen the incident where Chief Greenway reportedly yelled at **** **** after an OSP Trooper had been hit on a highway. Officer **** said he did not witness the actual event, but saw **** ****'s response to it the next day. Officer **** said,

*"He was extremely upset, angry, and told me what had happened. And it was, he's in the trailer with I think, Detective ****, now a sergeant. And the Chief and possibly somebody else, I can't remember if there was another person there. And Chief said he'd heard about what happened and he said, "Did you spike that car? If you spiked that car, your blankety blank gone." And then he said, "****, pull up the body camera video to show whether or not Corporal **** had spiked the car." But threatening his job if he did something without any kind of [inaudible 00:11:50] just is, what's going to happen."*

I asked Officer **** if there was anything about which I had not asked, and he said one thing had continued to bother him. Officer **** explained,

"Chief Greenway had pulled me aside one day, this was probably six years ago at this point. It's been a long time, maybe five. And he said he saw a great future out of me and knew I was going to move up and have a great career in law enforcement, [inaudible 00:12:46], I don't want to promote it all. And I've been on the [inaudible 00:12:52] for a long time. And he said, "You're not going to advance. Most ... Sorry, I don't know the exact wording he had, but it was along the lines of, you're not going to advance in this career if you're on the Association E-board. It's going to hinder you from advancing, from getting specialty positions, whatever." He didn't use a lot of specific words, but he said, "You're not going to move along as fast." Does that make sense?"

**** ([REDACTED]

On December 16, 2024, I interviewed Ms. **** over the telephone. Ms. **** had been an officer with SHPD but had left and was working at the [REDACTED] Police Department.



I asked Ms. **** if she had any negative interactions with Chief Greenway and for her take on his leadership overall. Ms. **** responded,

"Yeah. So I didn't work with him for very long. I can't remember when he started, but it was only a few months. There was one negative interaction shortly after he started that I can remember. Again, this was a while ago. I remember when he first came in, he was very much all about wanting officers to be proactive and get out and doing stuff, being out of the office. Well, at that time our schedule was, we were on five, eights and I worked swing shifts, which is like 2:00 PM to 10:00, and there were no overlapping shifts. So I was often down a lot of reports. So I was very reactive. So when I wasn't out taking calls, I'd be back typing.

So I remember it was shortly after he had started, it was in the afternoon between 2:00 and 3:00, and I was in the office and I was typing and there was at least one, if not two other officers in there. And I remember Greenway came back and he said something to me to the effect, and I remember because he was very condescending in his tone, he said something to the effect of, "Do you remember what I said when I first started, how I wanted officers to be out doing stuff? Well, in law enforcement we call that a clue." So he said that to me and I was like, "Okay." And I got up and I left and I went out and I made a traffic stop and the first car I stopped I remember had a warrant, some guy had a warrant or something.

*Anyway, but it was upsetting because, not only talking to me like that, but talking to me like that in front of others. And then I remember talking, I want to say it was, I talked to **** about it later, and I remember just I felt embarrassed for how he talked to me and I remember kind of tearing up talking to him about it. And then I think he must have talked to Greenway because Greenway later, he asked me to go to coffee or something and he ended up actually apologizing to me for talking to me like that. I think we'd gone to Starbucks, if I remember. And I think at this time I was already deciding to leave St. Helens or try and lateral anyways. So I just remember then when he and I went out to coffee and talked, he already knew that I was trying to lateral and he was like, "Well, I can try and help any way I can," blah, blah, blah. And then, yeah, then I left not that long after."*

I asked Ms. **** if there was anything else I needed to know and she said,

"Yeah, not that I can think of. That just always stuck out in my mind of that negative interaction. Even though he apologized, I was just like, oh, this was a sign that I needed to leave St. Helens, that just solidified it. But no, that's the only thing I can think of."

****** **** (SHPD Officer)**

I called Officer **** to ask about an incident others had discussed about an interaction the union executive board had with Chief Greenway. I was told Officer **** was on the executive board at the time.

I asked Officer **** if there had been a meeting where Chief Greenway had said something about them being worthless and that they should go work somewhere else. Officer **** said he was at that meeting and shared,



*"I don't remember exactly. It had something to do with... I'm trying to remember. It had something to do with **** and ****, I think, and Sergeant ****. And somehow the union board got... I don't remember. There was something that they did that they didn't have permission to do as a union on duty or something like that. I was the president at the time, but I don't remember specifically what it was. We got called in. I do remember him saying something like that, that I thought he said something more like, I wouldn't write you recommendations or go apply at the sheriff's office, or I would write you, I don't remember. Something like I would write you or I wouldn't write you recommendations, and you should go work, apply for the sheriff's office. So the sheriff's office wouldn't take us. I don't remember specifically what it was."*

I asked Officer ****,

"Your perspective... It's been described to me as your Chief's like is really off and telling you guys you should apply other places. Did you think it was like, oh the Chief's kind of mad, that's weird. Or did you think it was like, what the hell, this is totally inappropriate. What was your sort of perspective on it happening?"

Officer **** responded,

*"I don't know if I'd say inappropriate or it was just a meeting. It kind of shocked me because whatever we were called in there for, I really didn't know anything about. It kind of shocked me. And then there was something about we had a union meeting, and I think I was working, but I had it cleared through Sergeant Eggers that as long as I was available for calls I could be at the union meeting, kind of presiding over it since I was president. I don't think the Chief knew about that, so he was upset about that. But like I said, whatever happened with, I think it was ****, **** and Brian or **** and **** or whoever it was, he was pretty upset about that."*

I asked Officer **** if there was anything else I should know and he said,

"I mean, he's a little eccentric at times, but he's also, I don't know, he's been a different Chief to work for. He's very good to work with. And then there's just times where it's kind of... It's different."

Interim Chief Joe Hogue (SHPD Lieutenant)

I interviewed Lt. Hogue at the SHPD administration building on January 6, 2025. I had interviewed a number of people and wanted to ask Lt. Hogue about his knowledge of different incidents to determine whether he had been a witness or to determine whether he had any background information about them.

I asked Lt. Hogue about something I had been told involving a former Officer named Boswell,

"He's a military guy and he put in for a canine position. And I was told that Chief Greenway had said something about him wanting to get a canine position having to do with whether or not he continued to be in the military. Did you ever hear that or do you know what I'm talking about?"

Lt. Hogue responded,



"Yeah, I don't remember all that was said, but it was believed that Boswell wanted that canine position, that the person that we had in there had been doing it for over 20 years, and we were trying to transition that into the right person. I know Greenway had expressed to me that he had reservations about Boswell doing that position because he was still in the Reserves and therefore was gone some weekends and stuff like that, but it just never really got off the ground. We never fully opened it up and had a process or anything like that. Boswell ended up going to the Sheriff's Office and-"

I told Lt. Hogue I had been told by **** ** that he had been told by the Chief to inform the Columbia County Sheriff's Office that St. Helens Officers would not longer be helping them, with the exception of Code 3 calls. Lt. Hogue said,

"I was on vacation at the time, and I was at Tenmile Lakes on the coast, and just where I was in the cell coverage I was in and out of cell service, and I remember going around a cove in the lake and suddenly got service again and my phone, I could just hear it blow up with a bunch of text messages. And there was a bunch of text messages about everything from what's up with this policy? What is the Chief thinking? What's going on? And I had no idea what we were talking about, of course.

But however, I eventually learned what we had, and it was that Greenway had changed the policy to where it was really just so restrictive on basic covering or coverage of other agencies. So an example would be, and this actually has happened, if to our north, Columbia City or the County, even if it's a half a mile out of the City is on field sobriety tests and they asked for a cover officer, that wouldn't fit the criteria for us to go cover. So Scappoose would have to leave their town, travel the distance through Warren, the seven, eight miles to get to St. Helens, then drive through St. Helens and go all the way over there. I didn't feel it was right for an agency our size in really rural Oregon because we were still, of course, asking for help on search warrants and we were still calling for cover occasionally."

I asked for Chief Greenway's reasoning for this and Lt. Hogue replied,

"Well, he went back and forth. Sometimes he would say that Norm Miller was a moron and an idiot. He was the Scappoose Chief at the time, and that we weren't going to take their calls for them. Other times he would say it's because Pixley, he didn't particularly feel that Pixley was worthy to be a sheriff.

What he mentioned was that it was a cop's going to get killed one day, and he was referring to the driving. So he would say, for example, "We're not going to get killed going code three in the middle of the night driving all the way to Scappoose because they haven't staffed their police department," or, "The City needs to hire more people instead of having us be the officer who covers or the one who gives advice." That's what he formally and officially said as his reasoning. In conversations with his command staff, it was debatable if that's really what the true reason was.

*I tried to talk him out of it, but the two main things at the time were, you had asked if I knew that **** ** had been asked to go speak to the whomever's Sheriff's Office. I didn't know it*



*that way. What I do know, and what I can tell you is that we did not message this at all. There was not a meeting with leadership from other agencies to where they could interject or critique or whatever. It just was by the stroke of a pen. And if **** * was asked to do that, that would have been the only messaging that I know of that we did at all.*

The tough part of that was some of us were coming back to Greenway saying, "Hey look, if a cop gets killed because we didn't cover them, that's not going to be a good look." He really discounted that as we were being dramatic, and we could always say that a cop's going to get killed. Ironically though, that was his reasoning that he was saying-

...for not driving, making the code runs. And I was trying to stress to him like, no, we still need to cover the other agencies. I think we addressed the driving issues on an individual basis. We have GPS in the cars and everything else."

I asked Lt. Hogue about how this was messaged and explained to the troops, and he said,

"Not formally. I mean, again, I was on vacation, so if he attended briefings that day or certainly, I don't remember there ever being a staff meeting. If it was ever brought up, it was very, very just succinct of, look, we're not here to take everybody else's calls and these other places need to hire more cops. Which I always considered it, I don't know if flattering is the right word, but if we're being asked by another agency that, "Hey, can I get some advice on this," I always thought that was okay.

He felt that the quality of the officers of the neighboring agencies was not up to par with ours. I think in a lot of cases that was true probably. He didn't feel that they had received the same training, but I didn't feel that the officers themselves and their families needed to be penalized for that. I mean, most of them got hired for the same reasons that we got hired. Probably they didn't have the most robust FTEP or whatever, as so many of the smaller agencies don't. Perhaps our FTEP could be scrutinized by a bigger agency. You know what I mean? So-

We had the following back-and-forth:

Jim Band:

*Okay. So **** * , just to reiterate that Pixley shooting, said **** * called him and said quote, "The Chief's losing it. You need to get clear as soon as possible." Do you remember that happening? Do you remember Greenway saying something to you? Like he said, you said the Chief's losing it. I don't know if you remember saying that or agree with that statement.*

Lt. Joe Hogue:

I remember-

Jim Band:

Do you remember the Chief losing it or something that would-



Lt. Joe Hogue:

*Somewhat. What I remember was I was talking to **** on the phone, but Greenway is talking over my ear, so if you've ever been on the phone and someone's trying to be part of the conversation and they're yelling stuff, so he wasn't screaming it, but it was loud, and so I'm trying to listen to **** on the phone, but Greenway was a few feet away yelling out, "He needs to come back. This doesn't qualify for why we would go help. The scene's secure. He needs to turn right around and come back."*

*But I'm listening because as I understood it, **** got there and was at least for a while the only one who had stripes. And so, of course, there's that...scene preservation and some photos and making some notifications. I think he was just trying to help, but it was difficult to navigate. So I don't remember saying, "The Chief's losing it." I think that would be an accurate description, but I just don't remember saying those exact words.*

Jim Band:

Were you shocked? I mean, it seems to me to say, "The scene's secure," and you've got involved officers who are supposed to be sectioned off, not talk to anybody, and then non-involved people show up, take care of the scene while those people get... Was this sort of stuff surprising to you that Greenway's take on-

Lt. Joe Hogue:

No, because I knew his disdain for the leadership of the neighboring agencies, which is what I was feeling at the time. It's a catch-22. Greenway would talk sometimes about how our people are young, they need more experience, they need exposure to things. In my eyes, this was exactly a case for that. You had a young corporal who this is a great opportunity for him to get to a scene, and granted he had been a detective, but at least for a little while, for him to run the scene, get things organized, I was looking at it from that perspective. I wasn't looking at it that I was pro Sheriff's Office or anti Sheriff's Office, pro-Scappoose or anti-Scappoose, which I think it was the lens the Chief was looking for. I was just looking at it as we got a dead guy, we've got a Sheriff that needs to get the hell out of there, and we need a scene to preserve. What a great opportunity for a young corporal to take advantage of that. That's how I viewed it.

