

# THE NACOLE REVIEW

SPRING 2003

## IN THIS ISSUE

- 2 LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT,  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
- 3 NACOLE MEMBERSHIP  
APPLICATION
- 4 OMAHA: A YEAR IN REVIEW  
BY TRISTAN BONN
- 5 CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT: TOOLS  
FOR SUCCESS - TOOLS FOR  
JUSTICE
- 6 NACOLE 2003 CONFERENCE  
HOTEL INFORMATION
- 7 NACOLE 2003 CONFERENCE  
REGISTRATION FORM
- 8 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CREATES A  
NEW MODEL OF OVERSIGHT  
BY STEPHEN J. CONNOLLY, RAY  
JURADO, ILANA B.R. ROSENZWEIG
- 10 POLICE RESPONSE TO PERSONS  
WITH MENTAL ILLNESS: SEATTLE  
CREATES NEW UNIT  
BY L.J. EDDY
- 12 NACOLE 2002 ANNUAL REPORT



## NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT (NACOLE) 9<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE

September 21 - September 24, 2003  
MILLENNIUM BILTMORE HOTEL | LOS ANGELES  
506 S. Grand Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90071

**Reservations: 800.245.8673**

{ **ON THE WEB @ [WWW.NACOLE.ORG](http://WWW.NACOLE.ORG)** }

### Contents

Home | History | FAQ  
Membership Application  
Board of Directors  
Nacole Review  
National Conferences  
NACOLE Update Mailing List

### Information & Guidance

U.S. Oversight Agencies  
Resources for Oversight  
Investigative Guidelines  
Varieties of Oversight  
Mediation | Board Training  
Bias Based Policing  
A Student's Guide to Police Practices

Independent Investigation into Police Conduct in an  
Environment of Terrorism

Citizen Review of Police Complaints: Four Critical  
Dimensions of Value

## LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

This is the first issue of the newsletter for 2003. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the entire membership and all those who attended the 2002 conference in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Additionally, I want to thank the NACOLE Board of Directors for their contribution and commitment to the organization. Welcome to new Board Members Denise Deforest, Eduardo Diaz and Pierce Murphy.

The 2002 conference was a huge success. The conference evaluation feedback we received was a key indicator of the excellent level of satisfaction with the quality of panels, workshops, top-notch speakers and the overall program offered. Enclosed is the annual report detailing 2002 accomplishments and the Board of Directors management of the association's business.

The planning for the 2003 conference is well under way. As a result of feedback from the general membership, the NACOLE Board of Directors has selected topics broad enough to allow thought provoking and spirited discussions on a range of issues in Policing and Civilian Oversight Post September 11th. The theme of this year's conference is **Civilian Oversight: Tools for Success - Tools for Justice. The two and one-half day conference will be from Sunday, September 21 to Wednesday, September 24, 2003.**

As always, NACOLE is committed to bringing dynamic speakers, keynotes and panelists from far and wide to address the conferees, and at the same time, fostering an exceptional environment for exchange of ideas and life experiences from many perspectives in policing and civilian oversight in the United States and abroad.

In closing, there is no doubt that one of the most important features of our conference is the opportunity to meet and talk with old friends and make new ones. You will have the added advantage of networking opportunities with government representatives from all levels and individuals from the private sector both nationally and internationally. As we face new challenges brought on by the ever-changing world situation, this is a conference you certainly don't want to miss!

### **MALVINA MONTEIRO, NACOLE PRESIDENT**

---

#### NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

866.4NACOLE | [nacole@nacole.org](mailto:nacole@nacole.org)

#### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

##### **OFFICERS**

**President** :: Malvina Monteiro :: Cambridge, MA

**Vice President** :: Barbara Attard :: Berkeley, CA

**Secretary** :: James Johnson :: Cincinnati OH

**Treasurer** :: Rose Ceja-Aragon :: Denver, CO

**Past President** :: Sue Quinn :: San Diego, CA

##### **MEMBERS AT LARGE**

Robert Aaronson :: Palo Alto, CA

Denise DeForest :: Omaha, NE

Eduardo Diaz :: Miami, FL

Teresa Guerrero-Daley :: San Jose, CA

Pierce Murphy :: Boise, ID

Dede Wilhelm :: Kauai, HI

# MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

## PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:

**Organizational:** Name of Civilian Oversight Agency on which you serve/have served or for which you work/have worked. Dates of service or employment: \_\_\_\_\_

Organizational members are agencies that provide civilian oversight of law enforcement by legislative or executive mandate. These agencies will receive one transferable regular membership and non-voting memberships for the remaining members of their boards/ staffs. **Annual dues: \$300**

**Regular:** Regular members are individuals who are not sworn law enforcement officers and who serve/have served as Board/Commission members or staff for agencies mandated by legislative or executive authority to investigate and review complaints against law enforcement officers.

