

# Portland Police Bureau: Oversight and Accountability

## Appendix

### Contents

<b>LWVPDX Study Group Resources</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Police Accountability Study Interviews .....	1
Summary of LWVPDX Activities for Police Accountability (2015-2020).....	1
Examples of Other Municipal Oversight Systems .....	3
Police Reform Advocacy Groups .....	4
<b>Historic Documents</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>City Council and Auditor Reports</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Katz's Majority Report (2000).....	5
Auditor's Proposal (2001) .....	5
Eileen Luna Firebaugh Report (2008) .....	6
Stakeholder's Report and Recommendations (2010) .....	6
Stakeholder's Short Term Report (2016) .....	7
<b>Settlement Agreement</b> .....	<b>7</b>
Department of Justice Investigation (2012) .....	7
Department of Justice Settlement Agreement (2012) .....	7
Compliance Office/Community Liaison (COCL) Compliance Reports (2020) .....	8
Updates to Use of Force Directive.....	8
Portland Police Bureau Publicly Available Data .....	8
<b>Portland Police Bureau Information</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Training Advisory Council Five Pillars of Public Safety Structural Reform (2020) .....	9
Portland Committee on Community Engaged Policing (PCCEP) .....	9
Discipline Guide (2014).....	9
<b>OIR Consulting Company Reports</b> .....	<b>10</b>
Table of Critical Incidents .....	11
Summary of Seventh OIR Group Report, April 2020 .....	11
Summary of Sixth OIR Group Report, January 2019 .....	11
Summary of Fifth OIR Group Report, February 2018 .....	11
Summary of Fourth OIR Group Report, January 2016 .....	12
Summary of Third OIR Group Report, November 2014 .....	12
Summary of Second OIR Group Report, July 2013 .....	12
Summary of First OIR Group Report, May 2012.....	12
Summary of James Chasse, Jr. Case .....	13
<b>Portland Copwatch Background and Reports</b> .....	<b>13</b>
About Portland Copwatch .....	13
Standard of Review Position Paper (2011).....	14

# LWVPDX Study Group Resources

## *Police Accountability Study Interviews*

The LWVPDX Report on Police Accountability was based on independent research by a team of volunteers. This team conducted interviews with the following key stakeholders. All interviews were conducted during the year 2020 by Zoom meetings.

**Debbie Aiona**, Action Chair, League of Women Voters of Portland, September 21, 2020

**Candace Avalos**, Chair, Citizen Review Committee, August 26, 2020

**Cliff Bacigalupi**, Captain, Internal Affairs, Portland Police Bureau, June 11, 2020

**Janelle Bynum**, Representative, State of Oregon, November 10, 2020

**Mary Hull Caballero**, City Auditor, City of Portland, August 31, 2020

**Ross Caldwell**, Director, Independent Police Review, June 10, 2020

**Shawn Campbell**, Chair, Training Advisory Council, Portland Police Bureau, October 13, 2020

**Lew Frederick**, Senator, State of Oregon, July 13, 2020

**Jo Ann Hardesty**, Commissioner, City of Portland, August 20, 2020

**Dan Handelman**, Portland Copwatch, August 21 and October 30, 2020

**Brian Hunzeker**, Portland Police Association President, December 3, 2020

**K. C. Jones**, Policy Analyst, Independent Police Review, June 10, 2020

**Chuck Lovell**, Chief of Police, Portland Police Bureau, November 16, 2020

**Bryan Parman**, Commander, Professional Standards Division, Portland Police Bureau, June 11, 2020

**Tom Potter**, former Mayor of Portland and former Chief of Police, July 27, 2020

**Floyd Prozanski**, Senator, State of Oregon, December 2, 2020

**Michael Reese**, Multnomah County Sheriff, August 13, 2020

**Carmen Rubio**, Executive Director, Latino Network, (now Commissioner, City of Portland), June 24, 2020

**Mike Schmidt**, Multnomah County District Attorney, August 24, 2020

**Greg Stewart**, Acting Captain, Training Division, Portland Police Bureau, September 11, 2020

**Daryl Turner**, Portland Police Association President, September 25, 2020

**Ted Wheeler**, Mayor, City of Portland, November 6, 2020

## *Summary of LWVPDX Activities for Police Accountability (2015-2020)*

The League of Women Voters of Portland has been active in calling for police accountability for many years. The following list provides an annotated bibliography of testimony LWVPDX has offered at various occasions in different venues in the city. You can read the full testimony referenced here by clicking on the link for each paragraph. These letters are available at our website:

