



Nathan Vasquez, Multnomah County District Attorney

1200 SW 1st Avenue, Suite 5200, Portland, OR 97204-1193
P: (503) 988-3162 | F: (503) 988-3643 | www.mcda.us

September 10, 2025

via email only

Marc Poris
marc.poris@gmail.com

Lisa Rogers
lisa.rogers@portlandoregon.gov

Re: Petition of Marc Poris challenging the redactions made to retire-rehire documents involving Portland Police Detective Erik Kammerer

Dear Mr. Poris and Ms. Rogers:

On May 19, 2025, petitioner submitted a public records request to the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) for, in relevant part, “all written recommendations submitted on behalf of Erik Kammerer when he was being considered for PPB’s Retire-Rehire program” and “Chief Day’s communications to Erik Kammerer when he was admitted to the Retire-Rehire program.”¹ PPB produced these documents to petitioner on July 22, 2025, but made limited redactions to obscure Det. Kammerer’s unit assignment and brief discussion of his Internal Affairs history. Petitioner argues that the public interest requires release of this information.

While this matter was pending a decision by this office, PPB released a second version of the records with less information redacted. The specific change between the first release and the second is that it is now clear that Det. Kammerer continues to work in the homicide unit. The records produced to petitioner now show that Det. Kammerer is a participant in the Retire-Rehire program; the identities of the individuals who recommended him for that status; the text of their recommendations of him excepting the words following “In looking at his IA print out...,” and that he is assigned to work homicide cases. The redactions obscure: 1) Det. Kammerer’s specific assignment within the homicide unit and the roughly two lines discussing the Internal Affairs print out in A/Lt. Hughes’ recommendation of Det. Kammerer.

DISCUSSION

Only one redaction, covering a sentence and a half, is attributable to ORS 181A.674(3). This exemption covers “information about a personnel investigation of a public safety employee of the public body if the investigation does not result in discipline of the employee.” The information PPB has redacted fits within this exemption. The question then is whether the public interest nonetheless requires disclosure in this particular instance. ORS 181A.674(4).

¹ A third item in the request is not at issue in this petition because there were no records that matched its terms.

Petitioner's public interest argument focuses primarily on the question of Det. Kammerer's unit assignment, without reference to the information about any internal investigations. Given the nature of a public records dispute, I can only discuss the redacted information in the most general terms. The redacted summary tells us little about the inner workings of PPB's disciplinary process and it would not provide a basis from which to assess the merits of any individual claim or case. Given the specific information redacted and the context in which it appears, I do not find that the public interest overrides the applicability of the exemption in this instance.

As to the redactions based on Det. Kammerer's specific assignment, the City has substantially narrowed that issue by releasing that he is assigned to work homicides. In 2013 this office held that information about the specific unit assignments of officers assigned to specialty units (that is, not precinct patrol officers or command staff) was subject to the exemption in ORS 192.345(22). *Petition of Handleman*, MCDA PRO 13-22 (2022). Petitioner does not directly challenge this holding, and in the absence of an argument that it is erroneous, I apply it to the present case and likewise conclude that the redactions obscuring Det. Kammerer's specific assignment within the homicide unit under the Retire-Rehire program is conditionally exempt from disclosure under ORS 192.345(22).

Given all the arguments advanced by petitioner and the City, a review of the specific redactions, and the City's actions subsequent to the filing of this petition, I conclude that the interests in accountability, public safety, and operational security have been appropriately balanced. Further release of information is not warranted on this record.

ORDER

Accordingly, the petition is denied.

Regards,

NATHAN VASQUEZ
District Attorney
Multnomah County, Oregon

By: 

Adam Gibbs
General Counsel