



Joint Committee on Police Oversight Meeting Agenda - Wednesday, November 1, 2023, 5:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM

When: Nov 1, 2023 05:30 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)
Topic: Joint Committee on Police Oversight Meeting

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://zoom.us/j/98255015845>

Or One tap mobile :

+19292056099,,98255015845# US (New York)

+13017158592,,98255015845# US (Washington DC)

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 305 224 1968 US

+1 309 205 3325 US

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 646 931 3860 US

+1 360 209 5623 US

+1 386 347 5053 US

+1 507 473 4847 US

+1 564 217 2000 US

+1 669 444 9171 US

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 689 278 1000 US

+1 719 359 4580 US

+1 253 205 0468 US

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

Webinar ID: 982 5501 5845

International numbers available: <https://zoom.us/j/98255015845>

1. Agenda

Subject	1.1. Motion to amend/adopt agenda
Meeting	November 1, 2023 - Joint Committee on Police Oversight Meeting Agenda - Wednesday, November 1, 2023, 5:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	1. Agenda
Department	
Type	
Recommended Action	

2. Adopt Draft Minutes

Subject	2.1. Adopt Draft Minutes
Meeting	November 1, 2023 - Joint Committee on Police Oversight Meeting Agenda - Wednesday, November 1, 2023, 5:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	2. Adopt Draft Minutes
Department	Council and Board
Type	
Recommended Action	

3. Public Forum

Subject	3.1. Verbal Comments
Meeting	November 1, 2023 - Joint Committee on Police Oversight Meeting Agenda - Wednesday, November 1, 2023, 5:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	3. Public Forum
Department	Council and Board
Type	

4. Councilor Discussion and Review of Vital Questions

Subject	4.1. Councilor Discussion and Review of Vital Questions
Meeting	November 1, 2023 - Joint Committee on Police Oversight Meeting Agenda - Wednesday, November 1, 2023, 5:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	4. Councilor Discussion and Review of Vital Questions
Department	Council and Board
Type	
Recommended Action	

5. Adjournment

Subject	5.1. Motion to adjourn
Meeting	November 1, 2023 - Joint Committee on Police Oversight Meeting Agenda - Wednesday, November 1, 2023, 5:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	5. Adjournment
Department	Council and Board
Type	
Recommended Action	

ORDINANCE and CHARTER CHANGE JOINT COMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 18, 2023

Remote via Zoom

DRAFT MINUTES

Members Present: Councilor Traverse (Ordinance Committee Chair), Gene Bergman (Charter Change Committee Chair), Councilor Carpenter, Councilor Hightower, Councilor Doherty, Councilor Shannon

Staff Present: Joseph Dempsey (City Attorney's Office Staff), Josh Diamond (Outside Counsel)

Others in Attendance: Jordan Redell (Mayor's Chief of Staff), Sharon Bushor, Melo Grant

Meeting called to order at 7:03 PM.

1.0 Agenda

Motion to adopt/amend agenda

Motion to Adopt the Draft Agenda.

Motion by Councilor Hightower, Seconded by Councilor Doherty

Final Resolution: Motion Passes

Yes: Unanimous

2.0 Adopt the Draft Minutes from October 3

Motion to Adopt Minutes as is.

Motion by Councilor Traverse, Seconded by Councilor Carpenter

Final Resolution: Motion Passes

Yes: Unanimous

3.0 Public Forum

No verbal public comments for this item.

4.0 Councilor Discussion and Review of Vital Questions

Meeting discussion began with section 2b of Attorney Diamond's matrix (available on CivicClerk).

Councilor Carpenter corrected the matrix that the referral to the CJC will not come before the investigation, but that the referral to the CJC is a parallel activity depending on the context of the complaint.

Councilor Traverse laid out his proposal for a basic charter change. The Commission would be immediately notified about complaints and UOF incidents. The Chief would decide on whether to investigate and the Commission would receive updates and could provide feedback. The Chief would notify the Commission of the final decision and the Commission would receive that and can request more information. Then, by a super majority vote, the Commission could open an investigation using an outside investigator. Then the Commission would offer their recommendation. How to rectify any discrepancies is still yet undecided.

