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Message from the Chair:

Thank you for your interest in the Citizen Review Board’s work and for reading our annual report. Since its inception, the ACRB has continually benefitted from the contributions of every board member, staff member, and stakeholder.

All persons involved with the Board represent a comprehensive and diverse community, and everyone brings a unique and valued perspective. I believe this is the single greatest strength of the Board.

The ACRB remains committed to the legacy of Kathryn Johnston and to our role as an independent body, where people can seek redress when they believe Atlanta police or correctional officers have abused their authority.

We take great pride in giving thorough consideration to all complaints that fall within the Board’s jurisdiction, and doing so in a manner that is fair to all parties involved. Our staff members are very professional and committed to investigating and processing complaints thoroughly and expeditiously. Our Board members, similarly, are dedicated to giving each complaint a fair hearing and deciding a complaint based on the evidence that is present.

For most of 2012 the Board was without a full time executive director while engaged in a search to fill that position. Ms. Sharese Shields served as interim director, and as a previous long-time board member, her experience and dedication helped carry the Board through this period. At the end of the director search, the Board voted to hire Mr. Samuel L. Reid. Mr. Reid came to the Board with extensive experience in citizen oversight of law enforcement, including directing the citizen review board in Minneapolis. His knowledge, enthusiasm, and dedication were apparent from the start. Today, the ACRB is moving in a very positive direction. Among the goals for the coming year are increased community outreach and more extensive training for each Board member.

Thank you again for your interest in the ACRB. As always, we welcome your comments and questions.

Best regards,

Paul E. Bartels
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Executive Summary

The purpose of this annual report is to inform our stakeholders—citizens, community organizations, city administration, city council, and the law enforcement departments—of the work of the Atlanta Citizen Review Board (ACRB) during 2012. During the last quarter of 2012, the agency developed a strategic plan and three goals to support its commitment to provide greater service to the citizens and officers of Atlanta. The pursuit of these goals will move the agency from the creation stage that it has been in since 2008 to a fully functioning agency that can achieve the agency mission and the desires of the various stakeholders.

For the first eight months of 2012, the ACRB executive director position was vacant. The absence of a full-time director stalled the ACRB’s progress. During the absence of a permanent executive director, the ACRB hired Interim Executive Director Sharese Shields Ages who served on a part-time basis.

The ACRB began to take a new direction under the leadership of a permanent executive director, Samuel Lee Reid II, in August 2012. After the hiring of Mr. Reid, from September through December 2012, the board and staff worked diligently to implement board training, as well as, a community outreach plan and mend relationships with the community, the Atlanta Police Department (APD), and the Atlanta Corrections Department (ACD). The agency began new outreach initiatives and developed new performance measures to evaluate the agency’s progress toward meeting its mission.

By the end of 2012, the ACRB and the APD made significant improvements in their operational relationship. Improvements in this relationship are a new beginning that should allow the departments to address the concerns of the citizens of Atlanta. The APD worked cooperatively to fulfill ACRB requests for information and documents. APD officers cooperated with the ACRB process without missing any interview appointments.

The majority of this report focuses on the 2012 data associated with ACRB complaints involving APD officers. The most significant highlight of this report is that the APD disciplined personnel on 83% of the sustained complaints adjudicated by the ACRB, which means that on the clear majority of sustained complaints, the ACRB and APD assessed the facts similarly. This is a clear indication that the city’s investment in officer accountability through civilian oversight is working.

The ACRB received 67 complaints. The ACRB only received one complaint involving a corrections officer from the Atlanta City Jail. The board adjudicated 19 complaints and sustained 32% of those complaints.

False arrest allegations accounted for 42% of the allegations received in 2012. The percentage of false arrest allegations increased significantly from the number received in 2011. For the third straight year, the number of excessive force allegations decreased. From 2011 through 2012, excessive force complaints decreased by 24%.
Atlanta Citizen Review Board
The Atlanta Citizen Review Board (ACRB) is an independent investigative agency of the City of Atlanta, authorized to accept and investigate citizen complaints against Atlanta police and corrections officers.
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Why do we do what we do?
In 2006, 92-year old Kathryn Johnston was killed when three undercover Atlanta police officers illegally raided her home in the Northwest Community of English Avenue/Vine City. Ms. Johnston’s death and the details surrounding the police officers’ misconduct brought home the community’s concerns about police officers’ relationships with the community and officer accountability. As a result of many committed and dedicated citizens’ actions and demands, elected officials answered the call and created the Atlanta Citizen Review Board.
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Introduction

The ACRB operates as an independent check and balance of the Atlanta Police Department’s (APD) and Atlanta Correction Department’s (ACD) responsiveness to citizen complaints against officers. Perceived and actual officer misconduct is damaging to citizens and officers. Complaint investigations offer citizens the opportunity to receive redress for their grievances when officer conduct is deemed a violation of APD or ACD policy. While complaint filings are often viewed as negative, each complaint is an opportunity to educate the public and officers, monitor officers’ actions, assure the public that the City is serious about officer accountability, and improve officer behavior and citizens’ perceptions and realities of officer behavior. Complaint filings serve as thermostats of the level of citizen satisfaction with officer behavior.

In addition to its check and balance function, for the complaints the agency receives, the ACRB is an independent communicator of citizen complaints against Atlanta police and corrections officers. This communication offers the transparency that is a hallmark of civilian oversight. Through transparency of the process and reporting of outcomes, the agency is able to inform the public of the City’s progress in effectively managing officer behavior and promoting public confidence that citizen complaints are handled fairly and timely.

