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Message from the Chair:

I am pleased to present the Atlanta Citizen Review Board (ACRB) 2013 Annual Report. Thank you for your support, interest in the ACRB’s work and for reading our annual report. Year 2013 proved to be another successful year of growth. We focused intently upon training and outreach and as a result, our Board and investigative staff learned a great deal, which will benefit the agency, and most importantly, the citizens of Atlanta.

As an independent investigative agency empowered to receive, investigate, hear, make findings, and recommend action on complaints against Atlanta police officers and Atlanta corrections officers, we take our work very seriously. We look forward to adding mediation to our service offerings in 2014. We recognize that many people who utilize our services do not have another avenue for redress. Therefore, it is with a great sense of responsibility that the ACRB engages in civilian oversight with the goal to be above reproach in our fairness for citizens and officers. The ACRB is committed to serving the citizens and visitors of our great city with the highest level of professional investigations and decisions on citizen complaints against Atlanta police officers and Atlanta corrections officers.

We take great pride in the board’s ability to discuss citizens’ concerns in a forum that is transparent and reflective of a cross section of citizens of Atlanta. The board’s strength of diversity, of thought and perspectives, allows the board to make decisions that includes citizens’ expectations of our law enforcement professionals, based upon departmental policies and the law.

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

Best regards,

William Harrison
Executive Summary

The purpose of this annual report is to inform Atlanta Citizen Review Board (ACRB) stakeholders—citizens, community organizations, city administration, city council, and the law enforcement departments—of the ACRB’s work during 2013.

In 2013, the ACRB continued with its commitment to conduct required community outreach. The ACRB attended festivals and made presentations throughout the Atlanta community to communicate with citizens about the ACRB process and role in police accountability. The agency also held its first annual art and essay contest for students. The purpose of the contest was to encourage dialogue between adults and youth about proper interactions between citizens and law enforcement.

The ACRB increased its service to citizens as it relates to complaint filings by 85%. The agency received 124 complaints, containing 159 allegations. Of the 124 complaints, 25% were dismissed because the allegations were outside of the ACRB jurisdicational categories and 26% were against officers from jurisdictions other than Atlanta. The ACRB received one complaint involving an officer-involved shooting death. The majority of complaints received in 2013 came from APD Zones 1, 3, and 5 and Council Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 12. One complaint was received against an Atlanta Department of Corrections officer.

False arrest allegations led the allegation categories with 35%, followed by excessive force allegations at 27%.

The Board made decisions on 20 complaints, sustaining or partially sustaining 45%. At the time of this report, the Chief of the Atlanta Police Department had returned decisions on all complaints. The decisions included 12 final (accepted or rejected) decisions and eight rejected decisions pending the completion of the APD Internal Affairs investigation. Of the 12 complaints with final decisions, the chief accepted the board’s decision on 75% of the complaints, one of which was a board sustained complaint. The eight complaints pending the chief’s final decision included five complaints sustained by the board.

By the end of year, the ACRB had made significant progress in its performance measures. While the ACRB is still in the early stages of establishing baseline measures, a review of the 2013 performance measures revealed that the ACRB had success in the majority of its performance measures. The ACRB served more people, reduced its investigative timeline, and increased the number of completed complaint investigations. In regards to the performance measures that includes the APD’s actions on ACRB complaints, it is too early to determine the measure of success due to the number of complaints pending a final decision from the APD.

Going into 2014, the ACRB will continue to develop and implement a mediation program, establish a sustainable awareness and education program, and further reduce its investigative timeline.
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Introduction

This report provides the 2013 ACRB citizen complaint data involving Atlanta Police and Corrections officers. The data was collected from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013. 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. 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. 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. Citizens who exercise their civic responsibility by filing legitimate complaints about officer behavior gain a sense of empowerment over the experience with an errant officer. 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 increase citizen confidence and trust in officer accountability, the ACRB understands that fair and objective investigations and adjudications also serve to assure officers that frivolous and meritless complaints are appropriately handled during the ACRB process.

Making actions count is what the ACRB was committed to doing in 2013. The ACRB worked diligently to increase its presence in the community. Community presence is important to the work of the ACRB because it is only through the agency’s presence and appropriate and timely action that the community will trust the agency to address their concerns.