I asked Lt. Hogue about ****' explanation about what happened when he had been assigned to the detective unit. I asked what happened and Lt. Hogue said,

"Yeah, I can't clarify what the Chief's motivation would be. I can only speculate. But what I do know is that we have a shift bid. We do a few a year. One of the bids begins in September, and I think that the reason was the SRO. We would have a new bid because the SRO would leave the patrol schedule and go back to school typically around that type of year.

So it was getting to that time and Greenway and I had had discussions that we needed two detectives. The one detective thing, it wasn't quite working because sometimes a detective needs backup or just someone to go with. Plus the amount of work that they have, we couldn't justify it with one. It's hard to justify it with two.



*Well, the timing of it was at one time we had **** and **** in as detectives. We ended up having to put **** back on the road just because of being short-staffed. Well, right around that time we applied for a grant for our own computer forensic lab, and so Greenway and I were kicking the tires on who should be the examiner. And originally, we had ****, of course. He was the brains behind wanting the grant. And then since he was the only detective at the time and **** was briefing me on the ins and outs of having this, you really don't want one person, you want two. You want people checking each other's work and all of that. So we thought, well, we got to come up with a second examiner, and we knew that some people would probably be interested.*

The training that they had to go to was really long. It was I think around, I don't know, it was two or three weeks, maybe a month, that they had to be gone at this thing. So a pretty big bite for an agency our size, but I didn't want necessarily a patrol person doing this for a couple different reasons. Is it's just hard to schedule patrol when you're having minimum staffing, and you have the officer in doing examining phones or whatnot. Even though that looks like a pretty good reason, the other person on the road that's taken on calls probably isn't going to see it that way.

The other reason was I didn't want to get into a bargaining thing where the union was going to say, "Well, geez, I went to the school, and I need a 10% raise or whatever for this." So the easier thing for me was get that second detective back when we can and add language to the job description that would be part of the duties was that, oh, by the way, you need to attend this.

*So the deal, if you will, all along was that **** would go to this training to become an examiner and that he would be the next detective. He was runner up in the process when **** got it, and so we felt that that was pretty easy to do. Plus he was really interested in doing it, and he was techie like that. It all added up.*

*The other part of that was Greenway had asked **** would you like to do this because the job description is changing, and you would need to go to the school and do this? And he apparently thought about it and ultimately said, "No, I'm not interested in doing that. I'd rather just work the road," which is fine. So we were all set to go.*

*He, being ****, had just gone to the training, I believe, and we were doing the shift bid. We did not have **** bid for a patrol shift to begin in September because he was going into detectives, and we were all fine with it. We had a staff meeting, and I announced in front of Greenway and everybody that, "Hey, here's your new detective. He originally went to school," blah, blah, blah, and never really thinking anything of it. It was, I don't know, several days into September where I had learned that Greenway had gone in and chastised **** for being in the role that he was assigned, essentially."*

We had the following conversation about this:

Jim Band:

*That's really strange to me. Somebody in charge had told ****, "Hey, you're a detective."*



Lt. Joe Hogue:

*Yes, me, through collaboration with Greenway, and we told him in front of everybody. The entire staff knew that he was a detective. In fact, he had, I'm chucking because he had really reorganized the detective office to get it how he wanted it. This was done in August, and Greenway and I were at the station and someone said, "Hey, did you see all the work **** did out there," kind of comically. And so he and I went out there together. Greenway and I have looked at the layout, and I actually thought it looked pretty cool. And Greenway and I used to have our office in there. I said to Greenway, "We should have done this when we were in here." So we talked about it, we laughed about it, we saw the new office, we had a staff meeting.*

Jim Band:

So why do you think that he would go to him and say, "Why do you think you're not a detective?"

Lt. Joe Hogue:

*The only thing I could come up with is that I learned that **** was still receiving detective pay even though he had not been a detective in months and months, and even though he had said he didn't want to be a detective, and even though he said he didn't want to do the new requirement to... even though he said he didn't want to do the new requirement to continue to be a detective. So the only thing I can think of is that he didn't want there to be essentially three detectives who were getting detective pay when we really only had two. Now, why he had allowed **** to receive that pay far longer than he should have, I have no idea. What I can tell you is that, and speaking to **** after his confrontation with Greenway, he was in a sense threatened by Greenway of, "Hey, look, don't even think about filing a grievance," or something, words to that effect. And I think he was really afraid of it being discovered that we had three people getting paid and two budgeted type of thing. So that's the only thing I can come up with. Because he never disputed that we needed two detectives or that we needed more cops in general. And certainly he and I collaborated on, again, developing a job description that required you are a detective slash mobile device examiner. So it was bizarre.*

Jim Band:

*It just seems like a weird way to treat ****. I've got texts that he, he showed me texts that he'd sent his wife the day it happened. They were just dumbfounded.*

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Yeah, I was too. And I felt bad for him. But I can tell you he did not just show up one day and started investigating cases. He was-

Jim Band:

Told to.

Lt. Joe Hogue:



Promoted and was told to on a particular date. That's exactly what he did. And it was really bizarre.

Jim Band:

Do you think that Greenway, everyone things like that? Just from my own experience, those are the kinds of things that I think really affect morale and how you treat people. Do you think that Greenway just didn't understand that or didn't care about that?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

*He definitely struggled when he first got here with, I think just Oregon employment laws and unions in general. For instance, when he got here, he could not believe that I was not in a union. And I explained to him, no, I'm a lieutenant. He didn't understand why he wasn't in the union. And "We need to form our own and we need to unionize." And, "No, no, we can't do that." So there were some struggles, which perhaps anybody coming from another state, depending on the state, may have had. I think towards the later part, and so this deal we're talking about with ****, this was only back last fall I think. As time went on, he got more and more brazen and confident, probably more confrontational and maybe just more comfortable in... For instance, going in and telling ****, "Don't even think about filing a grievance," is apparently what words of that effect that he had told ****. When he first got here, he would be the one to say, "We need to file a grievance." And so it was definitely a flip-flop. Sometimes he really wanted to use the union. In this particular case, he was making sure that the union was not used. If there ever had been a grievance that I had heard in the last several years that the union should have done, it would've been this one.*

I asked Lt. Hogue about the text **** **** showed me where Chief Greenway had told him to tell people to stop signing up for overtime shifts and that it made it difficult to go to a 20-hour shift schedule. I asked what the result of people not filling the overtime shifts would be. Lt. Hogue replied,

"Well, you just wouldn't have the coverage. And the problem is it's really two or nothing, the way the policy and the collective bargaining agreement reads. And so you can't have just one officer on duty. It's two or none. But no, without filling the overtime. And we have sergeants filling overtime too for just minimum coverage. But yeah, I don't know what his thought process on that. All that would've resulted in is eventually us telling the City, there's not going to be any cops on at this time. And again, it's kind of back to what I said originally about the outside agency assist policy. I think that's something that needs to be communicated and massaged. But had everyone just stopped doing that, I mean we could have on the very next night potentially just not had any coverage."

I asked why Chief Greenway wanted to go to a 20-hour shift and Lt. Hogue replied,

*"That's interesting. I wrote a bunch of schedules that were 20 hours in 2021, and I met with Greenway and I met with John Walsh, the City Administrator, and I met with a gentleman named **** Brown, this is all at the same time, who was the finance director, finance director slash I think assistant city administrator at the time. And I was kind of coming up with these models of what policing looks like now and kind of wanting us to get together and really plan for what*



we're wanting to do. Do we want to just have an agency that answers 911 calls or do we want to be more involved in the community? All of those things, we need to identify that first. And then the biggest thing was we had, either had or were about to pull SROs out. And also the detective thing that I talked about, I wasn't comfortable having just one. I certainly wasn't comfortable having zero. Imagine right now with this school case that we have, if we didn't have at least two detectives, which really that hasn't been enough.

But really what I wanted to do was to kind of say mostly to John Walsh, look, he was projecting a really, really bleak and grim forecast for the budget, there's two ways we can do this. We can try to budget and try to hire staffing and keep the levels of what's recommended. And we were kind of going after what was recommended on a previous staffing study that had been completed, which said we needed at least 26 cops. So we can go with that and make a goal either through levies or budgeting or whatever. Or there's this other thing we can do, which every other agency in the County does. And that's where you don't have 24-hour coverage. You go to some kind of on-call status or whatever during the hours that you're not actively patrolling. So here's kind of the two options that I see us being in the next four or five years.

The first one, obviously we need some money. The second one, well, you could keep the St. Helens Police Department at say 15 cops for years if you wanted to. But if you want to do this, you need to really get together with a union and agree on language in the collective bargaining agreement about on-call status. They're going to want some kind of pay, standby pay, call-out pay, or what have you. But I said one thing that concerns me that even if we never go to the 20-hour schedule is I would like to get at least the language and develop some of these schedules and have them ready to go. Because we had had an active shooter case where the officer basically took out an active shooter with his car. But it got me thinking at that time of, geez, some of these incidents you may end up putting four or five officers on leave. With as short-staffed as we are, we weren't ready for anything like that.

So I wanted at least the option to be on the books that call it Schedule B, and here's a clause on the last page of the CBA that says, hey, if the City has to go to this 20-hour schedule, this is what it would look like and this is how you'd be compensated. I was just really trying to just get the City to do that. Greenway was not interested at that time. I think he sat through the meetings, but he interjected a little bit, but that wasn't something that he, at least he didn't express to me that he wanted to go to that. I think it was at that time more than me saying, hey, look, here's an option."

We had the following back-and-forth conversation:

Jim Band:

Because I've seen several places where Greenway was upset that the City wasn't coming up with more money. It seems to me for a police chief to just be mad that the City's not giving him more, it's a little bit short-sighted in that there's not bags of money around where we'll just go grab a new bag of money. How did he expect... As you know, we funded our building with the utility fee. The City Manager, it was my job as Police Chief to go out. I sold that in the community for a year. It was my job to do, not the



Mayor's job, not the City Manager's job. And I think I interact with a lot of police departments, and it sort of seemed like that, like here's your budget, you provide patrol services, and then if you need more money, you make your case. And it seems to me like Greenway was putting all of that, somehow it was all on the Mayor, all on the City Manager to do those things, where most people, I think, see that as the Police Chief's job to staff the department.

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Yes, agree.

Jim Band:

Do you have an opinion, listening to him, of why he sort of saw it as their job and not his?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

I don't know that he necessarily really ever believed that. I think he fell out of favor with John Walsh and Rick Scholl towards the latter part of his time here. But I don't-

Jim Band:

So maybe lost his ability to influence?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

I don't think he... Well, he was never... Well, to influence them, yes. I think the communication had stopped to where they just weren't speaking to each other. And so certainly it would make sense that he had lost the ability to influence for sure. But I don't, I mean, I don't know that there was a turning point or an incident per se that he ever changed his belief or his philosophy on our staffing or our staffing levels. Or he never presented something that said, look, this is what I consider the minimum staffing. This is how many we need to hire. I never really saw that. Which was one of my frustrations is I never could get the last three chiefs and the City to all agree on what's the minimum staffing, give us a number. And I've always said it's hard to reach a target when we don't know what it is. So he certainly-

Jim Band:

And I would tell you that that's the Chief's jobs to come up with that.

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Yes.

Jim Band:

You're not going to go to a mayor who's maybe a bricklayer and ask him how many cops you should have. That's your job to tell them.



Lt. Joe Hogue:

Agree.

Jim Band:

I've seen several texts where he talks about the City Manager and the Mayor not supporting the police department because they haven't been on a ride along or been in the building. And I've seen in other communities, council people who are outright hostile toward their police department and didn't like them. Did you ever get the impression the Mayor and the City Manager didn't like the police department? I mean, I know why he doesn't. They didn't give him the money once, didn't fund the building. I think that those are reasons that he might say that he didn't think they supported the police department. Do people generally have a sense that those two don't like the police department or the police officers or the work it's doing?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

I don't know if they really believe that or not. John Walsh isn't a stand on the table, rah, rah type of leader. Rick has, at least through what he's said during Council, has always been supportive of us. In fact, look, the staff, they did increase staffing. And that's one of the things that Rick was barking back at, was that here's the budget of right before Greenway got here, here's the budget now, it's way bigger. Now, granted, a lot of that is because of wage adjustments. We're paid more on par with the agencies that we were losing officers to. But they also increased the staff by three or four officers.

Jim Band:

So did you guys get a pretty significant pay bump?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Significant, very significant.

Jim Band:

Like what percent?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Oh, depending on your rank, 15 to 18%.

Jim Band:

So how do you pay compared to the County and Scappoose?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

We pay a lot more. We are on par now with Hillsboro and Beaverton.



Jim Band:

Wow. Where'd that money come from? That's the budget, I guess.

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Some of it, the original bump I think was COVID money. And then to sustain that, of course, I think therein lies-

Jim Band:

Because that's only one time money, that COVID money.

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Right. And so to sustain that, I think that perhaps, I mean, it would be somebody with City Finance, but as it was communicated to me, that was a significant bump. And to have that and ask for a bunch more officers was a pretty big lift.

