In this issue we continue in-depth coverage of emerging oversight systems as we prepare for the fall NACOLE conference.

The National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) will hold its seventh Annual Conference at the Adams Mark Hotel in Denver October 9 - 12, 2001. Hosted by the Denver Public Safety Review Commission, the Conference theme is *Inclusion: The Balancing Act of Civilian Oversight*. Conference presentations will again bring together dynamic speakers and leaders in the field of oversight.

by NACOLE President  Sue Quinn
In 1993, several members of the U.S. delegation to the International Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (IACOLE) conference in Cambridge, Massachusetts met to discuss issues of mutual concern relating to civilian oversight within the United States. The agenda of this meeting was the formation of a national organization to address the specific needs of civilians organized for law enforcement oversight.

At the 1994 IACOLE conference in Orlando, Florida, U.S. delegates continued to discuss the creation of the new national organization. In April of 1995, a group of individuals met in Landover, Maryland and approved the articles of incorporation and preliminary bylaws. On May 16, 1995, the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) began its operations.

As NACOLE continues to grow, the relationship between police and community - particularly the minority community - continues to be one of the most critical social issues facing this country. The number of civilian oversight agencies in the U.S. has significantly increased. Of the nation’s 100 largest cities, 71 have citizen review mechanisms. Since 1996, NACOLE has assisted many cities in their establishment of systems.

NACOLE recognizes that the majority of law enforcement officers strive, often under dangerous and demanding circumstances, to carry out their duties in a restrained, lawful and professional manner. Despite this, the United States has a growing crisis of police misconduct. Citizens want to feel secure that police officers are in the community to serve and protect all citizens of that community. We believe that citizens have a right to assurance that adequate mechanisms are available to review and investigate questionable or unacceptable actions of law enforcement officers.

### Board of Directors

**President**

Sue Quinn  
San Diego, CA  
(619) 294-3205

**Past President**

Brian C. Reeder  
Indianapolis, IN  
(317) 327-3429

**Vice President**

Malvina Monteiro  
Cambridge, MA  
(617) 349-6155

**Secretary**

Barbara Attard  
Berkeley, CA  
(510) 644-6716

**Treasurer**

Clyde B. Davis  
Lanham, MD  
(301) 731-5808

**Members-at-Large**

Bob Aaronson  
Palo Alto, CA  
(650) 565-8800

Donald Casimere  
Sacramento, CA  
(916) 264-5704

Teresa Guerrero-Daley  
San Jose, CA  
(408) 794-6226

James L. Johnson  
Cincinnati, OH  
(513) 352-6990

Joseph Sandoval  
Denver, CO  
(303) 556-3161

Dede Wilhelm  
Kauai, HI  
(808) 448-8750

You can e-mail NACOLE board members at the NACOLE website, [www.nacole.org](http://www.nacole.org).
Lethal force death spurs creation of police review commission

**Background**
Responding to the need for a civilian review agency, the District of Columbia Council established the Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) in 1980; unfortunately, the CCRB was quickly plagued with a host of problems, including inadequate funding, and eventually, a voluminous backlog of cases. The Council abolished the flawed CCRB in 1995.

**New Beginnings**
In 1999, the Council and the Mayor created a restructured civilian review authority, the Office of Citizen Complaint Review (OCCR). The revamped OCCR, which officially opened its doors on January 8, 2001, is an independent agency charged with the review of citizen complaints against members of the District’s Metropolitan Police Department (MPD). The agency is empowered to investigate, mediate and adjudicate citizen complaints in the areas of unnecessary or excessive force, harassment, discrimination, use of insulting or demeaning language, and retaliation.

The agency’s budget for fiscal year 2002 is $1.4 million. OCCR’s staff consists of an executive director, deputy director, chief investigator, public affairs specialist, six staff investigators, and three support staff members. During the summer of 2001, we also employed two law students and three college interns. Plans are underway to hire additional investigators and to continue the year-round recruitment of student interns from area colleges and law schools. A five-member volunteer board called the Citizen Complaint Review Board (CCRB) serves as the governing body and oversees the agency. The board members, one of whom, by statute, is a Metropolitan Police Department employee, were appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the DC Council. In addition to overseeing the agency, the governing CCRB is authorized to dismiss complaints and make policy recommendations to the Mayor, the DC Council and the Police Chief concerning aspects of the management of the MPD that may bear on police misconduct, such as the recruitment, training, evaluation, discipline, and supervision of police officers.

