

Recommendations from the [Majority Report](#) of the Work Group convened in 2000 by Mayor Vera Katz

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty said at a July 23, 2020, press conference that she voted with the majority as a member of the work group. Her name in 2000 was Jo Ann Bowman.

Excerpted from the report:

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS- The Following is the Actual Language of the Recommendations Passed by a Majority and/or Unanimous Vote of the Work Group.³

#1. That, regardless of which model is recommended, there be a feedback instrument for both the complainant and the officer and that the feedback be optional and that statistics be kept.

Implemented

#2. That a dual intake procedure be initiated, making it possible for persons who are afraid or reluctant to go to the police with their complaints to go to another office outside the Police Bureau, where the complaints will be taken by non-police personnel.

Implemented

#3. That the civilian review system have the ability to perform independent investigations of allegations of police misconduct.

Implemented

#4. That there not be dual investigations of citizen complaints, and that citizens have the ability to choose either IAD or the civilian review board to do the investigation, but not both.

[NOTE: Part VII(B)(2) says: "The work group discussed the role of IAD after the establishment of a review board and concluded that the IAD should continue to serve both as a vehicle for internal Police Bureau complaints (officer vs. officer) and continue to serve as an optional vehicle for citizen complaints."]

Partially implemented

Implemented (Either IPR or Internal Affairs investigates a complaint.)

Not implemented (Complainant chooses investigator)

#5. That the Police Chief and the Police Commissioner be required to respond in writing to policy recommendations within sixty days; and that if the review board is not satisfied with the Chief's/Commissioner's response, he/she must publicly present his/her response to the City Council.

Partially implemented

Implemented (Chief's response to IPR's policy recommendations are published)

Not Implemented (IPR does not refer recommendations to Council)

#7. That PIIAC/the review board have the power to review completed investigations of police shootings and deaths in custody, regardless of who conducts the investigation, and that the board's findings be made public.

Implemented (Auditor's Office contracts with experts to review closed files, publish reports, and meet with community groups and City Council to discuss results)

#9. That sworn statements not be required at the intake stage.

Implemented

#10. That an oath (sworn statement) be required if a case is deemed worthy of investigation, especially if the statement is to be given evidentiary weight.

Partially implemented (Complainants and witnesses are not required to swear an oath. Officers are required by Code to participate in IPR interviews and are read an admonishment from the Chief that they face discipline if they do not participate truthfully.)

#11. That investigations into alleged police misconduct should be completed within 70 days as per the current General Order.

Implemented (in substantial compliance with requirement in Department of Justice settlement agreement)

#13. (a) That PIIAC (if it remains an Auditing Body) be able to change a Police Bureau finding and that this disposition be binding; (b) that the citizen review board have the authority to make a final finding that is binding.

Partially implemented

Substantially implemented (IPR can controvert the finding of an officer's manager to send the case to the Police Review Board)

Not implemented (Citizen Review Committee appeal decisions are not binding)

#15. That the final say on discipline belongs to the Chief of Police.

Implemented

#16a. That the citizen review board have the ability to recommend that discipline happens, and that the Chief/Commissioner should respond in writing within thirty days with an explanation if the recommendation is not accepted.

Partially implemented (Community members sit on both the Citizen Review Committee and the Police Review Board. The Police Review Board recommends discipline to the chief.)

#17. That PIIAC's recommendation that there be one investigator per 100 sworn officers be forwarded to City Council.

Implemented (Ratio is 1:57 based on budgeted positions.)

#18. That regardless of the model chosen, hearings will be public with the exception of personnel, medical, employment, and criminal issues and at the discretion of the committee.

Implemented (Citizen Review Committee appeal hearings are public.)

#19. That the model will allow for public hearings to discuss police policy and recommend changes to the police chief/commissioner.

Implemented (Citizen Review Committee meetings are public.)

#20. That the board be granted power to compel testimony of witnesses, including police officers, subject to due process and right to counsel, and that the City Council should implement changes to the City Charter or recommend changes to state law as necessary to effect this power.

Implemented (Independent Police Review is authorized in Code to subpoena non-sworn witnesses and documents. Code requires sworn Bureau members to participate in interviews or face discipline.)

#21. That the review board/PIIAC be located in a building separate from City Hall and the Police Bureau.

Not implemented (Independent Police Review is located in the Auditor's Office in City Hall. The Citizen Review Committee generally holds its public meetings in City Hall conference rooms and larger spaces.)

#22. That members be appointed rather than elected and that term limits be instituted.

Implemented (The Auditor nominates Citizen Review Committee members for Council confirmation. Independent Police Review is a division of the Auditor's Office.)

#23. That complete training be mandated for all citizen members, to be completed within a specific period of time following appointment.

Implemented (Independent Police Review staff trains Citizen Review Committee and Police Review Board volunteers.)

#24. That complaint forms and training be made available to all social service agencies, community centers, and neighborhood associations.

Implemented

#25. That training be made available to volunteers to help complainants file complaints and move through the process.

Implemented

#26. That the City hire necessary staff/resources to coordinate the process for implementing the previous two recommendations and that those resources be available to provide training.

Implemented

#27. That the necessary resources be designated to design and implement a Public Awareness Outreach Program.

Implemented

#27a. That regardless of the model, mediation should be available to all parties involved.

Implemented