**Annual dues: \$150.** Dates of service or employment: \_\_\_\_\_

**Associate:** Associate members are individuals concerned with the oversight of law enforcement. These members shall be able to participate in all NACOLE activities, including serving on committees, but are ineligible to vote or serve as officers. **Annual dues: \$100.**

### Please fill in the following:

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Name**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Organization**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Title**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Organization telephone (with area code)**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Organization address**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**City, State, Zip**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Home address**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**City, State, Zip**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Home telephone (with area code)**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Organization fax**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Home fax**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Home e-mail**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Organization e-mail**

**Are you a sworn member of a law enforcement agency?**  Yes  No

**MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO NACOLE. MAIL FORM AND PAYMENT TO:**

### NACOLE

P.O. Box 19261  
DENVER, CO 80219

PLEASE CALL OR E-MAIL IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS

TELEPHONE: 866.4NACOLE (866.462.2653)

E-MAIL: NACOLE@NACOLE.ORG

In August 2000, the Omaha City Council adopted an ordinance creating the Office of the Independent Police Auditor. With the support of a strong grass roots movement and the nationally recognized expertise of local university professor Sam Walker, the community opted for an auditor model of oversight. Oversight was opposed by the Police Union, Police Chief and the Mayor, but largely supported by City Council. The ordinance, although adopted in August 2000, was not funded until January 2001 and an auditor was not hired until the spring. A funny thing happened on the way to opening the office . . . . An election was held. Running on the issue of the Auditor's Office, among other things, the incumbent Mayor, and most of City Council, was unseated. The result was a mayor who supported the Auditor's Office and a City Council that, largely, did not.

The Auditor's Office opened June 4, 2001, one week before the new administration took office. The Auditor's Office was charged with oversight of the citizen complaint process conducted by the internal affairs unit of the Omaha Police Department. To that end, the auditor would monitor and audit citizen complaints investigated by the internal affairs unit. The auditor would have complete access to investigative files and the ability to attend interviews and request further investigation. The auditor would also collect statistical data regarding

citizen complaints and report patterns and trends of complaint through the publication of a quarterly report. In addition, the auditor would conduct public outreach to advise the public about the functions of the office. The office was originally budgeted for the auditor, an assistant auditor, and a secretary for a total first year budget of \$170,000.00.

---

---

**To supporters of the office, a sufficient budget was critical to the office's success.**

---

---

From the beginning, the cost of the office has been a point of contention. To opponents, the auditor represented a waste of taxpayer dollars; money better spent on police services. To supporters of the office, a sufficient budget was critical to the office's success. The week the new mayor and council were sworn in, they learned of a \$15 million revenue shortfall. In its first month of existence, the Auditor's Office was threatened with closure. While the Auditor's Office survived the budget cuts, the assistant's position did not.

Then, in October 2001, one of the newly elected city councilmen, who opposed the office, placed the ordinance that created the Auditor's Office on the agenda for repeal. This action prompted another round of debates about the merits of the office. A public hearing on

the matter was well attended. Supporters of the office showed up en masse and recounted, again, the reasons why they supported oversight. Those opposing the Auditor, including the Police Union and several councilmen, voiced the opinion that the office was unnecessary and that funds were needed for more pressing matters. The item was set over for a vote. Before the final vote could be taken, the City received a gift from an anonymous donor that covered the costs of the Auditor's Office. Concerns over potential conflicts of interest were quieted when the donor's identity was revealed; a local private foundation had made the gift. With the funding issue solved, opponents, lead by the union, called for oversight of the entire City, claiming it was not fair to single out the Police Department. Supporters of the office maintained this was a further attempt to dilute the auditor's focus and undercut the effectiveness of the office. In the end, a compromise was reached. The ordinance, with the addition of the Fire Department and a name change to "Public Safety Auditor," survived, but the funding authorization was repealed. All of this occurred in the first six months of the office's opening.