<https://lwvpdx.org/advocate/testimony/police-oversight/>

- November 30, 2015, Re: Independent Police review Division 2014 Annual Report. LWVPDX letter to Citizen Review Committee Chair. Notes “dramatic decline in the amount and quality of information and analysis in the report compared to past reports.” ([link to document](#))
- September 14, 2016, Re: Proposed changes to police misconduct complaint and appeal process. LWVPDX letter to Mayor Hales, City Council, Auditor Caballero, IPR Director Severe. Notes concern about the process used to develop current proposals and some provisions in the draft code changes. ([link to document](#))
- April 6, 2017, Re: Proposed Code Changes to Independent Police Review Division Code. LWVPDX letter to Mayor, City Council, Auditor Caballero. Opposes the elimination of public testimony during Citizen review Committee appeal hearings and case file review. ([link to letter](#))
- February 5, 2019, Re: OIR Group Sixth Report Portland Police Bureau Officer-Involved Shootings. LWVPDX letter to Mayor Wheeler, City Council, Chief Outlaw. Notes delay in releasing a report only five days prior to City Council Session, making it “difficult for community members to digest the information and provide meaningful feedback.” Expresses concern over similarity of problems to previous reports. Supports updating training curriculum. Urges City Council to “give serious consideration to allowing survivors of police shootings or the families of victims to request Citizen review Committee review of cases.” ([link to letter](#))
- June 4, 2019, Re: Status Conference: United States of America v. City of Portland Case No. 3:12-cv-02265-SI. Letter to Honorable District Judge Michael Simon. LWVPDX letter acknowledges the work of the Community Engagement and Portland Committee on Community-Engaged Policing (PCCEP) and expresses appreciation for the public briefing on the DOJ Settlement Agreement. Directs attention to serious deficiencies raised by committee relating to officer involved shootings, training and review conclusions. ([link to letter](#)).
- July 30, 2019, Re: Public Involvement in the Portland Police Association Contract. LWVPDX letter to Mayor Wheeler and City Council. LWVPDX asks for information on the proposed schedule for contract negotiations for 2020, the public engagement plan related to the negotiations, whether negotiating sessions will be open to the public and how the Council will respond to community recommendations. ([link to letter](#))
- October 2, 2019, Re: Portland Police Bureau Community Engagement Plan. LWVPDX letter to Mayor Wheeler, City Council, and Chief Outlaw. Makes recommendations on ways to inform the public and solicit community feedback. Suggests communication techniques and protocols for testimony used by other City bureaus. ([link to letter](#))
- November 18, 2019, Re: Public Involvement in the Portland Police Association Contract. LWVPDX letter to Mayor and City Council. Acknowledges response to LWVPDX July 30, 2019 letter. Encourages the City to support an “open and inclusive process, a robust public engagement plan and sufficient information to allow the public to understand how that engagement will influence outcome.” ([link to letter](#))
- December 18, 2019, Re: Public Involvement in the Portland Police Association Contract. LWVPDX letter to Mayor and City Council. Strongly reminds City Council that the public expects upcoming negotiations to include attention to public reports and recommendations. ([link to letter](#))
- February 23, 2020, Re: Status Conference: United States of America v. City of Portland Case No. 3:12-cv-02265-SI. LWVPDX letter to Honorable District Judge Michael Simon. Raises questions about the future of reforms given that the Compliance Officer and the DOJ have found the city “to be in substantial compliance with the Settlement Agreement and it is likely this will be the last year of oversight.” Appreciates “the Mayor’s stated commitment to maintain and support

the PCCEP.” Raises issue of whether the city staff and Portland Police Bureau will continue to participate. ([link to letter](#))

- July 28, 2020, Re: Proposed Charter Amendment: Police Accountability System. LWVPDX letter to Mayor and City Council. Support for “the basic elements of the redesigned oversight system in Commissioner Hardesty’s proposed charter amendment.” ([link to letter](#))
- November 3, 2020. Voters approve Portland Ballot Measure 26-217 to amend the City Charter and authorize a new, independent police oversight board. Vote reported as of November 9 is 297,699 in favor and 66,928 opposed. LWVPDX Board endorsed this measure.

