

Report on the Activities of the Ad Hoc Police Oversight Task Force

Prepared for the City Council of Albuquerque in Conformance with Resolution 13-143

Part 1: Introduction

The purpose of this document is to report the activities and recommendations of the Police Oversight Task Force (POTF) to the City Council of Albuquerque (CCOA). The document has three basic aims. The first aim is to document the creation of the POTF by the CCOA and the subsequent selection and backgrounds of the community members that served on it. The second is to recount the primary actions of the POTF during its meetings and deliberations from August 20, 2013 to January 29, 2014 and to transmit pertinent materials and information used in them. The third aim is to formally present the recommendations adopted by the POTF as well as other proposals, suggestions, and considerations considered important enough by the task force to be included in this report.

The document is divided in four parts or sections. The first part is this *Introduction* which lays out the purpose of the document and orients the reader to what will follow. This part does not serve as an executive summary but does serve as a roadmap to help guide the reader. The second part is the *Background* of the POTF leading to its recommendations. This part includes the POTF's formation and its plenary public meetings and hearings, as well as the meetings of its standing and ad hoc committees. The third section of this report is an *Overview of the Police Oversight Process (POP) Study* which is the primary focus of the POTF and the offices which it has examined in its considerations. These offices include both the Police Oversight Commission (POC) and the Independent Review Office (IRO) and, to a lesser degree, the Albuquerque Police Department's (APD) Internal Affairs Unit (IA). In addition, because it was primary information used in POTF study and deliberations, this section covers previous reports on the CCP commissioned over the years by the City of Albuquerque (COA) and examines the disposition of the recommendations in these reports. The fourth part of the report, and the most important, is the set of *Recommendations* developed by the POTF for the CCOA and other considerations which were deemed of sufficient import to be included. These recommendations and other matters are the chief work of the POTF.

The narrative parts of this report are a compendium of the work of the POTF. Therefore, description is kept to a minimum and seeks to summarize principal inputs, actions, and outputs of the task force while completing its work. In order to substantiate this description, all sections of the report make reference to and are backed up by a set of appendices. These

appendices are the bulk of the report. In the main, these appendices comprise the inputs into the reflections of the POTF such as requested research, other reports, or presentations from scheduled speakers; however, they also encompass the outputs of the POTF meetings and workings including agenda, minutes, and plans as well as the number, scope, and duration of the various task force meetings as recounted in agenda. In addition, these appendices present summaries of public input at public hearings or town halls which were held by the POTF as mandated by the CCOA. These latter documents are presented both in analyzed and raw form so that the reader may check analysis against comments.

Part 2: Background

As indicated by this document and prior reports, the COA (POP) embodied in the Citizen Police Complaint Process (CPCP) has been the subject of study for improvement for nearly twenty years. The current notice of the process, resulting in a CCOA resolution forming the POTF, took place over a year in which the press paid considerable notice to issues raised about the POC and its operations (see Appendix A: Albuquerque Journal Clippings on the POC). On the one hand, the POC handled particularly delicate matters such as appeals of IRO investigations, one into the shooting of an Iraq war veteran by the APD. On the other these issues included allegations of conflict of interest on the part of a POC member, violations of the New Mexico Open Meetings Act (OMA) and subsequent lawsuits on that matter, as well as longstanding vacancies on the POC which the CCOA did not fill.

A. City Council Action

In response to the foregoing events, the initial CCOA action was to consider an ordinance to suspend the POC and its operations (O-13-51). This ordinance failed with three for and six against. Nevertheless, subsequent CCOA action (F/S R-13-143) recognizing “recent events have eroded the public’s faith in the police oversight process and ... that the process needs to be reevaluated and changed if necessary,” resulted in the formation of the POTF (see Appendix B: Resolutions).

