



Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 3.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 3, 2009

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY
DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

Consent Discussion

SUBJECT:

Bill No. 2009-6 Updates various administrative provisions pertaining to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Citizen Review Board. Sponsored by: Councilman Gary Reese

Fiscal Impact

No Impact

Augmentation Required

Budget Funds Available

Amount:

Funding Source:

Dept./Division:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill will update various administrative provisions pertaining to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Citizen Review Board. The update includes changes to attendance requirements and removal standards for Review Board members, as well as changes regarding the management of the Board. The operations of the Board are governed by parallel City and County ordinances, as well as by State law. The proposed changes are consistent with those being made by the County in its ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Bill No. 2009-6
2. Business Impact Statement
3. Submitted After Meeting Bill No. 2009-6 First Amendment

Motion made by DAVID W. STEINMAN to Approve as Do Pass as First Amendment

Passed For: 2; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 0

RICKI Y. BARLOW, DAVID W. STEINMAN; (Against-None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-None)

Minutes:

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STEED noted the Director of the Citizen Review Board has requested parallel changes. Clark County has already started its process and this bill would be the City's version. He stated that most of the changes are administrative in nature and pointed out one modification would change the nature of the Board Directors service. He explained that,

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 3, 2009

currently, the Director serves at the pleasure of the City and County managers with direction from the Board of County Commissioners and the City Council. This bill would change that so the Director would only serve at the pleasure of the City and County managers.

Additionally, this bill would require the mandatory removal of appointees to the Board if they have three unexcused absences during a calendar year and any violation of the confidentiality agreement would result in automatic removal. This bill would define the Board's jurisdiction and the Director would have the ability to dismiss complaints if the Board has no jurisdiction over that case. This bill would permit a screening panel to initially review complaints and would extend the current 15-day requirement for a recommendation to 30 days. Included in the bill was an option for a non-binding mediation and both parties, the Mayor's office and the complainant would have the right to choose not to go through the mediation process. The bill would also authorize the Executive Director to issue subpoenas on the Chair's behalf. As some minor typographical errors had been corrected, DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STEED recommended approval as a First Amendment.

COUNCILMAN STEINMAN observed that the change in the terms of service for the Executive Director could create a very political situation.