Jim Band:

So you also got three or four new officer positions, you said?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Yes, yes. Over a period of time.

I told Lt. Hogue I had heard about Chief Greenway saying he hoped they did not hire anyone or hoped they would not get police candidates when they had job openings. I asked for him to explain this. Lt. Hogue said,

"Yeah, that was definitely a very, very difficult time for me. And that really started right around the time of when the union did the votes of no confidence on Rick Scholl and John Walsh, which I think was last January of '24, if I remember right. Well, we needed to hire and we had open positions and we had a process going. And it was like a lot of police departments are complaining about. It was very slow to get applications. And very few, if any, were laterals. As we got closer to spring, so I'm going to say March-ish, we had a lateral out of Montana that applied. And along with that, our list had grown of entry-level applicants, and ... as expected. So I was just starting to kind of get a process together, what's this going to look like, and doing the typical thing, getting an interview panel together and all that.

And around that time, Greenway started saying to me, well, I hope you don't get anybody. And the first couple of times he said it, I just kind of chuckled and didn't really say much. But he was pretty persistent on it. And finally I asked, I said, "Well, why would I have a process if we're not going to try to hire anybody?" And he said, "Well, until..." He said, "I don't want us to hire anybody." And he said, "Until people start seeing that people don't want work here because of John Walsh and Rick Scholl, there's not going to be any changes. Until those guys are gone,



there's not going to be the changes that we need." And I told him, I said, "Well, example, this guy that applied from Montana," I said, "He doesn't know who those two people are. And he may have checked out our social media and seen the name, but he's not coming here because of them. He's not coming here because of them."

*I said, "I don't really think it works like that. I think we just have the process like we do every other time." And then he started saying it, I was going to say out loud, it was out loud before, but in front of Sergeant **** and probably some other staff members. And it was getting to where it was... If he said things to just me, I would just talk to just him about it and we would try to brainstorm. It was already uncomfortable. But then when he started saying it to other people, it really made me feel uncomfortable because, I mean, some of these people may be involved in the hiring process. Of course, they may sit on the panel, they may be involved with something in the background, they may take the candidate on a ride along, et cetera and so forth. So it was getting really strange.*

Well, fast-forward until we had the actual interviews, so the oral board panel interviews. And I had sergeants on it and I had one patrol officer on it, and I maybe had an elected official on the panel too. But we had a pretty good day actually. We had a couple of entry-level people that we liked and then this kid from Montana. He was employed at the time at Montana State University, but as a sworn position, and he was bored. He had family up in Washington, so he was looking to get back out here. I saw it as this is nice, this is a blessing, that he still has to pass all the steps, but I saw it as I'm encouraged. And so I was really positive about it, and he kept telling, Greenway kept telling me, "That guy's not going to come here. We're not going to hire that guy." I was like, "Just let this play out. Let's do the process we always do. If he fails a step, then like anybody else, he's not getting a job." Well, he came into the interview, this applicant, this lateral, and he did pretty good. And the panel-

This applicant, this lateral, and did pretty good, and the panel liked it too. Well, one of the questions was, what's your biggest work-related mistake? He disclosed that when he was a teenager, he was a cadet with Washington State Patrol and learned a lesson. He had flipped the lights on, the overhead lights of a patrol car, and then through the advice of a paid, full-time trooper, kind of minimized that when he was asked by a supervisor, so they let him go. Significant, we're going to investigate it on the background, all of that stuff.

But what had happened, he interviewed in the morning, and then at lunchtime, the patrol officer that I had on the panel had to go to the office, the station for something, and he got there, and Chief Greenway, and I think a few other people had asked, "How's it going?" And he says, "Oh, we've got a lateral at least." And towards the effect of, "This guy looks pretty good." And somebody had asked him, "Is there anything bad in his background?" And he disclosed this story, and it was told to me later on that Greenway was saying, "Well, we're not hiring that guy."

But I didn't know about it until the end of the day. So the end of the day, we had a couple people that we wanted to move on to backgrounds. I think two for sure, possibly three, and the lateral was one of those. So, it's 5:00, 6:00 whenever we left City Hall with these interviews, and I just called him and said, "Hey, FYI, I'm going to give out some background packets to some guys, I'm



going to email them tonight." And he says, "You're not doing it to that lateral, are you?" And I says, "Well, yeah, actually, he was the top scorer for today." And he goes, "Oh, well we can't hire him." And I said, "Why is that?" And he said, "Well, he got fired from WSP."

*And I said, "How'd you know that?" And he says, "Well, **** was here, and I asked him." And so, that really pissed me off, that the Chief had, in front of people, was kind of holding court on somebody's background or application. I thought it was unprofessional. And I again told him, "Hey look, we may do a background. We may be five minutes into a background and say we can't hire this kid." But I said, "We are not at that point yet. We are going to do this." And I kept telling him, "We're going to do this like we do every other process."*

Lt. Hogue said this candidate had been about 18 or 19 when this happened and said it seemed like the candidate was being honest about it. Lt. Hogue went on,

"So, the very next day... This had bothered me all night, and the very next day I called Kathy, who was our HR, and Greenway had a, I would say habit, I was going to say habit, but he would sometimes go down to City Hall, and if he liked the person, he would kind of go in and spill some of the stuff we were working on, or kind of ask for advice or whatever, which to an extent is fine. But I was really worried that he was so adamant that he... If you looked at what he was saying before, that, "I hope we don't get anybody," and then it looked like he was trying to kind of sabotage this hiring process, I just really wanted to get ahead of all that with HR, who was of course processing these apps, and had set up these interviews.

So I called Kathy and I said, "Hey Kathy, I just want to remind you that we have a process to all this stuff, and we have backgrounds, we have sites, we have all these steps, and we're not going to deviate from that." And she asked what I meant and I said, "Look, I've had some really weird conversations with the Chief," and I said, "I don't know what he's up to, but it's just really concerning to me, that it looks like he's trying to kind of railroad this thing." But I said, "If he comes down here, just please refer them to me, and don't send someone a letter that said they're not moving on. Don't do that." I was really worried.

So, that was kind of the... When you asked the question, had I ever heard that? Yes, I had on many occasions. And then even after, Greenway and I felt that we didn't like the backgrounds... investigations that just simply emailed the form to everybody to fill out and get back. I think, actually going out and doing face-to-face interviews. So, I made arrangements to go to Bozeman, Montana, to go do his background. [inaudible 00:55:13], "We need to do our due diligence on this, especially if there are any concerns." And he just would kind of under his breath say, "Well, that guy's not going to... He's not going to come here. He's not going to come here." It was just bizarre, because the first really three or four years he worked here, he wasn't that way. He would've been excited about this, and excited to some extent to meet this person, and do all that. So, yeah, it was hard-

This led to the following back-and-forth:

Jim Band:



So, on one hand, you need officers to come work here to fill shifts, and on the other hand, it sounds like he's trying to make that not happen. And my understanding that the reason for that was, he wanted the City to quote, "Feel it," or...

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Yes.

Jim Band:

Feel the brunt of not giving him the number of people that he wanted or needed.

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Right. Right. And I guess for what he expressed to me, that if we don't fill the positions, and then somehow we could, I guess message to people, "Well, it's because the City... No one wants to work here." Which again, the average 22-year-old that's applying has no idea who the City Manager is, or the Mayor, and doesn't really care.

Jim Band:

Well, I'd say conversely, you guys are paying more than other people. That's the kind of stuff people come for.

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Well, and he said that, this lateral I'm talking about. He... Everybody's hiring. Right? And so he had applications in at a few other agencies, I think Washington County, and a few others, if I remember right. And so, I kind of felt like if he's attractive enough, then it's a competition, and so not... Finding something questionable early on and not going through the process I felt was detrimental to us.

Jim Band:

So, were the current City Manager and Mayor, were they the City Manager and Mayor when you guys got the pay bump?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Yes.

Jim Band:

Okay.

Lt. Joe Hogue:

And he got one too, as well as I.



We had the following conversation on a different topic:

Jim Band:

Okay. Okay. And so, had he, on the vote of no confidence...did he tell you that he'd been involved with the Union about, I don't know if orchestrating that is the right word, but at least communicating with them about doing that? Did you know he was up to that? Did you know anything about that?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

No, I suspected it, because there was just certain... He had fallen out of favor with John and Rick, or at least they had fallen out in favor of him. But it was too uncanny that many of his sticking points of reasons why that they were ineffective leaders were also kind of recited by the Union when they did the votes. It was just too weird for me that he had no involvement. But at the time of when they said to counsel that they had done the no confidence vote, he had not told me anything like that.

Jim Band:

Did he ever after the fact talk to you about it?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Yes. Months later, when we were going through a significant disciplinary process with one of our officers. It was getting to the point where we had sustained this officer on really critical policy areas, and it was getting to where the Loudermill hearing was coming up. It was within weeks, if not days. And so, Greenway... It was early on in the week, and he came in first thing in one morning, and really kind of just plopped down in front of my desk and said that he didn't sleep all weekend. And I asked him what was wrong, and he said, "Well, these guys got shit on me." And I said, "What are you talking about?" And he said, "Well, the officers have..." The guys, or the officers, whatever [inaudible 01:00:28], "They got a bunch of text messages on me."

And I said, "Okay, like what?" And he says, "Well, I said some terrible things about Walsh and Rick...and told the Union guys to do the vote of no confidence." Which added up, because again, like I spoke about, just the terms that they used, seemed like they were terms that he often used, and frankly, the Union really wasn't that aggressive or even that involved. I mean, my frustration over the years was that I had trouble getting the Union to really, as a whole, to really get involved with a lot of things, and I really wanted them to be more involved in the community, sponsor a little league team, that type of stuff to get out there a little bit. So, it made sense.

And my exact response was, "Holy shit." And I said, "Brian," and I usually call him Chief, but I said, "Brian, go down to John Walsh, and self-report this." And I think he thought about it, because he kind of just sat there and he just was quiet for a little while. And I said, "John's not a fly off the handle kind of guy, and I think you just go down there and you own it, and whatever. You were in a bad spot at the time, but I think you got to get ahead of this thing." And I think he thought about it, I really do. And he left my office, and we went about our way.



And then it was hours later, but it was the same day, just hours later, I saw him again, and I said, "Hey, did you go down and talk to John?" And he says, "No, I'm not doing that." And he said something that he was worried about this coming up when he had the Loudermill hearing, with [inaudible 01:02:32], and then it clicked. And I said, "So wait a minute. Is the Union basically blackmailing you with this information?" Because I thought... The way he was making it sound, it was like he was worried, and they had threatened him over the weekend or something like that.

Jim Band:

Yeah.

Lt. Joe Hogue:

*So, I needed some context here. And he says, "No, they're not threatening me." And so, I sat there a moment, and I said, "Well, wait a minute. How do you even know that they're going to use this?" And he says, "Well, *** ***** called me this weekend and said that the Union has these text messages, and that they were threatening to use them." But he didn't elaborate when and where they were going to be used. He was worried, and expressed to me that he was worried that somewhere in the Loudermill process that this was going to be brought up. And I said, "Brian, that's another reason why I think you should go down and self-report. Don't let Walsh or someone be blindsided by this. I think you need to kind of explain what it is and what it isn't." And by that time, he was adamant that he was not going to do that.*

I asked Lt. Hogue about an internal investigation Sgt. ***** had discussed with me. I asked if Lt. Hogue knew why that investigation had not been initially given directly to an outside agency. Lt. Hogue said,

"Yeah, that was a weird one. Greenway... One thing about him is, you cannot accuse him of not knowing procedures, or taking the right steps, and proper channels, chain of command, all of that. And that was really a big thing when he got here, was, "We need to have chain of command." And I think to his credit, we were a little off kilter on a lot of that. So, he would tell me these stories about being in Vegas, and just how many levels, and how many committees, and all these things that you had to be involved with, and the proper steps, and you couldn't just go out and do things on your own type of thing.