The public’s trust of the City of Atlanta’s law enforcement departments is not solely dependent on the daily interactions of officers through their contact with citizens on the street and in the city jail. It is also dependent on the actions of the law enforcement departments’ and ACRB’s fair, timely, and thorough investigations of and responses to citizen concerns about their interactions with law enforcement members.

In 2013, the ACRB continued its march forward toward fulfilling its mission statement. With the support of Mayor Reed’s administration, the Atlanta City Council, and the APD, the agency received funding to develop and implement a joint mediation program with the APD to handle lower-level citizen complaints.

The ACRB also began fruitful conversations with the Atlanta Corrections Department. The ACRB and the corrections department collaborated on ways to increase the ACRB’s presence at the Atlanta City Jail.

To allow the reader to focus on areas of interests, this report is divided into ten sections. Section I discusses the agency. Section II provides a discussion of the 2013 data. Section III provides the ACRB decisions and APD responses. Section IV discusses the Atlanta Department of Corrections. Section V discusses the development of a mediation program. Section VI provides information on the agency’s 2013 outreach. Section VII highlights the agency’s commitment to training. Section VIII discusses the agency’s performance measures. Section IX discusses the challenges facing the agency at the end of 2013. 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: From Moving the Needle to Making Actions Count**

In 2013, the agency continued with the momentum created in 2012. Focusing on its three-point plan involving training, awareness, and education to drive its operation, the ACRB worked diligently to become a presence in the community and provide training to the board and staff. To make its actions count, the ACRB tracked its activities for evaluation and improvement. As this annual report will provide, the ACRB made its actions count in 2013 and is poised to make a greater impact in 2014.

The first point – TRAINING – Board and staff training is the investment to ensure that the board and staff are prepared and remain prepared to handle citizen complaints. The agency continued with its 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 provided trainings in 2013. Training highlights will be provided in Section VII.

The second point – AWARENESS – The purpose of the awareness goal is to increase the agency’s visibility and the public’s and officers’ understanding of the ACRB. Awareness of the agency and its function is critical to building trust and confidence in the agency’s work. 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 ACRB took advantage of media and social media opportunities as they arose in 2013. The agency increased its outreach by 500%. The ACRB presented to more audiences and attended more events than in the past. The agency created a database of internal and external stakeholders to improve communication with stakeholders.

The third point – EDUCATION – 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. 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. The agency took a great leap in expanding its message of proper interactions between citizen and officers to young people with its First Annual ACRB Youth Art and Essay Contest. The ACRB created a youth coloring and activity book to promote dialogue between youth and adults about proper interactions between citizens and officers, and what to do if they ever have a concern.

Moving the Needle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present (Action Phase)</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Increased public confidence in law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness</td>
<td>Outreach (Awareness and Education)</td>
<td>Positive perceptions of law enforcement professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of education</td>
<td>Appropriate corrective actions</td>
<td>Lower settlement and litigation costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Image</td>
<td>(policy changes, training, discipline)</td>
<td>Empowered communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased payouts to citizens</td>
<td>Effective use of data</td>
<td>Mutual respect between citizens and officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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, as well as, the board’s decisions and the chief’s response to the board’s decisions. This data can be used to measure the agency’s progress toward achieving its mission. The importance of performance measures is addressed later in this report.

Complaints Received

The ACRB received 124 complaints in 2013. The number of complaints received increased by 85 percent. On its face, an increase of 85% appears large and may cause concern that police actions have gotten worse over the year; however, the increase may indicate that underreporting has been an issue that is being corrected by the agency’s increased efforts to engage the public and the public’s response to the agency’s community engagement efforts. Chart 1 shows the increase in the number of complaints received. Further, this increase may be a positive indicator that the public is becoming aware of the ACRB process and recognize the value in using the process to resolve their concerns about interactions with officers. While it is difficult to determine why and when a citizen will file a complaint, it is a fact that awareness of the agency gives the citizen the power to exercise the right to file a complaint.

Chart 2 shows that the ACRB dismissed 70% of the complaints received in 2013. Dismissed complaints will be discussed later in the report.
Allegations Received

Chart 3 shows that the ACRB received 159 allegations contained in the 2013 complaints. The number of allegations received is higher than the number of complaints because several complaints contained multiple allegations or allegations against multiple officers. The table below shows the distribution of the allegations received.

![Chart 3: Number of Allegations Received](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Allegations Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 159 allegations received, the ACRB assigned 49 (31%) allegations to investigations, contained in 33 complaints. An allegation is assigned to investigation when it is determined that the allegation falls within the agency’s jurisdiction and there is a question of a potential violation of APD policy. The table below shows the distribution of the allegations assigned to investigations.