Counselor Shannon added on to Councilor Traverse's proposal that she thinks there should be a timing window where the Commission can choose to investigate.

Councilor Carpenter proposed a parallel investigation track. The Commission should be able to investigate a complaint or incident regardless of if BPD wants to do so. Councilor Hightower added that every high-level incident should be investigated. Hightower also added that there should be some systemic analysis incorporated into the charter change. Councilor Carpenter concurred that there should be authority vested in the Commission to address or cure systemic issues.

Melo Grant: I do not think time limits on complaints are appropriate. There are already many directives for most complaints and the CNA report offered a lot of solutions.

Jordan Redell: The complaint system established the low, medium, and high categories in the complaint policy of 2020. The categories correlate with the negotiated discipline section of the BPOA union agreement.

Councilor Hightower proposed having an initial level determination and then doing the investigation and potentially reassessing the level. She also added that the Commission should be reviewing data annually.

Councilor Bergman confirmed there is consensus on the Commission's access to evidence, authority to investigate, and would review complaints and make recommendations.

Jordan Redell and the Mayor's Office support having the Commission having the power to investigate, but it should be started by a super majority rather than a simple majority. The Administration is not sure about having anonymized complaint reports be published be part of a charter change.

Sharon Bushor: It should be written somewhere that we want the initial categorization of incidents to be able to be changed after the investigation. I also believe some entity needs to review the totality of the complaints.

Councilor Hightower disagreed with the Administration's position. She offered a compromise that the Chief could initiate an investigation on an incident and if they don't then the Commission, by simple majority, could conduct their own investigation. Parallel investigations seem unnecessary. At a minimum the Commission should be able to review the Chief's designation of incident level and their decision to investigate.

Melo Grant: I am against the super majority requirement. The Commission is a diverse group with different life experiences. I asked for data broken down by officer several times and it did not go anywhere.

Councilor Traverse offered that the Commission should be able to investigate an incident or complaint after the Chief has concluded their investigation if they want more information or disagree. There would be a difference between requesting additional information from BPD's investigation and actually conducting their own investigation. He does not think a super majority is necessary to request more information, but perhaps for an outside investigation. There should be some time limit where the Commission has to decide to conduct its own investigation. The Chief would then offer their decision and the Commission could agree or disagree.

Jordan Redell is unsure if the Administration could support having by-officer data breakdowns written into the charter.

Josh Diamond offered that subpoena authority and investigative powers should be written into charter. The other unresolved issue is the outcome if there is an impasse between the Commission and the Chief.

Councilor Hightower offered that situations that go to an impasse should go to the HR Director.

There is consensus that the threshold for the vote to begin an investigation should be in ordinance. The Administration disagrees with having this in ordinance and believes the threshold should be in the charter along with the authority. Councilor Shannon subsequently agreed with the Administration's view.

Councilor Carpenter proposed that if there is an impasse between the Chief and Commission then the HR Director could hear the complaint and then to the HR Committee if still unresolved.

Councilor Traverse suggested that officers should be treated no differently from other City employees. This would mean the final person would be the Mayor. He suggested removing from charter that the Chief has sole authority. If the Chief rejects the Commission's differing opinion then it would require the consent of the Mayor. The Administration agrees with this model.

The Administration added that the HR Director is the peer of the Chief and the HR Director has no current authority over discipline for other departments. Vesting the HR Director with this power also makes the Director a political person and would sour the confidentiality that the Director has.

Melo Grant: An important aspect of discipline is that the majority of issues are solved by additional trainings or changes to directives.

Councilor Shannon is uncomfortable with having political oversight of a profession such as the police. There is a State body that is not currently very functional. Professional officers deserve professional oversight.