The controversy surrounding the office diminished at the beginning of 2002. Since then, the office has been conducting its usual business. While there was very little start-up time, the office began monitoring cases

*continued on page 8 >>*

# CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT: TOOLS FOR SUCCESS - TOOLS FOR JUSTICE

## 2003 NACOLE 9<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE

NACOLE's 2003 training and development conference will be held in Los Angeles, California from Sunday, September 21 to Wednesday, September 24, 2003. Distinguish speakers, presenters and practitioners in the field of Civilian Oversight from through US will be featured.

Series of professional and development training workshops, individual and panel presentations and networking sessions will be offered at this year's conference. There will be a lot more time for question and answer periods between presenters and conferees. The conference agenda will focus on the following topics:

**Recognizing Excessive Force** :: Including Demonstrations

**Force Applied "Case Studies"** :: Foot/Vehicle Pursuits and Mental Illness

**Justice Post 911** :: Intelligence Gathering, Mass Demonstrations & First Amendment Issues

**Insights on a Serious Police Misconduct Case**

**Success in Civilian Oversight** :: What Programs Work?

**Forum** :: Various Models of Civilian Oversight

**Interviewing Tough Witnesses and Judging Credibility**

**Mediation**

Save these dates on your calendar and plan to stay a few days before and after the conference and visit the beautiful City of Los Angeles. More detailed information about the conference will be posted to: [www.nacole.org](http://www.nacole.org) as it becomes available.

---

## BENEFITS OF THE CONFERENCE

- Exposure to critical law enforcement issues shaping our future.
- Opportunities to undertake new roles in civilian oversight nationally and locally.
- Opportunities to meet and share ideas with leaders in the civilian oversight field.
- Excellent written materials, handouts and sample reports from other practitioners in civilian oversight.
- Membership in a fast-growing national network of civilian oversight and law enforcement leaders across the United States.
- Development of essential skills to involve the community as a partner in community policing.
- Extensive national dialogue between law enforcement personnel, citizens and civilian oversight practitioners.
- Define what communities need to know when establishing a civilian oversight system, changing existing review mechanisms and what accomplishments can be expected in the short and long term in any jurisdiction.
- Network with city and state agencies to promote civilian oversight and police accountability reform processes.
- Explain types of resistance used to derail or co-opt any form of civilian oversight system and effective strategies of countering that resistance.
- Discuss what a community can expect to gain from a functioning civilian review process, and how citizen review agencies are effective in the reduction of municipal liability suits.

# NACOLE 9<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE

(NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT)

**MEETING DATES: SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2003, THROUGH WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2003**

## CONFERENCE HOTEL:

**MILLENNIUM BILTMORE HOTEL | LOS ANGELES**

506 S. Grand Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90071

**Reservations: 800.245.8673**

## ROOM RATES:

Single/Occupancy	<b>\$129.00 per night</b>
Double Occupancy	<b>\$139.00 per night</b>
Additional Person	<b>\$20.00 per night</b>
Suites	<b>\$450.00+ per night</b>

A historic landmark, the Millennium Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, has been home to presidents, kings and Hollywood celebrities since it opened in 1923. The hotel's central location in downtown's business district provides an inner-city retreat for your group's attendees. A full array of concierge services, health club facilities and business services are offered in the old-world charm and elegance of great European hotels.

Millennium Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles is located at the corner of Fifth and Grand, in the financial and cultural heart of downtown Los Angeles. The hotel is within close proximity to the Staples Center Arena, Music Center, the Civic Center, theaters, shopping and restaurants. Just up the street are freeways which enable quick and easy access to Beverly Hills, Hollywood, Marina del Rey, Disneyland and Universal Studios. The Metro Subway is located across the street from the hotel. L.A. International Airport is just 30 minutes away. For more information visit: <http://www.millenniumhotels.com>.

The rates are extended for the period **three days before through three days after** the conference. The Room Rates do not include taxes. **Current taxes on hotel guest rooms are 14%, which rate is subject to change without notice.**

## RESERVATIONS

Guest reservations will be made by call in and must be received by the **cut-off date, Friday, September 5, 2003**. A valid major credit card or other deposit satisfactory must secure reservations to the Hotel. The hotel accepts American Express, Master Card, Visa, Diner's Club and Discover Card.

**To make room reservations by telephone, please call 800.245.8673.**

Check-in time is 3:00 p.m. on the first date reserved. Check out time is 12:00 noon. A late-departure charge may apply for any room occupied after the checkout time.

## TRANSPORTATION

The Millennium Biltmore Hotel is served by Super Shuttle (currently \$13.50 each way) from LAX Airport on a regular daily schedule.

## PARKING

Overnight valet parking is available at the rate of \$22.00 per day.