![Table 1: Distribution of Allegations Received](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Allegations Assigned to Investigations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Language</td>
<td>11 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>15 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Force</td>
<td>28 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Arrest</td>
<td>46 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Imprisonment</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Personal Injury</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>159 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Allegations Assigned to Investigations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Language</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Force</td>
<td>13 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Arrest</td>
<td>17 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Imprisonment</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Personal Injury</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

False arrest allegations continued to be the allegation most assigned for investigation. As discussed in the 2012 report, investigations of false arrest allegations are generally suspended until a resolution has been made on the associated criminal case, which could take several months. Eleven of the 17 false arrests allegations were suspended at some point during 2013.
The false arrest allegation will be studied during the agency’s review of its enabling ordinance to determine whether a change to the allegation would allow the agency to act on the allegations quicker.

False arrest allegations can arise out of any type of situation where an individual is physically arrested. The ACRB examined the underlying situations of the false arrests allegations received in 2013. In examining the complaints, false arrest allegations were mostly filed in situations where contact between the officer and citizen was officer-initiated through dispatch. Most of the underlying situations involved physical altercations, warrant service, and traffic.

The excessive force allegations assigned for investigations involved physical force (striking and kicking), Taser, impact weapon, and a shooting death. The excessive force allegations arose out of the following situations and contacts: warrant service, traffic, and physical altercation. The majority of the contact between citizen and officer was officer initiated.

Abusive language allegations were reported as profanity and name calling.

**Dismissed Complaints**

The percentage of complaint dismissals continued to be abnormally high in 2013. This high percentage is driven primarily by the number of complaints dismissed due to lack of jurisdiction. In 2013, the ACRB dismissed 25% of the complaints received because the allegations did not fall within the ACRB’s jurisdiction. The ACRB recognizes this as a continued challenge to serving the citizens. That 25% represented 34% of the dismissals.

As the ACRB continues to engage the public, more citizens become aware of the agency and wish to have the agency investigate their complaints. Citizens who wish to file a complaint with the agency expect the agency to handle their complaints; however, they are disappointed and become cynical of the City’s efforts to address officer misconduct when they are informed that they will have to file their complaints with the APD because of a lack of jurisdiction.

The ACRB is faced with the reality that the current ordinance does not fully meet the desires of the citizens of Atlanta. During 2014, the ACRB plans to make the argument for an expansion of the agency’s jurisdiction to include allegations that the ACRB currently has to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. The agency’s goal is to avoid mistakes of the past where citizens did not have an available option to address their concerns. An expansion of the ACRB jurisdiction would tighten the alignment of investigation allegations between the APD and ACD and would ensure that all non-criminal citizen concerns about police and corrections officers receive an independent investigation. As it stands now, citizens are forced to either forgo filing a complaint or file with the APD.
Complaint Incident Locations

An understanding of the location of where complaint incidents occurred is important to the agency’s ability to perform awareness and education activities. More importantly, an understanding of where complaints occur, combined with the types of allegations from the areas, can inform the agency and the police department of issues that may be related to officer assignments, supervision, disparities of treatment between the various locations. As the ACRB continues to move toward increasing its use of data, the ACRB will be in a position to timely communicate issues to the police department which would assist the department with making adjustments that may have an impact on what citizens in an area are experiencing.

Zones

In 2013, the distribution of complaints from zones became more evenly distributed. Zones 2 and 5 experienced reductions in the number of complaints received from their respective zones. Zones 1, 3, and 6 had increases in the number of complaints received from their respective zones. The majority of Zone 1 complaints involved allegations of excessive force, false arrest, and abusive language. Zones 3 and 5 complaints involved false arrest and excessive force complaints. Zone 4 remained constant at 4 complaints. Most complaint incidents occurred during the evening watch from 2:30 pm – 11:00 pm. Appendix B provides the Council Districts divided by police zones. Charts 5 and 6 on the next page show the distribution of complaints by zone.
In 2013, Council Districts 2, 4, 5, 7, and 11 had reductions in the number of complaints received from their respective districts. Council District 2 had the largest reduction in complaints, reducing by 5 complaints. Council Districts 1, 3, 6, and 9 had increases. The majority of the complaints for these council districts were false arrest and excessive force. Council District 3 had the largest increase in the number of complaints received in 2013, increasing by 7. The majority of the complaints received in Council District 3 involved excessive force and false arrest allegations. Unlike Council District 2 in 2012, where the rise in complaints were related to several complaints from the same incident and location, these complaints came from single incidents involving different citizens and officers.
Chart 7 and Table 3 show the distribution of complaints by council district.