On May 20, 2013 the CCOA passed unanimously 8-0 with one member (Harris) excused a resolution to form an “ad hoc” POTF (see Appendix B: Resolutions). The resolution further indicated that the POTF was to have eleven members with various specified specialties and that it was to complete its work by the end of December 2013 (Subsequently extended to January 31, 2014 by another resolution R-13-143). This resolution not only initiated the POTF but charged it with two main duties. The first was to evaluate the present CPCP and “report back to the CCOA with its recommendations for improving the police oversight process.” In so doing the resolution specified that, among other things, the POTF should review the prior reports on the POP reviewed in this report. The second duty was to mandate that the POTF hold at least three “Town Hall” meetings throughout the city to “...encourage [the public] to provide comments or suggestions for improving the police oversight process.” In addition, the resolution provided an appropriation of up to fifty thousand dollars to fund the POTF in its sessions and deliberations.

B. Task Force Formation and Meetings

The first task in implementation of F/S R-13-143 was to recruit, select and qualify the task force members specified in the resolution. Once selected and appointed by the CCOA the POTF then needed to organize itself and its work in order to perform both its regular business and complete its study of the POP. After the POTF kicked off its review work, scheduling supporting activities, deliberating on the issues brought up by members, and taking both formal action and conducting informal efforts occupied the bulk of its time.

1. Selection Process

To implement resolution F/S R-13-143, CCOA staff acted to develop and post the announcement and an application on the CCOA website to recruit citizens to serve on the POTF. In addition, a press release was developed to obtain press involvement in publicizing recruitment for the eleven positions required for the task force. Also, a press release was sent to the Albuquerque Journal resulting in an article publicizing the recruitment of members (See Appendix C: Journal Coverage). This strategy for promotion proved successful as one hundred and eleven people applied for the various specific positions (See Appendix D: Application). Ultimately, eleven members with the specified backgrounds and qualifications were identified and then selected to serve on the POTF.

- Ralph Arellanes, Non-profit advocacy member
- Frances Armijo, Community at large member
- Fabrizio Bertoletti, Governmental efficiency member
- Hans Erickson, Investigative/prosecutorial member
- Nancy Koenigsberg, Non-profit advocacy member
- Andrew Lipman, Community at large member
- Craig Loy, Community at large member
- Edmund Perea, Retired from APD member
- Peter Simonson, Civil liberties member
- Alan Wagman, Community at large member
- Leonard Waites, Community at large member

As indicated by the foregoing, the members selected represented a diverse cross section of the community. In addition, they filled the requirements of professional and other specialties required by F/S R-13-143 (see Appendix E: Members and Bios). With membership selected and members agreeing to serve, the POTF was able to begin to carry out its duties.

2. Task Force Meetings

The POTF began its deliberations on August 8, 2013 holding its organizational meeting in the Council Committee Room at the COA City Hall. Ten members were present and one joined the meeting by teleconference. As its first order of business, the POTF elected a Chair, Andrew Lipman and Vice Chair, Hans Erikson who then presided at that and subsequent meetings. As a way to underscore its commitment to openness in its deliberations, the POTF elected to hear public comment at all of its regular meetings.

As provided under OMA (mandated for the POTF by F/S R-13-143), all POTF meetings and agenda were duly noticed by publication on the CCOA website and copies provided to the public at each meeting. Likewise, meeting minutes were made available to the public both on the CCOA website and at regular meetings of the task force. Additional documents produced or considered by the POTF were both posted on the CCOA website and made available to the public at meetings. These included the prior studies of the POP considered by the POTF and covered in this document under Part 3, b. Prior Studies and Reforms of the CPCP below.

Thirteen regular meetings of the POTF were held (See Appendix F: List of Meeting Dates, Places and Times). Regular meetings of the POTF were used to conduct its routine business. This routine business included hearing public comment at each regular meeting. As well as hearing public comment, the routine business included regular parliamentary actions under Roberts Rules of Order (as mandated by F/S R-13-143). These actions covered organizational items such as adoption of the current session's agenda (See Appendix G: Agenda), approval of the minutes of the previous meeting (See Appendix H: Minutes), and setting future meeting dates and times.