A team of investigators investigates allegations of police misconduct. The team includes several bilingual people, an investigator with previous civilian review experience and members with 15 or more years of investigative experience at the state and federal levels. The OCCR is committed to the ongoing education and training of all staff. To date, OCCR investigators have participated in police ride-alongs, MPD academy training, sensitivity training at the U.S. Holocaust Museum, training in the FBI’s academy in Quantico, VA, and the Institute of Police Technology and Management, in Jacksonville, Florida.

**Mediation and Adjudication**
The OCCR has contracted with organizations to provide mediation and adjudication services for our agency. Approximately seventy-five percent of OCCR mediations have resulted in an agreement being reached by the citizen and the subject officer. More telling than statistics, however, is that evaluation forms indicate that citizens and subject officers have come away from the mediation sessions with a better understanding of one another and of the reasons for their respective actions during the incident that led to the complaint. Matters can also be referred to a complaint

In the NACOLE Review we continue to profile review boards around the country. How are they organized? What do they do? What can other cities learn from them? Join us as NACOLE members take this opportunity to share their experiences with the wider community.
examiner who may conduct a hearing, if necessary. If the complaint examiner sustains one or more of the allegations in the citizen’s complaint, the matter is then referred to the Police Chief for the imposition of discipline.

Projects on the Horizon

OCCR is creating a law library and a public affairs information repository where resource materials, news clippings, and information files will be housed. We are also developing a web site and state-of-the-art case tracking system. This information technology will enable citizens to obtain current OCCR statistics and file complaints with our office via the Internet.

We will also conduct a full-scale public outreach campaign. Despite the fact that the OCCR is conveniently located in downtown Washington, DC and easily accessible by metro rail trains and city buses, the OCCR plans to conduct extensive community outreach in areas of DC that have traditionally been marginalized. Outreach efforts will be the primary mechanism for learning about the needs and concerns of the city’s diverse communities.

Episodes such as the May 18, 2001 fatal shooting of a Latino male and the wounding of another Latino by an off-duty police officer reveal the deep-seated distrust many residents of the District of Columbia have towards members of the MPD. The fatal shooting, on the heels of revelations in March 2001 that hundreds of offensive e-mail transmissions about private citizens were sent by police officers to each other in their patrol car computers, reinforces the need for an independent citizen review process that handles complaints regarding incidents of alleged law enforcement misconduct.

The OCCR staff is mindful of the fact that we are located in the nation’s capital. As such, how we investigate allegations of police misconduct says a lot about us, our city, and perhaps, something about our democracy.

Resources for civilian oversight

Sue Quinn, NACOLE President

Community Centered Policing, Maya Harris West of PolicyLink

Based in Oakland & New York. “PolicyLink builds on the relationship of police officers and community residents as equal partners in public safety - and democratic participation. Across a spectrum of American communities, PolicyLink conducts research into promising practices in neighborhood policing, simultaneously encouraging coalition building among community-based organizations. It is a comprehensive strategy that comprises specific disciplinary areas, from personnel practices to collection and disclosure of data; from community oversight to the dynamics of police-community collaboration.”

Maya Harris West will speak at NACOLE’s Denver conference. The report describes creative, community partnerships with police. It includes a chapter on civilian oversight. Obtain it at this web address http://www.policylink.org/democracy/police_accountability.html or call for a hard copy.

Citizen Review of Police: Approaches & Implementation, Peter Finn


Authored by Peter Finn as contracted by the federal Department of Justice, this report details differing oversight processes in nine cities, and identifies the issues to be faced in planning, establishing and maintaining an oversight agency.

This is an important, useful report we should all have a copy on our shelves and be able to refer others to. It is an easy-to-read tutorial in oversight.

