

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Response</u>
PCW	The report does not contain updates on stop data collection, most use of force information, the Employee Information System or the PPB's efforts to interact with the mental health system.	Our reports in the first two quarters of 2019 were designed to provide assessment and guidance in sections of the Settlement Agreement that had not yet reached Substantial Compliance. However, we are required by the Settlement Agreement to assess each substantive paragraph each year. As such, our upcoming Q3 report and subsequent Q4 report will contain on sections and paragraphs that had reached Substantial Compliance prior to 2019. Therefore, updates on each of these sections and paragraphs will be made prior to the end of 2019.
PCW	The plan for IPR to triage complaints based on cases that are likely to result in a finding, including taking into consideration whether a person has filed multiple complaints, is concerning.	As noted in our report, the triage process employed by IPR assesses "the risk that the process will fail to identify, investigate, or substantiate officer misconduct." Therefore, when IPR believes that the case will proceed to a full investigation (thereby reducing the risk that misconduct will go unidentified), they can reduce the time taken at intake investigation (since a full, comprehensive investigation will be conducted by either IPR or IA). However, when IPR believes a case will not proceed to a full investigation, the intake investigation acts as a mechanism to ensure that no misconduct goes unidentified. Regarding PCW's comment on persons who have filed multiple complaints, we have revised our report to more clearly describe this process.
PCW	COCL should modify its report to state that City Council must take public input on PPB's Annual Report to comply with the spirit, not just the letter of the Agreement.	The Settlement Agreement specifically calls for PCCEP to review and comment on the draft PPB Annual Report, with the final report presented to the public in precinct meetings and to the City Council. As part of PCCEP's review, community input was solicited and incorporated, thereby fulfilling one of PCCEP's roles. There has also been opportunity for community engagement on these topics during the precinct meetings. The presentations are an opportunity for PPB to present the version of its Annual Report that has already been informed by community input and to "educate the community about its efforts in community policing in regards to the use of force, and about PPB's policies and laws governing pedestrian stops, stops and detentions, and biased-free policing, including a civilian's responsibilities and freedoms in such encounters" (Par. 150). While we agree that community input is important at all stages, we feel there have been sufficient opportunities for community members to comment on the Annual Report.
PCW	PCW continues to be concerned about Supervisory Investigations and Precinct Referrals which leave the police explaining to community members why officers behave in certain ways, rather than coming from a community perspective which might lead to changing those behaviors based on the complaints.	When speaking with supervisors, we discussed with them the importance of hearing community concerns rather than the process just being a lecture from supervisors. In our conversations, we heard a number of sergeants state that they listened to community members and relayed the learned information to officers so that officers, despite not violating any policies, could incorporate the community feedback into their future behavior. Additionally, some supervisors informed us they had attempted to hold a face-to-face discussion between community members and officers so that the community member might be given a chance to express their concerns. Therefore, the supervisory investigation contains elements of what PCW advocates for here.

PCW	The COCL assigns Substantial Compliance to Pars. 74, 75, and 77 without observing whether the new form utilized by the Inspector has been useful or has become standard practice.	The form utilized by the Inspector formalizes a process that we had previously assessed to be both helpful and regular. When identifying a policy, training, equipment, or personnel issue, the Inspector had, in the past, sent an email to the appropriate group/division (e.g. policy team, training division, etc.). However, because this was done via email, others could not access what emails had been sent or what response had been received - only the Inspector had this information. The form recently implemented ensured that multiple people could access the information in a centralized location. However, prior practice of identifying issues had been regularly occurring.
PCW	The COCL assigns Substantial Compliance to Pars. 99 and 115 without observing whether the BOEC training was effective.	The training provided to BOEC strengthened a concept of ECIT dispatch that we felt was lacking and therefore the remaining barrier to Substantial Compliance. Our review of the BOEC training provided in 2018 found it to be overall compliant with the requirements of Par. 99 except for one element - that the concept of "risk" was too narrowly defined. Upon reviewing the City's updated analysis on crisis response, we continued to find that the missing piece for Substantial Compliance was for BOEC to iterate to call-takers and dispatchers that "risk" was a broad term and that call-takers and dispatchers should utilize their expertise in making ECIT dispatch decisions. BOEC's 2019 training accomplished this by stressing the concept of "When in doubt, send them out." While the training accomplished this last piece, our prior assessments had already found the City's mental health response system to be largely in compliance with the Settlement Agreement.
PCCEP	Update Par. 149 to reflect PCCEP feedback on jointly developed metrics.	We have revised our report to reflect this.
PCCEP	Revise to report on the degree to which minority communities are less satisfied with the interactions with PPB officers.	We have revised our report to include this point.
PCCEP	Revise report to clarify a sentence on pg. 30 regarding "less of a concern".	We have revised our report to clarify this point.
IPR	Revise report to clarify and distinguish the "Person of the Day" and "Special Handling" process for individuals with a history of non-meritorious complaints.	We have revised our report to clarify and distinguish these two concepts.