Chart 7:

![Complaint Percentage by Council District](image)

Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>+/- change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citizen and Officer Profiles

The below profiles describe the typical individuals who had contact with the ACRB in 2013. The agency is well aware that the citizen profile does not reflect the anecdotal evidence of concerns raised by citizens throughout various communities throughout Atlanta. The profiles below represent those citizens who filed complaints and those officers who received complaints. With the establishment of a sustainable awareness and education program, more citizens may seek to utilize the formal complaint process to address their concerns about police.

The typical officer who receives an ACRB complaint is a male, between the ages of 25 and 35 years old, may be either black or white, and has been with the Atlanta Police Department for more than five years.

In 2013, two officers received more than one complaint.

The typical citizen who files a complaint is a black male, over 35 years old.

In 2013, one citizen filed two complaints.

Investigative Timeline

The duration of the investigative timeline is important to citizens’ and officers’ trust in the officer accountability systems. The ACRB understands that delays in the investigations or adjudications cause unnecessary concerns about the integrity of the investigation; as such, the agency makes every attempt to resolve complaints as thoroughly and quickly possible.

The ACRB staff completed 24 complaint investigations in 2013. Ten of those complaints involved false arrest allegations that were filed in 2012. The agency closed 15 of 33 (42%) complaints assigned to investigation in 2013. The remaining 2013 complaints contained false arrest allegations that were suspended awaiting the resolution of the associated criminal charge.

In 2013, the ACRB shaved 20 days from the 2012 investigative timeline. The number of days to complete an investigation decreased from 147 days to 127 days. The decrease in the number of days to complete an investigation is a reflection of the number of complaints that were suspended due to false arrests allegations. The suspended complaints will still need to be investigated once the criminal cases are resolved, so the decrease in the investigative timeline may not carry over to the future. The average length
of time to investigate allegations of false arrests was 250 days. False arrests complaints averaged a suspension time of 117 days. The investigations of those complaints averaged 133 days once the complaint investigation was reactivated. During the time that a complaint is suspended, witness and officer interviews are conducted and records are gathered.

Chart 8:

![2013 Investigative Days Chart]

Section III: ACRB Decisions and APD Responses
The most informative and public communication about police accountability in the city of Atlanta are the board’s deliberations and decisions on ACRB investigated complaints and the subsequent responses from the APD and ACD chiefs. During these points of action, the citizens of Atlanta are able to determine how responsibly the agency and the law enforcement departments are addressing citizens’ concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustained:</td>
<td>The investigative file provides sufficient evidence to support the finding that the officer committed the violation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfounded:</td>
<td>Complainant admits to false allegation, the charge is false or not factual, or the accused officer was not involved in the incident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-Sustained:</td>
<td>There is insufficient evidence to sustain a finding that the officer committed the violation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exonerated:</td>
<td>The incident occurred but the officer’s actions were justified, lawful, and proper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACRB Decisions

The board is charged with carefully evaluating the evidence obtained during the ACRB staff investigations. After evaluating the evidence, the board makes a decision as to whether the subject officer engaged in misconduct in violation of APD policies and directives. The board decisions on investigated complaints are in conformance with the APD complaint determinations. The board may choose one of five decisions on an allegation.