Also, other particular business actions took place at the POTF regular meetings such as planning work and adopting resolutions or other motions that were introduced by POTF members or that were developed and introduced by subcommittees (See below 4. Task Force Subcommittee Meetings). For example, the POTF adopted a Work Plan or Roadmap which was used to guide its work to completion (See Work Plan in Appendix I: Documents) and that provided an initial, illustrative outline for this report. As another example, the POTF discussed and approved a communication to the CCOA expressing concern about the potential impact of the APD and Albuquerque Police Officers Association (APOA) contract negotiations in developing and adopting the recommendations contained in this report (See Memo in Appendix I: Documents).

As contemplated in F/S R-13-143, the POTF also heard testimony from Subject Matter Experts (SME) or other speakers invited to present information to it (See Appendix J: List of Speakers). In all, the POTF invited and heard from ten presenters during the course of its deliberations. Those presenting included the current Chair and Vice Chair of the POC, several sitting POC members, the IRO, representatives of APOA and APD/IA, and the lead author of the 2011 MGT report. As a rule, follow up questions were posed to the SMEs by POTF members and some SMEs were invited to return for additional testimony or to answer additional questions.

In addition to its routine and particular business actions taken at its meetings, the POTF also held a facilitated process for development and adoption of recommendations. The employment of facilitation was due to the recognition by the POTF members of the difficulty of gaining broad agreement on a specific set of recommendations for the CCOA given their divergent background, experience, and points of view. Therefore, during six regular POTF meetings from December 4, 2013 through January 21, 2014, time was set aside for facilitated

interaction by the POTF and approximately eighteen hours of meeting time were devoted to the facilitated process to develop and gain agreement on recommendations. During this facilitated process the rules were suspended, binding votes were not taken, and the chair did not preside over the meeting. Rather, the facilitated process was led by an outside facilitator, Mr. Timothy Karpoff, brought in for the purpose of guiding these sessions to develop and gain broad agreement. This process resulted in the recommendations included in this report in Part Four.

3. Task Force Town Halls

As well its regular meetings, the POTF held three “town hall meetings” as required by F/S R-13-143 to solicit comments and suggestions about the POP from the public. The three meetings were held at three COA public sites in different quadrants of the city. The first forum was held September 3, 2013 at the North Valley Senior Center and subsequent ones were held on September 17 at the West Mesa Community Center and October 17 at the Cesar Chavez Community Center (See Appendix F: List of Meeting Dates, Places and Times). At its early meetings, discussion was held by the POTF about the possibility of holding a “virtual town hall” aimed at increasing opportunities for participation and coverage of the city, but largely due to the press of other duties and the constraints of a limited time in the CCOA resolution, this proposal was not implemented

Participants at the three town halls that were held were enthusiastic although the number present was not overwhelming. In all, twenty-six members of the public commented to the POTF at the three town halls. A list of speakers, summary of these comments, and an analysis of their comments is presented in Appendix K: Speakers, Summary, and Analysis of Public Comments. Although specific comments raised a number of issues, analysis shows that comments touched on eight main themes or categories: police violence and corruption; fear of retaliation and confidentiality; public trust in the APD; POC independence and objectivity; POC professionalism, preparation, and training; public participation and transparency at POC meetings; purpose of the task force and the roles of its members; APD training and response capability. Of the total sixty-four mentions made in the foregoing eight categories over half, thirty-five or about fifty-five percent, were in just three categories: public trust in the APD (11 comments or about 20 percent); police violence and corruption (11 or about 17 percent); trust in the APD (11 or about 17 percent).

4. Task Force Subcommittee Meetings

The foregoing lays out the formation of the POTF and operations at its regular meetings and public hearings. As the minutes of these meetings indicate, the press of business at the regular meetings left little time for work planning or pointed identification, study, and discussion of particular areas for improvement of the current POP and involved offices.

As the POTF discussed and developed its work plan at regular meetings, the proposal surfaced to form subcommittees to plan and guide the POTF work as well as to more easily consider and study particular parts of the POP and related issues. To facilitate the planning of its work and do follow up of implementation of items adopted at regular meetings the POTF

formed a Management Subcommittee charged with these tasks. This was the first subcommittee formed by the POTF and it consisted of three members of the POTF including the POTF chair; CCOA staff was provided to it and attended its meetings.