*And this, again, was in this last spring. And so, this is right around the time of the hiring of the Montana guy and all of that. And I got a call late afternoon from him, that he said, "Hey, just keeping you in the loop. I assigned ***** a..." I think he said tax evasion case, "A tax evasion case? What?" And he says, "Well, *****," she was the event coordinator at the time, "She's got... There's all this missing money, and all this stuff." And so he says, "I don't think she's reporting all of her income." And I said, "Well, that could be, but you haven't done anything yet, right?" I said, "You just have told *****."*

*And he says, "No, no, no. I told ***** this morning, he's already started." And I thought, and I said... Again, this was a Brian, this wasn't Chief. I said, "Brian, no, we don't do this. We make a phone call, and we toss this thing off. We don't do this ourselves. It's against the City, and it's*



*just not something that... We're not going to have our detective work on an IRS case. We'll cooperate of course, but we can't have the guy leading the charge." And he says, "I know, but I really want **** to work this case." And I said, "But this is a mistake." I said, "Brian, this is a mistake."*

*And he said, "Well, it could be, but I need **** to work this, or at least be heavily involved, and I already set up and instructed **** that he is to meet with me weekly and brief me on the status of this case." And I said, "Brian, that looks bad." And he says, "Yes, but this will finally be the thing that gets John Walsh put on admin leave." And I said, "Well, why is that?" And he said, "Well, because he was overseeing tourism, and if there's issues, or missing money," he said, "This is finally going to be the thing that gets him." Because he thought on the vote of no confidence, that was months prior, that the counsel was going to be pretty much obligated to put him on admin leave. And that clearly didn't happen. So, to me, I don't know the merits of the case, but what he expressed to me, that it sounded more like he was pivoting to another way to get Walsh put on admin leave, and using our detective sergeant to get there, and I just didn't agree with it, procedurally, whatsoever."*

I asked Lt. Hogue if Chief Greenway had ever told him about logging into a Scappoose City Council meeting. Lt. Hogue said,

"I actually more overheard it. I was mentioning a little bit ago that at one time, Greenway and I, we had our office over with detectives, and so it was this... A cubicle setup. And one day, I was already there, and he came in, and kind of gathered everybody around, but I was just at my desk and overheard it. And he said something about... This was back during the pandemic. And so, most City Council meetings then were virtual. And so, he tells this tale of, he would often watch City Council meetings of other cities. Like the fire board was having a public meeting, he would just attend, not as himself. He would just kind of attend as a guest. So, that wasn't anything necessarily out of the ordinary for him. But this particular time he kind of gathered some officers around, and really kind of boasted that, "Scappoose is so screwed up that they don't even do the right admin credentials, or access, or permissions on this Zoom meeting for City Council."

So basically, he said, "I logged in, and I found out that I could basically act as the admin of this, and I was muting people, and X-ing them out of the whole meeting." And so, he was telling these guys this story, and he was pretty amused by it, and they were amused by it too, that he was kind of controlling this meeting. And so, he described it as people would talk, and he would either mute them, or X them out, and then there would be this, "Oh, we lost him," type of thing. And then the person would log back in, and he kind of described this chaotic situation of, "Well, geez, I keep losing my connection," and all that. And so, he kind of just described this scene where he's amused by controlling this meeting, and muting, or X-ing people out."

I asked Lt. Hogue if Chief Greenway had told him under what name he logged into these meetings and he said yes. I asked Lt. Hogue what that name was and he said,

"Mike Coxlong."

I asked Lt. Hogue the following,



"So, what's your impression like, you're number two here, and he's telling this to your employees, what's your impression of that? Does that promote professionalism of the organization, and good judgment on the part of the Chief? Or is that a good thing or a bad thing for the Chief to be telling the troops?"

Lt. Hogue replied,

"Well, it's a bad thing for anybody, but particularly bad for a Chief. And I think that's... It kind of went along with, he would talk to the staff, sometimes even in a formal setting, like a staff meeting, and really disparage other cities, or other officers, and other agencies. And so, it concerned me that he was really showing them that that was okay. And so, sometime later, I had a conversation with him, and I said, "Hey, don't do that." And I said, "Remember this? You brought Union guys in and told them this story." And I said, "I will tell you that historically, bargaining units love to keep score, and love to bring that stuff up later." So I said, "Just be-

I asked Lt. Hogue if Chief Greenway had ever said anything to him about using his vehicle lights or siren to get through traffic when going to or from work. Lt. Hogue responded,

"Yes and no. I heard him say it. It wasn't necessarily to me. One that I recall was, we were down at... Greenway and I were down at City Hall, and the Public Works Director was down there, and we were just chatting, and it was kind of a group thing. And Greenway would often talk about how long his commute was. And so, he would sort of wrestle with, "Do I go Highway 30, and cross over the bridge at Longview? Or do I go even to Portland and cross over the I-5 bridge?"

And so, he would wrestle with what was the best way to get home. And the Public Works Director also I think he lived in the same town, or lives in the same town, that Greenway does. And so, they were just talking about the pain of commuting home sometimes, depending on what time they left and all of that.

And I don't recall who brought it up first, but the two of them were laughing and joking about Greenway. They were all caught in traffic. And so, the public works guy's caught in traffic. And he apparently sees Greenway, lights and sirens in his truck, go around the traffic jam. Or there may have been construction or something like that. And so, the Public Works director said, "Well, geez. Well, I need lights and all this."

Well, it was just something that everyone laughed about. But shortly after that, the public works guy talked to me about becoming a reserve, which I said, "No, I can't have a department head out with a badge. You're dealing with someone during the day. And then at night, you're coming over with a badge for whatever reason." I said, "No, I can't do that." But yeah, there was a discussion that I wasn't a part of, but saw and overheard, and all that."

I asked Lt. Hogue about a discipline issue involving Officer **** and some social media posts. Lt. Hogue said,

"So, your original question was about the policy and some discipline. And so, there's a vote of no confidence. Then, that spring you had three things that were challenging that were occurring at once. One I already spoke of. Well, two I already spoke of. One was the hiring of the lateral for



Montana, the struggles during that. Then, you had the significant disciplinary thing with Officer ****.

Then, at the same time, you had Officer **** who was making really disparaging posts on social media about John Walsh. But he was making them as himself, as ****. And he was calling out John Walsh as being corrupt. It was clearly in violation of at least one of our policies. And I had basically started an investigation on that. And I gave that to ****'s Sergeant, ****, and basically told him, "Look, here's policy."

No. Actually, let me back up. There were posts about it. But I either believed that Greenway was involved in encouraging officers to, for instance, do the vote of no confidence, or Greenway had already disclosed to me that he had. But I was suspicious that perhaps **** had been encouraged to do this, which would muddy the waters on a discipline or anything.

So, this is what I did initially. I printed out the policy, and I gave it to each sergeant to do briefing training and then have an accompanying F6 training record with it to memorialize that they had been briefed. The policy was already in effect, of course, but I thought, "I'll tell you what. I will basically start from scratch, and retrain everybody on this, and we'll go from there." And so, that happened. And **** was one of those that attended the training and got training credit for it on the F6.

Well, shortly after that, I became aware that not only did he continue, **** that is, but he was really disparaging on the City Manager. And it, again, was over tourism and all this, which for all I know could be true. I don't know. But at the same time, you can't essentially be a police officer and call out the City Administrator as a crook. It was awful. It was clearly in violation of the policy. So, I looked at it, and I assigned it to his sergeant to start an IA on this and get going on it.

And this was all... So, like I said, **** still was in some stage... He may have even been still working here, but he may not have been put on leave or anything like that yet. It was all right around the same time.

So, **** completes this investigation. Wasn't much to it. You either made the posts or you didn't. He made the posts. He admitted it. I think he admitted that, "Yeah. Reading the policy again, I'm in violation of that." And this went... So, similar process. We sent it to our attorney and was awaiting Greenway's decision on what discipline.

But before that...so I ended up sustaining... I think there was two policies, and I sustained those based upon the sergeant's IA that he did. That was sent to legal. And legal came back with, "Well, we need more information as far as, 'Yes, **** makes the post as himself and names the City Manager. And that creates a whole bunch of comments from other users about the City Administrator. But some context is needed as far as do the people that posted this know that he's a police officer?'" The quick answer was, "Absolutely, they do."



Lt. Hogue went on,

*"But it was looking like we needed to go back and interview, I don't know, 8, 9, 10 people about, "Hey, do you know who **** is? How do you know him," type of thing, and all of that. So, we were getting ready to do that. I was getting ready to do that.*

*And just out of coincidence, Greenway tells me that he had just given **** a verbal reprimand. And I said, "You what?" And he says, "Yeah, I already told him, 'Don't worry about this. This is going to be just a verbal reprimand.'" And I said, "Well, I just got an email from the attorney with all this stuff we need to do." I was uncomfortable with it. But he was in the position, he made his decision, and it's one of those things that you don't always agree with everything. But I was-*

I asked Lt. Hogue if this was Officer ****, he answered,

*"This was ****. Now, the significance for me in that, it was suspicious to me for a couple of different reasons that I'll explain. Greenway, at least what he expressed to me was... When he first got here, in his first two or three years, I would describe his philosophy on handling discipline as pretty cutthroat. His thing he'd say to me was, "Fire them and let them fight for their job back." And again, that was one of those, like I talked about earlier, like, "Well, Oregon, it's not quite like that." So, his thing was, "Look, if we've got guys that aren't adherent to our policies, get them out of here," type of thing. That was his general philosophy.*

Well, this one was blatant in that... Not only just in what he posted, but it was just a few days after he just had training on this very issue. And I even went back to his Sergeant at the briefing. I said, "I'm just confirming. I see his name on the F6. I'm confirming that he was in there. You explained everything. You asked if there were questions." And he said, "Yeah. He said he understood, and he had no questions."

*Well, that was pretty blatant. And not only is it in violation of the policy, there's a certain level of insubordination, I felt, to it as well, which Greenway would never put up with. So, that it would go to just a verbal didn't make me very happy. And so, I didn't get irate or disrespectful, but I asked for an explanation. And he said, "Well, this way nothing goes in his file and we don't have to do all these steps that we're doing with ****," which was going on simultaneously.*

*Well, it was suspicious to me because these are the two guys, **** and ****, that he was mentioning these texts messages about doing the votes of no confidence. It felt to me that he didn't want... It wasn't what was best for the agency. And I was trying to do what was right for the agency, and maintain the discipline, and the order, and the policies. But-*

This led to the following back-and-forth:

Jim Band:

I was just going to say, what you're... If he knows you're doing an IA, he's not following your policy. You let the IA finish before you make a determination.

Lt. Joe Hogue:



Correct. And it felt to me that it wasn't so much that he felt it was a very, very light offense and didn't need anything. I think he was circumventing being put in the position of that [inaudible 01:28:19] or any other type of setting where these text messages could be used against him.

Jim Band:

*Yeah, I think I need to talk to **** again because I didn't talk to him about that. Back on that Halloweentown, was there a comment you had said to me, something about a whistleblower at one time, that on the... Was that about the Halloweentown, the investigation, that it protected Greenway as a whistleblower?*

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Well, he did that a few times. I don't think necessarily just about Halloweentown. He mentioned that... So, there was the vote of no confidence. And I don't know if it was the very next day, but the next time I saw Greenway, he was pretty happy with it. And he was expressing to me that, "Finally somebody did something, and these nice guys need to be out of there, and all that."

And I said, "I would call it a swing and a miss." Excuse me. I wouldn't say he was offended, but he seemed taken back that I said that. And I said, "I thought it was a piece of crap for two reasons." I said, "One, why is it just John and Rick, and not the police liaison, actually two police liaisons, the current one and then the former one, who would've been the police liaison during the time period that they were saying, 'You should have hired more police officers'? I don't know why you wouldn't have. I don't want anybody on it, but I don't know why you wouldn't include everyone else."

And I was criticizing. I was critical of the process and I was critical of... And then, it named tourism in this. So, it was like, "What are we doing here? We're talking about leadership. We don't have confidence in your leadership. And then, you're pivoting. The union letter is pivoting towards tourism." I said, "It looks like a mess." And I said, "I just think it leads to more questions than [inaudible 01:30:30]. At least get Walsh and Rick put on admin leave."

And I said, "Well, I don't think that's going to happen with Rick. I think with Rick you'd have to have more like a citizen recall for the Mayor, in my opinion." And I said, "I don't think the Council will vote to put John on admin leave." But I said, "I don't know." But I said, "You're not getting rid of Rick because of the union vote. You would need an act of the citizens at a recall, if I'm not mistaken."

He seemed kind of disappointed with that, and said, "Well, at least whenever you Google their names, that's the first thing that's going to come up. And I'll have some protection because, if they come after me, then I'll be able to say it's retaliation for the votes of no confidence."

Jim Band:

So, he's sort of admitting his hand was in that?

Lt. Joe Hogue:



Well, he's admitted that he had an interest and that he's justifying it. And yeah, probably had a hand in it. And then, he brought up that same verbiage during the... Like I said, I disagreed with having our detective sergeant work this IRS case, so this tax evasion case, as I would any tax evasion case. But his motivation again then was, "Well, I was told about this. I assigned somebody. And once, if they do put him on admin leave... Or it will give me at least some protection that, if they ever come after me, I'll have the protection that, 'Well, you're just retaliating me because I reported this and had somebody investigated.'"

So, I think he started talking more and more like that as time went on, into I'd say year five, to where he would start talking about, "Yeah. Well, when they come after me," or, "When they ever come after me," or, "When they finally questioned me about..." He just started to begin a lot of sentences that way.