### *Examples of Other Municipal Oversight Systems*

The LWVPDX Study Group reviewed the following police departments which currently have oversight committees. Each is unique and reflects its community. While none can be transferred in whole to Portland, each has aspects that might be applicable here.

#### San Diego, California

A Community Review Board on Police Practices consisting of 23 unpaid citizens, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council, is charged with:

- 1) reviewing and evaluating serious complaints brought by the public against police officers and
- 2) reviewing all officer involved shootings and in-custody deaths.

Investigations are handled by Internal Affairs and reviewed by the Community Review Board. If the Board does not concur with the findings of the Internal Affairs investigation, they can call for further investigation or send the case to the Mayor who makes a final determination.

A police reform measure was passed unanimously at their General Election in November 2020. A charter amendment, it establishes an Independent Commission on Police Practices. This Commission will have its own legal counsel and the authority to use subpoenas to independently investigate allegations of misconduct and incidents involving in-custody deaths.

#### San Francisco, California

Police Department policy, disciplinary hearings on charges of police misconduct, and imposing penalties is handled by the San Francisco Police Commission. This is a seven-member city body appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. These are salaried staff (with an average salary in 2020 of \$154,589) and appointed for four-year terms.

Police misconduct charges can be filed by the Chief of Police or the Director of Public Accountability (DPA). The DPA, originally known as the Office of Citizen Complaints, was created as a separate department in 1982. Trained investigators handle complaints with their report reviewed by supervisors. If all concur, the officer and complainant both receive notification by letter. If the complaint is sustained, it goes to the Police Chief. After ten days, a review hearing can be held by the Police Commission.

The DPA has a Mediation Program. Both parties must agree to working with a trained mediator. If successfully mediated, the charges are not considered disciplinary proceedings in an officer’s record.

There are also Community Police Advisory Boards for each of the ten District Police Stations. All members on these boards are voluntary. They advise the district station captain about public safety, crime, and quality of life issues.

## Eugene, Oregon

Eugene has a three-pronged approach to civilian oversight: police auditor, police commission, and citizen review board. Both the auditor and civilian review board report directly to the Eugene City Council.

The Citizen Review Board is composed of five to seven members as determined by the city council. They serve an unpaid three-year term with no more than three consecutive terms. Their mission is to provide fair and impartial oversight and review of citizen complaints and internal investigations. The board promotes community involvement, and they advise the city council.

The most interesting and applicable part of their law enforcement effort is CAHOOTS, which stands for Crisis Assistance Helping Out on the Streets. It is a community-based public safety system to provide mental health first responses for crises involving mental illnesses, homelessness, or addiction. Beginning in 1989, both Eugene and Springfield are covered by a 24/7 response van with a medic and a crisis mental health worker. Using the number of calls the police would have handled, CAHOOTS saved the police department an average of \$8.5 million each year from 2014-2017.

At the time of this writing, the City of Portland is establishing its own version of a CAHOOTS-like service with the Portland Street Response and has launched a pilot project of it as of February 2021 in the Lents Neighborhood. U.S. Senator Wyden plans to present to Congress a similar program for the nation.

## *Police Reform Advocacy Groups*

- American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) on demilitarization of protests: <https://www.aclu-or.org/en/news/portland-police-must-demilitarize-its-response-protests>.
- Council on Islamic-American Relations (CAIR) Oregon regarding PPB oversight: <https://cairoregon.org/portland-community-organizations-disappointed-by-portland-police-chief-response/>
- Coalition of Communities of Color: <https://www.coalitioncommunitiescolor.org/ccc-news/5-29-openletter>
- Oregon Justice Resource Center: <https://ojrc.info/your-right-to-protest>
- Pacific Northwest Family Circle: <http://www.pnwfamilycircle.org/>
- Protect Our Stolen Treasures: <https://protectourstolentreasures.mystrikingly.com/>
- PUAH (Portland United Against Hate): <https://www.portlandunitedagainsthate.org/stop-cop-riots>
- Street Roots on police reform, including calls for police officers who support reforms to have a voice: <https://www.streetroots.org/news/2020/09/02/editorial-portland-needs-clear-leadership-police-reform>
- Western States Center: <https://www.westernstatescenter.org/press>