As we strive to instill citizen confidence and trust in officer accountability, we understand that fair and objective investigations and adjudications also serve to assure officers that frivolous and meritless complaints are appropriately handled during the ACRB process.

This report provides the 2012 ACRB citizen complaint data involving Atlanta Police and Corrections officers. The data was collected from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012. The distribution of ACRB data will aid the community and elected officials in understanding what types of officer behaviors and actions motivated citizens to file complaints during 2012. In addition, the presentation of the data in an annual report is a tool for citizens to measure and assess how the departments responsible for officer accountability are meeting citizens’ expectations of improving officer behavior. This report also provides information that will increase the public’s understanding of the ACRB operation. The delivery of this data is to fulfill citizens’ demands for accountability through transparency, which is required for the agency and the officer accountability systems to be credible and trustworthy.

This report provides explanations for the data presented; however, several data sections will require future studies and the collection of data and analysis over a longer period in order to make meaningful inferences and identify the causes for disparities in complaints. As the ACRB moves from its initial stages to a maturing agency, the ACRB will include more substantive analysis of collected data and engage in deeper discussions of measurable outcomes from the ACRB operation.

To allow the reader to focus on areas of interests, this report is divided into eight sections. Section I discusses the agency. Section II provides a discussion of the 2012 data. Section III discusses the ACRB adjudications and APD responses. Section IV discusses the Atlanta City Jail. Section V discusses the ACRB performance measures. Section VI provides information on the agency’s 2012 outreach. Section VII discusses the challenges facing the agency at the end of 2012. Section VIII is the conclusion.
Section I The Agency

Mission

Our mission is to provide the citizens of Atlanta credible, fair, and independent investigations and recommendations on Atlanta police and corrections officer misconduct complaints. Our work provides opportunities for both departments to consider policy change recommendations and correct officer behavior in order to promote the highest standards of conduct. Our aim is to lessen the possibility of urban unrest and promote public confidence in the Atlanta police and corrections departments.

Vision

To be known for integrity, competence, and results.

To be recognized as national experts in improving community/police relationships.

To provide the best citizen oversight of a local enforcement agency in the nation and be recognized as the experts in civilian oversight.

Values

*Integrity* – We recognize and acknowledge that citizens expect us to do our best work, use our best methods, do what we say we will do, and stay true to the reason for our existence. We will end each day with our integrity intact.

*Credibility* – We recognize and acknowledge that our actions tell more about us than our words. We will consistently do the right things at the right time.

*Accountability* – We recognize and acknowledge that just as we seek to hold others accountable for their actions, we too shall be accountable for our actions.

*Fairness* – We recognize and acknowledge that our investigations only have meaning when every case and everyone involved is treated fairly and respectfully, without regard to race, color, creed, religion, sex, domestic relationship status, sexual orientation, national origin, gender identity, age, physical disability, or criminal or misconduct history.

*Results driven* – We recognize and acknowledge that, at the end of the day, answers must be given to these questions: Did we change an officer’s behavior? Did we provide a citizen with redress for an officer’s behavior? Did we provide the citizen with the tools needed to deal with an encounter with an officer? Did we impact the APD or ACD’s policies or culture?

*Commitment* – We recognize and acknowledge that only through perseverance and steadfastness can we accomplish our mission.

*Teamwork* – We recognize that, while the board and staff have different functions, it is only through teamwork and staying true to the mission that we can accomplish the needs of the citizens and officers.
Excellence – We recognize that excellence is a continuous process that must be doggedly pursued. We are committed to the pursuit of consistent excellence.

Service – We aim to serve the citizens of Atlanta with respect, competence, and professionalism.

ACRB Responsibilities

Typical of many civilian oversight agencies, the ACRB was created to alleviate citizens’ distrust and dissatisfaction with local law enforcement agencies’ ability or willingness to establish and maintain effective officer accountability. Sections 2-2201 and 2-2211 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Atlanta authorize the Atlanta Citizen Review Board to receive and investigate citizen complaints against Atlanta police and corrections officers. The ACRB accepts complaints in the following areas: (1) abusive language, (2) false arrest, (3) false imprisonment, (4) harassment, (5) use of excessive force, (6) serious bodily injury, and (7) death.

In addition to receiving and investigating complaints, the ACRB is authorized to:

- Provide advice on police and corrections departments’ policies and actions that will improve relations between the departments and the community.
- Hold public hearings.
- Select appropriate individual incidents to review and broader issues to study which may be of concern to the community, the police and corrections department, or the chiefs of police and corrections.
- Initiate studies upon request to the board by any member of the public or the police department and the department of corrections, or at the board’s own discretion.
- Inform the public about the board and its duties, and develop and administer an ongoing program for the education of the public regarding the provision of the ordinance.
- Exercise subpoena power and compel access to or production of materials or the appearance of person as may be relevant to investigate or study or review matters within the board’s authority and discretion.
- Recommend general reforms (such as changes in training, changes in the preservation of records, changes in counseling available to officers) or specific actions directed at individual officers (including, but not limited to, hiring, firing, promotion, demotion, punishment, or commendation).