Jim Band:

Okay. One more question. Was there an OSHA complaint that was initiated by the Chief?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Well, I don't know. There were a few OSHA complaints. Well, the first one was really strange. And it had to do with proper ventilation in the evidence room and maybe in the evidence processing area, which is really, really specific. I mean, ideally, there's only a few people that should be in that area, particularly the evidence room. It was really specific.

And so, my first thought was, "Well, our evidence person clearly made this complaint. And I'm pissed off because I would rather you come to staff and let's have a discussion. This is the first I'm hearing it. We probably are out of compliance. But this isn't the way that I like to do business." So, I was pretty hot that it went this way instead of us communicating as a staff. And I told this to Greenway, I said, "We need to have some communication with some of our employees here. Yes, can you file the OSHA complaint? Yeah, but that's not... Hey, I thought we were working through stuff. And they feel comfortable coming to us if they need more money. But they"-

Jim Band:

Did you ever ask that employee if they filed the complaint?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

No, he kind of stopped me. And I was like, "Let's get her in here. We need to have a chat." And he said, "No. I think it was Steve Topaz," who was a City Councilor at the time. And I sat there for minute. I said, "So, the Councilor that's never been in our building filed an OSHA complaint about the ventilation of the evidence area?" And he says, "Well, yeah. I think it was him. I think when he was driving by, he must've done a..." I said, "When he was driving by, he made an OSHA complaint about the ventilation or whatever?"



Jim Band:

Was this guy friendlier with Greenway?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Yes. He was a very, very eccentric City Council-

Jim Band:

What was his name?

Lt. Joe Hogue:

Steve Topaz, T-O-P-A-Z. As absurd as his explanation was, it was clear to me that he was not wanting me to explore asking the employee. That's the message that I got, was like, "Well, don't push there." And so, I didn't, but it was always suspicious to me. But did I think that he did it at the time? No, I can't say that I did, but as time went on...

Like I said, Greenway was a big union guy on his prior agency and talked about that a lot. And he would just make comments, like, "Well, the union should file an OSHA complaint and file several grievances over the working conditions here," which some of the things I agreed with. The building is a dump. Let's be honest. It is. But that's not the way I would want to go about it.

So, that's kind of the mantra or the process I would see. He would make comments. He would make these kind of grandiose, "The union needs to..." Or, "Somebody should..." or, "Somebody's wife needs to..." And then, months later, it would happen.

The second OSHA complaints were kind of like that. They were things that I think everybody could see, but he was very, very vocal about, "Somebody ought to file a grievance. Someone ought to do an OSHA complaint." Then, they would happen. And so, I don't know that he filed them himself, but I can just say that he would be pretty specific just in conversation about what he felt needed to happen around here. And then, it would.

One thing, this is an example. Three or four years ago, we had a community survey. And I never took it because I work here. But it was a "Your satisfaction" through this app. Right? And so, rate the public works department one to five, or whatever the scale was. Rate the library. And the police department came back with a 91% approval rating, which pretty high for a PD. And I think it was the highest of anybody.

But later on he told me that he did it and rated the police department really high. But then, he figured out that all you had to do was refresh your browser, and then you could do it again and as many times as you wanted. And so, he said he just sat there on a Saturday and just kept refreshing his browser, while he was watching a game or something, and just kept rating us really high.



But it put us in a tough spot of... Yeah, I think we do have a good police department. I've always felt that way, that for our size I think we do have a good PD. But at the same time, it was one of those things I didn't really want to hang my hat on the score, which I didn't feel was-

Rick Scholl (former Saint Helens Mayor)

On January 13, 2025, I spoke with former mayor Rick Scholl over the telephone. Mr. Scholl started off by telling me the following,

*"Sure. Well, when he started, it was great. First five years was wonderful. Six years was wonderful. Seven years was wonderful, actually. It wasn't until this whole "Panty-gate" thing arose, and I'll go back to actually it started before that when I made him apologize for lying in a public meeting about Heather Epperly does a Halloween town parade, and she was trying to get the Chief to sign off on it and was working with ****, but he was CC'd in every email that came from our internal emails from the Parks Department. A guy named Jeromy Hasencamp, who's a retired... He worked for State police, but now he does private security. So he was the security on the parade. And then I talked to Andy Hasencamp, who is Oregon State Police, and said if I wanted that interaction, I'd have to pull a public records request.*

But there was something there, he said. But if I wanted it, I'd have to pull a public records request. I said, no, I don't. I've got two out of the three here. I can see that he's been CC'd in all these emails and that he absolutely knew, and the parade had been happening two years prior. This was, like I said, two years ago. And he was hired, what, about six years ago? Five years ago."

I clarified that Greenway was hired in 2018, and Mr. Scholl went on,

"Yeah, so six years ago. So for him to say that he knew nothing about a parade in our meeting, 'cause he was set up to do a presentation right after her testimony, and he just went off, like crazy. It's on video. And these girls were crying because they were just trying to get some help from outside agencies and they can't help unless the City and the Chief being the one that can sign off on it. Oregon State Police cannot help if the Chief does not sign off and ask for help.

So when I was given the information of the emails from Jeromy Hasencamp and our own internal emails, I brought him in with Counselor Sundeen, myself and John Walsh, and I said, Hey, look. And Heather Epperly reached out to me also and said, "He lied in that meeting about what happened."

So I brought him in and I said, "Look, here's what we got. You lied about not knowing anything about this. You said you knew nothing about a Halloweentown parade that's been going on for years now, and you were CC'd in all these emails right here, and she wants a public apology." And he goes, "Well, I'd love to meet with her and I'll apologize to her." I said, "That would be great." So we brought her in at another meeting. He said, "Look, what do you want from me?" She goes, "I want a public apology." And he argued his point a little bit. Anyhow, long story short, he gave a half... he didn't open up to anything, an apology. And she texted me after that meeting, 'We got problems. And I think you know what I mean'. Heather Epperly did.



*So shortly after that is when this "Panty-gate" came about, which was a Christmas party where there was gag gifts there. And I wasn't even part of the party. I just showed up to wish everybody a Merry Christmas and eat some food. And **** was the author of those photos, who is our City Recorder. Only sent them to Chief Greenway trying to get him to come to this Christmas party. And that was three or four years prior to the allegations when they finally came out. And she's like, "I'm the one who took those pictures and I only sent them to the Chief to have him come to the Christmas party."*

And so from there, that's when our relationship started going a different direction, if I'm being quite honest, because I knew at that point in time that he was being vindictive over me calling him out. And he wasn't called out publicly ever, and he should have been. And his apology, if you watch it was not an apology, not for what the rant he went into in a public meeting about Heather Epperly and her worker that showed up crying that they couldn't get any help. It was a big parade. There was a lot of people here, and it was very scary.

*So later in that when you're referring to the union guys meeting, the January meeting, prior to that, I had met with Lieutenant ****, Brian ****, ****, myself, City Administrator, Brandon Sundeen, Gloria Butch, our new Financial Director. And these guys came in saying, "Hey, we want this \$10 water bill fee, instead of trying to build a police station, which we know we need a new station, but we need officers right now." I'm like, "That's only adopted for a police station, and I'd like to just keep it towards that." They were very adamant. And they continued to talk and say, "We just need more officers though. We got some retiree guys coming up." So I'm like, "Are you sure that's what you guys want?" They said "Yes, absolutely."*

So I have a special meeting just on the water bill and talking about why we're going to be moving the citizens' \$10 fee from a police station to staffing because of the retirees coming up, and was blindsided by them that I needed to resign and voted no confidence and just all kinds of... And in that meeting, I was just blown away by what was going on, but I was kind of smart ass and I said this, I said, "Well, at least I can appreciate that I can see your face. That you're here in person doing this. And I was hoping to have a productive meeting and I'm still hoping we can have a productive meeting." And so we just moved on from that discussion, which...it was very heated.

And then they continued to badger the City Council to try to have us put another \$15 onto people's water bills. So \$25 a month to have a police station and more officers. And I have increased their budget, I'll say I because I'm the longest one there, was eight years. Every budget committee meeting when I first came in it was 2.4 million when Moss left seven years ago. May have been 2.8, and it was at 5.6 that year. So we had increased them over \$3 million.

*So there was a lot of different things that transpired that... and the Chief was never around. He was always behind the scenes. And it appears that he was working with the ****s on stuff because it's a small town and you can't hide in a small town. The actions, they would show up and say things at our meetings that appeared to be coming directly from the Chief of Police, like he was orchestrating this. And I was just very saddened when I heard finally Joe come forward, to the extent of how much he had been working behind the scenes to get me out of office and John Walsh fired.*



*And you can appreciate this, Jim, you're retired police officer from Oregon City, is that that uniform represents dignity, honesty, it demands respect. And I just have never ever had any interactions with any of our officers like that, ever. And I don't think a lot of people in the public have either as far as that happening. And it was just happening behind the scenes and so sneaky that it's just an ugly mess. I couldn't speak on any of it because I love this City so much and I wasn't going to open us up to a lawsuit, and I also don't want to give him a dime at all to exit. So I basically lost the election knowing a month before everything that had transpired between him and the ****s and the crew. So yeah, it was just very, very frustrating to not be able to say anything.*

Mr. Scholl told me the police budget went from 2.4 million dollars to 6 million dollars this year.

Mr. Scholl shared speculation about what was going on politically in the City and Chief Greenway's potential involvement. He also shared a story about Chief Greenway disclosing information about a current employee being abused as a child that he (Scholl) thought was inappropriate.

Findings and Analysis:

On Tuesday, January 14, 2025, I was informed that Mr. Greenway formally resigned his employment with the City of Saint Helens. At this time, I was in the process of scheduling an interview with Mr. Greenway through his attorney, Chris Mascal. Mr. Greenway had been compelled to be interviewed by the City Administrator but resigned before the interview occurred.

I stopped the investigation at this point; this report is based on the interviews and investigation completed up to the point Greenway resigned. I was directed by Akin Blitz to complete this report, based on the evidence and information found in my investigation to the point where Mr. Greenway resigned. Due to Mr. Greenway's choice, I have not had the opportunity to hear Mr. Greenway's accounts of events and matters described by witnesses.

I learned from Akin Blitz at the time Mr. Greenway's decision to resign was communicated to him that public interest and transparency dictated that the report be completed, and that if the report were injurious to his reputational interests such that that law required a liberty name-clearing hearing, then Mr. Greenway would be afforded the right to make a record upon proper request. I was therefore asked to complete my work relying on the information I had developed.

Mr. Greenway would likely have provided explanations or helpful context to some of these accusations. The investigation, this report, and my analysis would have been longer had Mr. Greenway not resigned during the investigation.

1a. Failure to provide professional leadership to the department and City;

- See Summary and Conclusion sections below.

1b. Failure to establish, maintain, and foster positive and effective working relationships with those contacted in the course of work;



There were various reported incidents that fell under the category of this allegation. I have detailed most of them in no particular order.

1. Officer **** told me about an incident that happened a couple years prior, where he responded to a DUII at the post office. Officer **** said Chief Greenway was at the call. Officer **** said he arrested a male subject, who was seated in the back seat of his police car and was calling out to them. Officer **** said Chief Greenway walked over to the handcuffed subject and said, *"Shut the fuck up or I'll kick your teeth in."*

Officer **** said that after the incident, Sgt. ****, who was also present, told him at the station that what Chief Greenway did was wrong.

I interviewed Sgt. ****, who corroborated ****'s account of incident. I asked Sgt. **** about the impact on their department culture of the Chief saying things like this in front of subordinates. Sgt. **** replied, *"No, it doesn't set the right example. That's where, at least in my role as a Sergeant, I was kind of that that's what **** told the conversation that we had afterwards. That was kind of my role saying, like I said, 'Hey, the Chief is the Chief, and he has his own boss. I'm your guys' boss and this is how things are going to go when I'm running it like a shift. We're not going to say stuff like that. It's not appropriate.'" And I think the guys, at least on my shift, for the most part, kind of understood that."*

The Chief of Police sets the tone for how employees within the department should talk to people, especially members of the public. It is significant that a sergeant felt the need to share with a newer employee to not do what Chief Greenway had done and to point out that Chief Greenway's behavior was inappropriate.

2. Another incident raised by employees was Chief Greenway chastising Officer **** for his perception that she was taking too much time to write reports in front of other officers. I spoke with Ms. ****, who had left SHPD and took a position as an officer with [REDACTED] Police Department. Ms. **** told me incident upset her to the point of tears, which was confirmed by other officers. Ms. **** said she had simply been trying to catch up on reports because she had been busy.

Former Officer **** **** told me that shortly after Officer **** left the room, Chief Greenway was told that he made Officer **** cry. **** said Chief Greenway responded by saying that's why you do not hire women in law enforcement.

