

Meeting Agenda

Community Policing Board

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Margo Morales
(360)753-8150

Thursday, March 12, 2026

6:00 PM

Olympia City Hall, CR 207

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.A ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 3.A [26-0186](#) Approval of November 6, 2025 Community Policing Board Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Minutes](#)

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

- 6.A [26-0187](#) Community Policing Board Chair Election 2026

- 6.B [26-0198](#) 2025 Draft Police Auditor Annual Report

Attachments: [Police Auditor Draft 2025 Annual Report](#)
[Olympia 2025 Use of Force Cases Index](#)
[Draft 2025 Annual Report Comment Letter](#)
[Civilian Police Auditor Ordinance](#)
[Community Policing Board Ordinance](#)

- 6.C [26-0196](#) 2026-2027 Civilian Police Auditor Draft Work Plan

Attachments: [Civilian Police Auditor 2026-2027 Work Plan Draft](#)
[Draft Work Plan Comment Letter](#)

7. REPORTS

8. OTHER TOPICS

9. ADJOURNMENT

Upcoming

Accommodations

The City of Olympia is committed to the non-discriminatory treatment of all persons in employment and the delivery of services and resources. If you require accommodation for your attendance at the City Advisory Committee meeting, please contact the Advisory Committee staff liaison (contact number in the upper right corner of the agenda) at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. For hearing impaired, please contact us by dialing the Washington State Relay Service at 7-1-1 or 1.800.833.6384.



City Hall
601 4th Avenue E.
Olympia, WA 98501
360-753-8244

Community Policing Board
Approval of November 6, 2025 Community Policing Board Meeting Minutes

Agenda Date: 3/12/2026
Agenda Item Number: 3.A
File Number:26-0186

Type: minutes **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Approval of November 6, 2025 Community Policing Board Meeting Minutes



Meeting Minutes - Draft

Public Meeting

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Information: 360.753.8244

Thursday, November 6, 2025

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

Community Policing Board Onboarding

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m.

1.A ROLL CALL

The following members were present:

Elizabeth Drake, Reiko Callner, Robin Rosencrans, Anita Kraft, and Lisa Ostler

The following members were excused:

Adan Espino and Sarah Nagy

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS - None

4. BUSINESS ITEMS

4.A [25-0940](#) Community Policing Board New Member Orientation

Board members participated in a combination of team building exercises and onboarding exercises.

The discussion was completed.

4.B [25-0941](#) Community Policing Board Chair Election 2025

The Board agreed to postpone elections until the next meeting.

The decision was postponed.

5. REPORTS - None

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

Upcoming

Accommodations



Community Policing Board

Community Policing Board Chair Election 2026

Agenda Date: 3/12/2026
Agenda Item Number: 6.A
File Number:26-0187

Type: discussion **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Community Policing Board Chair Election 2026

Recommended Action

Move to elect a Community Policing Board Chair and Vice-Chair.

Report

Issue:

Whether to elect a Chair and Vice-Chair to the Community Policing Board.

Staff Contact:

Margo Morales, Community Engagement Program Specialist, Office of Organizational Development and Performance, 360.753.8150

Presenter(s):

Margo Morales, Community Engagement Program Specialist

Background and Analysis:

City advisory boards are represented by a chairperson, elected by their respective groups, that facilitates meetings of their board and act as a representative of the group to City Council.

The Community Policing Board is a newly established advisory board and does not yet have a chair or vice chair elected. At their November 6, 2025 regular meeting the Board agreed to postpone elections until their first 2026 regular meeting, since two board members were not in attendance. Staff will reintroduce the role and responsibilities of serving as chair and vice chair and discuss term limits for each position to support the board in the election process.

Climate Analysis:

This is not expected to have an impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

Equity Analysis:

Having a chair and vice-chair will allow the Board to function effectively and efficiently, ensure that all members are able to contribute their diversity of experiences and perspectives to the work of the Board.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

There is a strong community interest in the work of the Community Policing Board. Ensuring that the board has a chair and vice-chair to facilitate meetings and represent the Board to Council will ensure that the board is effective as community representatives and fulfilling its purpose.