Meeting regularly, this subcommittee developed, presented, and reconfigured suggested work plans and possible additional subcommittee structures to the full POTF. Information about potential subcommittees and their focus was sought from POTF members and this was used to develop additional subcommittees and their charges (See Appendix L: Subcommittee Areas of Interest). After deliberation about the number and types of subcommittees, the full POTF adopted three additional subcommittees for a total of four:

1. Management
2. Police Oversight Commission
3. Independent Review Office
4. Albuquerque Police Department Internal Affairs

Membership on subcommittees was determined by the POTF Chair after an expression of interest by POTF members. The POTF Chair served as an ex officio member on all subcommittees. Subcommittee assignments resulted in the following distribution of members to the subcommittees:

1. Management: Bertolotti (Chair), Lipman, Simonson
2. Independent Review Office: Wagman (Chair), Erikson, Bertolotti
3. Police Oversight Commission: Simonson (Chair), Armijo, Koenigsberg, Perea
4. Albuquerque Police Department Internal Affairs: Arellanes (Chair), Loy

Subcommittees met as often as each deemed necessary to develop reports for the full POTF; usually once each week. Subcommittee meeting dates and times were posted on the CCOA website and were open to the public. CCOA staff was provided to each subcommittee and attended meetings in order to provide support and transmit requests for additional resources or research. Some additional research was requested by subcommittees and provided to them to inform their deliberations (See Appendix M: Additional Subcommittee Requested Documents). This research was aimed at providing additional background to the materials already reviewed by the full POTF or answering specific subcommittee questions.

Although, the actual process followed for developing recommendations to present to the full POTF was particular to each subcommittee, the Management Subcommittee did provide some guidance to aid subcommittee deliberations. This consisted of two guidance documents. One document was set of cascading questions that could be considered and answered in turn by each subcommittee to help focus discussion and recommendations on identified problems. The other guidance document was a framework for preparing well considered and focused recommendations. The basic format of this framework was that used in the MGT Reports of pairing findings with recommendations. In addition to focusing

subcommittee deliberations in recommendation preparation, these two documents helped to make the subcommittee reports more similar in their scope and depth and therefore more easily compared by the full POTF (See Appendix N: Subcommittee Guidance Documents).

Subcommittees produced reports that were presented to the full POTF beginning at the meeting of December 4, 2013. Although subcommittee consensus was both hoped and aimed for, in the case of the IRO subcommittee, there was disagreement on the importance of some issues and a difference on the scope of improvements and reforms among the members. Therefore, the IRO subcommittee initially submitted both a majority and minority report. These subcommittee reports served as the principal and initial inputs into the facilitated sessions that followed to develop the recommendations contained in this report. (See Appendix O: Subcommittee Reports). After the presentation of these initial subcommittee reports, further written guidance was given for the formatting of subcommittee presentations and the facilitation process that followed (See Appendix N: Subcommittee Guidance Documents).

Part 3: Overview of Police Oversight Process Study

As mandated in F/S R-13-143, the POTF members reviewed and discussed both the current Police Oversight Process which is implemented by the CPCP and the prior studies and recommendations done on it. This was one of the first activities on the POTF work plan. Much of the preliminary study and work of the POTF at its meetings was occupied by this task.

Initial assessment of the current CPCP was done in three ways. First, by examining pertinent documents such as the POC Ordinance itself, the POC Rules and Regulations, and other current COA legal opinion on the appropriate reading and implementation of the ordinance (See Appendix P: POC Documents). Second, this was done by examining graphic depictions of the flow of work and key decisions that are implicit in those documents. Third, POTF members heard testimony from key actors in the CPCP on their roles and responsibilities and made inquiries of clarification on the CPCP.

POTF members were provided with the full text for their review of the three prior reports on the COA CPCP done in 1997 by Walker Luna and by MGT in 2005 and 2011. Also, these studies were placed on the POTF page on the CCOA website. In addition, staff prepared two sets of documents to help in the analysis of these prior reports and their impact on the CPCP. These two sets of documents are presented briefly below.