Contact the National Institute of Justice for a copy; it is NCJ 184430. Or obtain it electronically at this address in Acrobat Adobe format: http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/184430.pdf or in at this address in Non-Acrobat Adobe format http://www.ncjrs.org/txtfiles1/nij/184430.txt
Membership application

Select a membership category:

☐ Sustaining Members

*Sustaining members* are organizations and individuals who wish to make tax deductible contributions to further the goals and principles of NACOLE. *Donations begin at $500.*

☐ Organizational Members

*Organizational members* are agencies of board who provide civilian oversight of law enforcement by legislative or executive mandate. These agencies will receive one transferable regular membership and associate memberships for the remaining members of their boards. *Annual dues: $300*

☐ Regular Members

*Regular members* are individuals who are not sworn law enforcement officers but who work or have worked for agencies that are mandated by legislative or executive authority to investigate and review complaints against law enforcement officers. *Annual dues: $150.*

☐ Associate Members

*Associate members* are individuals concerned with the oversight of law enforcement. The 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.*

☐ Student Members

*Student members* are individuals who are full-time students and are concerned with the oversight of law enforcement. Student members will be able to serve on committees but are ineligible to vote or serve as officers. *Annual dues: $25.*

*All memberships include a one-year subscription to the NACOLE Review.*

(over)
Membership application
Please fill in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization or company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization telephone (with area code)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization address</td>
<td>City, State, Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home address</td>
<td>City, State, Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home telephone (with area code)</td>
<td>Organization fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home e-mail</td>
<td>Organization e-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home fax</td>
<td>Membership type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Make checks payable to NACOLE

Mail form and payment to:
NACOLE
P.O.Box 1110
Lanham, Maryland 20703

Please call or e-mail if you have questions
phone: 1-866-4NACOLE   e-mail: Nacole95@aol.com
Civilian police oversight in Philadelphia currently has two permanent components: the Police Advisory Commission, which is an external, non-police agency, and the Office of Integrity and Accountability, which is an internal, Police Department office that is staffed by civilian personnel. Both agencies operate independently of the Police Department and make public recommendations to the Police Commissioner and other City officials. Although the focus and processes of the two agencies differ, they share the common objective of trying to improve policing in Philadelphia.

The Police Advisory Commission is the direct descendant of the Police Review Board (1957-59), and its later version, the Police Advisory Board (1959-69). The Police Review Board was the first official non-police, municipal administrative agency created to consider complaints from the public alleging misconduct by members of its police department. Philadelphia Mayor Ed Rendell established the Police Advisory Commission by way of Executive Order in 1993.

The Commission’s general mission is to monitor and improve police-community relations. To that end, the Commission is authorized to investigate individual complaints filed by members of the public. The Commission also is empowered to study police department policies, practices and customs. The Commission may initiate its studies and investigations at the request or complaint of a member of the public, or of its own initiative.

Like its predecessors, the Commission’s role is strictly advisory. The Philadelphia City Charter reserves solely to the Police Commissioner the authority to discipline police officers. The Commission’s findings and recommendations, although public, must be forwarded to the Mayor, the City Managing Director and the Police Commissioner for their notice and review three days in advance of any public dissemination.

The Commission began operations in February of 1994. Commission membership consists of 15 “permanent” and 4 “alternate” members, all of who are appointed by the Mayor to serve without compensation for four-year terms. The Mayor, however, must select seven of the permanent members and two of the alternate members from a list of City Council nominees. The Commission members elect their own Chair. Pursuant to its enabling act, the Commission’s membership is to reflect the diversity of the City and all members must be Philadelphia residents. At least three members of the Commission should have law enforcement backgrounds, but cannot be currently employed as law enforcement agents. The Commission’s staff consists of six full-time employees, three of whom are Special Investigators. The Commission has an

“...The Commission’s complaint investigation process...is conducted by civilian investigators totally independent of the police department. The Commission’s process...includes open, fact-finding hearings conducted by Commission members as well as written, public opinions that include findings of fact, and as appropriate, recommendations for discipline against specific police officers.”

by Ellen Ceisler, Director, Integrity and Accountability Office, City of Philadelphia Police Department; and Hector Soto, Executive Director, Police Advisory Commission, City of Philadelphia
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annual budget of almost $400,000. The Executive Director is hired by the Commission, and in turn is authorized to hire the staff. Currently, Philadelphia has approximately 7000 sworn police officers; the Department has an annual budget of nearly $400 million dollars.

Unlike its predecessors, the Commission has full investigatory authority including subpoena power. And while the Commission’s jurisdiction on civilian complaints partially overlaps the jurisdiction of the police department’s Internal Affairs Bureau, the Commission’s complaint investigation process differs in that it is conducted by civilian investigators totally independent of the police department. The Commission’s process also differs in that it includes open, fact-finding hearings conducted by Commission members as well as written, public opinions that include findings of fact, and as appropriate, recommendations for discipline against specific police officers.