Options:

- 1) Elect a Chair and Vice-Chair
- 2) Elect a Chair and Vice-Chair at another time.

Financial Impact:

No known financial impacts created by electing a chair and vice-chair.

Attachments:

None



Community Policing Board

2025 Draft Police Auditor Annual Report

Agenda Date: 3/12/2026
Agenda Item Number: 6.B
File Number:26-0198

Type: discussion **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title
2025 Draft Police Auditor Annual Report

Recommended Action
Move to approve a comment letter for the 2025 Draft Police Auditor Annual Report to be forwarded to the City Council with the Police Auditor’s final report.

Report Issue:
Approval of a comment letter for the 2025 Draft Police Auditor Annual Report to be forwarded to the City Council with the Civilian Police Auditor’s final report.

Staff Contact:
Margo Morales Community Engagement Program Specialist, Organizational Development & Performance, 360.753.8150

Presenter(s):
Shelby Parker, Interim Police Chief
Stephen Connolly, Police Auditor, OIR Group
Michael Gennaco, Police Auditor, OIR Group
Sam Pailca, Police Auditor, OIR Group
Margo Morales, Community Engagement Program Specialist

Background and Analysis:
In July 2024 the City Council accepted recommendations from the Social Justice and Equity Commission on Community Oversight of Law Enforcement. Included in the recommendations are that the Police Auditor will meet regularly with an established Community Board to share an overview of misconduct complaint investigations, use of force incidents and recommendations so board members can learn, ask questions, share concerns, and provide the community’s perspective regarding recommendations.

In 2024, members of the Social Justice & Equity Commission had an opportunity to pilot this part of the recommendations, receiving briefings from the Police Auditor on their draft 2023 Annual Report and 2024 Mid-Year Report, as well as updates from the Police Chief on the Olympia Police Department (Department). Commissioners shared their community perspectives and feedback on the Auditor’s reports with the City Council in the form of a comment letter that was attached to the report and submitted to the City Council.

In March 2025 Council approved amendments to the Olympia Municipal Code to establish a Community Policing Board. During the recruitment and selection process for the Community Policing Board, the Police

Use of Force Community Representatives received briefings from the Police Chief and Police Auditor and provided community perspectives on the Auditor's draft 2024 Annual Report.

The current Community Policing Board members were appointed at the September 30, 2025, City Council meeting, and completed onboarding orientation in November 2025. This will be their first regular meeting. Board members will receive an update on the Department as well as review and provide feedback on a draft report from the Police Auditor. Input from the Community Policing Board will be considered by the Police Auditor before finalizing their 2025 Annual Report.

In December 2024 the City Council approved updates Olympia's municipal code to establish the recommended enhanced responsibilities of the Auditor and launched a recruitment and selection process. In May 2025 OIR Group was approved by the City Council to fill the role of Auditor for the City of Olympia. The 2025 Draft Annual Report is OIR Group's first report as Civilian Police Auditor. The primary role of the Auditor is to review misconduct investigations and supervisory evaluations of force incidents completed internally by the Department and provide regular reports to the City Council, which include recommendations for police department operations, policy and training based on the findings of their audit.

The purpose of this agenda item is for the Community Policing Board to discuss the Auditor's 2025 Draft Annual Report and approve a comment letter summarizing their input, which will then be forwarded to the City Council with the Auditor's final Annual Report.

Climate Analysis:

This project is not expected to have an impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

Equity Analysis:

The intent of the Community Policing Board is to enhance community involvement in law enforcement. It's also the intent that Board membership be diverse and representative of the community's demographics and lived experiences, including community members who may have been justice-impacted. Having community members learn about the Auditor's findings and provide input on their recommendations contributes to changes in policing training, policies and practices that are in alignment with community needs and interests and contributes more broadly to building trust and legitimacy in the City's public safety system.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

There's broad community interest in community involvement in law enforcement, including the role and recommendations of the Auditor and in the OPD data and policy updates shared by the Police Chief. The Auditor meeting regularly with the Community Policing Board supports ongoing transparency in policing for community members.

