

PCCEP Member	The report does not adequately critique the PPB and City and does not provide recommendations for improvement.	The COCL respectfully disagrees with this position and notes a number of factors that should be taken into consideration. First, this is the sixth year we have been monitoring PPB's and the City's compliance with the Settlement Agreement. Prior to the maintenance year, we provided extensive critical analysis of how PPB and City practices were not in compliance with the Settlement Agreement and provided recommendations for corrective action. However, we are now in the maintenance year, meaning that our prior critiques have been largely resolved, leaving us only to evaluate whether PPB and the City have remained in compliance. Second, we identify in the report areas where critiques were provided prior to PPB and the City finalizing documents - for instance, we provided comments, critiques, and direction on this year's in-service training material. We also held debriefing sessions after observed trainings to identify areas of improvement - actions not reported here. Third, in some sections we discuss deficiencies that we had identified but that PPB or the City had already corrected without us bringing these issues to their attention (for example, see the EIS reviews required of the Chief's Office). Where COCL suggestions may be beneficial, we have added them in the final draft report, though note they are not a requirement for maintaining compliance. Finally, the Settlement Agreement is a legal document that defines (in explicit terms) what the COCL's responsibilities are for evaluating the PPB and City. We have stated many times that a comprehensive implementation of the Settlement Agreement will not lead to a perfect police bureau. However, we believe that the implementation of the Settlement Agreement has led PPB and the City to develop systems for identifying emergent problems and remediating them. As a result, we have recommended (and continue to recommend) that PPB and the City use these tools to identify other areas which could be improved. However, the COCL's authority does not allow us to make this a requirement for complying with the Agreement.
Community Member	The report notes outcome disparities with persons of color but rather than recommend reducing the disparity, COCL suggests improving trust with the community.	In our report, we have also recommended training on implicit bias and procedural justice which go directly toward reducing the disparity with persons of color and increasing community trust. Additionally, the fact that PPB has collected and published data on disparities has opened the door to a robust discussion about solutions. Finally, extensive research shows that legitimacy is one outcome of procedurally just and unbiased interactions. Our recommendation for PPB to improve community trust implies they will need to do this through reducing disparate outcomes - something that we have continued to stress in prior reports as well as in our discussions with PPB and the Training Division.
Community Member	Report should recognize that although training and statistical analyses show a positive direction, there remains the feeling in the community that things haven't changed. There are people who are afraid when being followed by the police and people who are afraid to make a complaint. We need to get to a place where police officers recognize their impact on people in the community and that there are people who are hurt and continue to distrust the police.	We recognize that substantial compliance with the Settlement Agreement will not lead to a perfect police bureau and that the relationship between community members and the police can always be improved. We therefore have revised our introduction to include the sentiments expressed by this community member and to note the importance of the police bureau being continuously vigilant about how they are interacting with the public and how these interactions affect public trust in the police.
Portland Copwatch	While about a dozen tables and graphs are included in the report, most of them have to do with concerns about whether the police are filing certain reports on time and how many mistakes are in them, not how often force is used or, significantly, whether anyone using the complaint process feels their experience was satisfactory.	While our report does contain tables and graphs related to the accuracy of reports, we also include graphs and tables related to outcomes including how often force is used (both in the aggregate as well as with calls involving a mental health component), ECIT officers responses, BHRT outcomes, EIS reviews by supervisors, administrative closures of complaints, and timelines for complaint investigations. With respect to the comment about contacting complainants, we have purposefully not contacted them so as to maintain the confidential nature of the administrative complaint process. We believe it would be potentially damaging to the accountability system if complainants were under the impression that their complaints were being shared with entities outside of IPR and IA.