Ms. **** told me, *"Even though he apologized, I was just like, oh this was a sign that I needed to leave St. Helens, that just solidified it."*

3. Another incident was shared by former Corporal **** ****. Mr. **** said he had gone to the scene of a crash where an OSP Trooper had been struck by a vehicle and nearly killed. Mr. **** said the next day, Chief Greenway read a press release by the Sheriff's Office about the incident and started screaming at him. Mr. **** described Chief Greenway as red and shaking.

**** described the following, *"And I said...I got upset, I said, About?...The Sheriff's Office press release says there was spike strips. You told me you didn't deploy spike strips. And he looks at the union*



*president and he says, ****, pull up the body camera right now. If you're lying to me and I see it on that camera right now, I'm firing you now. Screaming at me. And I said...I looked at ****, and he turns over and starts pulling up the body camera. And my brain's going, union president, union employee, administrator. You're pulling up the body camera? Are you kidding me? So he starts to pull it up.*

And I very calmly said, Like I told you last night, we did not deploy spike strips. We didn't set up for spike strips. We went to the scene after the trooper was struck, do you have any more questions? Yell, yell, yell, yell, yell, yell. I said, Is this disciplinary? Yell, yell. No, no. But look, I'm going to review that and if you're fucking lying to me, you're fucking fired. And I went, Thanks Chief. Turn around and walked out of the office. Those two guys saw that exchange.

Mr. **** said for some reason Chief Greenway had assumed that he (****) had deployed spike strips and yelled at him before knowing what actually happened. Mr. **** pointed out that Chief Greenway had yelled at him and threatened to fire him over an incident where he (****) received a life-saving award from the Oregon State Sheriff's Association.

4. Another incident shared by some employees involved members of the union executive board at the time. Officer **** told me the incident stemmed from an email they (union) had sent to Chief Greenway at his request. There had apparently been some tension between the members of department and the administration. Officer **** said Chief Greenway had approached them and asked them to send an email outlining the issues they wanted addressed, so they could sit down and talk through them. This included ****, ****, ****, and ****; all four of them remembered the incident.

After receiving their letter, Chief Greenway had a meeting with all of them and was apparently very angry about the email. Officer **** said Chief Greenway told them, *"You're the worst cops I've ever worked with. You are the cause of all the issues at the Department. I hope you're looking for other work. I don't have a reason to fire you, but I will not write you a letter of recommendation if you apply elsewhere. The Sheriff's Office won't take you, no office will take you."* The officers I interviewed who were present gave similar accounts.

**** told me he filled out applications at two different agencies within 24 hours of this happening. With the exception of Officer ****, everyone said Chief Greenway later apologized to them for this tirade.

5. Several people gave accounts of Chief Greenway retaliating against Sgt. ****, Detective ****, and **** **** after a union meeting. Chief Greenway had learned some of what had been said during a union meeting related to on-call pay and the major crimes team. Chief Greenway was apparently angry with people who said things at the union meeting that Greenway did not like.

**** **** said the next morning, because of what he (****) had said during the union meeting, Chief Greenway told him, *"You're turning in your take-home car, effective today. You are no longer on any special assignments. You're done, Special Investigations unit done. You're not involved in investigations. You're done."*

Sgt. **** told me that he was scheduled to go to a homicide conference that had been paid for by a community partner. Sgt. **** said that because of what Chief Greenway heard he (****) had said during the meeting, Chief Greenway canceled Sgt. ****'s training conference. Chief Greenway



apparently also canceled training Detective **** was to attend because of what he (****) had said during the same meeting.

I will discuss the departmental impacts of these incidents in the Summary and Conclusion sections below.

1c. Failure to contribute to the overall quality of the Police Department's service by:

Allegedly withholding mutual aid, major crimes and necessary community wide law enforcement cooperation with other law enforcement partners.

I reviewed a comparison of the Outside Agency Assist Policy that was in place under Chief Greenway and immediately changed when Lt. Hogue took over as the Interim Chief. The policy drastically reduced the ability of St. Helens officers to assist officers from neighboring jurisdictions. It was widely known throughout the County, amongst agency partners, that this policy was in place. This led to a significant amount of conflict between SHPD and agencies such as the Columbia County Sheriff's Office, Scappoose Police Department, and the Oregon State Police. This policy by Chief Greenway was well outside the norm of interagency relationships that are generally valued and fostered between law enforcement agencies in Oregon.

At a time when SHPD dealt with staffing issues and had trouble covering the City, it is difficult to understand how this policy benefitted the St. Helens community. This policy affected the safety of law enforcement officers in other communities and as well as the safety of officers in St. Helens.

According to the staff interviewed, Chief Greenway did not clearly communicate this change to partner agencies or inside the walls of SHPD. Former Corporal **** told me he was tasked with going to the Columbia County Sheriff's Office and informing them they (SHPD) would not be covering them any longer. This was a major operational change, and it was outside the boundaries of normal police functions amongst agency partners. This should have been explained and communicated clearly from Chief to Sheriff.

As discussed earlier, Chief Greenway yelled at an officer who went to the scene where an OSP Trooper was nearly killed after being struck by a vehicle. Another employee said Lt. Hogue called after they responded to the scene after Sheriff Pixley had just been in a fatal shooting, telling them to clear because Chief Greenway was losing it. Officers dealt with blowback and questions from members of other departments. This had a negative impact on morale, and I was told one officer left for another agency specifically because of this policy.

It would have been helpful to hear Chief Greenway's justification for this policy. My understanding was that the City Administrator and elected officials knew Chief Greenway put this policy into place. It appears they deferred to Chief Greenway's judgment, as he was the law enforcement professional. My understanding is that Lt. Hogue in his Interim Chief capacity changed this policy immediately, which was the right thing to do.



Allegedly stating to staff, “I hope we don’t get any applicants...” during a police officer recruitment.

Several employees relayed hearing these comments from Chief Greenway, it is discussed in the Summary section below.

Allegedly interfering with and undermining the City’s police officer recruitment.

Lt. Hogue shared that Chief Greenway was dismissive of a lateral applicant from Montana, who the interview panel had liked during the process. Lt. Hogue was frustrated by Chief Greenway’s apparent lack of openness about this candidate and shared that concern with the Human Resources Director. Lt. Hogue said Chief Greenway was disqualifying the candidate without letting the hiring process run its course. The perceived reasoning behind Chief Greenway’s behavior was that he wanted the City to “feel it” in terms of his belief that they were not giving him the staffing increases for which he had asked. Chief Greenway engaged in a pattern of conduct adverse to the City’s interests, which is discussed further below.

Allegedly openly discrediting partner law enforcement agencies and their leadership and referring to partner law enforcement agency leadership derogatorily.

A number of employees said Chief Greenway regularly referred to Sheriff Pixley as “muffin tits.” I was shown a photograph of Sheriff Pixley next to an overweight wrestler wearing a mask, which had apparently been circulated by Chief Greenway to some of the police staff. An employee gave me this picture and said it was texted to him by Chief Greenway.

One employee said Chief Greenway had made a comment about punching the prior Scappoose Police Chief in the face. It seemed widely known that Chief Greenway did not like either of these partner agency heads and that he would deride them in front of subordinates.

Allegedly demanding an officer falsify range training records.

I found no evidence to support this allegation or determine where it originated.

Allegedly unprofessionally addressing a subordinate employee (detective) and pressuring the detective to not make any complaints regarding pay or filing of a grievance, on or about 9/2/2024.

**** said that he was being promoted to detective, which was common knowledge in the department. This included him being left out of the shift sign up at the time he went into the detective unit. Lt. Hogue told me Chief Greenway had to have known Detective **** was being promoted and shared a story about taking Greenway to show him how Detective **** had rearranged the detective office in preparation for his movement to detectives.

Detective **** said he showed up for duty as a detective and Chief Greenway walked up and asked him what he was doing dressed like a detective and told him that he (Greenway) had not made him a detective. Detective Sgt. **** was present and talked to Detective **** after Chief Greenway said this.



Sgt. **** told me, *"And so we go back over and **** was pretty upset. He's like, "I don't understand what that was all about. I got in trouble from the Chief for showing up to work in an assignment that I was put into, and he's telling me that I can't receive my Detective pay." And so I'm like, "****, here's the deal. I can't explain it either. I'm not going to look you in the eye and tell you I know what the hell that was because I don't." But I said, "Here's the reality on the ground. You can file a grievance with the union. As a former union guy, you're clearly a detective. You're not on the patrol schedule." All the reasons, Mr. Band, I just told you. But I also said, "I'm going to look you in the eye as **** to ****. If you do that, you're not going to be free of consequences and the likelihood that you're going to stay in here as a detective is minimal." I said, "I have every confidence you're going to get bounced out."*

Detective **** shared text messages he had sent his wife after this happened. One text Detective **** sent to his wife stated, *"It's a long story. But it can't happen. Chief is just relying on me not challenging it, because if I do, I'll get pulled from detectives. It's fucked up and wrong. I just don't have an avenue here."*

Detective Edwards said, *"So when he's telling me, "Hey, I know you're not going to grieve this. I know that you're not going to call your attorney." It's like, okay, he's telling me not to call my attorney and that if I do, he didn't provide any ramifications if I did, he didn't give any consequence, but it was my understanding that if I did, that I would be pulled."*

Detective **** felt what Chief Greenway did was wrong and felt there was nothing he could do about it. I asked Detective **** if he thought there would be retribution and that he would be pulled from detectives if he said anything and he said yes. Detective **** said Chief Greenway later apologized and told him there had been a miscommunication between him (Greenway) and Lt. Hogue.

Lt. Hogue said it was clear that **** was going into the detective division. Lt. Hogue did not understand why Chief Greenway did this and I was not able to interview him (Greenway) to get his side of the story.

Based on the accounts of ****, ****, and ****, Chief Greenway's behavior was very unprofessional. Based on my experience, this type of behavior can lead to a very caustic and negative culture in the department. Chief Greenway appears to have pulled the rug out from under Detective **** for no apparent reason. Judging by his text conversation with his wife, Detective **** was dumbfounded and very upset.

Both Detective **** and Sgt. **** had the opinion that if Detective **** raised the issue with the union, Chief Greenway would have found a reason to kick him out of detectives. This was one of several scenarios I was given that explained why several employees felt Chief Greenway retaliated against people who made him angry. This was Chief Greenway's reputation amongst the troops.

Allegedly being demeaning, disrespectful, bullying and abusive in behaviors directed at subordinates.

- See Summary and Conclusion sections below.



Allegedly offering certain officers a “deal” where they didn’t have to take or pass the required physical fitness test but would still receive incentive pay without meeting the fitness test requirements.

- See #8.

2. Alleged suspected theft of time and inappropriate use of City resources by not recording sick and vacation leave in accordance with City policy.

Several employees said Chief Greenway was gone all the time. I had police department staff look through Chief Greenway’s computer Outlook emails and calendar. I found one week in September of 2024, where Chief Greenway had emailed someone that he had been out that week for vacation. That week was not reflected in Chief Greenway’s time bank.

There was no good way to track Chief Greenway’s vacation schedule. His time bank showed that he had never burned a single hour of vacation during his employment. There were records that showed Chief Greenway burned executive leave hours for different absences.

3. Alleged inappropriate use of City resources by using city-issued vehicle for personal use and encouraging others to do the same.

I interviewed a number of employees and found no evidence concerning this allegation.

4. Alleged intentional disruption of a City of Scappoose City Council meeting by attending virtually and then intentionally removing a member of the media and other presenters from on-line attendance.

A number of SHPD employees shared a story that Chief Greenway told them he had logged into at least one Scappoose City Council meeting under the name “Mike Coxlong.” These employees also relayed that Chief Greenway told them the administrative rights were not locked down in the Scappoose meetings. Because of this, Chief Greenway told them he was kicking people out of the meetings via the computer, including a member of the media and some presenter.

I spoke with City of Scappoose staff, who found records that show someone had logged in under the name Mike Coxlong on November 1, 2021, for two different meetings. On the City of Scappoose website, I found minutes from a Scappoose Work Session and Regular Council Meeting that show a Mike Coxlong attending remotely.

The Scappoose City Recorder did not have a memory of people being kicked off of the meetings. It is possible that it happened without anyone suspecting anything and thinking it was a connection problem. I was unable to find proof that Chief Greenway actually kicked anyone out of the meetings.

I did not get to interview Chief Greenway about this and was unable to find digital proof that he was the one logged in under that name. The fact that Chief Greenway made these consistent and specific statements to a number of people, and that I was able to find the name logged onto Scappoose meetings, indicates that at least a portion of what Chief Greenway said actually happened.



Had I been able to interview Chief Greenway, I would have asked him about his involvement in the meetings and asked for his justification of sharing information like this with subordinates.

5. Alleged attendance and participation in a City of Scappoose City Council meeting and the Board of Directors meeting of Columbia River Fire and Rescue logging into the meeting as someone else and using that person's log-in credentials and identity without permission to conceal this activity.

