



Seattle City Council Police Accountability Panel (SCCPAP)
Minutes of Monday, February 18, 2008 Meeting
6:30 pm – 8:30 pm
Executive Working Session

Present: Panelists Leo Hamaji, Steve Herbert; Lynne Wilson; Michael Pendleton, facilitator; Nancy Roberts, staff

Attending by Phone: Eric Schnapper

Absent: Veronica Alicea-Galvan; Kellye Testy

This meeting was considered an executive work session and was not taped or filmed. Eric Schapper joined the group via conference call.

Michael Pendleton will present at the Public Safety meeting on Friday, 2/22 at 3:15 to discuss the panel's work thus far, what it has decided to focus on, next steps, and timeline.

Michael asked for comment on his draft letter, which was distributed via email and at the meeting. Lynne liked the letter, suggested adding a paragraph about issuing this panel's own report, making sure to comment to the effect that "the work is not necessarily done."

Discussion of what this group wants to focus on. Amplification of OPARB and the Auditor's roles? Perhaps work with OPARB to get more clarity. Comments:

- Accountability/transparency of the department as a whole. There is currently a range of ways to unduly restrict information coming out of SPD. OPARB should have plenary authority to review closed cases and comment on a wide range of issues.
- Address the rules that limit public access to information about what's going on in SPD, for example, sealed discovery.
- Complainants can't comment on accuracy and details of reports, but officers can.
- Non-resolution category in investigations – what options are left?
- Interrelation of criminal charges and OPA – what to do to make sure they don't interfere with each other.
- If the Guild wants to run the department, then they should bear legal responsibility when things go wrong.
- Much more information is needed in order to issue a report on the above concerns.
- Washington Supreme Court case law governs release of internal investigation files.
- Want to discuss OPARB, its limits of power and the range of issues it can consider. The PARP report was very vague on this issue, perhaps this panel can be more specific.
- OPARB is limited by statute to what it can get, and is always fighting an uphill battle. Do not want to limit OPARB's scope, want it to be able to report on anything.
- The Auditor is only one person, limited by individual competency, is not able to accomplish as much, does not have as much diversity as a larger board such as OPARB.

The group began to focus on OPARB's role, scope and size.

- There is no sense of anywhere that the public can go. OPARB has been perceived by the public as a neutral party where people can get information, perhaps redress. We want to keep this aspect intact.



Seattle City Council Police Accountability Panel (SCCPAP)

- PARP's recommendations re OPARB were vague because there was no unanimity on PARP. Some felt OPARB's role should be cut back.
- OPARB is viewed as a pain in the butt. They are seen as the entity that caused all this exposure, they are very inconvenient, and made people uncomfortable. The original legislation was not well crafted. They are under cumbersome confidentiality agreements and are at odds with the City Attorney and the Chief of SPD.
- Peter Harris would like to talk to this group to learn what they want to achieve, so he can help craft better legislation.
- Michael Pendleton provided more background on OPARB.
- The Guild contract about OPARB is very restrictive. Perhaps it would be better to beef up the Auditor's role, give it support staff.
- There needs to be better public access to information out of SPD, and the training records need to be more open and available.

It was decided that the panel would focus its effort on better defining the role of OPARB and of the OPA Auditor as it relates to OPARB, and on increasing public accessibility and transparency.

The group was asked to commit to meeting on every Monday evening through March. Michael will request that Peter Holmes (OPARB) and Peter Harris (Central Staff) meet with the panel next Monday, 2/25, to better define just what is wrong or missing in the current OPARB legislation. Guild representatives may be asked to attend a subsequent meeting – perhaps on March 3?

The next meeting will be on Monday, May 25, 6 – 9 in the Boards & Commissions room, as usual. This will be executive session, so there will be no recording or taping of the meeting.

Future meetings are planned for successive Mondays – March 3, 10, 17, 24 and 31.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Next meeting: Monday, February 18, 2008, 6:30 – 8:30 pm, City Hall, Room 265, Al Rochester room