A. Brief Descriptions of the CCP

One challenge for the POTF in reviewing the current CPCP was squaring the flow of work and decisions as outlined in the POC Ordinance and the decisions and actions delineated in the POC Rules and Regulations. Also, some of the actual interactions and hand off among agencies and offices such as the POC, IRO and APD/IA are the result of ad hoc processes and arrangements made to accommodate changes not contemplated by those enabling documents or to conform to resource availability. To assist in analyzing these processes and structures,

staff developed decision flow charts and obtained other graphic depictions used by the IRO. These were presented to the POTF in a regular meeting to help outline and understand the current CPCP (See Appendix Q: Decision and Flow Charts).

As the flow charts make clear, there is some divergence between the POC Ordinance and its Rules and Regulations. Partly this is due to some internal contradictions in the POC Ordinance. The effect of this divergence is that it can be unclear when ad hoc procedures have been developed to address these instances or which procedure may be followed in some instance. Some examples of these divergences and lack of specificity:

- POC Rules and Regulations do not address IRO-POC non-concurrence
- POC Rules and Regulations do not address next step after appeal denial
- POC Rules and Regulations and the POC Ordinance differ on issuance of Complaint Response Letters
- POC Rules and Regulations and the POC Ordinance differ on appeals process to COA Chief Administrative Officer

B. Prior Studies and Reforms of the CPCP

Members of the POTF closely reviewed the reports done in by Walker-Luna and MGT. These reports were useful for preliminary and final deliberations of the POTF because they indicated sets of findings and recommendations that were useful in the current CPCP study. Nevertheless, two questions were raised by members of the POTF in discussing the findings in these documents. The first recurring question was how the reports compared over time in their analysis, findings, and recommendations. The second recurring question was what recommendations had been adopted and implemented over time by what offices and agencies and what were the reasons why some recommendations had been adopted and others had not been adopted.

To facilitate answering these questions, two sets of documents were prepared by staff for use by the POTF in making comparisons across documents and time. The first set of documents was a summary of each report focusing on the problems identified, findings, and the recommendations in each of the three principal reports. The second set of documents was a chart that summarized the status of the adoption of recommendations from the prior reports (See Appendix R: Prior Report Summaries). Using these reports the POTF was able to get an overview of at least partial answers to these questions.

As a review of Appendix R: Prior Report Summaries indicates, some parts of the CPCP have been changed or improved over the years and others have not. The system itself has changed from the Public Safety Advisory Board and Independent Counsel System mentioned in the Walker-Luna 1997 report to the current POC and IRO system which is the subject of the two MGT reports in 2006 and 2011. In addition to the change in the system, some recommendations in the prior studies were carried out, for example:

- CCOA taking a more active role in overseeing the system (Walker-Luna 1997)
- Extension of the citizen appeal deadline from ten business days to 30 calendar days (MGT 2006)
- Bringing POP processes into conformance with Garrity limitations (MGT 2006)
- Establishing criteria for complaints that are handled by the IRO and those referred to APD/IA (MGT 2006)
- Indication of mediated cases is now included in the quarterly and annual reports (MGT 2011)
- IRO has implemented a method of tracking Commissioner training through the office's administrative assistant (MGT 2011)
- Specific disciplinary outcomes of sustained complaints and long-term trend analysis are published in quarterly and annual reports (MGT 2011)

The IRO has been provided with the funding by the CCOA to hire a full-time analyst whose task it is, not to investigate complaints, but to monitor complaints and other data available in order to proactively address policy and systemic issues. (MGT 2011)

Nonetheless, as reflected in the POTF Recommendations (See below, Part 4: Recommendations) numerous other recommendations raised in the prior studies have been only partially addressed or not implemented. Due in part to the passage of time and the changing of actors as well as the inability to compel information from other branches of the municipal government, it was difficult for CCOA staff and for the POTF or to determine the specific impediments to the carrying out each recommendation. Nevertheless, it is clear that much of this situation is due to limited resources dedicated to the POC and IRO functions. In other cases, it is due to limitations on actions by the current POC Ordinance. In still other cases, it is due to actual opposition by actors in the POP. Some examples of recommendations from prior reports that were not put into effect:

