

## Q2 2022 Community Comments and COCL Responses

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>COCL Response</b>
Rochelle S	Provide greater context into the types of weapons that persons in mental health crisis are armed with.	We have updated our report to provide greater context into this issue.
Dan H.	Clarify within the report what is meant by the term “de-policing”	We have updated our report to clarify this term.
Dan H.	The COCL praises the PPB for making progress in training officers around Crowd Control despite not having done a meaningful analysis or waiting for the experts' report [pp. 87-89].	PPB’s Training Division has done a meaningful needs assessment of crowd control and conducted a number of trainings on this problem. However, we have also said that the findings of the outside assessment by IM LLC will need to be incorporated into updated training once completed.
Dan H.	The COCL rightly expresses concern that IPR dismissed five force cases in technical violation of the Agreement (129) [pp. 160-161]. However, they let slide one case that involved hands/feet/knees saying there was no force, with no further explanation. Three others were dismissed because the lawyers would not let the victims undergo interviews, which does not constitute "lack of merit" as asserted in the Report. The last one was about a person who said they were forcibly removed from a vehicle, but similarly did not submit to questioning.	As noted in the report, the allegation involving hands/feet/knees appears to be a coding error as a review of the intake documents did not reveal any force being used at all. Thus, we suggested IPR review their process for entering, verifying, and maintaining data. For other cases, we note that IPR’s closure justification was “lack of investigative merit.” However, as pointed out by Portland Copwatch, we maintain that this remains a technical violation of the Settlement Agreement.
Dan H.	In an incident where an officer used a Taser five times, when three times is considered the maximum before it becomes a serious use of force, the COCL found no issues but did not describe the circumstances that would justify the event.	We have revised our report to describe the circumstances.

## Q2 2022 Community Comments and COCL Responses

Commenter	Comment	COCL Response
Dan H.	The COCL should insist on an investigation of officers who refuse to lock up their weapons upon entering Unity Center as well investigate how frequently it happens and whether Unity Center staff has contacted PPB since regarding such occurrences.	It is our understanding that the specific officers were not identified but rather this was an overall trend that Unity Center staff were seeing. We will provide an update on this issue in our next report.
Dan H.	The Settlement Agreement requires a review of each officer's training twice a year. As noted in our last analysis, that is only happening once per year; the DOJ found noncompliance for this issue: The COCL says the effort still gets the PPB a passing grade.	In 2020, both DOJ and COCL found the PPB in Substantial Compliance on Par. 81. We have continued to focus on the accuracy and completeness of the LMS records as required by Par. 81, not the review period, with knowledge that informal reviews were occurring during the year. Annual performance evaluations are a standard practice in the field.
Dan H.	The COCL asserts that "trainings such as PPB-led Community Active Shooter Preparedness were mentioned as examples of ways to increase community engagement" (84) [p. 76]. Is that really the kind of engagement envisioned by the Community Engagement Plan-- heightening the fear of crime that the PPB says it is supposed to be mitigating?	We agree that this is not the best example of community engagement. We will clarify and provide other examples used in the training to engage the community to build trust and their skills. The training was more comprehensive, with attention to other community training programs, such as <i>WomenStrength</i> .
Dan H.	While the COCL finds that the City is in compliance with paragraph 122 by conducting parallel criminal and investigative investigations of the same incidents [p. 152], they say that interviews by Internal Affairs do not take place until after the criminal investigations end (84) [p. 78]. This is a crucial issue for deadly force cases, and a clear explanation is needed.	The administrative investigation begins concurrent and is carried out until such a point where the case cannot progress without an interview with the involved officer. At this point, the administrative investigation is required to be tolled until the criminal investigation is completed.

## Q2 2022 Community Comments and COCL Responses

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>COCL Response</b>
Dan H.	The COCL states that "communications can provide community engagement through IPR referrals" (84) [p. 76]. It is not clear at all what this means.	If a problem with the PPB occurs, one the sergeant's roles can be to refer a community member to IPR to register a complaint, but this is only one of many "communications" that were covered in this training. We will clarify.
Dan H.	The COCL finds one of the new paragraphs (190) in Substantial compliance because the City budgeted overtime specifically to ensure officers can get trained. They say that the rating will fall to Partial if the budget is cut [p. 205], but this should result in a "Non-compliance" rating.	This has been updated to say "Non-compliance" instead of Partial Compliance.
Dan H.	p. 59 (and possibly other places) refer to "No Mental Health" as if the people did not have any kind of mental health one way or the other, probably means no mental health component or no mental illness.	We have updated our report to address this issue.