Councilor Traverse brought up that professionals do have bodies in State government, but the officers are still employees of the City and we can discipline them if necessary; similarly to how lawyers or doctors can be disciplined by their employers without losing their license.

Councilor Bergman agreed, if there is no outside new oversight body, that the Mayor is the top official for the City and is responsible for the police department.

Councilor Traverse said he was not against having a second oversight body, but it would have to be different from current appointments.

5.0 Adjournment

Motion to adjourn.

Motion by Councilor Shannon, seconded by Councilor Traverse.

Yes: Unanimous

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 PM.

A. Investigative/Review Function

1. [DD40](#), Section 1, Subsections B, C, D, F, and G describes the process by how allegations of violations of Department Rules or Regulations are initiated from within or outside of the Department.

Does the Committee wish to make any changes to how internal or community complaints are initiated?

2. [DD40](#), Section 1, Subsections A and E vests the authority to investigate all internal and community complaints regarding Department personnel with the Chief who determines whether an investigation is necessary or not. The [2021 Mayoral Executive Directive](#), requires that all use of force incidents that result in injury be reported to the Police Commission after investigation, but only after the Chief confers with the Mayor and receives the Mayor's approval with any recommendation from the Chief.

The overarching question is: Does the Committee wish to make any changes to this authority and process?

The following specific questions are raised by this broader question:

Should internal complaints be treated differently than community complaints?

Should conduct other than just use of force incidents that result in injury be reported to an oversight body (e.g., dishonesty, discrimination, harassment, criminal conduct, or other serious misconduct)?

Should reports to an oversight body only be reported after the Mayor has reviewed the Chief's recommendation?

Should an oversight body have a role in deciding who investigates internal or community complaints?

Are there distinctions based on the severity of the allegation ("categorization") that would change who is the investigator and decisionmaker on the disposition of the complaint?

Article XV of the [BPOA collective bargaining agreement](#) defines the continuum of lower-, mid-, and higher-level infractions. Should there be a modified process for categorizing complaints (e.g., should the process be authorized by charter?, etc.) and, if so, how does that intersect with collective bargaining rights?

Who decides on the categorization of the allegation?

Is the categorization reviewable?

3. If the Committee believes an oversight body should have a role in deciding who investigates internal or community complaints, who other than the Chief and their designee should conduct the investigation?

The following options are raised by this question: the oversight body itself, an independent investigator selected by the oversight body for a particular investigation, an independent monitor selected by the oversight body to conduct all investigations, etc..

4. For an explanation of the current investigatory framework, see [DD40](#), Section 3.

The broader question is: Should the current investigatory framework be changed?

More specific questions are:

Should this framework apply equally to all complaints?

What authority should an oversight body other than the Department have in the course of their investigation (e.g., right to review documents, subpoena testimony, review any Department investigation, make recommendations, etc.)?

5. If the Committee believes the Chief should retain some or all authority to investigate internal or community complaints, what role should the oversight body have during that investigation process?

More specific questions that arise from this broader question are:

Must the Department inform an oversight body upon the filing of a complaint and, if so, when must this notification take place?

Is the Department required to provide regular updates during the investigation?

Must the Department report back to an oversight body at the conclusion of all investigations?

Must the Chief's recommendation be approved by anyone—the Mayor, the Commission, an oversight body—prior to the decision being finalized?

6. [DD40](#), Section 2, outlines rights and obligations of employees during an investigation process, cross-referencing due process considerations in the [BPOA collective bargaining agreement](#).

Does the Committee wish to explore any changes to these due process considerations and, if the Committee supports different processes to investigate complaints, should the same due process considerations apply to each process?

7. If the Chief retains some or all authority (and responsibility) to investigate internal or community complaints, what occurs after the Chief issues their conclusions on how a complaint should be disposed?

Does an oversight body have any role if the Chief retains the authority and responsibility to conduct the investigation and make recommendations on the disposition of the complaint (e.g., review the investigation and make recommendations, etc.)?