## HEALTH CLUB

A full service Health Club is available for use by your attendees, currently at \$7 daily. Health Club features include saunas (wet and dry), exercise equipment (Nautilus, Life Cycles, imported Italian tile swimming pool circa 1926), steam room, whirlpool and massage therapists (additional fee).

# NACOLE 2003 CONFERENCE

## REGISTRATION FORM (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title/Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_

State/Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

### EARLY REGISTRATION (by August 29, 2003)

\$275 Regular Member - early registration/before August 29, 2003\*

\$325 Regular Member - late registration/after August 29, 2003

\$375 Non-Member - early registration/before August 29, 2003

\$425 Non-Member - late registration/after August 29, 2003

\*AGENCIES WITH ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIPS CAN REGISTER STAFF AND BOARD MEMBERS AT \$275/\$325 RATE.

**Amount Enclosed \$** \_\_\_\_\_

**Please make checks payable to NACOLE and mail to:**

P. O. Box 19261 Denver, CO 80219

Telephone 866.4NACOLE (866.462.2653) :: Fax 303.256.5491 :: E-mail Nacole@Nacole.org

**Please call or e-mail if you have questions**

---

### *For office use only*

Date postmarked \_\_\_\_\_ Date paid \_\_\_\_\_

Received by \_\_\_\_\_

p Cash                      p Check                      Check No. \_\_\_\_\_

Member Status \_\_\_\_\_

Registration Status                      p Early                      p Late

**No REFUND FOR CANCELLATION AFTER SEPTEMBER 10, 2003**

TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS MUST BE MADE EARLY AND THROUGH YOUR LOCAL TRAVEL AGENCY OR ANY MAJOR AIRLINE CARRIER

The Office of Independent Review (OIR), which monitors the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD), began its work in October of 2001. The County Board of Supervisors and LASD have provided OIR with many of the advantages associated with effective civilian oversight, including adequate resources and full access to departmental records, meetings, and personnel. Importantly, the outspoken support of the Sheriff himself also helped to establish a favorable climate from the start.

While these factors provided a strong foundation, the process of turning opportunity into positive results has nonetheless involved a learning curve for the new entity. One of the lessons to emerge is a "recipe" of sorts for recommending reforms to LASD and guiding them through to implementa-

tion. At NACOLE's 2002 Fall Conference in Cambridge, Massachusetts, OIR's six attorneys reported on their first year and shared their approach to achieving systemic change.

## IDENTIFY THE ISSUE(S)

OIR's work with LASD has two primary components: the independent monitoring of specific investigations into alleged officer misconduct, and the broader evaluation of policies, practices, and training issues that may be implicated by those investigations. For example, one of OIR's first major projects involved an incident that had provoked a civil rights lawsuit against Los Angeles County. The history of that case through the criminal and then civil courts revealed a number of issues that warranted further consideration.

Along with overseeing LASD's internal investigation of the incident, OIR identified systemic deficiencies that had contributed to the problems in the case. The deputies' alleged misconduct (including false report writing, false testimony, and evidence planting) was never substantiated. However, several avoidable lapses ended up lending credence to the plaintiff's claims. Some of these were related to inadequate training and failure to establish stricter protocols for surveillance operations of the sort that led to the plaintiff's arrest for possession of drugs for sale. Others had to do with faulty protocols for responding to defense subpoenas, which kept important evidence from the jury and later resulted in the appellate reversal of the plaintiff's conviction. OIR eventually settled on four different problematic areas and

*continued on next page >>*

## OMAHA: A YEAR IN REVIEW (CONTINUED FROM PAGE 4)

and preparing reports almost immediately. The Auditor's Office has published six full quarter reports, with a fourth that served as a year-in-review published shortly after the June 30, 2002 cut off. In the first three reports, the Auditor's Office made 29 recommendations, 20 of which have been acted on positively (more recent recommendation data will be published in the next report). The number of completed investigations increased during the first six months the office was open. In 2000, the internal

affairs department completed 59 investigations of citizen complaints. In 2001, six months of which the Auditor's Office was open, the department investigated 77 citizen complaints. Both the Police and Fire Departments have cooperated fully, allowing the Auditor's Office needed access and integration into their investigations.

In 2002, the City went through another budget cycle and another dramatic budget shortfall. Once again, the

Auditor's Office was left out of the general fund. The original private funding was matched with another grant and the Auditor is now funded through the end of 2003. Truthfully, this probably saved another attack on the office. The Auditor's Office will likely remain privately funded until there are public funds to support it. Currently, we are looking for more grant money to keep the office in existence. While this is not an ideal situation, it beats the alternative. ■

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY CREATES A NEW MODEL OF OVERSIGHT (CONTINUED)

sought ways to prevent their recurrence.