Options:

1. Approve a comment letter on the 2025 Draft Police Auditor Annual Report to be forwarded to the City Council with the Auditor's final report.
2. Do not approve a comment letter on the 2025 Draft Police Auditor Annual Report to be forwarded to the City Council with the Auditor's final report.
3. Direct staff to return at a later date for continued discussion and approval of a comment letter to be forwarded to the City Council with the Auditor's final report.

Financial Impact:

The City contracted with OIR Group for Civilian Police Auditor services for an initial one-year term beginning on May 7, 2025, valued at \$105,000.

Attachments:

Police Auditor Draft 2025 Annual Report
Olympia 2025 Use of Force Cases Index
Draft 2025 Annual Report Comment Letter
Civilian Police Auditor Ordinance
Community Policing Board Ordinance

City of Olympia

Independent Police Auditor Annual Report

March 2026

Independent Police Auditor Team
Michael Gennaco
Stephen Connolly
Sam Pailca



OIR
GROUP

6510 Spring Street #613
Long Beach, CA 90815
OIRGroup.com

Introduction

This is the first report prepared by OIR Group¹ in its capacity as the new independent Police Auditor for the City of Olympia. We were selected by the City Council in May of 2025, as part of a larger re-structuring of police oversight here, and began our work shortly thereafter.

The core of our scope of work as Auditor relates to the review of certain investigations completed internally by the Olympia Police Department ("OPD"). As in most jurisdictions, the initial responsibility for handling public complaints of officer misconduct and for reviewing officers' use of physical force rests with the Department itself. There are various reasons for this, including resources, jurisdictional authority, and expertise. But it is also true that the most effective police agencies are those that prioritize accountability and self-scrutiny, and have meaningful structures in place to accomplish those goals.

In short, there are arguments for continuing to entrust law enforcement agencies with these important investigative and review processes. But these exist in tension with skepticism by some about the objectivity and rigor with which an agency is willing or able to appropriately evaluate its own personnel in these contexts. Recent decades have intensified a national trend in which the public expects more of an opportunity to "weigh in" on policing, an independent check on how an agency performs this critical work, and more transparency about how investigations are conducted and resolved.

The City of Olympia has adopted a multi-faceted approach to community engagement with policing issues. Along with OPD's internal units and participation in state and regional accountability mechanisms for uses of deadly force, the City also has a seven-member "Community Policing Board" comprised of residents. Representatives from that Board are able to directly monitor key investigative and review functions (including critical incidents such as officer-involved shootings). And that Board offers its input to the Police Auditor as part of the process for finalizing the Auditor's semi-annual public reports.

¹ Primarily based on southern California, OIR Group is a private team of police practices experts that has worked in the field of independent oversight of law enforcement since 2001. We have served in a variety of auditing, monitoring, consulting, and investigative roles in jurisdictions throughout California and in several other states. Those states include Washington, where we did three separate review projects for the King County Office of Law Enforcement Oversight and also consulted with the state Attorney General's Office on developing a new statewide "best practices" use of force policy. For this project, we are joined by Seattle resident Sam Pailca, who brings extensive experience with local police oversight issues.

The central component of the Auditor's role – and the basis for the findings and recommendations discussed below – is the review of completed misconduct investigations and supervisory evaluations of force incidents. Through our agreement with the City, we receive periodic notifications from OPD when investigative files are completed and ready for distribution. We then have the opportunity to evaluate those files through an independent assessment of the Department's investigative memos and – importantly – the underlying evidence that was gathered and assessed by OPD.

For this first report, the vast majority of the cases we looked at were force incidents – a total of 50 of them. Only one misconduct investigation was completed during our initial review "window," which closed on December 31, 2025.

The material in each case was made available to us via direct access to the Department's own computer database.² We looked at scores of reports, photographs, and body-worn camera recordings in order to form our own impressions about individual case outcomes and the process as a whole. Below, we share those impressions, as well as a number of recommendations for systemic adjustments and improvements that arise from our own familiarity with best practices across multiple jurisdictions.