If an oversight body makes recommendations on the disposition of the complaint and the recommendation is not followed, does the decider have to explain why the recommendation was not followed?

8. If an oversight body obtains authority to investigate internal or community complaints, what is the process going forward after it reaches its conclusions on how the complaint should be disposed (e.g., what rights do parties (accused, complainant, Department have upon receipt of the conclusions of the investigation)?

Should the complainant have any rights to appeal if they disagree with the final disposition?

What due process protections should be incorporated?

Should there be any changes to the requirements of the [BPOA collective bargaining agreement](#)?

Should anybody else (e.g., other community members) who is aggrieved by a decision have the right to appeal or to raise objections?

9. If an oversight body has authority to review an investigation of an internal or community complaint and a recommendation is made, what is the process going forward?

Should the complainant have any rights to appeal if they disagree with the recommendation?

What due process protections should be incorporated?

Should there be any changes to the requirements of the [BPOA collective bargaining agreement](#)?

Should anybody else (e.g., other community members) who is aggrieved by a decision have the right to appeal or to raise objections?

10. Should there be a process by which disagreements over the recommended action are resolved and by what authority is the process codified (e.g., charter change by which entity other than the Chief is resolving disputes)? What changes if a complaint is about the Chief?

B. Auditing.

1. What role, if any, should the oversight body have as an auditor. Sub-issues to consider:

What is the scope of matters subject to auditing (public safety trends, reviewing and creating new policies, adherence to policies and procedures, internal investigatory processes, analysis of aggregate data on discipline and other police practices).

What events should trigger an audit, e.g., periodic reviews or other events.

What is the scope of investigative authority as auditor, access to data, analytics, policies, procedures, and reports.

What degree of community involvement should an audit involve, including recommendations and feedback?

2. Deconflicting procedures regarding auditing/monitoring function: What procedures should be in place to make sure oversight body's operations work harmoniously with ongoing internal affairs investigations, criminal investigations, prosecutions, etc.
3. Transparency for public accountability and need for confidentiality in certain circumstances. When should data or other information be kept confidential, for how long, and under what circumstances.

C. Composition, selection, and resources.

What should be the oversight body's composition, selection and resources (e.g., staffing).

ARTICLE 62. POLICE DEPARTMENT

183 Board of police commissioners; composition; terms.

The board of police commissioners shall consist of seven (7) legal voters of said city, to be appointed by the city council with mayor presiding to serve for three (3) years and until their successors are appointed and qualified.

(Act No. M-18, § 2, approved 3-1-16)

184 Same-powers and duties.

(a) The city council shall make rules and regulations for the government of the entire police force and shall fix the qualifications of applicants for positions and service on said force and the chief of police shall furnish the city council with any information they may require concerning the finances of the police department. The chief of police shall be responsible for all expenditures made by the police department and no expenditures shall be made by the department except in conformity with the standards promulgated by the city council.

(b) The board of police commissioners shall have such authority and responsibility relating to the management of the police department, its services and facilities, as may be delegated from time to time by resolution of the city council. Said board shall notify the mayor and the chief administrative officer, in writing, of any and all changes, modifications or additions to the rules and regulations of the department.

(c) Without limitation to the foregoing, the board of police commissioners and the chief of police may propose rules and regulations for the government of the entire police force in a manner not inconsistent with those established by the city council. Adoption of such proposed rules and regulations requires joint approval by the board of police commissioners and the chief of police. In the event joint approval is not provided by the board of police commissioners and the chief of police, either party may bring forward to the city council the proposed rule or regulation for the city council's consideration.

(d) The board of police commissioners shall have the authority to receive and review all civilian and internal police department complaints of alleged police misconduct. The board of police commissions shall have the authority to independently investigate any complaint of alleged police misconduct upon a vote of [] % of its commissioners.