### DETERMINE THE EXISTING APPROACH AND THE REASONS FOR IT

OIR recognized from an early point that it would need to “do its homework” in order to be credible and effective in suggesting reforms. The input of knowledgeable parties became an early priority in helping OIR determine whether perceived shortcomings or gaps in LASD practices really could and should be fixed. Because a big issue in the case involved the surveillance protocols of the deputies who arrested the plaintiff, OIR spoke with LASD’s surveillance experts to determine the applicability of their techniques to other specialized units in the department. OIR also learned about the history and the evolving priorities of the community-policing unit from which the deputies came. OIR chose to focus on a couple of specific protocols that could have made a difference in the case at issue, and which were not required under the unit’s existing directives.

### TEST THE PROPOSED CHANGE WITH THE PEOPLE BEST ABLE TO EVALUATE IT.

LASD’s executives are obviously the parties who must approve changes in policy or practice, but the line-level personnel are those whose execution of them will dictate their ultimate value. Accordingly, OIR pursued feed-

back from the parties who would be responsible for the tasks covered by proposed new policies.

### **OIR recognized from an early point that it would need to “do its homework” in order to be credible and effective in suggesting reforms.**

For example, one of the new policies OIR advocated was a broader interpretation of defense subpoenas requesting records of radio and mobile computer transmissions among deputies. These transmissions fall into several different categories, and LASD had a practice of narrowly interpreting subpoenas to limit the categories provided. Often, defendants and their counsel lacked the “magic words” to adequately describe and receive the specific communications they sought. OIR consulted the Communications Bureau personnel who actually respond to such subpoenas, and asked whether a more inclusive interpretation would be impractical, burdensome, or otherwise inadvisable. This interaction helped OIR to refine its recommendation, and to eliminate potential obstacles before they could impede reforms.

### GO UP THE CHAIN OF COMMAND

Once the groundwork was in place for each of the proposed changes, OIR made presenta-

tions to the executives who had authority over the relevant areas of the department, in ascending order of authority. It included the background to OIR’s involvement, a description of the perceived problems and the proposed solutions, and a discussion of how implementation could efficiently occur. This process, and the interactions they involved, allowed for further refinement and constructive discussion. Moreover, securing the support of the supervisors at each level of the LASD hierarchy helped build momentum for the reforms as they made their way to the ultimate decision-makers.

### **OIR’s client is the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.**

### SEEK INPUT FROM NON-DEPARTMENTAL SOURCES

OIR’s client is the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. Accordingly, before seeking implementation of OIR-initiated reform, it seeks input from the Board. This allows OIR to learn about and incorporate the perspective of the entity most directly responsible for protecting the public’s interests. In a similar way, when OIR recognizes that one of its proposed reforms may effect a particular outside entity (such as the court system in the subpoena response issue described

*continued on page 10 >>*

# POLICE RESPONSE TO PERSONS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS: SEATTLE POLICE CREATES NEW UNIT

BY L.J. EDDY | SERGEANT, SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT | COORDINATOR, SPD CIT | HOSTAGE NEGOTIATOR

Since the deinstitutionalization of the mentally ill in the mid sixties, our jails have become the most often used "mental health facility", more so than any hospital. Nationally, over 7% of police calls involve a person suffering from a mental illness. A large percentage of these contacts are the result of some kind of disturbance, or misdemeanor criminal activity. Currently, in most police training academies, officers receive little more than 4 hours of instruction in how to communicate with the mentally ill. The unfortunate fact is that, as a direct result of their illness, some persons engage in behaviors that are defined as criminal, (for example: the person who busts up a TV in a store, because the television was "causing them pain"; or the person who assaults another because of their delusional belief that the other person is part of a conspiracy to kill them). All too often, responding police officers are viewed by the mentally ill

person as "part of the conspiracy", and immediately find themselves in an adversarial role. Public safety needs must always be taken care of first before further assessment or intervention occurs. Once a situation is stabilized, good training in communication and assessment of the person with mental illness can become extremely valuable in trying to control situations that could escalate and result in the use of force.

---

**The unfortunate fact is that, as a direct result of their illness, some persons engage in behaviors that are defined as criminal...**

---

Because of a lack of training in dealing with persons suffering from mental illness, most officers have limited options when encountering a disturbed, distraught, and possibly violent, person who may be mentally ill.