See answer above for #4 regarding the City of Scappoose.

After Mr. Greenway resigned, I did not pursue the investigation into whether he logged into a Columbia River Fire and Rescue Board Meeting under the name of **** *.

6. Alleged deletions or requests of others to alter, conceal or destroy (delete) public records (body cam records of interactions).

This allegation appears to have been related to a use of force event involving a male subject taken into custody by the Saint Helens Police Department. This included a use of force by Chief Greenway on the edge of a waterway. According to Sgt. **** *, the deletion of these videos happened because the officers involved failed to appropriately mark/tag their videos in the AXON system. Because of this, the software automatically deleted the videos after a period of time pursuant to their system settings.

I did not find any evidence that these records were inappropriately deleted.

7. Alleged admissions or boasting about your own misuse of emergency vehicle equipment during your commute to or from home.

Lt. Hogue overheard a conversation where Mr. Greenway told the Public Works Director he had used his emergency lights to get through bridge construction traffic when commuting. I spoke to Director Zaher, who said he did not witness Mr. Greenway doing this. Officer **** * told me Mr. Greenway had told him he used his emergency lights to get through traffic when commuting.

This would not have been a legal or appropriate use of emergency vehicle lights.

8. Alleged falsification of training records and falsification of fitness testing and pay differential entitlement records.

I did not find any evidence of training record falsification.

SHPD offers a fitness incentive, which means that an employee performs a physical test and receives a 5% annual raise if they pass the test within a set parameter. Comparatively, this is a significant benefit compared to other fitness incentives throughout the State.

One allegation was that Chief Greenway falsified fitness test results for some employees. Two different employees shared information regarding falsified fitness testing results.



Former Corporal **** told me the following regarding fitness testing, *"But, I do remember it was in the squad room, and I can't remember what I was doing there, [inaudible 00:02:04] uniform or patrol shift, or what, but it was just Greenway and I, and he told me like, "Hey, look, I know these physical fitness incentives are bullshit, I know these tests suck. I'm going to make it so only I score these, and you don't really have to run it, I'll just say you did. Are you interested in doing that?" And I said, "No, thanks. I don't want to do that." "Well, think about it, think about it." He says. "Just think about it. Nobody's going to watch, nobody will ever know. If you don't pass it in time, I'll just say you passed it in the time for the big money."*

Mr. **** said he did not take Chief Greenway up on this offer. I asked Mr. **** if anybody else had been offered this from Chief Greenway and he said ****.

I asked Mr. ****, a former St. Helens Police Officer, about this. Mr. **** said, *"Yeah, so at the time we were still required to run the state ORPAT, the utility test with the obstacles and all that. And he (Greenway) was the proctor, for whatever reason. We went out to the garage at the Police Department building, which is where we used to run it, all the equipment was set up. And when I got out there, he said that he was going to write down my time, and I was not going to run it. And I kind of looked at him a little weird, and he said, "Is that a problem?" And I said, "Guess not." So we waited out in the garage for a period of time, and then he wrote a score down."*

I asked Mr. **** what he thought about that and he responded, *"I thought it was strange. I'd never been in a situation like that. But the way that he said it, and his tone of voice and look on his face, made it sound like there wasn't really an option for me at that point. So I didn't know what to do."*

I found both statements by Mr. **** and Mr. **** to be credible. I asked several employees about whether they were offered this from Chief Greenway. Nobody else had been offered this by Chief Greenway, but several had heard about it happening.

For police discipline, the definition of Untruthfulness per Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 265-005-0001 states:

***"Untruthfulness"** means being dishonest or untruthful in a manner that reflects adversely on the ability of a law enforcement officer to perform their official duties, which includes knowingly or willfully: making false statements, falsifying work-related records or official documents, omitting material facts or material information, or answering questions or providing information in a manner that is incomplete, evasive, deceptive, or misleading. A statement is not considered untruthful when the officer reasonably believes that deception (i) is necessary due to the nature of the officer's assignment, such as an undercover assignment; (ii) is necessary to acquire information for a criminal investigation, or (iii) to protect the officer or others from an articulable threat. The use of deception in these circumstances must be for a specific and legitimate law enforcement purpose.*

Chief Greenway might have provided context or an explanation for what happened here. Chief Greenway might have denied this happened. The accounts by both former employees seemed credible and it would be something that might be difficult for Chief Greenway to explain.

Because of the consistent statements by Mr. **** and Mr. ****, I think it is likely that Chief Greenway was untruthful in submitting a score for a fitness test that Mr. **** did not take. This led to **** getting a 5% pay increase for something he did not do.



In addition to violation of the untruthfulness policy, it appears Chief Greenway created and submitted false public records to the training, personnel and payroll records of the City concerning ****'s ORPAT test and eligibility for the 5% fitness pay. Making a false public record constitutes the crime of forgery and is a felony.

The allegation and the weight of the evidence are significant. Had Chief Greenway not resigned, this would have been a serious issue with *Brady* implications that would needed to have been addressed.

9. Alleged falsification, deletion or elimination of a disciplinary or administrative record.

This allegation involved a use of force incident, which at the time of this investigation was subject to civil litigation. While I did not do a deep dive into what occurred here, conversations with Lt. Hogue suggest this was not a falsification and that Mr. Greenway did not do anything wrong here.

10. Allegedly providing false testimony under oath in civil litigation.

This allegation involved a use of force incident, which at the time of this investigation was subject to civil litigation. While I did not do a deep dive into what occurred here, conversations with Lt. Hogue suggest this was not a falsification and that Mr. Greenway did not do anything wrong here.

11. Allegedly meddling in collective bargaining in order to undermine the City's interests, and instigating labor strife by acts instigating subordinates to act in ways adverse to the City and being disloyal to the City.

- See Summary and Conclusion sections below.

12. Allegedly meddling in union affairs, orchestrating a union vote of no confidence, and influencing union officer statements which attacked City officials at City Council and otherwise.

I reviewed a number of texts between ****, ****, ****, and Chief Greenway; these were provided to the City by the union attorney, Dan Thenell. The texts involved conversations between the three about a special Council meeting that was upcoming on 1/10/24, to discuss the police budget.

The day of the meeting, Chief Greenway texts "*Food for thought on some closing points for tonight.*" Chief Greenway then lists talking points that include the following, "*SHPA has lost confidence in the ability of our mayor and city administrator to effectively do their job by placing our residents' safety at risk. Just some thoughts.*" This is the Chief of Police feeding statements to the union executive board for the purpose of them (union) blaming the Chief's boss and the elected Mayor for issues within the Police Department.

In these texts, Chief Greenway called Mayor Scholl a moron. Another remarkable comment by Greenway was that "*Walsh and Rick are solely responsible for the staffing mess.*" The Chief of Police is responsible for staffing the Police Department in a way that best serves the community, those are not jobs of the Mayor or the City Administrator.



As a former police chief for 10 years in Oregon, there are several things about this that seem baffling. The St. Helens Police Department was given an approximate 15% across the board raise in 2021. In terms of wages, this put the Department in line with agencies like Hillsboro and Beaverton, despite these cities being much larger, facing different demands for services, and having greater resources. Chief Greenway had apparently sold this as a way of retaining officers who might leave for larger agencies. Anecdotally, I have never heard of a raise this significant happening anywhere else in Oregon. It represents a tremendous amount of community support for the Police Department.

Additionally, the City approved a \$10/month fee on the utility bill to build a new police facility. The current City Administrator and Mayor were there when both of these things happened. These are both very significant, positive efforts to support the police department. In spite of these things, Chief Greenway seemed to have given everyone the message that the City Administrator and Mayor did not support the police when there was pushback against even more requested increases to the police budget by Greenway.

I was unable to ask Chief Greenway why he seemed focused on Walsh and Scholl. The rest of the City Council votes independently. Nobody had an answer as to why Greenway blamed these two for not giving him everything he asked, while he seemed to have left the other Councilors alone.

Summary

This investigation uncovered issues that were likely policy violations and also performance issues. To make complete findings regarding the policy violations, it would have been beneficial to interview Chief Greenway and get his perspective on what was said by others. That being said, for some of the allegations, there is sufficient evidence to draw conclusions without a statement by Greenway.

The Summary and Conclusion sections will touch on some of the issues raised and provide a subjective analysis of Chief Greenway's actions from a job performance perspective.

There were several concerning issues raised that had significant implications, like the false fitness incentive scoring result. Had Mr. Greenway remained employed, this issue would have raised *Brady* implications that would need to be addressed. The position of the Chief is different than anyone else in the Department. One of the many duties of a Police Chief is to set the tone and culture within an organization. While Greenway would have provided his own perspective on the issue related to falsifying fitness incentive tests and might have denied it, the statements by **** and **** were consistent and credible.

Even if Chief Greenway had denied offering **** a falsified fitness test result and giving **** a falsified test result, their statements weighed against a potential denial by Greenway would likely have led me to the conclusion that Greenway was untruthful in his actions related to the test results. It is notable that Chief Greenway would later terminate **** for allegations that included untruthfulness.

One concerning statement came from Sgt. **** related to the **** termination. At the time this occurred, Sgt. **** said Chief Greenway came to him in the computer lab and told him that **** had some "*highly and damaging*" text messages from Chief Greenway involving a no-confidence vote against Walsh and Scholl. I asked Sgt. **** if he got the impression Chief Greenway was worried those text



messages would come out because **** was in trouble. Sgt. **** replied, "[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sgt. **** said he did not relay the message to Officer ****. I asked Officer **** if this message ever got to him and he said no. I was not able to ask Chief Greenway about this allegation by Sgt. ****. The allegation would be consistent with the other facts in that **** was terminated and there were obviously damaging text messages from Chief Greenway as this report discusses. Sgt. **** also seemed very credible in his statement. If the allegation as dictated by Sgt. **** is true, this would be behavior that is best described succinctly as unethical.

One of the themes that emerged related to whether or not Chief Greenway promoted a culture of professionalism within the department. Several employees relayed incidents of Chief Greenway texting them pornographic pictures. These included descriptions of a picture of a Christmas tree next to a television with pornography on the television, a picture of a naked man with the photoshopped face of a former employee, and a picture of a nude African American male with what was described as a semi-erect penis. This is not acceptable within any workplace. The fact that the Chief of Police is sending these pictures to subordinates is perplexing and completely inappropriate. It demonstrates a complete lack of leadership, a lack of professionalism, and an obliviousness to his role as the Chief.

**** had been on the union executive board and was one of the officers who spoke at the meeting delivering a no-confidence vote against the Mayor and City Administrator. I asked Officer **** if Chief Greenway generally tried to get everyone work together in a positive way or if Chief Greenway was stoking up hate and discontent. Officer **** told me he would lean toward stoking hate and discontent. I asked why and Officer **** said, *"I think when he would be frustrated or unhappy with the City, that was the approach he would take and he would solicit the Association to assist in that goal, I guess."* I asked Officer **** if he ever felt Chief Greenway was using them and he said, *"Yeah, I think that's fair."*

I asked Officer **** how he felt about that now and he said, *"Yeah, I don't like that we were put in that position now. At the time, that would cross my mind from time to time, "Hey, why does he want us to do this?" He would encourage us to... **** **** and I spoke at numerous different City Council sessions and things like that, and some of those were encouraged by Chief Greenway, and it crossed your mind at the time, "Why are we being solicited to do this?" As opposed to him going down there and say, "Hey, here's where we're at with staffing." So I realized that to a lesser extent at the time, I guess, and more so now which I mean, it sucks we were put in that position."*

This statement by Officer **** sums up my perception of what was going on as an outsider. The texts make it clear that Chief Greenway was feeding the union representatives information to say in front of the Council. The text messages also show Chief Greenway calling the Mayor a moron and saying "F



him.” Chief Greenway disparages the Mayor and City Manager to **** and ****, telling them he has no respect for the Mayor and less for the City Administrator. In the texts, Greenway states, *“I have asked Walsh for years to fix these issues and he ignores me.”*

City Managers and City Administrators are not there to fix everything for a Police Chief. A Chief is given a budget and is required to operate within that budget. If a Chief needs to increase that budget to operate effectively, they work collaboratively with the City Administrator, elected officials, and community to make their case. This must all be done with an understanding that City budgets are finite, taxpayers only have so much tolerance for revenue increases, and communities have an expectation that all City services get funded.

I am unsure why Chief Greenway put the problems with the new police building and staffing issues on the Mayor and City Administrator. It would have been helpful to hear his perspective. Mayors and Councilors have authority, but that real authority is when they are seated in meetings to direct the City Administrator on the prioritization of initiatives and the budget. Then it is on the City staff to advance those initiatives. It seems that Chief Greenway took a swing at getting a new building completed and when the project ran into problems, he started blaming people instead of digging in and getting the project finished. Building projects run into problems, that is the nature of building projects.