As stated earlier, the ACRB conducts independent investigations of police and corrections officer misconduct allegations. The ACRB receives reports and evidence from the APD/ACD; however, the ACRB investigators evaluate all evidence and reports independently. Investigators are responsible for writing and submitting investigative reports with recommendations to the board. Investigations include, but are not limited to, information gathered from APD/ACD, complainants, witnesses, police and corrections officers, on-scene visits, examination of physical evidence, credibility assessments, and review of all pertinent reports. Investigators are responsible for interviewing all parties related to a complaint.
ACRB Structure

The ACRB is comprised of a citizen board and a staff of city employees. The board consists of 11 members appointed by the Mayor, City Council, Neighborhood Planning Units (NPU), legal and business associations, and the League of Women Voters. Appendix A provides the requirement for the appointment of board members. Members must be residents of Atlanta and are appointed to three-year terms. Board members are responsible for conducting complaint hearings and reviews, making determinations, making policy recommendations to the APD/ACD and participating in community outreach.

ACRB staff currently consists of an executive director, two investigators, and a business manager. The staff’s primary responsibility is receiving and investigating complaints, conducting community outreach and managing the day-to-day operation of the agency.

Strategic Direction: Moving the Needle

In 2012, the agency developed and implemented a strategic direction that would effectively address stakeholders’ concerns about the agency’s ability to achieve its mission. The ACRB created a three-point plan involving training, awareness, and education to drive its operation. The plan is designed to focus the agency’s attention on continuing with fair and thorough investigations, while working proactively to educate citizens and officers on proper interactions between citizens and officers. The plan also focuses on building citizen and officer awareness of the ACRB and its process. Lastly, the plan emphasizes training to ensure that the board and staff are efficient and proficient in their work. Through the three-point plan, the agency expects to begin to move the needle on police accountability and align citizen and officer expectations and outcomes related to officer accountability.
The purpose of the training goal is to ensure that the board and staff are adequately prepared to investigate and render decisions on citizen complaints. The agency made a commitment to consistently train board and staff, maintain records of training, and hold board and staff accountable for participating in training. The APD, staff, consultants, and the National Association of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement Annual Conference provide trainings.

The purpose of the awareness goal is to increase the visibility and understanding of the ACRB. Awareness of the agency and its function is critical to building trust and confidence in the agency’s work. This goal consists of more than handing out brochures sporadically and the occasional appearances at major community events. Through this goal, the agency demonstrates its commitment to assertively seek and create opportunities to discuss the ACRB and interactions between citizens and officers.

The purpose of the education goal is to proactively engage citizens about their concerns related to officer conduct and provide information about citizens’ rights and responsibilities. The ACRB developed a sustainable education program that will provide information and encourage discussion with citizens and officers. Through this goal, the ACRB intends to increase mutual understanding of needs and expectations between citizens and officers and provide opportunities for citizen empowerment as it relates to interactions with officers and seeking redress when issues arise. Another critical part of the education goal is seeking ways to educate officers through community feedback.

Moving the Needle

**Past**
- Lack of training
- Lack of awareness
- Lack of education
- Weak Image
- Increased payouts to citizens
- Lack of trust
- Lack of confidence

**Present (Action Phase)**
- Training
- Outreach (Awareness and Education)
- Appropriate corrective actions (policy changes, training, discipline)
- Effective use of data
- ACRB growth

**Future**
- Increased public confidence in law enforcement
- Positive perceptions of law enforcement professionalism
- Lower settlement and litigation costs
- Empowered communities
- Mutual respect between citizens and officers
The ACRB process is citizen friendly. Citizens only need to sign their complaint and attend the investigative interview. ACRB investigators accept walk-ins and are available for field interviews and after hours as needed.

Once a citizen has filed a complaint, the ACRB reviews the complaint to determine if it is within the ACRB’s jurisdiction. If so, an investigation is conducted. The investigation normally includes gathering documents, reports, and other evidence. It also includes interviewing the citizen, witnesses, subject officers, and witness officers.

Once the investigation is completed, an investigative report is forwarded to the executive director for review. Once reviewed, the report is forwarded to the board for review and adjudication.
Section II Data Discussion
This data discussion begins with the citizens’ contact with the agency and concludes with the chief’s action on the adjudicated ACRB complaint. The ACRB collects data at every decision point along the ACRB process. Data is collected to inform stakeholders of the number and types of complaints and allegations, and the demographics of the citizens and officers. This section also includes data that is used to measure the agency’s progress toward achieving its mission. The importance of performance measures is addressed later in this report. At the end of 2012, the ACRB began using the data to drive its business in order to provide better service to citizens. This new approach should allow the agency to be more assertive and responsive in its approach to officer misconduct.

Complaints Received

In 2012, the ACRB received 67 complaints, a decrease of 21% from the number received in 2011. Eighty-five complaints were received in 2011. The lower numbers may be attributed to the issues surrounding the ACRB during the first eight months of 2012. It should be noted that the data in this section does not include the one complaint against an Atlanta corrections officer. For definitions of complaint terms, refer to Appendix B.

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Complaints Received</th>
<th>Complaints Opened</th>
<th>Complaints Suspended</th>
<th>Complaints Dismissed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes complaint received during the prior month.
Dismissed Complaints

Tracking data related to dismissed complaints provides the agency with valuable information that guides the agency’s efforts to improve citizens’ understanding of the ACRB and provides data to assist the agency in advocating for an expansion of its jurisdiction in order to meet citizens’ needs. Data reveals that 55% of the complaints received in 2012 were dismissed. A review of the dismissed complaints shows that complaints dismissed fell into the following categories:

- false arrest complaints resolved against the complainant
- allegations not within the agency’s jurisdiction
- officers not within the agency’s jurisdiction
- time barred (over 180 days)
- no signed complaint received

In reviewing the allegations contained in the 37 dismissed complaints, the chart below shows the percentages of the allegations contained in the dismissals.