## Historic Documents

The following sections contain links to static copies of longer reports hosted on the LWV website. You will find these primary source documents, archived in their entirety, which the LWVPDX Police Accountability study team used to generate much of their report. These include major reports from both outside consultants and from within the PPB, and offerings of recommendations for public safety changes. We include PPB directives and policies on use of force and some other internal PPB policy guidance, to aid understanding of how the Bureau conducts itself and expects its officers to behave. We also include a report on the Standard of Review produced by the community group Portland Copwatch which advocates for police reforms. These reports are stored here in order to ensure that members can access copies regardless of whether they are removed from the original host site. Below, you will find summaries of the document contents with the links to the static reports in full.

### City Council and Auditor Reports

*Katz's Majority Report (2000)*

[Link to full Majority Report from 2000](#)

In May 2000, Mayor Vera Katz appointed a volunteer group to address community concerns about the citizen review process in Portland. The mayor's action was in response to a proposal by the NAACP, the National Lawyers Guild and other community groups, as well as to the 2000 Police Accountability Campaign initiative process.

The work group was tasked with examining the citizen review process and making recommendations to the Mayor and finally to the City Council. The 18-member group included the NAACP/NLG, PAC-2000, PIIAC Citizen Advisors as well as representatives of the Portland Police Association and the Police Bureau, among others.

*Auditor's Proposal (2001)*

[Link to full Auditor's Proposal from 2001](#)

After a series of complaints about police misconduct, the City Council asked the City Auditor to study other oversight systems, review the recommendations of the 2000 PIIAC Work Group and suggest changes to improve Portland's police complaint system.

The Auditor proposed the creation of two new boards to replace the current PIIAC: The Division of Independent Police Review (IPR) within the Office of the City Auditor, and a Citizen Review Committee (CRC) as appointed by the City Council. The IPR would take on a major role in receiving, reviewing and

investigating complaints about police behavior, while the Police Bureau would retain primary authority to investigate complaints. The CRC would review and decide on citizen appeals of Police Bureau and IPR investigation findings.

*Eileen Luna Firebaugh Report (2008)*

[Link to full Eileen Luna-Firebaugh Report from 2008](#)

The Mayor's Office of the City of Portland contracted Eileen Luna-Firebaugh to conduct a performance evaluation of the Independent Police Review Division (IPR), including the Citizen Review Board (CRC) for the years 2002-2007. The primary purposes of the study were to determine the effectiveness of the IPR and also to determine how satisfied the Portland community was with the IPR system. Previous studies had revealed a number of problems. Complainant perceptions of effectiveness and satisfaction in the system, as documented by the IPR's surveys, had been low since the inception of the IPR system. There was widespread community dissatisfaction with the IPR system. There was a lack of trust that complaints about police misconduct are being seriously addressed. The report included recommendations regarding the CRC, the IPR, and PPB.

*Stakeholder's Report and Recommendations (2010)*

[Link to full Stakeholder's Report and Recommendations from 2010](#)

The Stakeholder Committee was convened to recommend additional improvements to the City's oversight of the Portland Police Bureau. Its goal was a safer city where the experience of trust, mutual respect and effective problem solving between community and police is increasingly shared by all.

A few key recommendations of the Stakeholders:

1. Ensure that IPR investigations include more serious complaints, including use-of-force complaints, especially shootings, deaths in custody and physical injury requiring hospitalization. The IPR should conduct other investigations involving allegations of racial profiling, illegal searches, conflicts of interest and other highly emotional issues to the community.
2. Change the definition of "supported by the evidence." The definition should change from the "reasonable person" standard to a "preponderance of the evidence" standard.
3. Give the CRC the authority to make policy recommendations directly to the PPB.
4. Ensure the CRC has power to compel officer testimony and that of other witnesses at appeal hearings.
5. Require prompt explanation for decisions that differ from the Police Review Board's recommendations.