Regarding the staffing issues, Chief Greenway’s statements to staff are confusing. Again, it would have been helpful to have Chief Greenway’s clarification. In a text, Chief Greenway says to **** and **** that Mayor Scholl and John Walsh do not support the police because they have not been on a ride along with the police and have not been in the police station. While they might not have ridden with a police officer, both supported the police by giving the police an approximate 15% across the board raise in late 2021 and passed a fee to build a police station. Both of those things are very significant and rare in cities across Oregon. They demonstrate immense support for the police. It seems that when Chief Greenway wanted more money and the City did not give him what he wanted, he blamed Walsh and Scholl.

The interviews and texts led me to a conclusion that Greenway put his personal agenda ahead of the needs of the City. He engaged in a pattern of conduct that undermined the Mayor and City Administrator. **** **** showed me several texts from Chief Greenway. They included consecutive texts that said, *“We need the guys to stop working the OT to do that. With everyone filling the OT slots it’s hard to go to 20 hours.”* I asked **** about this text and why Chief Greenway would not want people to sign up for overtime coverage. **** said, *“Yeah, I agree. I, personally, I don’t like a lot of these things he said, but he said them. Sometimes he would say them in staff meetings, that he wants the City to feel the strain. He would frequently tell me to tell our officers not to sign up for overtime. And said that, “We can’t mandate you guys to work overtime.” Despite our contract actually saying they can. Our contract says that it’s per departmental need, and obviously in emergency overtime situation, that is departmental need. So I never told anybody not to work overtime.”*

**** also said, *“But he would frequently tell me to tell them, “Hey, don’t work overtime. Let the City feel the pain of not hiring more people.”*



Lt. Hogue shared that this desire for the City to “feel it” was the same reason Chief Greenway would say openly to staff that he hoped they did not get any applicants to fill police positions. Lt. Hogue also felt this was the reason he felt Chief Greenway dismissed a lateral applicant from Montana without consideration.

To restate this, it was widely known that the Saint Helens Police Department needed more officer positions—they were having trouble covering shifts. Chief Greenway asked for a significant budget increase to hire additional police officer positions. The request was not granted, so it seems Greenway did not want officers to cover shifts on overtime and did not want good applicants to be hired to in some way get back at the City for not giving him what he wanted. In this case, the City “feeling it” would be synonymous with the community being more at risk with reduced police coverage.

The job of the police and certainly the Chief of Police is to keep the community as safe as possible with the resources available. It would have been very helpful to get Greenway’s perspective on what was going on here. Based on the statements of employees, it paints a picture of Greenway vindictively prioritizing proving a point over ensuring the community was safe. This was malfeasance.

Conclusion

Had Greenway not resigned and had the City been in a position where they needed to consider his future employment, my analysis of the performance and effectiveness of Greenway as a police chief would have been significantly longer and more detailed.

In addition to the untruthfulness policy, it appears Chief Greenway created and submitted false public records to the training, personnel and payroll records of the City concerning ****’s ORPAT test and eligibility for the 5% fitness pay. Making a false public record constitutes the crime of forgery and is a felony.

While the range of incidents shared by employees were varied, the following themes developed.

1. Treatment of employees and department culture:

There have been numerous accounts provided in this report by past and present employees that describe the department culture created by Greenway. These range from Chief Greenway texting pornographic pictures to subordinates, Greenway yelling at someone in custody that he was going to kick their teeth in, to Greenway making an officer cry in front of coworkers.

Several consistent accounts were given of Chief Greenway completely losing his temper with employees and then later apologizing to them for his behavior. The incident described by **** **** was a troubling example. Corporal **** responded to a call where an OSP Trooper nearly lost his life after being struck by a vehicle. Seeing a fellow officer injured like this would have been traumatic. Chief Greenway responded by yelling at Mr. **** that he was going to be fired if he (****) lied to him about deploying spike strips.

Mr. **** had never deployed spike strips; this was an assumption Chief Greenway made for some unknown reason. The first thing that should come out of a Chief’s mouth after knowing her or his officers were involved in such a stressful call would be to ask the officer how they were doing. This is a



very basic best practice related to ensuring your officers navigate the stressful calls that leave lasting scars.

**** ended up being given a lifesaving award for his response, while his own Chief jumped to a conclusion, yelled at him, and threatened to fire him for the same call.

Greenway's response to the Pixley officer involved shooting appears to have been wrong for similar reasons as well. In this case, Chief Greenway was reportedly "losing it" because St. Helens officers were trying to assist another agency during a fatal officer involved shooting.

In both incidents, Chief Greenway seems to have been more concerned with his preoccupation with not helping other agencies than with the big picture of public safety in the community. This would have been radically confusing to patrol officers and line supervisors to navigate.

As mentioned, Chief Greenway had a reputation of retaliating against employees and taking things from them when he was angry, such as taking ****'s vehicle and canceling Sgt. ****'s training.

Chief Greenway openly disparaged other law enforcement leaders, the City's Mayor, and his own boss, the City Manager.

The Police Chief sets the standard in an agency, including the tone for professionalism, respect, and how people should treat each other. It is difficult to understand how employees would see an example of appropriate workplace behavior based on the descriptions employees gave of Brian Greenway.

The importance of officer wellness has come to the forefront of police best practice. At a time when the public expectation of police officers has never been higher, the challenge of recruiting, hiring, and keeping good candidates has never been harder. The culture of a workplace has tremendous significance for officer wellness. The City approved a significant pay increase within the last few years to improve retention of employees. The culture created by Greenway would make it difficult to recruit and keep the best police candidates, regardless of pay.

2. Undermining City leaders and involvement with the union.

Line officers and elected officials have different views of the City. Mayors, Councilors, and City Managers see the entire City and work to address all the needs of a community by prioritizing initiatives and managing a finite budget. Officers tend to just see what happens within the walls of the police department. One job of a police chief is to be something of a liaison between the two, communicating the needs of the department to City leadership while explaining to members of the department the challenges of budget constraints and the competing issues facing elected officials.

I witnessed an example of this in the January special meeting when **** and **** relayed their lack of confidence votes regarding the Mayor and City Administrator. The officers seemed to pit City departments against each other in terms of budget priority. They were critical of a waterfront project to which the City had dedicated resources. It is easy for officers who do not see the whole picture to get a perspective that people are going to be dying in the streets if a city doesn't shut down what they see as lower priorities to fund the police department. What they do not see is the need for cities to expend



resources on growth projects to increase their tax base. While communities generally have very high levels of support for police, they also want all City services funded.

Officers do not know how City budgets work. They do not understand things like PERS liabilities, insurance costs, and other burdens facing city budgets. These are things officers are going to want the City to be able to pay long after they retire. It is important for cities to grow and thrive to ensure they have strong and sustainable revenue sources.

It is the job of a police chief to communicate that within their police department. The choice of funding City services is not a simple either/or, the reality is every department needs to be funded through a balance of priorities. It is understandable that police officers think the services they provide are more important than anything else, but it is not realistic. These conversations and this push/pull within government budgets happens all the time. Chief Greenway pushed his officers into an oversimplistic view of the budget and seemed to have convinced them they were somehow being wronged.

In the case of St. Helens, it has led to some officers thinking they are not being supported by the City, while at the same time the City has put tremendous investment into the police department. This being the approximate 15% pay raise and \$10 utility fee for the new building. Any department would have been very happy to have one of these investments by their City. In this case, in spite of these investments, Chief Greenway seems to have convinced everyone they were not supported.

In May of 2024, voters voted no by a voting margin of 15% against a local option levy to add four police positions to the budget. This demonstrates that elected officials were willing to put the levy on the ballot. In this case, the voters made a fairly strong statement that they did not support additional tax revenue for the police. It is unclear what Chief Greenway or the union thought Mayor Scholl or City Administrator Walsh were to have done to come up with additional revenue. Their perspective seems unrealistic. General fund revenue comes from taxes—the voters said no.

A look at the City budget shows that the support of the police has grown over recent years. In 2018, the Police Department budget was 34% of the appropriated general fund budget. In 2024, the Police Department budget was 40% of the appropriated general fund budget, a significant increase. The police department has also increased their number of officers in that time. The police department had 17 sworn officers in 2018, and they have 24 sworn officers at this time in 2025. That is a current officer per thousand ratio of 1.67. This ratio does not tell a complete story of the needs of a community, but anecdotally it is on the high side of agencies in Oregon. Here is a random comparison of officer per thousand ratios of a few random cities in Oregon:

Albany Police Department:	1.14
Grants Pass Police Department:	1.41
Oregon City Police Department:	1.22
Tigard Police Department:	1.38
St. Helens Police Department:	1.67



I do not understand how the perception that the police department was underfunded exists. Shift coverage might be difficult with the current openings, but the chosen shift hours utilized by the department are also problematic. 10-hour shift schedules are great for employees, who enjoy a four day work week with three day weekends, but they are unequivocally the most difficult way to staff a police department. This is basically because 24 hours are not divisible by 10.

This analysis of staffing matters because I have been unable to support the theories put forth in the no confidence vote and by Chief Greenway that the City was or is understaffed. My perspective is that there are two issues related to staffing within the police department.

The first is filling open positions. It is the police chief's responsibility to build a culture that will draw the best candidates. While St. Helens PD has great comparative pay, Chief Greenway's described bombastic nature does not appear to have built such a culture. Chief Greenway's disdain for working with other police agencies would likely keep many local lateral candidates from applying—this strange stance was known regionally, and it was seen as a negative.

The second is the shift schedule. From the perspective of employees, a ten-hour shift is great because it provides manageable work hours and three-day weekends. The downside of these schedules is that they are easily the most difficult to fill. There are several examples of departments going off of ten-hour shifts to eight or twelve hour shifts when positions are lost or in emergencies.

The point here is that Chief Greenway seems to have worked up the union and members of the public with misguided information. The City of St. Helens seems to have strong support for their police department. Chief Greenway, with the help of the union executive board, seem to have taken advantage of that support. Some members of the public seem to have taken them at their word, though the evidence shows the department is not underfunded at all.

Several employees shared details about an investigation into allegations of missing funds tied to something called Halloweentown in St. Helens. Lt. Hogue and Sgt. **** both stated it was inappropriate for Chief Greenway to have assigned the investigation to Sgt. **** rather than an outside agency. They are correct in this very basic concept. It would never be appropriate for a City to investigate itself in such a case.

Lt. Hogue said he told Chief Greenway that doing this investigation internally was a mistake. Lt. Hogue said, *"And he said, "Well, it could be, but I need **** to work this, or at least be heavily involved, and I already set it up and instructed **** that he is to meet with me weekly and brief me on the status of this case." And I said, "Brian, that looks bad." And he says, "Yes, but this will finally be the thing that gets John Walsh put on admin leave." And I said, "Well, why is that?" And he said, "Well, because he was overseeing tourism, and if there's issues, or missing money," he said, "This is finally going to be the thing that gets him." Because he thought on the vote of no confidence, that was months prior, that the Council was going to be pretty much obligated to put him on admin leave. And that clearly didn't happen. So, to me, I don't know the merits of the case, but what he expressed to me, that it sounded more like he was pivoting to another way to get Walsh put on admin leave, and using our detective sergeant to get there, and I just didn't agree with it, procedurally, whatsoever."*



It seems Chief Greenway became fixated on Mayor Scholl and City Administrator Walsh. Lt. Hogue said Greenway told him, *“Until people start seeing that people don’t want to work here because of John Walsh and Rick Scholl, there’s not going to be any changes. Until those guys are gone, there’s not going to the changes we need.”* This was during a conversation about Chief Greenway saying he did not want the City to get any good police candidates. Lt. Hogue correctly stated that new candidates do not care who the Mayor or City Administrator are.

It is difficult to understand why Greenway openly voiced that he hoped the department would not get candidates during open hiring processes and told the union executive board to tell officers not to sign up for overtime coverage shifts. I would have been very interested to hear Greenway’s perspective on this. Both of these things demonstrate that Chief Greenway’s actions were counter to his responsibility as a police chief. The public wants to be safe and they count on the police chief to do everything in his or her power to achieve that end.

Chief Greenway seemed to have lost sight of his position. The different statements and behaviors shared through interviews showed that Greenway seemed more preoccupied with some sort of personal vendettas against former Mayor Rick Scholl and City Administrator John Walsh than with the community expectation of his job as chief. It also seemed that Greenway was willing to do this at the cost of public safety.

Simply put, Chief Greenway undermined his own boss, the City Administrator, and the elected Mayor of St. Helens. An analysis of the text messages between Greenway, ****, and **** make it clear he was instrumental in their votes of no confidence; this was insubordinate and unprofessional. Greenway’s conduct violated his most fundamental duties of loyalty to the public interest, to the City as his employer, and to upholding rule of law, state law, and the City Charter—because he abused his power and discretion as Chief of Police and the authority of his office.