Chart 1:

Suspended Complaint

Twenty-eight percent of the complaints received in 2012 were suspended, pending the outcome of an associated criminal case. In 2012, 16 investigations of false arrest allegations were suspended.

Complaints involving false arrest allegations are generally suspended until a resolution has been made on the associated criminal case, which could take several months. The resolution of the criminal complaint is important because if a citizen accepts a guilty plea (including pleading to a lesser charge), is found guilty, or has the case dead-docketed (case postponed indefinitely, but may be reinstated), in many cases, there is
a negative impact on the complainant’s ACRB false arrest investigation. In other words, citizens must prevail in the criminal complaints against them to be successful in false arrest allegations against officers.

Under Georgia law, to be successful on a false arrest claim (1) there must be an arrest under the process of law, (2) without probable cause, (3) made maliciously (4) with prosecution terminating in the favor of the complaining party. The acceptance of a guilty plea, being found guilty, or having a case dead-docketed will generally create an inference that probable cause existed for the arrest.

Nevertheless, despite the challenges of investigative delays and the resolutions of false arrest complaints against complainants, the investigation of false arrest allegations are taken very seriously because of the consequences that innocent citizens have to deal with after an arrest lacking probable cause, for example, challenges involving employment, housing, familial and social relationship, and exposure to potential probation and parole violations.

Allegations Received

Allegations received represent the concerns that citizens have about particular officer actions. Allegations received are the total number of allegations filed with the agency, including allegations outside of the agency’s jurisdiction and allegations of suspended investigations. Generally, the number of allegations will exceed the number of complaints because complaints usually contain more than one allegation.

Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegations Received</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Language</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Force</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Arrest</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Imprisonment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Personal Injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite a 17% overall decrease in the number of allegations received from 2011 through 2012, the number of false arrest allegations increased by 66% (14) from 2011 through 2012. False arrest allegations accounted for 42% of the allegations received in 2012.

A review of the allegations received shows that several allegations of false arrests were made against officers of other agencies and arrests made on warrants; however, those allegations do not explain the increase in the number of false arrest allegations during 2012. The ACRB will need to conduct a deeper study to determine whether the number of high false arrest allegations is an indication of officer actions
that can be addressed through officer training and policy changes, or whether the incidents are isolated incidents that require additional supervision of officers and discipline to reduce the number of allegations. The ACRB will continue to increase citizens’ understanding of what constitutes false arrest and the limits of the ACRB jurisdiction as it relates to arrest and the subsequent criminal process.

Excessive force accounted for 17% of the allegations received. The majority of the excessive force complaints included allegations involving rough handling, use of the ASP baton, tight handcuffs, pepper spray, and a dog shooting. The number of excessive force allegations fell slightly from 2011 through 2012. Excessive force allegations have steadily decreased over the past three years.

Twenty-three percent of the allegations received in 2012 fell in the “Other” category. Allegations classified as Other included citizen concerns about racial profiling, the quality of police service, officer negligence, constitutional violations at the jail, officer rudeness, inadequate counsel against public defender, general complaints, and harassment (distinguished from the type of harassment covered under the ACRB Ordinance). Considering the number of complaints in this category over the past two years, the ACRB will need to explore expanding the ACRB’s jurisdiction to better serve the concerns of citizens and continue its outreach to explain the ACRB’s current jurisdiction. To assist citizens with their out-of-jurisdiction complaint filings, the ACRB refers citizens to the appropriate agencies for assistance.

**Complaint Incident Locations**

The tracking of complaint incident locations data is especially important in areas that have a history of police misconduct concerns and complaints. The collection and tracking of this data provides useful information regarding the changes in citizens’ concerns about officer conduct and the relationships between citizens and officers in different areas of the city. Timely review and analysis of the data will allow the ACRB and the police department to monitor the impact of policies, discipline and corrective action, and citizen engagement.

The challenge for the ACRB is to identify the contributing factors for the disparities and focus on developing strategies to reduce the disparities. Among the factors that may contribute to the disparities of the number of complaints received from different areas are: the type of area (business zone, entertainment area, high transient population, stable neighborhoods, etc.) and the use of different policing tactics (quality of life, suppression, problem-solving, crime prevention, etc.); level of apathy related to police misconduct; level of visibility of the ACRB; citizens’ access to other avenues for resolution of policing concerns; and the level of trust that citizens of different areas have in the City’s ability to correct officer behavior. Identifying the causes in order to reduce the disparities is a continuing challenge for the agency.

As depicted in Chart 2 and Chart 3 on the next page, a disproportionate number of complaints were received in Patrol Zone 5 and Council District 2 as compared to the other zones and council districts. Appendix C provides a table with the council districts divided by zone.
Chart 2:

Complaints by APD Patrol Zone

Chart 3:

Complaints by Council District
Complainants

Eighty-one percent of the citizens who filed complaints that were assigned for an investigation in 2012 were black. Seventy-eight percent of the complainants were over the age of 35 years old and sixty-three percent were males. Only one citizen filed multiple complaints in 2012.

While the above percentages indicate that there is a disparity between the number of complaints filed by blacks and the age of complainants as compared to other races and age groups, in order to fully understand the significance of the above percentages, a deeper analysis requiring more data should be performed. As with the location of complaints, several factors may contribute to the percentages discussed above. Among the factors that may contribute to the disparities of the number of complaints filed among the races and ages are: the total number of APD contacts and reasons for those contacts; the characteristics of those who have contact with the police; characteristics of the officers making the stops; geographic areas of the contacts; the policing tactics used in certain areas; citizens’ level of comfort in reporting misconduct; citizens’ awareness of the agency and trust in the process; age of the citizen; and citizens’ access to other avenues for resolution of their concerns. Studies into these areas will assist the ACRB in its effort to improve the perceptions and realities of citizens and their interactions with law enforcement. These studies will also allow the ACRB to determine if there are certain patterns and practices of law enforcement that contribute to the disparities.