ACRB staff sent (10) 2013 complaints and (10) 2012 complaints to the Board for decisions. The board sustained 9 of the 20 (45%) complaints that it reviewed in 2013. The majority of the allegations were either sustained or not sustained. A few allegations received exonerated or unfounded recommendations. It should be noted that a not sustained decision does not necessarily indicate that the allegations contained in the complaint were false or meritless; it merely indicates that the evidence obtained did not support a sustained finding. In some not sustained complaints, the lack of witnesses made the decision to sustain difficult; however, not impossible. Even without witnesses, in some cases, the agency is able to support a sustained finding. A few citizens have expressed concern that unless a complaint can be sustained there is little value in filing a complaint against an officer; however, reporting legitimate concerns about officer actions serves many purposes. Filing legitimate complaints that are fairly and timely investigated sends a clear message to officers that questionable behavior will be exposed to the department, which is a good deterrent. The complaints may also contain information that when aggregately compiled and reviewed may lead to emerging issues that need a closer examination. Further, filing legitimate complaints on errant officers is important to law enforcement management because complaints may inform the department that an officer may need to be supervised more closely. Additionally, complaints may also be included in the department’s early warning system, which when compiled with other indicators may reveal an officer experiencing challenges that need to be addressed. Lastly, many officers who work hard every day to carryout their duties correctly are concerned about the activities of errant officers (whether detected by a citizen complaint or not) because their activities affect the department’s morale and create negative citizen perceptions and realities that all officers have to deal with based on the actions of a few. As the agency continues to improve its use of its database, the agency will use the data to determine whether trends or patterns are developing with certain officers or within certain areas of the city regardless of whether a complaint is sustained or not sustained.

APD Chief’s Responses

The ACRB ordinance requires the Atlanta Chief of Police and the Atlanta Chief of Corrections to respond to the board’s decisions within 30 days of receipt of the decisions. Prompt responses to complaints are important to building and maintaining community and officer trust in the city’s police ac-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionally Closed:</td>
<td>Reasons outside the Department's control prevent it from continuing or completing its investigation of a complaint, and/or from charging and prosecuting an accused officer when sufficient evidence exists to charge the accused officer. Examples may include: the officer resigns, dies, or is no longer employed by the Department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
countability systems. The chief’s final response is the culmination of the agency’s and department’s actions to responsibly provide fair and timely resolution to complaints.

The ACRB sent 20 complaints to the police department in 2013. At the time of this report, the chief had agreed with the Board’s findings on 9 out of the 12 complaints received. Eight complaints were pending a decision and three complaints decisions were rejected. The below chart and tables show the percentage breakdown of the chief’s decisions.

Chart 9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APD Chief’s Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chief’s Rejected Board Decisions

For this report, rejected decisions are those decisions where a final chief decision has been received and the chief rejected the board’s decision. In 2013, the chief provided three final decisions that rejected the Board’s sustained decisions after the APD Internal Affairs investigation determined that there was no violation of APD policy. Of the 12 complaints that received final decisions (excluding the pending decisions), the chief rejected 25% of the board’s sustained complaints.

The agency has requested the files that the chief rejected to review the subsequent internal affairs investigations. The agency will conduct a review of the investigations to determine whether there are training opportunities for the board and staff, different assessments of the facts between the ACRB and the APD, new facts that were uncovered during the subsequent internal affairs investigation and not considered in the ACRB investigation, or an indication of a change in the department’s discipline philosophy and handling of ACRB cases. Table 4 on the next page provides the rejected complaints.
At the time of this report, the chief had provided responses to 12 of the 20 complaints sent to the APD. Of those 12, the chief agreed with the board’s decision on nine of the complaints, which is 75%. However, it should be noted that eight of the nine complaints had a board finding of not sustained.

Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Recommendation by Board</th>
<th>Chief’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-28</td>
<td>FA-Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-49</td>
<td>FI-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FI-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-62</td>
<td>FI-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FI-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-34</td>
<td>EF-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-03</td>
<td>EF-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FA-Unfounded</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-07</td>
<td>EF-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FA-Unfounded</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-53</td>
<td>FA-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EF-Exonerated</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AL—Abusive Language  FA—False Arrest
FI—False Imprisonment  EF—Excessive Force
It is common in police accountability that agreement on not sustained recommendations are usually accepted at higher rates than the sustained recommendations. Nevertheless, the ACRB must determine the reason for the difference between the acceptance rate and the rejection rate by first focusing on the board and chief decisions, and then, considering other factors that may contribute to the disparities. Some common factors that have contributed to disparities in some municipalities are: law enforcement does not recognize the value of the outside agency’s work, civilian agency not trained to examine complaints, civilian agency not qualified to make decisions, law enforcement bias and/or oversight bias, perception of the oversight’s hidden agenda, law enforcement’s failure to accept the role and authority of the oversight, and lack of political support to hold law enforcement accountable.

The challenge for the oversight agency, law enforcement, and elected representatives is to remain focused on the quality of police accountability services and the responsibility to citizens to restore and maintain public trust in the police department.