The Seattle Police Department has developed a program that works to improve its overall response to persons who are emotionally upset, or may be mentally ill.

In 1998 the Seattle Police Department joined in partnership with the Seattle-King County Health Department, Mental Health Division and the Washington State Alliance for the Mentally Ill (WAMI) to organize, train and implement a specialized team of police officers. This unique and creative alliance was established for the purpose of developing a more intelligent, understandable and safe law enforcement approach to people who are in mental crisis. This community effort is the genesis of the Seattle Police Department's Crisis Intervention Team (CIT).

The CIT consists of volunteer officers from each of the five precincts. CIT officers respond to mental disturbance calls that

*continued on next page >>*

---

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY CREATES A NEW MODEL OF OVERSIGHT (CONTINUED FROM PAGE 9)

---

above), OIR attempts to consult with representatives from that entity in order to weigh their views of the change and adjust the proposed reform if appropriate.

### IMPLEMENT THE PROPOSED CHANGE

---

Securing LASD's approval for recommended changes was certainly a critical moment in the process, but OIR remained active through their actual

implementation. This involvement took different forms, all of which were intended to promote the ultimate success of the reforms by facilitating them in concrete ways. For example, OIR offered to draft the language of the policy changes and accompanying memoranda. This saved LASD some effort and obviously increased OIR's level of input. OIR also recognized that tailoring the specific changes as narrowly as pos-

sible made the approval and implementation process much less cumbersome and time-intensive than a broader-based initiative would require, while still accomplishing significant improvements in the identified areas. Finally, OIR has committed to monitoring the reforms on an ongoing basis, in order to evaluate their effectiveness and help the department maintain its own level of focus in these areas. ■

**POLICE RESPONSE TO PERSONS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS: SEATTLE POLICE CREATES NEW UNIT (CONTINUED)**

bring officers face to face with complex issues relating to mental illness. (CIT officers have regular duty assignments as patrol officers, but are identified in the dispatch system as being mental illness specialists).

CIT officers participate in specialized training under the instructional supervision of mental health providers, family advocates (WAMI) and mental health consumer groups. A 40-hour multi-discipline training program enables officers to better understand and respond to calls involving persons demonstrating signs of mental illness. The CIT consists of approximately 260 officers and sergeants. (212 are assigned in the patrol division). These officers maintain 24 hour, 7-days a week coverage. CIT training provides officers with education about mental illness and how best to handle a person who is experiencing a crisis. With this training, CIT officers can confidently offer a more humane and calm approach. CIT officers also learn more about local resources and services and how to effectively refer to appropriate service providers.

**A Crisis Intervention Team is not a panacea for all police involvement with persons who may be mentally disturbed.**

A Crisis Intervention Team is not

a panacea for all police involvement with persons who may be mentally disturbed. Such a program is a beginning for necessary adjustments that must be made from traditional police responses to similar situations. The CIT program (modeled after a program developed in Memphis, Tenn.) has been developed in other cities across the United States. The Seattle program has been studied for possible replication in other Washington State agencies, as well as the United Kingdom. The CIT model has been instrumental in offering: 1) specially trained officers (CIT) to respond immediately to crisis calls; 2) ongoing training of CIT officers provided by mental health professionals; 3) establishment of partnerships of police, mental health providers, mental health consumers, and the State Alliance for the Mentally Ill, as well as Department of Corrections. (Direct involvement in the Dangerous Mentally Ill Offender (DMIO) program)

The Seattle Police Department has taken the CIT program a step further. Almost coincidentally, the Seattle Municipal Court developed a Mental Health Court model to better handle situations involving persons who are mentally ill and charged with misdemeanor crimes. The CIT works closely with the Mental Health Court staff to assist the court clients in maintaining their safety and fulfilling their obligations to the court.

In addition to its close relationship with the Mental Health Court staff, the CIT maintains a liaison with community mental health providers who are tasked with supervising those designated as Dangerous Mentally Ill Offender (DMIO). CIT is also in constant communication with the Department of Corrections regarding the supervision of offenders who struggle to maintain compliance because of their mental illness.