(e) As the result of an investigation set forth in subsection (d) above, the board of police commissioners may recommend discipline to the chief of police. The chief of police may accept the recommendation subject to the notice and hearing provisions in Article 62, section 190(a) or reject the recommendation. In the event the chief of police rejects the recommendation, a human resources panel shall resolve the impasse, subject to the notice and hearing provisions set forth in Article 62, section 190(a) and the right of appeal set forth in Article 62, section 190(b). This human resources panel shall consist of three (3) persons appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the city council. Each panel member shall serve for staggered three (3) year terms.

Commented [1]: Should there be an additional provision to provide subpoena authority upon a finding of "probable cause" or "reasonable basis" to believe the officer has engaged in some level of misconduct.

Commented [2]: An alternative or additional basis could limit such independent investigations to allegations of misconduct involving high level matters, use of force, allegations of discrimination, etc.

ARTICLE 63. CHIEF OF POLICE AND CAPTAIN

185 Officers of police force designated.

(a) The direction and control of the entire police force, except as herein otherwise provided, shall be vested in a police officer who shall be called the chief of police, and such other ranking police officers as the city council shall authorize. The order of rank and succession within the police department shall be as designated by the city council by regulation.

(b) Except as herein otherwise provided, such officers shall have the powers and duties granted to police officers by Vermont law and assigned to them by regulations adopted under section 184 of this Charter.

ARTICLE 65. REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION

190 Chief may remove member for cause; hearing.

(a) Whenever it shall appear to the chief that any member of said force has become incompetent, inefficient or incapable from any cause, or is or has been negligent or derelict in his or her official duty, or is guilty of any misconduct in his or her private or official life, or whenever any well-grounded complaints or charges to such effect are made in writing to the chief by a responsible person against such member, the chief may investigate and, after appropriate notice an hearing, dismiss such member from the force, order a reduction in rank, or suspend the member without pay for a specified time period in excess of 14 days. In connection with any possible dismissal, demotion, or suspension for more than 14 days, the chief's notice to the member shall be given at least 48 hours prior to any hearing and shall include a description of the charges being considered. In connection therewith, the chief shall have the power to subpoena witnesses and to administer the oath to such witnesses. The board of police commissioners shall hear any appeal filed in a timely manner with respect to such actions of the police chief. The time of filing an appeal and the nature of the appellate process shall be as determined by such board of regulation. Following its consideration of any such appeal, the board may affirm, modify, or vacate the decision made by the police chief.

(b) The city council's human resources committee shall hear any appeal filed in a timely manner with respect to discipline issued by the chief of police in subsection (a) above or the human resources panel set forth Article 62, section 184(e). The time of filing an appeal and the nature of the appellate process shall be determined by the human resources committee. Following its consideration of such appeal the human resources committee may affirm, modify, or vacate the decision made by the police chief or the human resources panel.

Commented [3]: An alternative here is the human resources panel referenced in section 184 above.

(b)(c) Whenever it shall appear to the mayor that the chief has become incompetent, inefficient, or incapable from any cause, or has been negligent or derelict in his or her official duty, or is guilty of any misconduct in his or her private or official life, or whenever any well-grounded complaints or charges to such effect are made in writing to the mayor by a responsible person, the mayor may suspend the chief from duty pending a hearing thereon by the city council. The city council shall forth with notify the chief of the charges preferred by them, or of the complaints or charges presented by such responsible person in writing, and shall thereupon proceed to consider and investigate the same. It shall appoint a time and place for the hearing of such complaints and charges so made,

shall give the chief reasonable notice of the same, not less than 48 hours, and the city council shall have the power to subpoena witnesses and to administer the oath to such witnesses.

~~(e)~~(d) If, upon hearing, the city council shall find such complaints or charges to be well founded, it may dismiss the chief from the force, demote him or her in rank, or suspend him or her without pay for a period not to exceed 60 days. The procedures outlined in this section shall control in the event of any conflict with section [129](#) of this Charter as pertains to the removal of the chief.