The Commission has initiated 36 fact-finding hearings, commonly referred to as panel hearings, since beginning operations in February 1994. The first hearing was a ten-day, televised event during December 1995 involving the death of a young Puerto Rican man. Most hearings, however, are usually six to eight hour proceedings conducted on two weekday evenings before a panel consisting of not fewer than three Commission members and Commission counsel. All hearings are audio taped as well as stenographically recorded. All witnesses, including the target police officer and other police witnesses, appear pursuant to Commission subpoena. Thirty hearings of the Commission’s hearings have been held since January 1998 with six more tentatively scheduled for fall of this year (2001).

Civilian complaints coming under the jurisdiction of the Commission are those alleging unreasonable use of force including deadly force, abuse of authority excluding failure to provide proper police service, and verbal abuse, if the alleged offensive language was in degradation of the complainant’s race, skin color, ethnicity, religion, gender, sex or sexual orientation. The Commission can accept third-party and, with limitations, anonymous complaints. During the fiscal year ending on June 30, 2001, 192 complaints were filed with the Commission. Complaints alleging unreasonable use of force have been in decline during the last three years while complaints alleging abuse of authority usually in connection with a police stop, detention or search have been on the increase.

Civilian complaints alleging general offensive language, the failure to provide proper police service, corruption, or acts of criminal behavior by police fall strictly under the jurisdiction of IAB. The total number of civilian complaints filed in Philadelphia during a fiscal year is usually between 600 and 700.

Because of its broader authority unlike its forerunners, the Commission can also conduct studies and public hearings on policies, practices and customs of the department that impact on police-community relations. Recently, the Commission conducted an all-day hearing on issues and problems associated with the police department’s enforcement of search and arrest warrants. A public report of the Commission’s findings and recommendations will be issued by the end of November 2001. The authority granted the Commission to conduct broader studies and inquiries overlaps to some extent with the authority granted to the Integrity and Accountability Office, the other prong of Philadelphia’s civilian oversight of its police. Its history begins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of police oversight in Philadelphia:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Police Review Board, 1957-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Police Advisory Board, 1959-1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Police Advisory Commission, 1993 - present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal police offices and committees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Integrity and Accountability Office (IAO), 1996 - present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Blue Ribbon Task Force, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
three years after the founding of the Commission.

In September 1996 the City of Philadelphia entered into a Settlement Agreement with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Police-Barrio Relations Project, in response to litigation initiated by these groups arising from the investigation of, and prosecutions for corruption and misconduct in the City’s 39th Police District - one of the most damaging and expensive police scandals in Philadelphia’s history. The lawsuit alleged widespread and pervasive systemic deficiencies in the Philadelphia Police Department which contributed to an ongoing cycle of scandals that rocked the Department, cost taxpayers tens of millions of dollars, and severely eroded public trust and confidence in the integrity and effectiveness of the police force.

The Agreement sets forth a comprehensive plan for reform in the Philadelphia Police Department. The goal of the Agreement is to minimize and deter police corruption and misconduct to the greatest extent possible, and thereby enhance public confidence in the Philadelphia Police Department.

To assist in meeting this goal, the Agreement called for the creation of a permanent Integrity and Accountability Office (IAO) to analyze and critique accountability and corruption control policies, to identify systemic deficiencies that give rise to or permit corruption and misconduct within the Police Department, and to make recommendations for change. The IAO is responsible for monitoring and auditing departmental policies, practices, and operations as they relate to the detection and control of misconduct and corruption in the Department. In order to effectuate the broad duties of the Office, the IAO at its discretion, can initiate studies and audits, has access to virtually all Department records and personnel, and can make its findings public.

Over the past three and a half years the IAO has had the access and independence necessary to carry out its responsibilities, has issued several reports covering a broad range of issues, (including the performance, policies and practices of the Department’s Internal Affairs Bureau, numerous personnel management issues, use of force, discipline, enforcement of narcotics laws, etc.) and has presented recommendations - many of which have been implemented by the Police Department.

The parties to the Settlement Agreement intended that the IAO would work cooperatively with the Police Commissioner and other City departments. The IAO is also currently answerable to the United State District Court Judge who has jurisdiction over the City’s compliance with the terms of the Agreement. However, by virtue of the IAO’s essential function to monitor and audit the Police Department, and in order to remain effective and credible, the IAO must exercise independent judgment in reporting findings and making recommendations.