- Undertake an outreach program to publicize complaint process (Walker-Luna 1997)
- Develop a brochure to include with the public letter record that defines in plain language the terms used to explain the outcome of the investigation of the CPC to the complainant (MGT 2006)
- Develop criteria that establish the minimum and maximum length of time the IA commander may work in that assignment (MGT 2006)
- A complete separation of responsibility, where APD/ IA handles only internal cases and the IRO handles all citizen complaints (MGT 2011)
- Amend the POC ordinance to require the POC, through the IRO, to consider the published chart of sanctions and recommend discipline for all sustained complaints, separate from the discipline imposed by the APD (MGT 2011)
- Extending the IRO contract time-period to more than a two year period as currently required (MGT 2011)

Many of the following POTF recommendations were developed to meet the perceived impediments to implementing changes in the POP suggested by outside study. Not the least of

these is the call for resources to support the POP that are not at play in the COA budget process. Another is the notion of creating a quasi-independent agency to carry out the POP.

Part 4: Recommendations

Using the facilitated process recounted above, the POTF, developed, refined, and adopted Recommendations for the CCOA as mandated in F/S R-13-143. This part of the report presents those recommendations and additional considerations approved by the POTF for transmittal to the CCOA. They are presented in two sections: Statement of Principles and Recommendations.

The Statement of Principles was adopted by the POTF as a potential aid to the interpretation of the recommendations transmitted in this report. POTF members desired to ensure that, if CCOA members had doubts about the sense of any recommendations, guidance was provided. The Statement of Principles was compared in POTF deliberations to the preamble of a code or ordinance which helps to provide background for interpretation.

The Recommendations approved by the POTF are organized into four Goals. The Goals are specific aims for what constitutes a radically transformed police oversight system. Under each Goal specific recommendations are offered as particular outcomes for implementation of the new system so that it functions both in accordance with the adopted Principles and to reach the stated Goals.

A. Statement of Principles

These recommendations and any related changes to the Police Oversight Ordinance shall be interpreted and construed to support the following legislative purposes:

A. to foster and perpetuate policing policies and practices that effectively maintain social order and which at the same time foster mutual trust and cooperation between the police and the citizenry

B. to ensure that the civilian police oversight body functions as independently as possible from the executive and legislative branches of the government of the City of Albuquerque

C. to provide citizens and police officers a fair and impartial forum for adjudication of grievances against individual police officers and against the police department as a whole

D. to gather and analyze data on trends, complaints, impacts, and practices concerning the actions of the Albuquerque Police Department, the impact of those actions on the community, and the impact of those actions on police/community relations

E. to provide policy guidance to the City Council, the Mayor, and the Chief of Police, including guidance on police procedures and guidelines

B. Recommendations Adopted by POTF

Goal 1: The Civilian Police Oversight Process will have a greater level of independence

Recommendations:

1. Mediation should be the first option for resolution of Citizen Police Complaints. Mediation services should be obtained from entities outside of City government. Mediators should be independent of the oversight body and APD, and should not be former employees of APD.
2. The Civilian Police Oversight Process should be structured as a quasi-public agency.
 - a. This agency (Civilian Police Oversight Agency) will be responsible for the full range of Civilian oversight of police, from investigation of individual Citizen Police Complaints through policy formation. The Agency will employ sufficient staff to carry out these functions.
 - b. The Agency will administer its own budget and supervise its own staff, in compliance with the City's Merit Ordinance and contractual services policies and procedures (Public Purchases Ordinance).
 - c. The Agency should employ an attorney to provide legal advice and to advocate for Agency positions before other branches of City government.
3. The Civilian Police Oversight Agency should have a dedicated and independent source of funding.
 - a. Funding will be determined by a specific metric, for example, an amount equal to a percentage of the total APD budget, or a per capita amount per police officer.
 - b. If legally possible, members of the newly formed Civilian Police Oversight Board will receive a stipend/compensation (but will not be eligible for City benefits).
4. Citizen Police Complaint findings should not be released to APD prior to finalization by the Agency.