Portland Copwatch	The report says that only one person who resigned expressed frustration with the PCCEP. Longtime activist Sharon Gary Smith made a statement about feeling inadequately supported by the City when she resigned from PCCEP, months prior to People with Mental Illness Subcommittee Chair Patrick Nolen quitting after his presentation to the Judge.	In her April 2019 resignation letter, PCCEP member Sharon Gary-Smith noted "After consideration of the charge I accepted, a review of ongoing IT issues that keep me disconnected from the PCCEP email critical information and, finally, family circumstances that are now consuming a lot of my time, I have concluded that I do not have the bandwidth to continue participating on the Portland Committee for Engaged Community Policing (PCCEP)." While she experienced frustrating issues related to accessing her City-issued PCCEP email address, her resignation letter did not express frustration with PCCEP. She wrote: "I have been proud to work alongside colleagues, younger and older, whose best intentions have been on display whenever we have gathered to deliberate, review and reach decisions about our significant task; in their willingness to sacrifice time and energy to explore and render recommendations for the greater good. It has been impressive and I so appreciate the level of leadership and collaboration that marks the PCCEP."

Portland Copwatch	In addition to the Training Advisory Council (TAC), the report indicates that the Training Division has gotten input from PCCEP and the community survey (though it's not clear what in that survey directly related to training) as well as experts (with the only example being the OIR Groups which reviews deadly force incidents). In other words, it does not appear that anyone in the general public has the ability to suggest changes to Training.	As PCW points out, the TAC and PCCEP have provided input on training, both of which give opportunities for the general public to give comments on training. Additionally, the community survey - completed by more than 1000 randomly selected residents -- yielded dozens of findings about the public's concern over the treatment of marginalized groups - concerns that had direct implications for PPB training.
Portland Copwatch	The Compliance Officer has attended briefings with officers who were subjected to interventions after their actions led to alerts in the Employee Information System. It would be helpful to get an idea whether these debriefings are substantive and lead to changes in officer behavior.	We believe this comment is inaccurate. Our report does not say we observed debriefings with officers. That section of the report reads "On a quarterly basis, the Force Inspector meets with Precinct Commanders to discuss findings related to the force audit overall...and groups which demonstrate higher rates of force. We have personally observed debriefing sessions between the Inspector and Precinct Commanders..." In the use of force section (see page 12) we note that "such meetings provide valuable insight for RU Managers to manage officer uses of force" thereby indicating that we believe they are substantive. Additionally, we note that the process used by PPB has led the RU Managers to conduct their own analyses and proactively identify trends and implement remedial action, thereby having a direct impact on officer behavior.
Portland Copwatch	The report states that the Mayor appointed two new members to PCCEP at the end of March but those appointments are required to be affirmed by City Council, and that has not yet happened as of May 7, 2020.	Our report's note on the Mayor's appointment of two new members was based on comments by PCCEP Co-Chair Lakayana Drury during the April meeting, as well as the addition of both new members to the PCCEP website's list of members. However, a review of council agendas since February confirms the council has not yet confirmed the Mayor's appointments. We have revised our report to clarify this point.
Portland Copwatch	The report notes that Judge Michael Simon "declined to remove the conditionally-approved designation" of PCCEP's structure despite approval by the DOJ and PCCEP itself "defend[ing] its functionality" to the court. If the COCL had listened to the various community members who testified to the judge, expressing reservations about the long term viability of the PCCEP, perhaps they would have figured out that this "community engagement" body still has to prove itself.	To understand community engagement, COCL has spend five years listening to many segments of the community (through community meetings, interviews, PCCEP town halls, PCCEP subcommittees, and citywide surveys and numerous COAB meetings), as well as the few select individuals who testified before Judge Simon. Our decision to support PCCEP, as well as DOJ's decision to support PCCEP, was based on a careful review of the facts, both past and present.
Portland Copwatch	The COCL should give more background about the issues between the "Independent" Police Review and the Citizen Review Committee.	The purpose of this section was to acknowledge the issues and urge for a resolution rather than providing a detailed history. In prior reports we have provided a historical background, particularly with respect to the standard of review issue. We refer community members to those reports.
Portland Copwatch	The COCL does not comment on a 2019 case wherein Chief Outlaw agreed with the Citizen Review Committee to hold an officer accountable for lying ("truthfulness"), then changed the underlying allegation to be about Satisfactory Performance, which lowered the presumed discipline of termination to one day off without pay. The lack of analysis of this breakdown in the oversight process throws out the window the COCL's claim there are "good checks and balances" working in Portland.	We continue to emphasize that we do not focus on single cases but look at the entire system and how it works across all cases. Although this case was not in the sample of cases we reviewed, the cases we did review (which contained administrative closures, supervisory investigations, precinct referrals, and full administrative investigations) indicated that findings and decisions are reasonable and supported by a preponderance of the evidence. Our review of all checks-and-balances systems (including controversion, appeals, and PRBs, among others) continue to indicate that patterns or practices of deficiency have been resolved.
