

Comparison of Current and Proposed Administrative Investigation/Resolution Systems for
Complaints Involving a Public Member

Stage	Current System	Proposed System	Advantage of Proposed System
Incident - no use of force	No automatic investigation	No automatic investigation (no change)	Not applicable
Incident - use of force	PPB Sgt. 940 investigation	IPR on-scene investigation	Non police investigation
Complaint	File with IPR	File with IPR (no change)	Not applicable
		Advocate assigned	Helps complainant
Complaint investigation	IPR does intake investigation	IPR investigates	No transferring complaint to IA - saves time
	IA (90% of time) or IPR (10% of time) investigates	IPR investigates	IPR compels officer testimony
Fact finding	Commander makes findings	5 members of CRC make findings with input from Commander	Eliminates fact finding by Commander - saves time
Outcome	IA and IPR send letters	IPR sends letter	Eliminates IA - saves time
Appeal	File within 14 days	File within 30 days	Provides more time to appeal
	CRC hears appeal within 21 days	CRC hears appeal when available	Time constraint only on paid staff

Stage	Current System	Proposed System	Advantage of Proposed System
Conference hearing	PPB can request conference hearing with CRC on CRC's recommended findings	Eliminate conference hearing	Eliminates conference hearing - saves time
City Council role	City Council hears if PPB and CRC disagree	City Council hears if PPB and CRC disagree	Not applicable

The following applies to the terms in the table:

“CRC” means Citizen Review Committee.

“IA” means the Portland Police Bureau’s Internal Affairs Division

“IPR” means Independent Police Review Division.

“PPB” means Portland Police Bureau.

“PRB” means the Portland Police Bureau’s Police Review Board.