Goal 2: The Civilian Police Oversight Agency will be invested with clearly defined and broader authority

Recommendations:

5. The Civilian Police Oversight Agency should have the authority to recommend officer disciplinary action from the Chart of Sanctions for sustained Citizen Police Complaints.
 - a. The Chief of APD must respond in writing if the recommended disciplinary action is not imposed.
6. The Civilian Police Oversight Agency should have the authority to recommend changes to APD policy, training, programs, and procedures.
 - a. The Chief of APD must respond in writing to the recommendations, indicating which recommendations will be followed and providing an explanation for those that will not be followed.
7. The Civilian Police Oversight Agency should have greater access to civilian complaints, court complaints, and Internal Affairs case data.
 - a. This will allow greater analysis and understanding of trend data to support recommended policy changes.
8. The Civilian Police Oversight Agency should periodically audit individual Citizen Police Complaints and act as an appeal body for all Citizen Police Complaints.
 - a. The Agency shall have access to full investigative files, including statements of witnesses and police officers.
 - b. The Agency shall have the authority to subpoena documents and witnesses and take testimony under oath.
9. The length of time that citizens have to file Citizen Police Complaints from the date of incident should be increased to 120 days.
10. All complaints about direct civilian-officer interaction should be routed to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency, regardless of source.
 - a. All internal APD complaints not relating to civilian-officer interaction will be handled in accordance with APD policy.

Goal 3: The Board of the Civilian Police Oversight Agency should be broadly representative of the entire community and should be balanced geographically and demographically, and with respect to the stakeholders of the police oversight process. The Board will collectively have a broad range of skills, backgrounds and experience

Recommendations:

11. The Board of the Civilian Police Oversight Agency should consist of nine members, selected at-large.
12. Civilian Police Oversight Agency Board members should serve a maximum of two, three-year terms on a staggered basis.
13. Civilian Police Oversight Agency Board members should be selected through the following process:
 - a. The City Council will form a selection committee of five members who are not elected officials or members of City Council staff.
 - b. The selection committee will establish a well-publicized, fair and equitable application process.
 - c. The selection committee will evaluate prospective Board members according to the following minimum standards:
 - i. Residency within the Albuquerque city limits.
 - ii. Successfully pass a background check.
 - iii. Personal history lacking any pattern of unsubstantiated complaints against APD.
 - iv. Have the demonstrated ability to engage in mature, impartial decision making.
 - d. The selection committee will submit their recommendations for Board membership to the City Council for approval.
14. Upon selection, Civilian Police Oversight Agency Board members will complete an orientation program consisting of the following:
 - a. Attendance at Board meetings.
 - b. Becoming familiar with Agency policy and procedures.
 - c. Failure to complete the orientation program will result in not being appointed to the Board.
15. All Civilian Police Oversight Agency Board members should complete a specific training program, which shall consist of:

- a. Completion of the APD Civilian Police Academy.
 - b. Civil Rights training.
 - c. A specific number of APD ride-alongs.
 - d. Annual firearms simulation training (FATS).
 - e. Internal Affairs training.
 - f. Periodic additional training programs.
 - g. Board members are also encouraged to attend national conferences and workshops relating to police oversight, such as the annual NACOLE conference.
- Failure to comply with the training requirements may result in dismissal from the Board.

Goal 4: The Civilian Police Oversight Agency will develop and implement a program of community outreach with the intent of reaching a broader segment of the community

Recommendations:

16. The Civilian Police Oversight Agency will report on its community outreach efforts to the City Council on a semi-annual basis.
17. The Board of the Civilian Police Oversight Agency should be given a new name to reflect the changes recommended.
18. Citizens should be provided with adequate notice when their Citizen Police Complaint will be heard by the Agency.

List of Acronyms Used

Albuquerque Police Department (APD)
Albuquerque Police Officers Association (APOA)
City Council of Albuquerque (CCOA)
City of Albuquerque (COA)
Citizen Police Complaint Process (CPCP)
Independent Review Office (IRO)
New Mexico Open Meetings Act (OMA)
Police Oversight Process (POP)
Police Oversight Task Force (POTF)
Police Oversight Commission (POC)
Subject Matter Experts (SME)

DRAFT