Chief’s Pending Decisions

To comply with the ordinance requirement that the chief respond within 30 days of receipt of an ACRB finding, the pending complaints below were officially received as rejected because the internal affairs investigations into those complaints had not been concluded. The chief indicated in his rejection letters that he would reconsider the Board’s recommendations after the investigations have been completed. The reconsideration of the Board’s recommendation is a final decision. In compliance with the ordinance, the chief’s response averaged 23 days, which is a decrease from 30 days in 2012. However, the APD has three cases from 2012, where the agency’s records do not show that a final decision has been communicated to the ACRB. Table 6 on the next page provides the chief’s pending decisions.
Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Recommendation by Board</th>
<th>Chief’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-10</td>
<td>FA-Unfounded AL-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Final Decision Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-34</td>
<td>EF-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Final Decision Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-38</td>
<td>Harassment-Not Sustained</td>
<td>Final Decision Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-11</td>
<td>EF-10 Day Suspension</td>
<td>Final Decision Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-22</td>
<td>FA-3 Day Suspension EF-3 Day Suspension</td>
<td>Final Decision Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-10</td>
<td>EF-5 Day Suspension AL-1 Day Suspension</td>
<td>Final Decision Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-35</td>
<td>FA-Training</td>
<td>Final Decision Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-49</td>
<td>FI-Written Reprimand</td>
<td>Final Decision Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AL—Abusive Language
FA—False Arrest
FI—False Imprisonment
EF—Excessive Force

At the end of 2013, 40% of the complaints sent to the APD were pending completion of the Internal Affairs investigation. The ACRB and APD will need to discuss ways that would ensure that a more timely final response can be achieved to meet the needs of the departments. Trailing Internal Affairs investigations delay the ACRB’s communication of the outcome of ACRB complaints to the citizens and officers. Significant delays in communication erodes citizens’ and officers’ confidence that the police accountability systems are responsibly handling their complaints.

Section IV Atlanta Department of Corrections

As with 2012, most of the ACRB’s work focused on the Atlanta Police Department; however, the ACRB has authority to receive complaints against Atlanta Department of Corrections officers. ACRB complaints against corrections officers typically fall under the abusive language, harassment, and excessive force categories. The ACRB received one complaint against a corrections officer in 2013.

During 2013, the ACRB and the Atlanta Department of Corrections met to discuss ways for the ACRB to have a presence at the jail in an effort to increase the jail population’s awareness and understanding of the ACRB.

Keeping in mind the safety of the corrections personnel and inmates, the corrections department and ACRB identified several actions that would increase inmates’ awareness of the ACRB services. At the
end of the year, the ACRB and the corrections department had begun implementing some of those ideas. The ACRB looks forward to continued cooperation and collaboration with the Department of Corrections.

Section V Mediation

In July 2013, the Mayor and City Council approved funding for the development and implementation of a joint ACRB/APD mediation program.

Mediation of citizen complaints against law enforcement officers has grown over the years. Many municipalities have used mediation as a means of addressing some citizen complaints. Mediation, when used properly, is a tool that increases citizen satisfaction with the accountability mechanism and provides greater understanding between officers and citizens.

The ACRB and APD worked diligently to develop a mediation program. The departments met over several months and drafted a process and procedures that would ensure that the citizens and officers concerns are adequately reflected. At the writing of this report, the ACRB and the Atlanta Department of Law have been engaged in adding clarification of responsibilities and expectations within the process and procedures. The ACRB anticipates that the program will be implemented during 2014.

Section VI Community Outreach

Community outreach is essential to the accomplishment of the ACRB mission. Community and officer engagement through awareness building activities and educational opportunities helps increase confidence in the agency’s process as a viable option that can be used to address citizens’ complaints fairly.

In 2013, the ACRB made a strategic shift to assertively pursue community engagement activities. From participation in several events, the agency received information that some communities still experience officer action that causes them alarm. From the anecdotal evidence obtained during outreach events and measurable factors (such as, increases in citizen complaints in 2013 and the amount of public funds spent on lawsuits related to officers’ actions), it is clear that the ACRB must continue to increase its community and officer engagement, strengthen its investigative resources, and implement new strategies that will allow the ACRB to fulfill its mission and meet the desires of the public.

In 2013, the ACRB participated in the following citizen/office engagement activities.

- Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Breakfast
- Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. March and Rally
- APD Police Recruit Academy presentation
- Board and staff Ride-a-Longs
- ACRB Art and Essay Contest for youth
- Historic West Side Festival
- Sweet Auburn Festival
- Festival of Lights
- NPU Presentations
- APAB Presentation
• Overground Railroad
• Creative Loafing PSA Ad
• People’s Agenda Meeting
• Radio Advertisement
• Placement of agency materials at various locations.
• Morehouse School of Medicine Prevention Research Fair
• Local Government Cable Channel 26 PSA

Section VII Training

In 2013, the board and staff participated and attended the following training, seminars, conferences, and activities:

• FBI Color of Law Investigations presentation
• APD Excessive Force presentation
• Internal Affairs and Police Liability Trainings
• Mediation training
• Advance mediation training
• Jail and prisoner liability
• early warning systems/managing police misconduct
• Taser legal issue and litigations
• IA Pro Conference
• NACOLE Conference
• Officer involved shooting
• IA Pro Training
• (2) Board retreats

Training is critical to the board and staff's ability to investigate and render decisions that are consistent, supported, and thoroughly deliberated.

Section VIII Performance Measures

Performance measures are an important part of assuring citizens that the ACRB and the law enforcement departments are moving in the right direction to address their 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 nine performance measures that support the city’s public safety initiative and the agency’s mission and strategic goals. Six of the measures may be considered as output measures. Three measures may be considered as outcome measures.

The six output measures are: (1) the number of complaints, (2) types of allegations, (3) number of completed investigations, (4) average number of days to complete an investigation, (5) the number of days to receive a response from the chief and (6) the number of days to receive the chief’s final response. These measures allow the ACRB to monitor changes related to citizen concerns about officer actions and behavior. These measures are also indicators of the timeliness and efficiency of the operation.
The three outcome measures are: (1) the percentage of sustained complaints resulting in discipline or receive 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. 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 this report contains the second year of tracking these performance measures, the ACRB has not established solid baselines to determine the success of the departments. 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 success. At the end of 2014, the ACRB will have three years of reliable data to start using as benchmarks and performance goal setting.

The performance measures table below shows that complaints and allegations increased in 2013. This may be an indicator that the ACRB’s efforts to meet citizen’s demand for agency visibility resulted in increased usage of the ACRB services. Despite the increase in complaint filings, the ACRB completed more complaint investigations during 2013, while reducing the investigative timeline. However, the reduction recognized in 2013 is related to the number of suspended investigations, which will be added back into investigations when the associated criminal charges are resolved.

As the ACRB continues to mature, assessing the ACRB outcomes 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 additional primary and secondary performance measures and use data from a variety of sources to measure changes in officer behavior. The agency will utilize its power to conduct studies to provide more transparency of officer accountability. The table on the next page provide the performance measurement data.

Table 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRB Performance Measures (Output)</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of complaints</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Allegations</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of completed investigations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of days to complete an investigation</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Dismissed Complaints (allegations&amp; officers)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of days for chief’s decision (compliance with ordinance)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of agreement on sustained complaints resulting in discipline</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall percentage of agreement between the police department and ACRB</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of agreement on the Board’s discipline recommendation</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentages reflect the 12 decisions received from the APD during 2013 only.

It should be noted that the 2013 percentages for the outcome measures do not provide an accurate picture of the chief’s eventual response rate. With 40 percent of the cases pending the chief’s decision, it is difficult to assess fairly the level of agreement between the police department and the ACRB. Therefore, the level of agreement between the ACRB and the APD will need to be discussed in the semi-annual report. Reporting at the semi-annual report should provide time for the police department to complete investigations and render decisions on the outstanding ACRB complaints.

As mentioned earlier, the complaint process is the opportunity to encourage trust in the department and the police accountability systems and provide positive encouragement (reinforcement) for correct officer behavior. However, the measure of the level of trust and encouragement is dependent on timely resolutions and the communication of appropriate actions.

Section IX: Challenges

The agency has several challenges that it will need to address in 2014. The most important action is to expand the ACRB allegation jurisdiction. Having to dismiss over 30% of the complaints received because of jurisdiction limitations is a disservice to the citizens of Atlanta. The ACRB will need to continue to work diligently for a mediation program to provide additional opportunities for citizens and officers to have a greater understanding of situations that created a complaint. The length of time to receive a final decision on sustained ACRB complaints is a growing concern that will need to be addressed.

Section X: Conclusion

The ACRB will continue to position itself to have a greater impact on improving relationships between citizens and officers. 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.
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)
### 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 C

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.

