

Attachment 3

	Current Oversight of Law Enforcement	Review Board	Full Investigatory Board	Hybrid Review/Investigatory Board
Description	APD conducts all investigations (Office of External Affairs and Professional Responsibility); Human Rights Commission provides oversight on excessive force, demeaning language, and harassment cases; APD reports the results of internal investigations in these areas to the Executive Committee of the AHRC and the Director of the Office of Human Rights for their review.	APD Conducts all of the investigations, CPRB reviews the investigations and makes findings as to accuracy, completeness, and impartiality of investigations and issues recommendations as to discipline	CPRB conducts all investigations; APD no longer conducts any investigations (or no longer conducts certain kinds of investigations); Board becomes a separate city agency which obtains all necessary information for investigation and issues decisions on discipline	APD conducts all investigations except those assigned by the Code to the CPRB, with a focus on use of force by a law enforcement officer, death or serious injury to any person held in custody, serious abuse of authority or misconduct, allegedly discriminatory stops, and other incidents categorized as “abuse of authority” or “severe misconduct.”
Subpoena Power	Human Rights Commission has subpoena power	Rarely	Frequently	Potentially on the matters it investigates
Binding Disciplinary Authority	No	No	Frequently	Potentially on matters it investigates
Receive Community Complaints	No	Frequently	Frequently	Potentially
Decide How a Complaint will be Handled	No	Rarely	Frequently	Yes
Review Police Complaint Investigations (e.g. for thoroughness, completeness, accuracy)	Yes	Frequently	Rarely	Potentially
Conduct Independent, Fact-Finding Investigations	No	Rarely	Frequently	Frequently
Perform Data-Driven Policy Evaluations	No	Sometimes	Sometimes	Potentially
Recommend Findings on Investigations	Yes	Sometimes	Frequently	Frequently
Where Model is Used		The majority of civilian oversight bodies in the US are review boards, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Fairfax CountyUrbana, ILKnoxville, TNSt. Paul, MNAlbany, NYSt. Petersburg, FL	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Washington, DCSan Francisco, CANashville, TNPittsburgh, PANew York, NYSan Diego County, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Portland, ORAlbuquerque, NMKansas City, MOAtlanta, GABerkeley, CACambridge, MA

Attachment 3

Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none">No additional public bodies are needed;Provides a third party review without a new entity needing to be formedAlready has subpoena powerCity Council appointed board	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Review Board and Management work as a team;Efficient process since investigations are all done the same way;Limited staffing needs because it can use the existing staff network;Provides an opportunity for review of certain complaints/incidents and investigations;Ensures the community has the ability to provide input into the complaint investigation process;Community review of complaint/incident investigations may increase public trust in the process;Generally the least expensive form of oversight since it typically relies on the work of volunteers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Fully independent of law enforcement agency;Full-time civilian investigators may have highly specialized training;May reduce bias in investigations into resident complaints;Civilian-led investigations may increase community trust in the process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Recognizes different levels of investigative needs;Generally less expensive than full investigative bodies, but more expensive than review-focused bodies;Still uses existing processes/systems;Utilizes aspects of the investigative, review and auditing models in a combination that may be unique to the community in order to achieve the balance of oversight demanded by the community;Provides the freedom and the responsibility to tailor the various components of the system to the particular needs and characteristics of the community;Some researchers call a hybrid model the “Ideal Police Review System.”
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Human Rights Commission has other responsibilities as well;May not have expertise on policing matters;Human Rights Commission does not have independent authority to investigate police misconduct, not all investigations are independent of APD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">May have limited authority and few organizational resources;May rely entirely on law enforcement for information;Review board volunteers may have significantly less expertise in police issues, limited time to perform their work;May be less independent than other forms of oversight without independent staff support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Most expensive and organizationally complex form of civilian oversight;Will require additional staff;Subpoena authority used to compel citizens (e.g., complainants or, more likely, witnesses) to testify or provide documents or other evidence could raise concerns from community;Removes disciplinary responsibility and, therefore, control of employees from Chief of Police;Has the potential to undermine the responsibility of the Chief of Police to maintain discipline;Civilian investigators may face strong resistance from police personnel, create adversarial relationship;Sets high expectations for change with the public, may result in disillusionment when expectations are not met quickly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">More expensive and organizationally complex form of civilian oversight than simple review;Will require additional staff.
Cost to City of Alexandria	No additional cost	The cost for a review focused civilian oversight board (based on the experience of other jurisdictions) would include the cost of	The cost for an investigation focused civilian oversight board (based on the experience of other jurisdictions) would include the cost of an Executive Director (\$200,000per year), the	The cost of a hybrid model depends largely on how the work is divided. Likely, it would include the cost of an Executive Director/Auditor (\$200,000 per year), at least

Attachment 3

		<p>an Executive Director (\$150,000¹ per year), the cost of an additional Assistant City Attorney I in the City Attorney’s Office (\$100,000 per year) and an annual budget for other expenses (approximately \$75,000per year) for a total cost of Model A = \$325,000 per year.</p>	<p>cost of two investigators (based on a best practice ratio of one investigator per 150 officers) (\$200,000 per year), the cost of an board appointed attorney (\$150,000 per year) and an annual budget for other expenses (approximately \$175,000 per year). Additionally, an additional Assistant City Attorney I in the City Attorney’s Office would still be needed because the impact the board relationship with the City’s structure will have will create additional legal work. (\$100,000 per year). Total cost of Model B = \$825,000 per year.</p>	<p>one investigator, potential cost of outside counsel needs for certain investigations (\$75,000 per year), the cost of an additional Assistant City Attorney I in the City Attorney’s Office (\$100,000), as well as the costs of other expenses (\$125,000). Total Cost of Model C = \$500,000 per year.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

¹ All cited personnel costs in this table include a 30% for fringe benefits.