Officers

Fifty-nine percent of the officers who received complaints that were assigned to investigations were black officers. Fifty-nine percent of the officers were between the ages of 25 and 35 years old. Ninety-one percent were males, and seventy-one percent had less than five years of experience on the Atlanta police force. Two officers received multiple complaints during 2012.

As APD works to achieve and maintain 2000 officers, new officers are continually joining the APD. With officers having less than five years on the APD force receiving 71% of the complaints in 2012, the ACRB will closely examine supervisory involvement and the types of allegations contained in complaints against officers with less than five years.

Investigative Time

The ACRB investigative timeline begins when a signed complaint is received in the office and ends when the executive director signs off on the completed complaint investigation.

The ACRB mission requires the agency to conduct an independent and timely investigation into citizen allegations. While the ACRB does not have an investigative time requirement, the APD has a 180-day complaint investigation requirement for its internal investigations. The agency strives to keep the number of investigative days below the 180-day requirement. In 2012, the average number of investigative days for an ACRB investigation was 146 days. Six investigations exceeded 180 days. Complaints that exceeded 180 days were a result of investigations being suspended, pending the adjudication of criminal complaints, expert medical review of medical records, and no executive director to sign off on investigations. An extreme false arrest investigation took 519 days to complete. This outlier is not included in the chart on the next page.
Section III: ACRB Decisions and APD Responses

After the executive director signs off on the investigative report, the report is scheduled for a board review and decision for the following month.

ACRB Decisions

The board reviewed and rendered decisions on 19 complaints in 2012. The board sustained six of the 19 complaints (32%), which was a decrease from 53% in 2011. Ten allegations were sustained. The table below shows the distribution of the sustained allegations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRB Sustained Allegations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Force</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Arrest</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Imprisonment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that an unsustained complaint does not necessarily indicate that the allegations contained in the complaint were false or meritless; it merely indicates that the evidence uncovered in the complaint did not support a sustained finding. The lack of corroborating evidence (lack of witnesses and recordings) is a major factor in many unsustained complaints.
Chief’s Responsibilities

While the ACRB has the authority to make decisions and recommendations for discipline on officers’ conduct, the chiefs are responsible for the management and discipline of officers. As with most employee management situations, the departments base their disciplinary decisions on the chiefs’ discipline philosophy; departmental discipline history; departmental policies, procedures, practices; and controlling laws. The chiefs has the discretionary power to make disciplinary decisions as the chief deems necessary.

The challenge for the ACRB and the Atlanta Police and Corrections Departments is to maintain openness of the disciplinary decision process and freely communicate the reasons to discipline or not discipline. It is only through transparent discipline decisions and communication that citizens will grow to trust the officer accountability systems.

ACRB/APD Assessments of ACRB Complaints

At the time of preparing this report, the chief had not made a decision on three of the complaints decided by the board. The ACRB and APD agreed on the assessment of 14 of the 16 complaints, which is 88% of the complaints and a major improvement from the 2011 agreement rate of 66%. Appendix D provides the board’s and APD’s decisions. Agreement on complaints demonstrates the APD’s respect for the ACRB’s investigations and decisions. Agreement in the evaluation of complaints is also an indicator of the performance of the ACRB and APD. The chart below illustrates the improvement in the agreement rate.

Chart 5:

The improvement in the APD’s assessment of ACRB adjudicated complaints is a positive indicator that the ACRB and APD are moving in the right direction with regard to the ACRB mission. It is also an indicator that the ACRB and APD are becoming better aligned in their evaluations of complaints. Though disagreements may arise in the assessment of complaints, they should be minimal and should be accompanied by discussions about the disagreements that will lead to increased understanding of the rationale.
for the differences in assessments. The value of the discussions should increase the alignment of assessments and outcomes and identify areas that may need to be evaluated and improved.

**APD Discipline Response on ACRB Sustained Complaints**

More important than the overall agreement rate is the rate of agreement on ACRB sustained complaints. In previous years, the APD received criticism for, in most cases, only agreeing with the ACRB decision when the ACRB complaint was not sustained, while rejecting the ACRB sustained complaints. In 2012, however, the chief disciplined on 83% of the sustained ACRB complaints. The chief disciplined on five of the six sustained complaints, which was a significant increase from the percentage of complaints disciplined in 2011 (44%), as shown in the chart below. Appendix E provides the chief’s responses to ACRB sustained complaints.

Chart 6:

One of the unintended benefits of the ACRB complaint filings is that the APD has an opportunity to review complaints that it may not have otherwise received. This is especially important as it relates to matters beyond the ACRB complaint allegations. This benefit was recognized in a case where the ACRB did not sustain the allegations in the complaint; however, APD sustained the complaint on other issues that were not within the ACRB’s jurisdiction. In addition to the APD’s opportunity to review complaints that might not be filed with the APD Office of Professional Standards (OPS), the existence and proper functioning of the ACRB provides external pressure on the law enforcement departments to consistently give citizen complaints thorough reviews and appropriate redress.

**Officer Discipline**

The APD uses a disciplinary matrix to administer discipline and corrective action on officers. The matrix is intended to provide consistency in the application of progressive discipline. The matrix provides consideration for the mitigating and aggravating circumstances, which includes employee intent, past performance, degree of culpability, discipline history, severity of infraction, acceptance of responsibility by the employee and other relevant factors. It should be noted that discipline is a factor considered for
promotion and special assignments.