**The Seattle Police Department has taken the CIT program a step further.**

The Crisis Intervention Team program is a community effort bringing the police and the community together for common goals of safety, understanding, and service to those suffering from mental illness and to their families. It is to these goals that the Seattle Police Department stands committed. ■

# THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

## 2002 ANNUAL REPORT

The National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement, or NACOLE, is made up of persons and organizations in the United States who work in civilian oversight, and of others throughout the world who are interested in the development and progress of oversight in the U.S. NACOLE incorporated in 1995; approved Bylaws in 1998; obtained nonprofit status in 1999 and elected its first Board in 2000. That Board concluded its two year term on December 31, 2002.

### THE MISSION

NACOLE is a nonprofit organization of civilian oversight practitioners and supporters working to promote fair, firm and consistent law enforcement in the United States through the practice of civilian oversight.

NACOLE is based on the belief that law enforcement derives its authority from the community; it requires a two way dialog between the community and those charged with the duty to enforce laws.

NACOLE provides training; referrals; information sharing and technical assistance to the oversight community and to persons and jurisdictions attempting to establish oversight

### THE MEMBERSHIP

NACOLE has several categories of Membership: Organizational Members, Regular Members and Associate Members.

Organizational Members are agencies that provide civilian oversight of law enforcement by legislative or executive mandate. They receive one transferable regular (voting) membership and non-voting memberships for the remaining members of their oversight Boards/ Commissions or staffs. They are eligible for Member Conference Fees for all board or staff members. Most organizational members are municipal or county jurisdictions; some are organizations contracted by governmental entities to provide oversight. Organizational Membership dues are \$300 annually; Organizational Membership is the most cost effective means for an oversight agency to receive the benefits of membership.

As of December 31, 2002, NACOLE's organizational members represented the cities of Albany, NY; Austin, TX; Berkeley, CA; Cambridge, MA; Claremont, CA; Indianapolis, IN; Ithaca, NY; Long Beach, CA; Los Angeles, CA; Minneapolis, MN; New Haven, CT; New York, NY; Novato, CA; Oakland, CA; Dayton, OH; Philadelphia, PA; Pittsburgh, PA; Portland, OR; Riverside CA; San Diego, CA; San Francisco, CA; Santa Cruz, CA; Seattle, WA; Syracuse, NY; Washington, DC and the counties of Los Angeles and San Diego, CA.

Regular Members are individuals who are not currently sworn law enforcement officers; who serve or have served as Oversight Board/ Commission members; or who work or have worked for agencies mandated by legislative or executive authority to investigate and/ or review complaints about law enforcement in the United States. Regular Members hold a non-transferable vote and are eligible for one Member Conference fee. Regular Membership dues are \$150 annually.

As of December 31, 2002, NACOLE's regular members represented various jurisdictions in Hawaii; California; Minnesota, Colorado, Ohio, Florida, Idaho, Pennsylvania, Nebraska; Illinois; New Hampshire; and Tennessee.

Associate Members are individuals concerned with civilian oversight of law enforcement, but who do not meet the requirements for Organizational or Regular Membership. Associate Members include persons who work in civilian oversight outside the United States; persons currently working as law enforcement officers; academics and others not directly providing or experienced in oversight. Associate Membership dues are \$100 annually.

As of December 31, 2002, NACOLE's Associate Members came from California; Iowa; Illinois; and Indiana, as well as Canada, Hong Kong, Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland.

NACOLE held its Annual General Membership Meeting on the third day of the Annual Conference, November 3, 2002, in Cambridge, Mass. Forty persons attended including 27 voting members.

### THE BOARD AND THE CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

NACOLE's Board is a racially diverse Board and represents all areas of the United States. It consists of President Sue Quinn (San Diego; Calif.); Vice President Malvina Monteiro (Cambridge, Mass.); Treasurer Rose Ceja-Aragon (Denver, Colo.); Secretary Barbara Attard (Berkeley, Calif.) and Past President Brian C. Reeder (Indianapolis, Indiana). Directors are Jim Johnson (Cincinnati, Ohio); Joe Sandoval (Denver, Colo.); Teresa Guerrero Daley (San Jose, Calif.); Robert Aaronson (Palo Alto, Calif.); Don Casimere (Sacramento, Calif.) and Dede Wilhelm (Kauai, Hawaii).

The Board provides and directs NACOLE's programs. The Board contributed approximately 3650 hours to NACOLE in 2002. About 1550 Board hours were spent on NACOLE's governance and 2100 hours on NACOLE's programs. NACOLE members who are not on the Board volunteered approximately 800 hundred hours of work on governance and programs. These hours equate to approximately two staff years.

*continued on next page >>*

The Board met twice in 2002; held twenty-one Board teleconference meetings and conducted other business by telephone and mail. The Finance, Conference and Fundraising Sub-committees held additional teleconferencing meetings.