Portland Copwatch	The COCL states CRC can "controvert" the original findings of the Bureau. That is not accurate. CRC's proposals are only recommendations. The COCL does not mention that Internal Affairs and the Assistant Chief overseeing the officer can also controvert the original supervisor's finding.	We have revised our report to clarify this point.
Portland Copwatch	While it is true that CRC hearings are open to the public, the only place Portland Copwatch know of where comprehensive reporting is done about the outcomes of those hearings is in the PCW newsletter, the People's Police Report.	We believe this is inaccurate. Detailed meeting minutes from CRC hearings are included on the CRC webpage.
Portland Copwatch	The report claims "CRC hearings, PRB hearings and overall accountability data are accessible to the public". PRB hearings are not at all accessible to the public, only the heavily redacted reports of those hearings (as noted by COCL).	We have revised our report to clarify that PRB hearings are not open to the public but that summaries are available to community members.

Portland Copwatch	The report defines transparency as the complainant being able to track the progress of their complaint and receive written updates, including letters explaining the findings. That is only transparent to an audience of one. It is mentioned that CRC appeals are public, which is the one sliver of true transparency to the public - even though the complaint and community have no access to the files CRC gets to review. That includes the complainant's attorney if they have one. The COCL calls the system "largely" transparent.	We believe this is inaccurate. Our report notes that, in addition to the letters, the CRC is open to the public, CRC minutes are available on the IPR website, redacted PRB summaries are provided on the PPB website, and "community members are able to view data on misconduct complaints, individual allegations, houseless arrests, and officer involved shootings/in-custody deaths by going to IPR's website." The combination of these factors is what led us to describe the system as "largely" transparent.
Portland Copwatch	The report indicates that because IPR and Internal Affairs have synchronized their trainings, IPR has been able to conduct "meaningful independent investigations." It is not mentioned they have to compel officer testimony through the PPB, nor that they are prohibited by the police contract from investigating deadly force cases.	The collective bargaining issues at hand with these comments are not within the purview of the COCL. Where IPR is able to conduct investigations, we maintain that the shared policies and SOPs, joint training, and ongoing consultation have resulted in IPR being enabled to conduct meaningful independent investigations.
Portland Copwatch	The report does not follow up on the COCL's concern raised in the Q4 2019 report that IPR does not have access to the state Law Enforcement Data System, which causes some delays in their investigations.	We did not include a follow-up because we had not listed this issue as a condition of compliance. Rather, we noted it as a structural barrier at the state level. However, we also noted that IPR was prioritized with regards to document requests and was receiving documents without unavoidable delay.
Portland Copwatch	The report says that supervisors generate After Action Reports for all investigations of Use of Force, but that's not true - as deadly force incidents are explicitly excluded per Agreement paragraph 69c.	We have updated our report to clarify this point.
Portland Copwatch	When considering that there are fewer alerts from the Employee Information System heading into officers' direct supervisors, the COCL speculates this is "likely" because the EIS and Responsibility Unit Managers know which alerts are most meaningful. Shouldn't these social scientists examine the data to see whether that is true?	Analysis of the data would not show this as there is no variable for "level of meaningfulness" - our position was informed by field work and interviews with individuals knowledgeable about the EIS system. When looking at the data, these individuals came to similar conclusions.
Portland Copwatch	The COCL guesses that people refusing services from the Bureau's five Behavioral Health Response Teams went up from about 10% to 20% because there is a new Team focused on the houseless community. There is no evidence to back up this claim.	Similar to PCW's comment on EIS, this is not a guess and our position was informed by interviews with individuals knowledgeable about BHRT operations.