~~(d)~~(e) The chief may, without notice or hearing for any infraction, violation, or disobedience of any of the rules and regulations of the police department that may seem to the chief sufficient, suspend from duty without pay any member of the police force for a period not to exceed 14 days.

<p>Traverse</p> <p>I. Complaints</p> <p>Intake via Community Complaint form.</p> <p>Deputy Chief of Adm. tracks complaints and record keeping of essential information. This includes identification of witnesses, documents, evidence, and other information obtained or consulted with during an investigation of use of force incident (UoF) and any response taken.</p> <p>Complaints categorized by BPD as lower, mid, and higher level consistent with CBA.</p> <p>II. Investigations.</p> <p>A. BPD.</p> <p>Lower level and some mid level complaints resolved quickly with first level of supervision.</p>	<p>Hightower/Carpenter</p> <p>I. Complaints</p> <p>Oversight body receives all complaints a week before regularly scheduled meeting.</p> <p>Oversight body shall categorize complaints by severity (low, medium, high per CBA), UoF, discrimination.</p> <p>BPD shall annually report individual-staff level outcomes, data to be disaggregated by race and disability.</p> <p>II. Investigations</p> <p>A BPD.</p> <p>Chief will provide updates on each milestone in the investigative process to the oversight committee.</p>	<p>Bergman</p> <p>I. Complaints</p> <p>All complaints should be reported to the oversight body.</p> <p>Oversight body shall have ability to independently designate level of seriousness of complaint.</p> <p>II. Investigations</p> <p>A. BPD.</p> <p>Lower level and some mid level complaints resolved quickly with first level of supervision.</p>
---	---	---

<p>Mid level, high level, and use of force escalated for Administrative Review (AR). AR determines whether IA investigation occurs. Referrals to SA or VCJC as needed.</p> <p>Reports of all complaints against members of the department sent to Police Commission (PC).</p> <p>Lower and mid level matters will be reported to PC via oral or written summary, status, and disposition. Recommendations of dispositions involving more than a written reprimand will be shared with the PC in advance of issuance.</p> <p>Regular updates provided on status of investigations involving high level matters, UoF, or unlawful discrimination. This includes key demographic information about the officers and subjects involved, reports, and video evidence. Recommendations for dispositions of such matters will be shared with PC before they are issued.</p>	<p>Chief will have the authority to refer resolution matter to restorative justice program, such as CJC.</p> <p>Chief will have authority to launch investigations after decision to refer matter to CJC has been made.</p>	<p>Mid level, high level, and use of force escalated for Administrative Review (AR). AR determines if IA investigation occurs. Referrals to SA or VCJC as needed.</p> <p>Reports of all complaints against members of the BPD sent to oversight body.</p> <p>Lower and mid level matters will be reported to oversight entity via oral or written summary, status, and disposition. Recommendations of dispositions involving more than a written reprimand will be shared with the PC in advance of issuance.</p> <p>Regular updates provided on status of investigations involving high level matters, UoF, or unlawful discrimination. This includes key demographic information about the officers and subjects involved, reports, and video evidence. Recommendations for dispositions of such matters will be shared with oversight entity before they are issued.</p>
--	---	--

Commented [JD1]: Is there an obligation to maintain confidentiality during executive session.