OPD's current system for reviewing force incidents has many strengths. Each incident goes through multiple assessments at different rank levels, and revolves around responses to a very detailed template. The circumstances of the incident are summarized, demographic data about participants is captured, and investigative steps (such as witness interviews, medical information, and photographs) are documented. A specific line item asks about "De-escalation Tactics Used" – thereby putting direct focus on the heightened expectation that force will be avoided or minimized where possible.

The initial supervisor makes a finding as to compliance with policy. Importantly, that person also makes a determination as to whether "training and proper tactics were followed" – a recognition that a force deployment could be justified but still worthy of non-disciplinary remediation. And those outcomes are then subject to a second evaluation by a different, higher-ranking OPD supervisor. Finally, all of the "packages" are reviewed by another command-level member of the Department, who serves as a centralized clearing house for the review process.

² We are grateful to City and OPD staff for their diligence in making sure that the necessary infrastructure was in place and functioning as intended.

All of this structured information gathering and evaluation reflects a commitment to thorough scrutiny on the agency's part. And we found for the most part that the resulting determinations to be reasonable and consistent with the evidence.

At the same time, we offer suggestions for slightly adjusting this approach. Our sense is that the focus as constituted is more narrow than it might be, and that a broader look at performance issues (beyond the "bottom line" question of use of force policy compliance) could be productive. We discuss below.

As for those "bottom line" questions, our cumulative impression is that OPD officers generally use force with justification, care, and restraint. With one exception (that we discuss below), the Department found that all of the force deployments had been in compliance with policy – and with one possible additional exception, concurred with those decisions based on our own review.

Most of the incidents involved responses to calls for service (as opposed to officer-initiated activity). The officers' approach to the subjects they encountered seemed very driven by the circumstances and the subjects' actions – and not by apparent bias, selective enforcement, or overreaction. A "takedown" – in which the subject were forced to the ground to overcome resistance and as a precursor to handcuffing – was by far the most commonly utilized force option. It generally resulted in minor injury only; several cases reported no apparent injury to the subject.

Additionally, we also saw several Taser deployments. This is considered a higher level of force, and we emerged with recommendations based on our scrutiny of the relevant cases. We also noted several instances in which the Department used the WRAP – a full body restraint device – for transport of a subject who had been resistant. As we discuss below, we recognize the potential value of this tool, but encourage OPD to revisit the nexus between policy and practice in terms of the frequency with which it is used.

In keeping with the City's established framework, we provide statistical information about the 50 incidents we reviewed, including subject demographics and a thumbnail description of the circumstances. We also discuss a number of topics for the Department's further consideration, based on our initial experience of reviewing and analyzing these cases. Our observations are in two basic categories: procedural (relating to the elements of OPD's internal review system itself) and substantive (relating more directly to officer performance and aspects of the force uses).

Statistical Overview

OPD tracks the demographic information of involved parties (including both officers and subjects) for each use of force incident. The following data is aggregated from the 50 individual cases we looked at.

Concerns arising from disproportionality, overrepresentation, and other statistical anomalies are understandable in the context of a national legacy of discriminatory treatment of minority groups. Accordingly, numbers like those we present below are an important starting point.

At the same time, a deeper insight into possible issues of bias requires assessment of additional variables, and even then definitive conclusions can be elusive. Importantly, and apart from the raw numbers, we did not see evidence of disparate treatment based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or other protected categories.

Subject demographics, as based on information reported within individual incident reports, were as follows³:

- 27 of subjects were White Males
- 7 of the subjects were White Females
- 8 of the subjects were Black Males
- 6 of the subjects were Asian/Pacific Islander Males
- 3 of the subjects were Hispanic Males.⁴

Other significant identifiers included the following:

- 15 of the incidents involved subjects experiencing likely or established alcohol or drug intoxication
- 14 of the incidents involved subjects experiencing likely or established mental health challenges
- 1 of the subjects was a juvenile.

As for the different force options represented in this sampling, it is worth noting that the exercise of police authority through physical means is always deserving of scrutiny and accountability. At the same time, the nature and severity of the *type* of force utilized in

³ One of the incidents involved a force deployment with two different subjects.