Discipline may include oral admonishment, written reprimand, suspension, termination, and demotion. Corrective actions include counseling, training, and participation in programs, psychological intervention, and leave of absence without pay.

In 2012, the chief imposed discipline in the form of four written reprimands, two oral admonishments, 2-day suspension, and a dismissal on officers who received sustained ACRB complaints. The discipline imposed represented 66% of the board’s discipline recommendations. Two board written reprimand recommendations received oral admonishments. The board also agreed with the discipline imposed on an officer who had received an ACRB complaint that the OPS investigated. Appendix F provides the APD’s responses to the ACRB penalty recommendations.

When the ACRB operation and process is working effectively, citizens receive redress on their complaints and the law enforcement departments are able to take advantage of a valuable tool that will assist the departments in managing officer behavior in ways that are consistent with the citizens’ expectations. In addition, officers receive a clear message that behaviors and actions that violate citizens’ rights and APD and ACD policies will be addressed timely and appropriately. Although citizens primarily consider the amount of discipline when measuring the effectiveness of the ACRB and the law enforcement departments’ handling of citizen complaints, training, coaching, and policy and training changes are also valuable tools used to manage and correct officer behaviors.

**Section IV: Atlanta Corrections Department**

The ACRB has jurisdiction over corrections officers who work in the Atlanta City Jail. Complaints against corrections officers typically fall under the abusive language, harassment, and excessive force categories.

While citizens have expressed concerns about the actions and behaviors of Atlanta corrections officers, the ACRB has received very few complaints. Historically, the ACRB has averaged less than two complaints a year against the corrections officers.

Possible reasons for the low number of complaints against corrections officers may be attributed to the lack of ACRB visibility at the jail and the limited outreach that has been focused on corrections officers. Another possible reason could be that citizens, after being released from jail, choose not to file a complaint against the corrections officers.

In light of the low number of complaints, the ACRB will need to study this area through outreach, surveys, and analyzing the corrections department’s internal citizen complaints to determine the level of misconduct and how the ACRB can adjust its practices to accommodate those wishing to file complaints against corrections officers. An effective first step that the ACRB is acting on is placing ACRB signage at the Atlanta City Jail and negotiating the placement of drop boxes at the facility.
Section V: Performance Measures

Performance measures are an important part of assuring citizens that the ACRB is moving in the right direction to address citizens’ concerns about officer misconduct. Performance measures are a set of indicators that the agency uses to measure progress on a periodic basis. The ACRB has identified eight performance measures that support the city’s public safety initiative and the agency’s mission and strategic goals; five of the measures may be considered as output measures and three measures may be considered as outcome measures.

The five output measures are: (1) the number of contacts, (2) types of allegations, (3) number of completed investigations, (4) average number of days to complete an investigation, and (5) the number of days to receive a response from the chief. These measures are indicators of the timeliness and efficiency of the operation. These measures also allow the ACRB to monitor changes related to citizen concerns about officer actions and behaviors.

The three outcome measures are: (1) the percentage of sustained complaints resulting in disciplined or receiving corrective action, (2) the percentage of agreement between the law enforcement departments and ACRB adjudicated complaints, and (3) the percentage of agreement on the discipline recommendations. Through regularly scheduled reports, these measures allow citizens to monitor and comment on the law enforcement departments’ responses to citizens’ concerns about officer misconduct. The percentages allow the public to determine how well the departments are working within the spirit of the ordinance and how seriously the departments are addressing officer misconduct. As mentioned earlier, a higher percentage of agreement in these outcome measures is evidence that the systems are working properly. However, at this time, the ACRB does not have an established baseline, based on national trends and data and historical ACRB data, to determine when the system is in danger. Nevertheless, negative changes in the percentages should encourage questions and discussions about what is occurring within the departments and between the departments that could be impeding agreement.

With the ACRB’s new strategic direction and goals and a desire to move beyond the creation stage to fully functioning, the agency started doing a better job of tracking information, activities, and data. At the end 2013, the agency should have solid baseline measures to determine needed adjustments and tweaks to the agency and the agency process.

As the ACRB matures and moves beyond its set up stage, assessing the outcomes from the ACRB will be important to measure the effectiveness of the agency’s work and the impact that it has on improving the quality of officers’ interactions with citizens and the perceptions and realities citizens may have of their interactions with officers. Over time, the ACRB may modify performance measures and use data from a variety sources to measure changes in officer behavior. The agency will utilize its power and resources to conduct studies to provide more transparency of officer accountability.

In reviewing the outcome performance measures (percentage of sustained complaints disciplined, the percentage of agreement between the law enforcement departments, and ACRB adjudicated complaints as discussed on Pages 28 and 29), the APD and ACRB made considerable progress in 2012. This progress is a welcomed beginning that can be built upon. For the citizens, this is a clear indication that the ACRB and APD are working toward addressing citizen concerns about police misconduct.
Section VI: Outreach
Outreach is central to the ACRB’s ability to meaningfully serve the citizens of Atlanta. Since August 2012, outreach has become a priority. The ACRB advocates citizen education to aid in citizen empowerment in dealing with officer misconduct. The ACRB is committed to reaching out to citizens and officers. With the change in strategic direction, the agency has implemented a community outreach plan focusing on deliberate outreach and education to officers and citizens. This shift in direction will allow the ACRB to proactively engage citizens and officers about the ACRB process and improving interactions between citizens and officers. The ACRB is developing performance measures that will ensure success of its outreach commitment.

