

<u>Source</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>COCL Response</u>
Portland Copwatch	Report does not contain any charts, graphs, or table of data	As PCW points out later in their analysis, our report covered the Accountability and Community Engagement portions of the Settlement Agreement and specifically paragraphs which had not been previously covered in our 2019 reports. For the Accountability Section, quantitative analyses were performed in our 2019 Q2 and Q3 assessment (see Pars. 121 and 128). Remaining paragraphs in the Accountability Section for our 2019 Q4 report largely required either technical assessment (for instance, PPB's requirement to issue CRO's) or assessments were more qualitative in nature. The same is true for the Community Engagement Section.
Portland Copwatch	Report indicates that the TAC's input is considered community input, exemplifying that the Bureau is not engaged in broad outreach when looking for feedback.	Whereas the TAC is a prime avenue for input on training, we do not believe it to be the only avenue. PPB conducts Citizen Academies, training related to Officer Wellness was influenced by the PCCEP, and community input to the Community Services Division can also impact training. Whereas we believe that community engagement is an organizational mindset (rather than a checkbox), we encourage PPB and the City to continue seeking avenues of community member input - however, TAC (as a requirement of the Settlement Agreement) continues to work within the proscriptions of the Agreement.
Portland Copwatch	It is inappropriate for the COCL to discuss "respectful treatment of 'difficult' people" since that implies the person is the problem and takes the focus off the community member's behavior.	We agree with this comment and have changed our report to read "...that are needed de-escalation and for respectful treatment of people during challenging circumstances...."
Portland Copwatch	COCL praises the Bureau for making public its evaluation reports about trainings, though not all reports are posted (for instance, the 2019 In-Service Supervisory Training report from October 2019).	This oversight was brought to PPB's attention and the 2019 In-Service Supervisory Training Report is now on their website (among other reports recently posted).
Portland Copwatch	The COCL finds that IA's 94% and IPR's 85.4% rates for completing full administrative investigations within 180 days is good enough, despite the Agreement clearly saying that no case should take over 180 days.	For each assessment of Par. 121 we have conducted in the past 5 years, we have noted that some cases will reasonably take over 180 days and that quality should not be sacrificed for expediency. We maintain this position and have ensured that no case unreasonably exceeded the 180-day timeline without corrective action being implemented.
Portland Copwatch	COCL does not address whether the outcomes of cases are accurate when addressing whether a case was completed within 180 days.	We refer the reader to our assessment of Par. 169 which states that our review of a broad spectrum of cases indicates investigations are reasonable and are supported by a preponderance of the evidence.
Portland Copwatch	COCL's report regarding the CRC makes it sound as if the COCL attended multiple CRC meetings, which they did not.	We disagree with PCW that our methodology was "merely look[ing] at the CRC's membership list on line." The COCL attended a CRC meeting in the fourth quarter of 2019 and has attended multiple meetings since beginning our work. Additionally, we review CRC documents and case findings in making out determinations about the diverse membership of CRC and it's operations.
Portland Copwatch	COCL says that they "observed" PCCEP in Q4 2019, though as far as we know COCL personnel were only at the October meeting.	In 2019 Q4, the COCL team attended or observed via livestream each of the full PCCEP meetings during the quarter and attended numerous subcommittee meetings and steering committee meetings. PCW's statement is inaccurate as to our attendance.