The IAO is comprised of two full time employees (A Director and Deputy Director) who are funded out of the Police Department’s budget. The current Director of the IAO is an “at-will” city employee, appointed by the Mayor of Philadelphia who essentially reports directly to the Mayor and the Police Commissioner.

In addition to the oversight provided by the Police Advisory Commission and the Integrity and Accountability Office, in May 2001 the Mayor of Philadelphia, the Honorable John Street, named a special Task Force comprised of six blue-ribbon members that is looking specifically at the police department’s disciplinary system. The Task Force is expected to issue a public report by the end of the year with findings and recommendations for improving the Police Department’s ability to police itself.

The Philadelphia police story continues.

“(...) the Philadelphia police story continues.”
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The Board of Directors is pleased to announce NACOLE’s seventh annual conference from October 9-12, 2001 in Denver, Colorado. The conference theme this year is “Inclusion: The Balancing Act of Civilian Oversight.” NACOLE is honored to accept Denver Public Safety Review Commission’s offer to host the 2001 conference. Special thanks to members of the Commission for supporting NACOLE’s work over the years and particularly Joseph Sandoval, NACOLE Board of Directors at Large, and Rose Ceja-Aragon, Director for their support and hard work for the past several months.

The Conference will again bring together dynamic keynote speakers; innovative ideas; challenging panels; and informed discussions among those working in oversight of policing in the U.S.

Oversight has grown in the past year and we look forward to new oversight practitioners joining NACOLE. Washington DC; Riverside and Claremont California; Las Vegas, Nevada; Omaha, Nebraska; and others have opened oversight offices since we last met.

The conference will be held at the Adam’s Mark Hotel and Resort, centrally located in the heart of Downtown Denver’s famous 16th Street Mall, a mile-long pedestrian promenade lined with over 150 shops, restaurants, and entertainment establishments. The hotel is also four blocks from the Colorado Convention Center and less than two miles from the prestigious Cherry Creek Shopping District. There are free shuttle buses that run its length, providing easy access to all major attractions. The Denver International Airport is just 26 miles away and there is shuttle service for about $17.00 each way and $30 round trip.

We hope that you and your community agency will be present at this year’s conference to contribute your ideas on the issues that we all face together.

NACOLE STRIVES TO

- Facilitate and involve the community as a true partner in community policing.
- Provide educational opportunities and technical assistance to existing and emerging organizations that perform civilian oversight of law enforcement.
- Encourage and promote the highest ethical and professional standards in organizations providing civilian oversight of law enforcement.
- Provide a national forum for exchange of information for agencies that provide civilian oversight of law enforcement.
PANEL DESCRIPTION AND TOPICS

PANEL DISCUSSION: Addressing Biased Based Policing
This panel will focus on how to identify bias-based policing, methods for communities to use to recognize and test what they know, what racial profiling statistics have to teach the justice system and how oversight processes can contribute to law enforcement providing unbiased policing.

PANEL DISCUSSION: Carving Progress from Crisis
Cincinnati is the latest urban region on our minds as we shape this conference. In this workshop we will examine Cincinnati and other cities in the aftermath of community crises and anguish. We want to heal our communities of the painful conflicts they suffer when community and police trust breaks down, but how do we begin? What does it take? Who’s done it successfully? What does success mean? How will we know? And how do we strengthen oversight in the service of community cohesion and rebuilding trust?

PANEL DISCUSSION: Working Effectively With Police Unions
Police officers have a wide range of procedural protections resulting from union negotiated contracts. This can hamper the efforts and recommendations made by civilian oversight agencies. Police unions have also, at times, taken strong positions opposing civilian oversight agencies, their authority, and efforts to bring about positive change. The political power that police unions can wield to influence elected officials must also be understood and appropriately countered. In order to be successful, civilian
oversight practitioners must work effectively with police unions as well as police administrations and executive leadership. This work must be done without crossing the line or violating community trust. An efficiently functioning civilian oversight agency will have the respect and confidence of the community and the police. The common work of civilian oversight and police unions is to forge and strengthen police/community relationships. This panel will discuss methods for civilian oversight agencies to use in “bridging the divide” and working with police unions.

**CASE STUDY: Evaluation of Cases: Balancing Where It Counts**
In this session, participants will break down into groups acting as review board members in a “summary hearing” setting, discussing and making decisions based on investigative reports and other evidence. Several varied reports will be “calendared” for discussion and action that may include motions for acceptance, further investigation, referral to mediation, or policy recommendations.