### 2013 ACRB Board Members
- Paul Bartels, Chair
- Maceo C. Williams Sr., Vice Chair
- Alan H. Morris, Secretary
- Osa Benson
- Bill Bozarth
- William L. Harrison
- Barbara Hubbard
- Ryan Johnson
- Labriah Lee
- Ruth Price

### 2014 ACRB Board Members
- William L. Harrison, Chair
- Ruth Price, Vice Chair
- Paul Bartels, Secretary
- Osa Benson
- Bill Bozarth
- Alan H. Morris
- Gerald Souder
- Maceo C. Williams, Sr.
- Sherry Williams

### Staff
- Samuel Lee Reid II
  Executive Director

- Kenneth Lively
  Investigator

- Sheena Robertson
  Investigator

- Myola Smith
  Business Manager
2013 ACRB Board and Staff

Paul Bartels
Chair
Appointed by
Atlanta Bar Association

Osa A. Benson
Appointed by
Gate City Bar Association

Bill Bozarth
Appointed by
Neighborhood Planning Unit A-F

Barbara Hubbard
Appointed by
Neighborhood Planning Unit G-L

Ruth Price
Appointed by
President of the
Atlanta City Council
Member with Law Enforcement Experience

Samuel Lee Reid II
Executive Director

Myola Smith
Business Manager
2013 ACRB Board and Staff

Maceo C. Williams, Sr.
Vice Chair
Appointed by
Neighborhood Planning Unit S-Z

Alan H. Morris
Secretary
Appointed by
League of Women Voters

William Harrison
Appointed by
Atlanta City Council

Labriah Lee
Appointed by
Mayor

Ryan Johnson
Appointed by
Neighborhood Planning Unit M-R

Sheena Robertson
Investigator

Kenneth Lively
Investigator
Board Member Osa Benson and her daughters at the MLK Breakfast.

Youth at the 2013 Historic Westside Festival.

ACRB Investigators Sheena Robertson and Kenneth Lively at the MLK Breakfast.

ACRB Staff and Board Chair at the 2013 King March and Rally.

From left to right, ACRB Vice Chair Maceo C. Williams Sr., Dr. Priscilla Oliver, and GA State House Representative (D-100) and President of the Atlanta North Georgia Labor Council AFL-CIO Dewey McClain.
Board Member Bill Bozarth the 2013 Festival of Lights—English Avenue.

Community Outreach Specialist Tracy Taylor at the ACRB sponsored Food Drive.

Community Outreach Specialist at the 2013 Historic Westside Festival.

Board Member Bill Bozarth and youth at 2013 National Night Out in the Pittsburgh Community.

ACRB staff preparing for 2013 National Night Out in the Pittsburgh Community.
2013 Second Place Winner Zaria Hardnett, her family, and school support at the contest reception.

Council Member Keisha Lance Bottoms presenting proclamation to 2013 Second Place Essay Winner Zarita Hardnett.

Council Member Cleta Winslow with 2013 Art Contest winner.

Council Member Felicia Moore presenting a proclamation to ACRB 2013 First and Second Place Essay Contest winners, Percie Thompson and Lunye Powers.
2013 First Place Art Contest Winner: Anthony Rhodan

City Council Members and 2013 First Place Art Contest Winner Anthony Rhodan, his family, and school supporters.

2013 Third Place Art Contest Winner: Lataeja Walker

2013 Second Place Art Contest Winner: Kamaria James

Council Members Keisha Lance Bottoms and Cleta Winslow with 2013 Art Contest Winners, Kamaria James and Lataeja Walker.
Swearing in of Board Member Osa Benson

Board Chair Paul Bartels welcoming New Board Member Gerald Souder.

Board Members preparing for monthly meeting.

FBI Special Agent Van Epps presenting on FBI Color of Law investigations.

Board Members attending FBI presentation on Color of Law investigations.

APD Detective Ayeni presenting Use of Force training involving use of Tasers.

Board Members attending APD Taser Presentation.
The Atlanta Citizen Review Board is a proud agency of the City of Atlanta.

Atlanta Citizen Review Board
(ACRB)

CITY OF ATLANTA
City Hall Tower, Suite 9100
55 Trinity Avenue, SW
Atlanta, GA 30303

Phone: (404) 865-8622
Fax: (404) 546-8401

E-mail: acrb@atlantaga.gov
www.acrbgov.org