⁴ We discuss this categorization below. OPD does not currently have a separate identifier option for Hispanic persons, and listed these subjects as White.

a given incident can vary considerably, and has obvious implications for differing thresholds of justification and potential injury to subjects. As noted above, the "takedowns" that constituted the most frequently used force option in the audit sample are considered lower level.

The distribution of options represented was as follows⁵:

- 44 "takedowns" of the subject (and accompanying effort as needed to accomplish handcuffing).
- 9 uses of the Taser (some of which did not connect or were not effective in achieving incapacitation of the subject)
- 1 use of patrol car to effectuate a collision with the subject⁶
- 2 K9 bites.

With the exception of one possible broken nose, the various force uses did not result in significant injury to the subjects. Several, however, involved complaints of pain or minor abrasions/lacerations that were addressed as needed.

Please see Appendix A for a brief summary of the circumstances and findings in each of the 49 incidents we reviewed.

Force Investigation Protocols

Expanding toward "Holistic" Review

As noted above, we found the scaffolding of the Department's force review process to be quite sturdy, with its multiple layers of evaluation and a thorough template that guides supervisors toward effective information-gathering and analysis. At the same time, we noted that the range of documented *outcomes* was somewhat narrow.

The standard form culminates with check-boxes to designate whether the force was "within the policy guidelines" and whether "training and proper tactics were followed." These are, of course, fundamentally important categories, and the latter reference to training and tactics is arguably open-ended in a way that would give latitude for additional issue-spotting.

⁵ Some of the incidents involved the use of more than one type of force in an effort to apprehend/overcome resistance.

⁶ This use of force was found to be "out of policy" by the Department in the subsequent review process.

Ideally, an agency's review process works as a learning opportunity as well as a mechanism for accountability. While some force events unfold quickly and are relatively minor in nature, others are more complex and implicate broader issues of communication, coordination, decision-making, technique, equipment, supervision, or other factors. A close review is a chance to identify and respond to a range of noteworthy aspects of the officers' performance – not for purposes of nitpicking, but as a way of reinforcing effectiveness and making constructive adjustments for the future.

Our sense is that at least some of this thoughtful, holistic issue-spotting is indeed occurring on a case by case basis. The Department said as much when we raised the question after the first few months of our tenure, but explained that, for documentation purposes, the focus has typically been more narrow.

While this is not unusual, we encourage OPD to expand the lens of more formalized issue-spotting as a way of both promoting comprehensive attention by supervisors and ensuring that worthwhile follow-up actually occurs. And we are pleased by the receptivity the Department has shown, as evidenced in some of the more recent case reports.

RECOMMENDATION ONE: OPD should consider ways to formally expand its force review template, in order to promote a greater range of issue-spotting and potential interventions with regard to officer performance.

Issues with the Subject Interviews

OPD force review protocols require supervisors to conduct interviews of individuals upon whom force is used. While the advent of body-worn camera recordings has altered the significance of this evidence as a key source of understanding about what occurred, the interviews are nonetheless important.⁷ The objective is to obtain a factual recitation of the incident from those individuals in order to help determine the propriety of the force, ensure that any injuries are identified and addressed, and create a contemporaneous record of the subject's version for future reference.

While in several cases we saw supervisors conduct interviews that accomplished these goals with neutrality, we also saw interviews that did not seem so designed. For example, one issue was the use of leading questions such as, “But you knew they were police officers, right?” or “Why didn't you comply?” In others, the interviews devolved

⁷ It is also true that recordings can be inconclusive in the context of a physical struggle: we saw instances in which cameras were dislodged or when proximity to the subject limited the perspective.

into belittling, lecturing, correcting, or challenging statements made by those upon whom force had been used.

In one case, the supervisor “cross-examined” the subject about her decision to run and not heed instructions to stop.

In one case, after a takedown and use of the Taser to subdue the subject, the supervisor’s subsequent interview with the subject was accusatory, confrontational, and lecturing.