Section VII: Challenges
By the end of the year, the agency identified challenges that would need to be addressed in the future. Among the immediate challenges facing the ACRB at the end of 2012 were limited office space, limited investigative staff, the need for a sustainable outreach program, establishing visibility at the Atlanta City Jail, and expansion of the ACRB’s jurisdiction.

It cannot be overstated that the ACRB’s limited staff resources impairs the agency’s ability to have a larger impact on officer accountability, increased transparency of the systems, and increased service levels to the citizens and law enforcement departments.

Section VIII: Conclusion
The Atlanta Citizen Review Board closed out 2012 in a much better position than it began. It secured new leadership and recommitted itself to serving the citizens and officers of Atlanta. Through the hard work of the board and staff, the agency was able to recognize success in 2012. The implementation of training, awareness, and education plans, as well as, mending and building professional relations were critical to moving the ACRB forward. As a result of the sustained complaints and subsequent APD action, several officers had the opportunity to learn from their actions and behaviors, while the complainants had an avenue of redress for their complaints. That is the essence of the agency’s mission.

The ACRB is positioning itself to have a greater impact on improving relationships between citizens and officers. The ACRB ordinance provides significant powers that the ACRB will begin to use to move the needle on officer accountability. The ACRB will conduct more studies and policy reviews and make more recommendations. Increasing the ACRB footprint through community education is a high priority.

Through additional reporting, increased visibility, citizen and officer engagement, and the APD’s and ACD’s appropriate responses to the ACRB’s work, citizens and visitors of Atlanta will be confident that the agency is moving in the right direction to accomplish the goals of city government and the demands of the citizens. As the ACRB continues to mature, the collection and dissemination of data on an annual and quarterly basis will provide additional transparency of the officer accountability systems and promote meaningful dialogue between the community and the departments involved in police accountability. The ACRB will continue to move the needle on officer accountability.
Appendices
Appendix A

Atlanta City Ordinance Section 2-2202

Appointment of members.

(a) The 11 members of the Atlanta Citizen Review Board shall be appointed as follows and said appointments shall be confirmed by the city council:

(1) One member shall be appointed by the mayor
(2) One member shall be appointed by the city council
(3) One member shall be appointed by the president of council with previous experience as a law enforcement professional.
(4) One member shall be appointed by neighborhood planning unit ("NPU") group A—F
(5) One member shall be appointed by NPU group G—L
(6) One member shall be appointed by NPU group M—R
(7) One member shall be appointed by NPU group S—Z
(8) One member shall be appointed from the Gate City Bar Association
(9) One member shall be appointed from the Atlanta Bar Association
(10) One member shall be appointed by the League of Women Voters
(11) One member shall be appointed by the Atlanta Business League

(b) "NPU groups", for this purpose, are recognized by alphabetically arranged groups of six or seven. The Atlanta Planning and Advisory Board ("APAB") shall be responsible for developing a process and coordinating the appointment of said board members.

(c) All initial appointments shall be confirmed by the council. Such appointments should be confirmed within 90 days of the effective date of this ordinance.

(d) All confirmed appointees should be inaugurated no more than 30 days after council confirmation.

(e) Upon inauguration the board will have up to 60 days to recommend standard operating procedures and recommended budgetary requirements to be approved by council.

(f) The members of the Atlanta Citizen Review Board may make recommendations to the mayor, president of council, and council members of prospective members to be appointed to the board.

(g) Nominees for the citizen review board and the citizens review board officer, if applicable, shall be subject to an employment background check as well as a criminal history check. Nominees shall execute all releases necessary for the department of personnel and human resources and the department of police to accomplish the same. If the nominee is determined to have committed a felony, the nomination will be withdrawn.

(Ord. No. 2007-13 (07-O-0141), § 1, 3-13-07)
Appendix B

Complaint Terms Definitions

To assist the reader with understanding the ACRB terminology used in Table 1, page 23, the following definitions are provided:

*Complaints Received* are the total number of complaints filed with the agency.

*Complaints Opened* are those complaints that are within the ACRB jurisdiction.

*Complaints Suspended* are those complaints where the investigations are suspended until there has been resolutions of the criminal complaints.

*Complaints Dismissed* are those complaints that do not fall within the Board’s jurisdiction or clearly have no merit.
## Appendix C