**WORKSHOP: Implementing Civilian Oversight: Striking a Balance**
Are you contemplating civilian oversight for your community? This workshop will provide you with the nuts & bolts on how to implement or strengthen police accountability through civilian oversight of the citizen complaint process. You will learn how three different models of civilian oversight operate. In addition to individual presentations, there will be a question and answer session, distribution of reference materials and opportunity for one on one consultation.

---

**Inclusion: the balancing act of civilian oversight**

- **Pat Sullivan**  
  Sheriff Arapahoe County, Colorado and Member Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc.

- **Bill Vandenberg**  
  Representative of the Progressive Coalition

- **Don Pierce**  
  Chief of Police Boise, Idaho and Representative of International Association of Chiefs of Police, IACP

- **Mark Silverstein, Esq.**  
  ACLU

- **Nita Gonzales**  
  President and CEO, Escuela Tlatelolco Centro de Estudios  
  Representative, Colorado Progressive Coalition (Publishers of “Racial Profiling by Law Enforcement in Denver, Colorado” August 2000)

- **Robert Yazzie**  
  Chief Justice Judicial Branch of the Navajo Nation Window Rock, Arizona

---

**Thursday, October 11, 2001**

9:00 - 11:30 a.m. **CONCURRENT SESSIONS**

**“Carving Progress from Crisis” - Governor’s Square 15**

- **Moderators:**  
  James Johnson  
  NACOLE Board of Directors and Legal Advisor for City of Cincinnati, Ohio

- **Robert Aaronson**  
  NACOLE Board of Directors and Attorney Consultant on Police Accountability Palo Alto, California

- **Speakers:**  
  Phillip Eure  
  Executive Director Washington DC Civilian Review Commission

  Ellen Ceisler  
  Director of Integrity and Accountability Office City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

  Rosa Melendez  
  US Department of Justice Community Services Officer City of Seattle, Washington

  Scotty Johnson  
  Police Specialist and President of the Sentinel Police Association City of Cincinnati, Ohio

**“Working Effectively with Police Unions” - Governor’s Square 10**

- **Moderator:** Donald Casimere  
  NACOLE Board of Directors and Director, Office of Police Accountability, City of Sacramento, California

- **Speakers:**  
  Lieutenant Eric Adams  
  New York City Police Department and a co-founder of 100 Blacks in Law Enforcement Who Care, New York, New York
NACOLE's Seventh Annual Conference:

**Evaluation of Cases: Balancing Where It Counts**  - Plaza Court 2-5

Moderators: **Barbara Attard**
- NACOLE Secretary and Police Review Commission Officer, City of Berkeley, California

**John Parker**
- Executive Officer San Diego County Law Enforcement Oversight City of San Diego, California

**Pierce Murphy**
- Community Ombudsman, City of Boise, Idaho

**Implementing Civilian Oversight: Striking a Balance**  - Governor's Square 10

Moderator: **Sam Walker**
- Professor, University of Nebraska, Omaha, and author, *Police Accountability: The Role of Civilian Oversight*

Speakers:

**Teresa Guerrero-Daley**
- NACOLE Board of Directors, and Independent Police Auditor, City of San Jose, California

**Christopher Moore**
- Commander, Internal Affairs Unit, San Jose Police Department San Jose, California

**Denise DeForest**
- Chairperson Denver Public Safety Review Commission City of Denver, Colorado

**Cheri Toney**
- Senior Investigator Office of Citizen Complaints City of San Francisco, California

6:30 – 7:00 p.m.  CASH BAR RECEPTION – WINDOWS (Foyer)
7:00 – 9:00 p.m.  DINNER - WINDOWS - Sponsored by Denver Public Safety Review Commission
9:30 – 11:00 p.m.  HOSPITALITY SUITE

**Friday, October 12, 2001**

9:00 – 1:00 p.m.  SIT-DOWN BREAKFAST- Governor's Square 11
- WRAP-UP, CONFERENCE EVALUATION AND SUGGESTIONS
- NACOLE ANNUAL MEETING
- NACOLE 2002 CONFERENCE SITE

---

NACOLE

wishes to express its gratitude to the following
for support and contributions to the conference:

- City Of Denver Public Safety Review Commission
- Rob Heverly, Former, Assistant Director, Government Law Center Of Albany Law School
- NACOLE Board Of Directors
- Rose Ceja-Aragon, Director, Public Safety Review Commission
**HOTEL REGISTRATION FORM**