## FINANCIAL REPORT

The Finance Committee continued to implement the systemic revisions begun in 2001. Clyde Davis, the Treasurer since NACOLE's founding, was succeeded by Finance Committee Member Rose Ceja-Aragon who generously and indefatigably applied her corporate comptroller experience to further NACOLE's goal of becoming grant-ready.

NACOLE's income derives from memberships, donations, conference enrollments, interest, the donated hours of the Board and other volunteers. NACOLE's principle cash income derives from membership dues of \$16,500 and conference fees of \$36,340. Donations in 2002 were \$2,695. As NACOLE has no staff, NACOLE programs are provided by the labor of the Board and several members. That in-kind labor is valued at \$180,845.

NACOLE's net income in 2002 was \$6,814. On December 31, 2002, NACOLE's assets were \$44,375.

## NACOLE'S 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE

"The Value of Civilian Oversight: Dollars and Sense"

NACOLE returned to the east coast for the Annual Conference, held from October 31st through November 3rd in Cambridge, Mass. Over fifty agencies and jurisdictions in the U.S. were represented, as were England, Northern Ireland and Britain. Over one hundred twenty-five persons attended.

Deborah Livingston's Keynote Address outlined four dimensions of value we obtain from civilian oversight: Holding officers accountable for misconduct; Keeping a record; recognizing complaints provide vital sources of information about a department and its relationship with the community it serves; Identifying patterns and problems related to policies or supervision rather than misconduct; and Building public trust and community cohesion through patient listening to all complaint parties. Ms. Livingston's discussion provided a blueprint other jurisdictions can use to analyze complaint data in reports such as Annual Reports and to educate their communities.

In a second Keynote, Northern Ireland's Police Ombudsman, Nuala O'Loan discussed the importance of conducting independent investigations into police conduct in an environment of terrorism. Ms. O'Loan's riveting discussion described the critical questions citizen oversight must raise; the

evidence-driven process her office uses; and the absolute necessity of robust, adequately funded oversight in an environment that includes terrorism.

Both these papers are available on NACOLE's website, at [NACOLE.org](http://NACOLE.org).

Other presentations included the use of oversight analyses to reduce taxpayer liability for police misconduct and/or errors; creative new oversight experiments; investigative skill building; and overviews of oversight models.

The eight NACOLE founders were recognized for their contributions in shaping the organization.

Expanding NACOLE Programs - In 2002, NACOLE

- Expanded its informational website at [NACOLE.org](http://NACOLE.org)
- Expanded the NACOLE ListServ wherein current queries, discussions and articles regarding police oversight and accountability are electronically distributed
- Enhanced electronic and telephonic communications in order to respond to public inquiries without delay
- Produced two editions of The NACOLE Review
- Conducted outreach activities through out the year and provided ongoing Technical Assistance to individuals, jurisdictions and the media.

Work we hope to accomplish in the future includes these goals:

- Growth of NACOLE membership; fundraising and obtaining grants in order to open a national office and hire staff
- Establishment of minimum training standards for oversight Board/Commission members
- Establishment of standards or accreditation for Boards/ Commissions and Auditor models
- Creation of advanced training for practitioners, Boards and Commission Members
- Participation in national and local dialogues about "post-September 11" policing and oversight

NACOLE's Board is grateful to the membership for having had the opportunity to contribute to the development of oversight in 2002. We invite your participation in this important work. ■

**THE NACOLE REVIEW**  
**SPRING 2003**

**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR CIVILIAN  
OVERSIGHT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT  
PO Box 19261,  
DENVER, CO 80219**

*first class mail*



**THE NACOLE REVIEW IS PUBLISHED TWICE A YEAR  
FOR THE MEMBERS OF NACOLE.**

**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT OF  
LAW ENFORCEMENT  
PO Box 19261,  
DENVER, CO 80219**

**866.4NACOLE | FAX 301.794.0264**

**E-MAIL: [NACOLE@NACOLE.ORG](mailto:NACOLE@NACOLE.ORG)**

**OR CONTACT THE NACOLE BOARD AT**

**[HTTP://WWW.NACOLE.ORG](http://WWW.NACOLE.ORG)**

**EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: MALVINO MONTEIRO, [MONTEIRO@NACOLE.ORG](mailto:MONTEIRO@NACOLE.ORG)**

**EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: PIERCE MURPHY**

**EDITOR: LISA ROBERTS**

**© 2003 NACOLE, INC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.**