### Council Districts divided by Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APD Zone</th>
<th>Council Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3, 4, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1, 4, 5, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th>ACRB Board Disposition</th>
<th>Chief’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-32</td>
<td>False Arrest</td>
<td>Unfounded/Exonerated</td>
<td>Unfounded/Exonerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-44</td>
<td>Excessive Force</td>
<td>Not Sustained</td>
<td>Not Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-47</td>
<td>Excessive Force</td>
<td>Not Sustained</td>
<td>Not Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-53</td>
<td>Excessive Force/Abusive Language</td>
<td>Sustained/Sustained</td>
<td>Not Sustained/Not Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-63</td>
<td>False Arrest</td>
<td>Unfounded</td>
<td>N/A²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-74</td>
<td>False Imprisonment/Excessive Force</td>
<td>Sustained/ Sustained</td>
<td>Sustained/Not Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-75</td>
<td>False Arrest/Abusive Language</td>
<td>Sustained/Not Sustained</td>
<td>Sustained/Not Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-76</td>
<td>Abusive Language</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-77</td>
<td>False Arrest</td>
<td>Not Sustained</td>
<td>N/A⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-78</td>
<td>False Arrest</td>
<td>Exonerated</td>
<td>Exonerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-81</td>
<td>False Imprisonment</td>
<td>Unfounded</td>
<td>Exonerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-82</td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Unfounded</td>
<td>Exonerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-90</td>
<td>Excessive Force/False Imprisonment</td>
<td>Exonerated/Exonerated</td>
<td>Not Sustained/Exonerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exonerated/Exonerated</td>
<td>Exonerated/Exonerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-01</td>
<td>False Arrest</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-03</td>
<td>Abusive Language/Excessive Force</td>
<td>Not Sustained/Not Sustained</td>
<td>Sustained/Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-05</td>
<td>False Arrest/Excessive Force</td>
<td>Not Sustained/Not Sustained</td>
<td>N/A³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-06</td>
<td>False Imprisonment</td>
<td>Not Sustained</td>
<td>Not Sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>False Arrest</td>
<td>Exonerated</td>
<td>Exonerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-28⁶</td>
<td>False Arrest</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>Sustained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹There were two allegations against two different officers in this case.
²There has not been a response from Atlanta Corrections in reference to this case.
³There were two allegations against two different officers in this case.
⁴There has not been a response from Atlanta Police Dept. in reference to this case.
⁵There has not been a response from Atlanta Police Dept. in reference to this case.
⁶The investigation was completed in 2012; however, the board and chief’s findings/response was obtained in 2013.
### Chief’s Responses to ACRB Sustained Complaint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Work Rule Violated</th>
<th>Penalty Imposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-74</td>
<td>Appropriate Action Required</td>
<td>Oral Admonishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees shall respond in an appropriate manner to all situations by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Being considerate of the rights, feelings, and interests of all persons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Taking action in each situation to provide the necessary and appropriate service and insuring the proper notification of supervisors when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Requesting the assistance of supervisors when the appropriate action required is unclear, not possible given circumstances, or not within the scope of authority of the employee of whom such action was requested.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Performing official acts in a lawful, restrained, dignified, impartial, and reasonable manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-75</td>
<td>Conformance to Directives</td>
<td>Written Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees are required to familiarize themselves with, and conform to, the rules, regulations, directives, and standard operating procedures of the Department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Work Rule Violated</td>
<td>Penalty Imposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-75</td>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>Dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees shall be truthful in their written and spoken words at all times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct</td>
<td>Written Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees shall not act in an official or private capacity in a manner that shall bring discredit upon the Department or themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conformance to Directives</td>
<td>Written Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees are required to familiarize themselves with, and conform to, the rules, regulations, directives, and standard operating procedures of the Department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-76</td>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>Written Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees shall be civil, orderly and courteous to the public, co-workers, and supervisors and should not use coarse, insensitive, abusive, violent, or profane language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Work Rule Violated</td>
<td>Penalty Imposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-01</td>
<td>Conformance to Directives</td>
<td>Oral Admonishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees are required to familiarize themselves with, and conform to, the rules, regulations, directives, and standard operating procedures of the Department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-28</td>
<td>Conformance to Directives</td>
<td>2-Day Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees are required to familiarize themselves with, and conform to, the rules, regulations, directives, and standard operating procedures of the Department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-53</td>
<td>No violation Cited</td>
<td>No Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Subject Officer</th>
<th>Penalty Recommendation by Board</th>
<th>Penalty Imposed by Chief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-74</td>
<td>Lonnie Character</td>
<td>FI- Written Reprimand EF-9 Days Suspension</td>
<td>Oral Admonishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-75</td>
<td>William Kellner</td>
<td>FA-Written Reprimand FA-Written Reprimand</td>
<td>Written Reprimand Dismissal Written Reprimand Written Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Matteson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-76</td>
<td>Peter Trotta</td>
<td>AL-Written Reprimand</td>
<td>Written Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-01</td>
<td>Andrae Warren</td>
<td>FA-Written Reprimand</td>
<td>Oral Admonishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-28</td>
<td>Terrence Malone</td>
<td>FA*</td>
<td>2 Day Suspension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The chief had disciplined the officer prior to the board decision. The board agreed with the discipline.
Atlanta Citizen Review Board

A Year In Pictures
Child at 2012 National Night Out.

Reverend Dr. Joseph E. Lowery and ACRB Investigator Sheena Robertson at the ACRB Executive Director Reception.

From left to right, Atlanta Chief of Police George Turner, ACRB Executive Director Lee Reid, and original ACRB member, Seth Kirschenbaum.

ACRB Vice Chair Maceo C. Williams Sr. and Executive Director Lee Reid at the Pittsburgh Community Youth Fall Festival.

ACRB Chair Paul Bartels at the Executive Director Search Community Forum.
ACRB Investigator Kenneth Lively working.

Atlanta City Council Member Ivory Young and Board Member William Harrison at 2012 National Night Out.

Youth at the Festival of Lights

APD Officer and Officer McGruff at 2012 National Night Out.

APD Community Affairs Liaison Alice Johnson and member of the APD Police Union President Michael Kreher at the Executive Director Search Forum.
ACRB Business Manager Myola Smith at the 2012 National Night Out.

Outreach Consultant Sandra Walker and Executive Director Lee Reid at English Avenue Community Festival.

APD Officer and youth at the 2012 National Night Out.

ACRB member Alan Morris and ACRB Investigator Kenneth Lively at the Executive Director Reception.

From left to right, APD Chief of Staff Major Vincent Moore, ACRB Investigator Sheena Robertson and APD Office of Professional Standards Major Elder Dancy at the ACRB Executive Director Reception.

Community members enjoying the 2012 National Night Out.
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