*Stakeholder's Short-Term Report (2016)*

[Link to full Stakeholders Short-Term Report from 2016](#)

Mayor Hales and Commissioner Fritz requested the stakeholders convene to discuss two issues of contention at the September 14, 2016 City Council meeting. Their first goal was to provide recommendations about the size of the Citizen Review Committee (CRC), and whether and how to make public comments during CRC Appeal Hearings. Secondly, the stakeholders were to recommend steps needed to complete a comprehensive stakeholder review.

## Settlement Agreement

The following section provides summaries of relevant resources regarding the Department of Justice (DOJ) Settlement Agreement and the methods by which the Portland Police Bureau is evaluated for compliance. Each summary contains a link to the primary source document.

*Department of Justice Investigation (2012)*

[Link to DOJ Investigation into PPB from 2012](#)

In 2012, the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) completed an investigation into the Portland Police Bureau with the intent of determining whether the Bureau used excessive force against people with mental illnesses. While the DOJ investigation focused on disparities in use of force on persons experiencing mental illness, this focus should not be interpreted as indicating a lack of racial disparities in police treatment. The investigation found that the PPB did use excessive force against people experiencing mental crises and identified three areas which exacerbated these problems at a systemic level:

1. Deficiencies in responding to persons with mental illness or in mental health crisis
2. Inadequate reviews of officers' use of force
3. Inadequate investigations of officer misconduct

*Department of Justice Settlement Agreement (2012)*

[Link to DOJ Settlement Agreement from 2012](#)

The Department of Justice Settlement Agreement went into effect in 2012, and Portland is still under the terms of this agreement. The agreement had seven general categories:

1. Use of Force (policy and compliance audits)
2. Training
3. Community-Based Mental Health Services
4. Crisis Intervention



5. Employee Information System
6. Officer Accountability
7. Community Engagement and Creation of Community Oversight Board

#### *Compliance Office/Community Liaison (COCL) Compliance Reports (2020)*

Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the COCL does a quarterly assessment regarding whether Portland is sufficiently compliant. The reports started in 2015 and may all be found on the [COCL's website](#). Additionally, the first three reports from 2020 may be found on the Appendix site (the Q4 report has not been finalized as of 2/20/2021 but is expected to be released in the near future):

#### *Links to reports*

- [COCL Q1 2020](#)
- [COCL Q2 2020](#)
- [COCL Q3 2020](#)

#### *Updates to Use of Force Directive*

Under the DOJ settlement, the PPB was required to make numerous updates to its Use of Force Directive, specifically around discipline, reporting, and Electronic Control Devices (ECDs). The table that may be opened with the link below shows whether the Directive, as of January 19, 2020, is considered to be under compliance, along with the section within the directive in which the change is addressed.

[Link to DOJ Settlement Agreement Use of Force Directive.](#)

#### *Portland Police Bureau Publicly Available Data*

Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Portland Police Bureau must make certain data around arrests, citizen complaints, and use of force available to the public. The following dashboards are visible on the PPB and IPR websites:

- Officer Involved Shootings (PPB): <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/police/76940>
- Officer Involved Shootings and In-Custody Deaths (IPR): <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/ipr/article/682501>
- Police Misconduct Allegations (IPR): <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/ipr/article/713752>
- Police Misconduct Complaints (IPR): <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/ipr/article/688265>
- Use of Force Report (PPB): <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/police/76875>

## **Portland Police Bureau Information**

*Training Advisory Council Five Pillars of Public Safety Structural Reform (2020)*

In 2020, the Training Advisory Council released a visionary document, listing core elements of reforms, starting with police training.

[Link to Five Pillars of Public Safety](#)

**About the Training Advisory Council:** The TAC was created in 2012 as a PPB advisory body by city resolution 36912. The TAC is a citizen’s group with the mission of providing ongoing advice to the Chief of Police and the Bureau’s Training Division in order to continuously improve training standards, practices, and outcomes through the examination of training philosophy, content, delivery, tactics, policy, equipment, and facilities. The TAC is also tasked by Section 86 of the DOJ settlement agreement with the City of Portland to identify and report to the Chief of Police any patterns in the Bureau’s use of force. Source website:

<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/police/61449>

*Portland Committee on Community Engaged Policing (PCCEP)*

Source: [PCCEP Charter](#)

Mayor Wheeler convened the PCCEP in 2018 to act as an independent advisory committee to the Mayor and Chief of Police with a specific focus on police services and relationships with people living with mental illness and people of color. The PCCEP is also charged with independently overseeing the implementation of the DOJ settlement agreement. The PCCEP’s mission is to continue building trusting relationships to improve police-community relations.