Portland Copwatch	The COCL also speculates that the reason there is less disparity in when officers send people in crisis to the hospital whether or not those officers are specially trained for the Enhanced Crisis Intervention Team is that the dispatchers and Bureau now know better whether ECIT is needed.	Our report notes that this may be one explanation and our position is informed by a cause and effect assessment. BOEC has stressed the importance of sending ECIT officers out. The remaining calls (which do not get an ECIT response) are therefore likely lower-level calls which non-ECIT officers have the training to handle.
Portland Copwatch	The COCL claims to have observed the Training Advisory Council meetings in November and "February" where Use of Force data were discussed. However, TAC only meets in odd-numbered months, and the second report was actually in January.	We have revised our report to clarify this point.
Portland Copwatch	The reports states that the Bureau adopted a five year strategic plan but that plan is not finalized or at least has not been published to the PPB's website.	The five year plan was being prepared for the website and was scheduled to be public by the time of our report. However, the COVID-19 pandemic caused a delay and the plan will be uploaded on the website in the near future.
Portland Copwatch	The report notes that the amount of force used by police (804 times a year) isn't as important as the "force to custody ratio," in other words, how often they use force when arresting someone. However, in addition to the people in mental health crisis who are not necessarily being taken into custody, frequently the use of force against protestors (which is not even included in the annual count) is also not related to people being arrested. So in other words, the roughly 3% of time force is used compared to custodies isn't really meaningful as it (a) includes force not leading to custody and (b) doesn't include all uses of force.	We continue to respectfully disagree with PCW that raw numbers are a more appropriate approach to measuring PPB force. When looking at the raw number of uses of force, context matters and that context directly relates to the number of interactions police are having with community members (for instance, 1000 uses of force in a city with a population of 1000 would be much different than 1000 uses of force in a city with a population of 10 million). By measuring force as a proportion of arrests, we can account for increases in officer interactions and have a more precise view of whether data indicate increasing officer dispositions toward using force. These data also have historical consistency (i.e. PPB has been measuring force and arrests for many years), allowing us to use consistent measures over time. We therefore continue to measure force events as a proportion of arrests as an acceptable practice to measure PPB force patterns over time.

Portland Copwatch	The report noted that the broader, random surveys related to the Agreement paid for by the City in 2015, 2016, and 2019 had an increase in satisfaction, though no data are shown in the report.	The citywide surveys conducted in 2015, 2016, and 2019 included questions about contact with the police. The findings were contained in reports by DHM and have been summarized by COCL in prior reports. While we mention them here, we do not find it necessary to repeat the full content of all prior reports in this report.
Portland Copwatch	In pushing back against the repeated observation by community members (not to mention the media) that the Unity Center is not adequately meeting the needs of people in mental health crisis, the COCL once again falls back on the notion that creating a "drop-off/walk-in center" was merely "aspirational" in the original Agreement. Because police used to wait an hour to help get people admitted to hospitals, now officers can get an ambulance to transport people rather than arrest them, the Compliance Officer concludes that Unity is enough like a drop-off and walk-in center to comply with the Agreement.	PCW assumes that it is speaking for all community members and stakeholders on this matter, though we note that all community members and stakeholders do not agree with with PCW's position. During our townhall with PCCEP, the chair of the Behavioral Health Subcommittee noted that the Unity Center acts in accordance with a drop-off center. Additionally, nationally recognized experts on both the Department of Justice and COCL teams have noted the Unity Center complies with Par. 89. PCW notes in this comment that as a result of the Unity Center, officers are no longer required to wait "an hour" to get a person in mental health crisis the help they need (though often, officers were historically required to wait much longer) . As this was the rationale for drop-off centers, we agree that the Unity Center accomplishes this important goal. We therefore maintain that Unity Center is sufficient to meet the Settlement Agreement's requirement for a drop-off center.
Portland Copwatch	The report notes that COCL asked the Bureau to "reconsider" a section about the purpose of their In-Service Training in the last report, but doesn't explain what exactly was supposed to be changed.	We have revised our report to clarify this point.
Portland Copwatch	The report indicates that supervisors review officers' training records monthly for performance evaluations, even though performance evaluations are done annually.	We have revised our report to clarify this point.