In one case where OPD found the force used by the officer out of policy after a review of the body-worn camera, the supervisor expressed skepticism in the initial interview about the subject’s version of events (which was eventually largely proven true) by stating: “Make sure you are telling the truth.”

In one case involving a foot pursuit and a takedown, the supervisor lectured and then argued with the subject instead of interviewing him about the actual use of force.

Supervisors should be advised that their role in interviewing subjects upon whom force was used should be that of a dispassionate, professional, and objective collector of facts and the subject’s account. Their role is not to challenge, dispute, or lecture the person. While other evidence may end up not corroborating that account, it is not the supervisors’ role to dispute the person’s version at that point in time. The fact is that, whether deserving or not, the person who has had force used on them has suffered trauma, pain, and, at times, injury. The better approach is to try to develop rapport with the person and simply obtain that person’s account of what happened. When supervisors step in to immediately challenge or dispute that account, it suggests to the subject that the question of the propriety of the force has already been decided.

RECOMMENDATION TWO: OPD should clarify the intent of the subject interview and ensure that all responsible supervisors are aware of and trained in the best approaches to achieving a detailed account of the subject’s perspective.

Inconsistent Use of "Miranda" Warnings

Participation in an interview after a use of a force is voluntary for the subjects.⁸ Because they are in custody, questioning them arguably raises the issue of whether a Miranda advisement of their rights is necessary. We have seen different approaches to this among the agencies we work with: some provide the warning as a standard practice, while others forego it based on the distinctive purpose of the questioning (and the fact that any statements are segregated from criminal proceedings).

There are advantages and disadvantages to either choice, but OPD seemed internally inconsistent about it in a way that was notable. Our sense is that "picking a lane," and standardizing supervisors' understanding of and compliance with the preferred approach, would be beneficial.

RECOMMENDATION THREE: OPD should clarify its expectations for supervisors with regard to providing a Miranda advisement, and promote consistency across the Department.

Investigative Role of Witness Supervisors

In several cases, we noted that a supervisor who witnessed the use of force or was involved in the lead up to the use of force then conducted the force investigation. In that case, the witness supervisor assumed conflicting roles of being a witness to the force incident and then leading the investigation into the force incident. Ideally, in such situations, a non-involved supervisor should be called to conduct such force investigations to protect the objectivity of the process, consistent with accepted investigative practices.⁹

RECOMMENDATION FOUR: OPD should instruct its supervisors that direct, participate in, or witness a use of force that, when feasible, an uninvolved supervisor should be called to the scene to conduct the force investigation.

⁸ We saw several instances in which subjects declined/refused to participate, which is not uncommon for them. A separate issue is incapacity due to intoxication or mental health crisis, which we discuss below.

⁹ We recognize that, considering the size of OPD, there may not be a non-involved supervisor available to conduct the force review. In that case, the supervisor should document why another supervisor was not available.

Force User Should Not Be Present During Interview of Subject or Witnesses

In several cases reviewed, the officer(s) who used force was present when the subject was interviewed about the propriety of the force. Certainly, a person in custody may be reluctant to discuss the legitimacy of the force when the person who used force upon him is present to hear. In the same way, witnesses who may have had concerns about the use of force might be reluctant to share those concerns when the officer who used force is present to hear their account. Supervisors should be advised of this concern and ensure, consistent with best investigative practices, segregation of the force user, the person upon whom force was used, and witnesses during the on-scene fact collection process.

RECOMMENDATION FIVE: OPD should advise its supervisors to ensure that when conducting interviews of subjects or civilian witnesses to the force incident, that the officer who used force is not present.

Dealing with subjects who are under the influence

In several instances, subjects who were significantly under the influence of alcohol and/or illicit substances were not in a position to provide useful accounts to supervisors about the use of force. In such instances, rather than attempt to proceed with an interview, supervisors should defer such an interview for several hours in the hope that increased sobriety will enhance the coherence of the subject's account.¹⁰

RECOMMENDATION SIX: OPD should advise its supervisors that when encountering a subject who is severely under the influence, they should consider deferring the interview until there is opportunity for the influence to dissipate.