**ADAM’S MARK DENVER, CO**

**Reservations:** 1800-444-2326 or 303-893-3333 Fax 832-0320

**GUEST ROOM RATES/ GROUP RATES:**

Current Room Tax 13.55%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Single Rate*</th>
<th>Double Rate*</th>
<th>Triple Rate*</th>
<th>Quad Rate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deluxe Queen</td>
<td>$ 86.00</td>
<td>$101.00</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>$132.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deluxe Double</td>
<td>$ 86.00</td>
<td>$101.00</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>$132.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deluxe King</td>
<td>$ 86.00</td>
<td>$101.00</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>$132.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concorde Double</td>
<td>$121.00</td>
<td>$156.00</td>
<td>$191.00</td>
<td>$206.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concorde King</td>
<td>$121.00</td>
<td>$156.00</td>
<td>$191.00</td>
<td>$206.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deluxe Room 1 Bed</td>
<td>$ 86.00</td>
<td>$101.00</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>$131.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Suite</td>
<td>$295.00</td>
<td>$295.00</td>
<td>$295.00</td>
<td>$295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Suite</td>
<td>$795.00</td>
<td>$795.00</td>
<td>$795.00</td>
<td>$795.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Deluxe</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza Deluxe Suite</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Queen</td>
<td>$ 86.00</td>
<td>$101.00</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>$131.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Double</td>
<td>$ 86.00</td>
<td>$101.00</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>$131.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Bed of Suite</td>
<td>$ 86.00</td>
<td>$101.00</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>$131.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Bed of Suite</td>
<td>$ 86.00</td>
<td>$101.00</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>$131.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CUTOFF:** September 8, 2001.

- The rooms are held under the “NACOLE” block. **Please request this block when calling for reservation:**
- Group rate is available 3 days pre and 3 days post conference based upon availability.
- Attendee reservations must be accompanied by a deposit in the amount of one night’s accommodation to guarantee a room which will be credited to the last night for which the reservation was made.
- Guaranteed reservations are held (without occupancy) for one night only and not the entire length of the stay.
- Deposits from attendees are refundable if notice of cancellation is received and can be confirmed, with a cancellation number issued by the Hotel, at least 48 hours prior to arrival date.
- Check-out time is 12:00 noon. Guest check-in cannot be guaranteed prior to 3 p.m. on the day of arrival.
- All guests are required to present a valid credit card or cash deposit upon registration unless prior credit approval has been obtained from the Hotel.

**CREDIT INFORMATION:**

CARDHOLDER NAME: _______________________________________________________________________

TYPE OF CARD: ____________________________  EXP. DATE: ____________________________

CARD NUMBER: ____________________________________________________________________________

MASTER CARD INTERBANK NUMBER (4) DIGITS: ____________________________

BILLING ADDRESS: _______________________________________________________________________

Please return this form and one night’s deposit to:

ADAM’S MARK DENVER
1550 Court Place Denver, Colorado 80202
Attn: John Hogan, Convention Service Manager
NACOLE 2001 CONFERENCE REGISTRATION FORM

Name: _______________________________________________________________________________________

Title/Agency: _________________________________________________________________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________________________________________

City: _________________________________________________________________________________________

State/Zip: _____________________________________________________________________________________

Telephone: ___________________________   Fax: _________________________________________________

Email: _______________________________________________________________________________________

EARLY REGISTRATION  (by September 28, 2001)

☐ $250 Regular Member
☐ $250 Organizational Member
☐ $275 Student Member
☐ $300 Associate Member
☐ $300 Non Member

Registration Plus Membership

☐ $550 Organizational Member
☐ $400 Regular Member
☐ $400 Associate Member
☐ $300 Student Member

حفٌّاًّا ١٠٪ ٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍدٌٍٍd

Amount Enclosed $______________

Please make checks payable to NACOLE and mail it to:
P. O. Box 1110 Lanham, MD 20703

For office use only

Date postmarked _______Date paid __________________________
Received by __________________________
☐ Cash  ☐ Check  Check No.______________
Member Status __________________________
Registration Status  ☐ Early  ☐ Late

( No refund for cancellation after September 28, 2001

Travel arrangement must be done early and through your local travel agency or any major airline carrier.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE NACOLE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement  
P.O. Box 1110  
Lanham, Maryland 20703

© 2001 NACOLE, Inc. All rights reserved.