[Link to graphic of PCCEP Charter.](#)

*Discipline Guide (2014)*

In this document from 2014, then-Chief of Police Michael Reese lays out the metrics for how officers are held to account for misbehavior, through a systematized chart of possible disciplinary actions. Read these guidelines to see what police officers can expect when their conduct breaks with Bureau policy.

[Link to 2014 PPB Discipline Guide.](#)

## OIR Consulting Company Reports

The City of Portland has contracted with OIR to analyze all officer-involved shootings and in-custody deaths. OIR is a respected California consulting firm that works with law enforcement groups all over the country. Since 2004, they have issued seven reports, each covering several shooting incidents. In addition, at the city's requests, they issued a very detailed analysis of events around the in-custody death of James Chasse, Jr. The OIR team comes to Portland, reviews relevant written documents, and interviews staff about what happened. All reviews are two or more years after the incident. For example, the 2019 report covered nine events occurring from 2014 to 2017.

For each officer-involved shooting, OIR gives a detailed narrative of the events leading up to the encounter between suspect and police. They outline what the officers found at the scene and the chain of events prior to the moment when shots were fired. They document effective actions taken to reduce tensions, mistakes made in communication and planning, and the decisions made by personnel on the scene as they attempted to contain a perceived threat.

The OIR reports document progress over the years, in providing medical care to the injured, policy changes to increase officer safety, pro-active problem solving, training in de-escalation, exploring alternatives to use of deadly force, and better use of behavioral health specialists. In each report, OIR makes thoughtful recommendations for changes in procedures and policy that could improve outcomes. The chiefs of police have adopted many of these recommendations. It is clear that the OIR reviews of these deadly force incidents have been taken seriously by the Bureau and many proposals have found their way into policy directives and ongoing training.

OIR remains critical of the accountability process taking place at the Police Review Board. The deliberation at PRB hearings focuses on whether or not a shooting was within policy. PRB hearings do not give equal attention to the actions and decision-making that occurred prior to the time of the shooting itself. The investigation and analysis by the training division may identify opportunities for officers to have avoided the use of fatal force, but these observations do not get focused attention at the hearings. OIR has repeatedly pointed out that studying what happened prior to the shooting is a rich opportunity to gain insight into what might be done differently in the future. There is no formal process for suggestions that arise out of the investigation or analysis by the training division; there is no clear way to document whether a chief chooses to implement the proposed innovations.

The following documents summarize data from the OIR reports:

1. Table of Critical Incidents Reviewed by OIR from 2004 to 2018
2. Summary provided by the LWVPDX study team of OIR reports, listed in reverse chronological order, including links to the full reports
3. A summary of the report on the James Chasse, Jr. case, including a link to the original report

At the time of this report there had been no OIR analysis of the shooting incidents in the year 2019. There were no deaths at the hands of Portland Police in 2020.

### **Table of Critical Incidents**

When the OIR Group reviewed the conduct of the Portland Police Bureau in the course of their investigations, they reviewed a set number of incidents with civilians. The incidents they looked at usually resulted in serious consequences for the community and officers. Lists of these incidents are available in the table below.

[Link to Table of Critical Incidents.](#)

#### *Summary of Seventh OIR Group Report, April 2020*

This most recent report addresses some themes repeated from previous reports (detailed elsewhere in this appendix), such as delays in investigations and officer interviews. It recommends considering alternatives to violent encounters, even when behaviors were deemed within policy: “A theme that we have repeated over the years of our work in Portland (as well as numerous other jurisdictions) is the importance of acknowledging that there are lessons to be learned in every critical incident.”

[OIR Report 7, April 2020](#)

#### *Summary of Sixth OIR Group Report, January 2019*

This sixth report recommends reviews of tactical decision-making beyond whether behavior was within policy to how the decision-making could avoid deadly encounters. It suggests these incidents be used in training to help avoid violent encounters. It suggests the use of tactical retreat as a way to avoid injury or loss of life to both officers and civilians. As done previously, it identifies the concern about officers involved in multiple shootings, and recommends these patterns be considered for command-level corrective debriefs; it notes that suspect files include all criminal behaviors, not just the one for which they are currently charged.