¹⁰ We noted one case where the subject initially declined to be interviewed, but OPD traveled to the jail several days later and obtained an interview from him. We recognize that this approach may pose challenges from a practicality perspective, but assume it would only be relevant in a small percentage of cases and would not prove to be unduly burdensome.

Using Olympia’s Crisis Response Unit’s Expertise to Assist in Post-Use of Force Interviews

As noted in the City of Olympia’s webpage, the Crisis Response Unit (“CRU”) is an alternative response team that offers assistance to people in the Olympia community.¹¹ CRU responds to any person within the City of Olympia who is experiencing urgent mental health distress, poverty, unhoused persons, problems related to substance use, resource needs, and more. During our site visit, we were able to meet with leadership of the CRU and were impressed with the unit’s commitment and expertise in addressing mental health needs of those in crisis.

When OPD uses force on an individual, one of the supervisor’s key responsibilities is to conduct a preliminary evaluation of the situation, interview the person upon whom force is used, and photograph any injuries suffered as a result of the use of force. In our review, we observed multiple incidents of force being used upon individuals known to have or exhibiting signs of being in a mental health crisis. When the supervisor attempted to interview those persons, they were met with emotional and/or mental instability making it difficult to obtain the individual’s perspective on the incident. More significantly, the interview itself at times resulted in an escalation of the situation.

An individual was suspected of theft from a thrift store, ran from responding officers and was taken to the ground. After being detained, the individual reported that she was unhoused and going through a mental health crisis, but the supervisor attempted to conduct what turned out to be a non-productive interview, escalating the encounter.

An individual was reported to be trespassing and using profane language against the reporting party. Police responded, ordered the man to stop and when he ignored instructions, grabbed him and took him to the ground. The supervisor attempted to interview the man but was met with an incoherent response. OPD noted in its report that man was experiencing potential mental health issues.

OPD responded to a report of a man starting a fire in an alley. The man walked away to a nearby park and into a restroom. When the man did not respond to instructions to come out, OPD went into the facility and when he continued to resist, took him to the ground. The nature of the call and the man’s responses after the use of force indicated potential mental health issues.

¹¹ See below for a further discussion of CRU’s coordination with OPD in response to calls for service.

In these three cases, there was no apparent consideration of calling CRU to the scene, despite evidence that the detained person had potential mental health issues. If CRU had been called, its expertise could have been used to assist the supervisor in obtaining an interview of the persons upon whom force was used, as well as assisting in the overall de-escalation of the encounter. Moreover, after the subjects in these incidents were detained and handcuffed, there was little risk to having unarmed CRU personnel respond and assist with the post-incident response. OPD should consider taking advantage of CRU's expertise to respond to situations in which force is used upon a person going through a mental health crisis.

RECOMMENDATION SEVEN: OPD should encourage its supervisors to assist with their post-use of force responsibilities by calling CRU in cases in which the person upon whom force is used is potentially going through a mental health crisis.

Ensuring Medical Attention Provided to Individuals Who Request It

Our review found that generally supervisors used good judgment in providing or offering medical attention to those whom force was used upon. However, in one case, the supervisor expressed initial reluctance to provide medical attention to a woman who was professed to be injured by the use of force, citing the time and resources needed to do so and suggesting that any injury might have been pre-existing. While eventually the supervisor acceded to the request by the person to see a doctor, the initial hesitation to do so was unfortunate. OPD should instruct its supervisors to provide or offer medical attention without hesitation to anyone upon whom force is used who requests to see a doctor.

RECOMMENDATION EIGHT: OPD should instruct its supervisors to provide medical attention to anyone upon whom force is used and who requests medical aid.

Field Performance Issues

Force Incident Found Out of Policy

In one case during this review cycle, OPD found actions by an officer to be out of policy. In that case, the officer, while in his patrol car, tried to detain a man on a bicycle. As a result of officer-initiated action with his car, the man crashed and was then detained. OPD sent the matter to its collision review board which found that the collision was “avoidable”. The board further noted that OPD did not instruct vehicle positioning related to bicycle pursuits.