<p>B. Oversight Entity.</p> <p>Shall have access to all evidence obtained from the investigation of a UoF incidents and their underlying complaints.</p> <p>By majority vote, after receiving Chief recommendation, may initiate independent investigation upon any complaint involving UoF, unlawful discrimination, or high level offense.</p> <p>Investigation to be performed by independent monitor or counsel. Authority includes ability to interview witnesses, obtain documents, and other evidence.</p>	<p>B. Oversight Entity.</p> <p>Shall have the authority to refer matters for resolution through restorative justice program, e.g., CJC.</p> <p>Shall have the authority to launch a parallel, independent investigation based upon majority vote.</p>	<p>B. Oversight Entity.</p> <p>Shall have access to all evidence related to an investigation of a complaint.</p> <p>Shall have authority to conduct an independent investigation.</p> <p>Shall have the authority to hire its own investigator.</p> <p>Shall have the authority to publish anonymized complaint reports.</p> <p>Subcommittee of oversight entity would review complaints, oversee investigations, and make recommendations.</p>
<p>III. Disposition/Discipline.</p> <p>Within 14 days of Chief's recommendation, PC shall accept recommendation, request reconsideration, seek an independent investigation by majority vote, or make an alternative recommendation for disposition.</p>	<p>III. Disposition/Discipline.</p> <p>Chief will make a recommendation to oversight body for all high level, UoF involving injury, and matters involving bias.</p> <p>Oversight body may make a recommendation for all high level,</p>	<p>III. Disposition/Discipline.</p> <p>After Chief's recommendation, oversight entity shall accept recommendation, request reconsideration, or make an alternative recommendation for disposition.</p>

Commented [JD2]: This may require review of possible issues involving CBA and Public Records Act. In addition, access to evidence may be limited if referral is made to State's Attorney for criminal charges and public disclosure would adversely impact successful prosecution and/or access to a fair trial.

Commented [JD3]: JRD Question: Should format be similar to OPR, where there is a panel with a professional investigator, PC member, and counsel?

Commented [JD4]: JRD Question: subpoena authority?

<p>If no action is taken by the PC within 14 days after receiving the BPD's recommendation, the Chief's recommendation shall be considered final.</p> <p>A. Conflict with Recommendations.</p> <p>Chief may accept or reject PC recommendation. If Chief rejects, written explanation provided for rejection. If majority of PC disagrees after explanation, PC shall report disagreement to Mayor.</p>	<p>UoF involving injury, and matters involving bias.</p> <p>A. Conflict with Recommendations.</p> <p>If a conflict arises between the recommendations of the oversight body and Chief, HR Director shall reconcile.</p>	<p>If the Chief does not follow recommendation for alternative disposition, they shall publish their objections and reasons.</p> <p>A. Conflict with Recommendations.</p> <p>Oversight body shall have the authority, in cases involving higher level infractions or police abuse, to impose discipline in conflict with the Chief.</p>
<p>B. Communication with Complainant.</p> <p>Communications with complainant informing them of the disposition or other status.</p>	<p>B. Communication with Complainant.</p> <p>Communication with complainant informing them of the disposition or other status.</p>	<p>B. Communication with Complainant.</p> <p>Oversight body shall have authority to publish findings, recommendations, and dispositions.</p>

Commented [JD5]: JRD Question, who is the final arbiter of the disagreement?

Commented [JD6]: Issues of investigative confidentiality should be addressed.

<p>PC may report performance concerns regarding the Chief to the Mayor.</p> <p>Annual report to City Council regarding summary of the number, type, and disposition of complaints, UoF incidents reported to the commission.</p> <p>V. Civilian Oversight Entity.</p> <p>Entity shall have professional staff including an oversight monitor.</p>	<p>V. Civilian Oversight Entity</p> <p>One body, up to 9 members, including one or two per district.</p> <p>Subcommittees including directives, discipline, and _____.</p> <p>Professional staff, at least .5 FTE, should be housed within City Attorneys Office, HR, but not BPD.</p>	<p>Oversight body shall have ability to review BPD training.</p> <p>Oversight body shall report auditing and monitoring activities to the public. This includes ability to publish anonymized complaints.</p> <p>REIB shall also have access to oversight body's data and analysis to report on UoF and other interactions that implicate equity issues.</p> <p>V. Civilian Oversight Entity.</p> <p>Independent body from PC to investigate and decide discipline.</p> <p>Membership appointed by the City Council after soliciting input from a range of community organizations. The body should represent the diverse nature of the City's constituents including those from historically marginalized communities.</p> <p>Professional staff including a monitor to assist with auditing functions, independent counsel.</p>
--	---	--

		Budget appropriations commensurate with responsibilities, staff, and other community commissions and boards.
--	--	--