[OIR Report 6, January 2019](#)

#### *Summary of Fifth OIR Group Report, February 2018*

This report recommends reviewing incidents for ways decision-making led up to violent encounters. It reiterates the concern about sergeants stepping out of their role as supervisors in the field, and the concern about investigations taking too long. It encourages rendering emergency aid to injured subjects.

[OIR Report 5, February 2018](#)

*Summary of Fourth OIR Group Report, January 2016*

This report repeats concerns expressed in previous reports about untimely review processes and about sergeants in the field adopting tactical roles instead of maintaining their supervisory stance. It emphasizes the need to train officers for encounters with people in crisis, including ways to avoid use of force with individuals suspected of being suicidal. It highlights the need to review patterns in officer behavior, especially for officers involved in multiple shooting incidents.

[OIR Report 4, January 2016](#)

*Summary of Third OIR Group Report, November 2014*

This report again lifted up concerns about delays in the review process, suggested ways to involve stakeholders in the PRB, and emphasized officer accountability through discipline and training.

[OIR Report 3, November 2014](#)

*Summary of Second OIR Group Report, July 2013*

This report advised revising the Bureau's use of Tasers (Electronic Control Weapons), updating policies around foot patrol, developing safer ways to engage with suspects seated in vehicles, and encouraged sergeants in the field to maintain their supervisory (as opposed to tactical) role.

[OIR Report 2, July 2013](#)

*Summary of First OIR Group Report, May 2012*

This report identifies the impact of delays in the accountability processes and suggested integrating its Critical Incident Management training curriculum into training opportunities for patrol officers.

[OIR Report 1, May 2012](#)

### *Summary of James Chasse, Jr. Case*

In September 2006 James Phillip Chasse, Jr. died in police custody after arrest and detention by Transit Division officers. The OIR Report made recommendations regarding improved training and re-training, increasing consistency of tactics between the Transit Division and PPB, changes in personnel hiring policy, and increased transparency throughout PPB.

[Link to James Chasse, Jr. OIR Report](#)

## **Portland Copwatch Background and Reports**

### *About Portland Copwatch*

Source: "[About Portland Copwatch.](#)" Updated February 27, 2012.

Portland Copwatch (PCW) is a grassroots group promoting police accountability through citizen action. Portland Copwatch was formed as a project of [Peace and Justice Works](#) (formerly Portland Peaceworks) in 1992, a year in which Portland police shot a 12-year-old who had been taken hostage and Los Angeles erupted in the wake of the Rodney King verdict. PCW connects with groups and individuals to encourage civilian review of the police. They release regular reports monitoring police behavior in Portland. They especially follow cases of police misconduct and violence. They release a regular newsletter, the "People's Police Report," detailing local and national police accountability efforts. They also educate the public about civilian rights in encounters with police.

### *Selections from the Portland Copwatch website:*

We want to emphasize that we have respect for the dangers and pitfalls of being a police officer. This does not excuse police when they go outside the limits of the law, nor does it make bad laws good policy. We believe police accountability to the community and equal rights and treatment are of utmost importance.

---

### The Goals of Portland Copwatch:

- 1) To empower victims of police misconduct to pursue their grievances, with the goal of resolving individual cases and preventing future occurrences.
- 2) to educate the general public and, in particular, "target groups" of police abuse on their rights and responsibilities.
- 3) to promote and monitor an effective system for civilian oversight of police.

*Standard of Review Position Paper (2011)*

In 2011, Portland Copwatch released a detailed analysis of the “Standard of Review” used by the Citizen Review Committee in weighing the actions of Portland police. The paper is entitled ‘Standard of Review for Citizen Review Committee: Examining Replacing the Current “Reasonable Person” Standard with “Preponderance of the Evidence.”’ This document helpfully explains the rather confusing distinction between the “preponderance of the evidence” standard of review, which reform advocates prefer, and the “reasonable person” standard of review, which is what CRC currently uses and which some advocates feel hinders full accountability.

[Link to the 2011 Standard of Review Position Paper by Portland Copwatch.](#)