

Comment	Source	Response
Issue with the COCL and DOJ's lack of concern over the case where three PPB officers simultaneously deployed their tasers at a suspect. The COCL also did not include their recommendation of Officers testing their weapons before heading out in the field.	PCW	We disagree with the position that the COCL team had a lack of concern over this case. We clearly state our concern though note that it was a single occurrence and the entire event was scrutinized appropriately by the chain-of-command. However, we have added to our list of recommendations the suggestion to use in-service training to remind officers of their responsibility to test their CEW before deploying (though we note that this did occur during the training and will be reported on in our upcoming report).
No analysis of PPB's investigation of the OIS incident involving PPB and Clackamas County SO, as well as lack of mentioning PPB's slowness in releasing the Officer's name.	PCW	As we have noted in the past, the Chief's Executive Order was issued based on information received from the FBI and was approved by the DOJ.
Alarming use of vehicle "interventions" is obscured by how many times police use lower levels of force. COCL did not analyze the increase in PIT maneuvers from 2022 to 2023.	PCW/Town Hall	We followed up on this question with PPB who informed us that the use of vehicle interventions is related to increases in stolen vehicles and is used during focused operations.
COCL did not comment on the fact that police reported a high number of people in mental health crisis as being armed, counting "spit and bodily fluids" as a weapon.	PCW/Town Hall	While spit and bodily fluids are considered a weapon by PPB when used against them (i.e., getting spat in their face), they do not consider any individual armed with spit and bodily fluids just for it being part of their natural biology.
Par. 129 moved to substantial compliance because no new force allegations were swept under the rug.	PCW	We disagree with this phrasing. As we note in our report, "Over the past several quarters, we have seen instances of on-scene allegations of excessive force being forwarded for full investigation and have not identified cases where supervisors have failed to do so." Moreover, the purpose of Par. 129 is to ensure that allegations of excessive force <u>are not</u> "swept under the rug" and we affirmatively state that recent quarters have demonstrated action wholly in-line with the requirements of this paragraph.
COCL did not comment on the fact that 30% of strikes and kicks used in the past five years occurred last year.	PCW	We caution making strong conclusions on these statistics given (1) the overall low number of applications over the past 5 years (n=30) and (2) the data discusses applications and not events (one event may have multiple applications).

No follow-up of the Q1 Report that found 25% of 20 random cases reviewed were not tactically sound.	PCW	We disagree with this comment. As noted in our report, “For this quarter, we did not find any cases in which we believed the force was unreasonable or where members did not demonstrate appropriate force avoidance skills.”
Issue with the COCL unable to explain the delays in the 180-day deadlines (for IPR) without jeopardizing the cases. Thinks COCL should be able to make some statement regarding the delays and find Par. 123 out of compliance.	PCW/Town Hall	While we appreciate PCW’s concern, the fact remains that publicly discussing an ongoing investigation jeopardizes the integrity of the investigation. It was therefore be highly unethical to discuss the investigation before it concludes.
Issue with the BHUAC never actually reviewing the new ECIT training course but it being approved. Also, Paragraph 95 that notes the BHUAC’s role in making recommendations was found in compliance.	PCW	Members of the BHUAC were invited to observe dry-runs of the training and provide feedback after observation. Additionally, the training had previously been approved by BHUAC.
Issue with mental health section being in in substantial compliance even though the committee where the PPB is supposed to talk to medical facilities about transporting patients has not met in three quarters.	PCW	This workgroup meets when problems arise requiring collaborative discussion. No such problems have arisen and therefore they have not convened.
The report card doesn’t list how many paragraphs are still rated in partial compliance.	PCW	We have updated our report card to include the fact that 21 paragraphs remain in Partial Compliance.
Page 30 says 46% control against resistance and 30% resisted handcuffing which adds up to 76% - more than the 61% listed on page 28 (36.5% and 24.5%).	PCW	Page 28 reflects use of force by PPB over the last 4 quarters on all subjects. Page 30 reflects use of force by PPB over the last 4 quarters on subjects with actual or perceived mental illness.
Page 52 (and appendix): This is the first time I can remember that the BHCT and BHUCT have been clearly listed as separate entities. It's very confusing. They should use names that are less similar (unless it's the same group with two names, which I always assumed it was, but that is also confusing). Maybe when each is listed in the report there should be a parenthetical thought or footnote saying (the team inside the PPB) and (the team that includes other agencies). If that's even correct, it's not clear from the context of this draft report.	PCW	These are not separate entities and we have corrected this mistake. From now on, we will only use the term BHUCT.
Page 58 says something about how 28 hours plus 4.5 hours exceeds the 40-hour standard for CIT training.	PCW	The statement reflects the 4.5 hours of crisis intervention training given in May 2023, the additional training to be delivered in the third quarter, and the 28 hours of crisis

		intervention training that all recruits get in the statewide DPSST Basic Academy.
Page 110: Claims there was a Settlement Agreement and Policy Subcommittee meeting on April 12 but there was not, it was a Community Engagement Subcommittee.	PCW	We have corrected this mistake.
Page 116: The report says "we maintain our suggestion" but in theory there's a new entity in the position of the COCL. I understand why it's an easy shorthand but maybe "we maintain the COCL's suggestion".	PCW	In order to maintain continuity between COCL teams, we have retained many of the members from Dr. Rosenbaum's tenure. As such, these continue to be our suggestions and recommendations.