In addition, OPD considered whether the actions of the officer constituted a use of force and determined that the officer’s actions violated the Department’s Standards of Conduct related to Unreasonable and Unwarranted Force.

OPD noted that the officer had a prior oral warning and written warning for two separate violations of policy.

As a result of the finding, the officer was issued a written warning. In addition, the officer was required to attend a prescriptive police tactics instruction and a driving training safety class.

OPD is to be commended for its willingness to find the officer’s actions out of policy based on its policy and training. Moreover, OPD’s determination to send the officer to two training classes is in the best spirit of remediation. However, we were less sanguine about the light punitive sanction provided to the officer for his use of excessive force. Under OPD policy, a written warning is not even considered formal discipline and considering the nature of the offense and the officer’s past disciplinary history, a more serious (and progressive) consequence should have been considered.

Questionable K-9 Bite

During this cycle, we reviewed a questionable use of force involving the deployment of a police K-9. The case began as a report of a robbery, the subject was observed driving a vehicle and OPD and two other law enforcement agencies became involved in the man’s apprehension. Emergency equipment was activated but the man continued to try to elude law enforcement, causing a significant collision with a non-involved motorist. Eventually, one of the non-OPD personnel disabled the man’s vehicle by using a PIT (Pursuit Intervention Technique) in which the patrol car struck the back side of the car driven by the man, causing it to spin out.

Multiple officers from different agencies then yelled various and conflicting commands to the man on how to exit the vehicle and what to do upon exiting, apparently confusing the man and making it impossible to comply with all of them, even though it appeared as if the man was intent on surrendering. Nonetheless, an OPD officer deployed his K-9 on the man who was at the time on his knees, causing the dog to lock onto the man's arm for several seconds.

In its review, OPD recognized the conflicting commands from various officers and found that it may have been beneficial to give the subject additional time to comply. While finding the deployment of the police dog in policy, the Department recommended that the incident be forwarded to the K-9 team to review training and tactics. To the credit of OPD, we have been advised that the incident is being used as part of an in service training. While we would not have likely reached the same result regarding the appropriateness of deploying the K-9 when the dog was unleashed, we appreciate the deeper review that OPD conducted into the sub-optimal tactics surrounding this multi-agency response.

RECOMMENDATION NINE: In K-9 deployments, OPD should consider whether the subject had an opportunity to comply with commands in determining the appropriateness of the use of force.

Use of the Taser

We reviewed several uses of force involving the use of the Taser. In one case, officers responded to a domestic violence call. They encountered a man in a residence who grabbed a Taser that had been placed against him by a supervisor. The supervisor then deployed the Taser twice and an officer almost immediately followed with another Taser use.

Using a Taser by placing it against a person is considered using it in "stun drive mode". Unlike using the Taser in dart mode, stun drive does not cause neuromuscular incapacitation and only causes severe pain. Current OPD policy states that:

Use of the drive-stun mode generally should be limited to supplementing the probe-mode to complete the circuit. The drive-stun mode is not a lesser form of force, and all ECW deployment requirements must still be followed.

Apparently, OPD did not consider its own limitation on "stun drive" mode in evaluating the legitimacy of this use of force. Moreover, many jurisdictions have limitations on simultaneous deployment of Tasers that are not included in OPD's current policy. For example, the Washington Attorney General's Model Use of Force policy states that:

Officers should not intentionally deploy multiple ECWs at the same person, unless the first deployed weapon clearly fails.

The restrictions on multiple simultaneous use arose from research showing that such deployments can create greater risks of serious injury or death. OPD should include this restriction to properly advise officers on the risk of simultaneous deployment.

RECOMMENDATION TEN: OPD should ensure that when Tasers are used in stun drive mode, that such use meets its policy's extremely narrow justification criteria.

RECOMMENDATION ELEVEN: OPD should modify its Taser policy to restrict simultaneous deployments.

A "Stretched" Characterization of Threat

OPD officers responded to a report of a man who had barricaded himself in a commercial building, had been harassing employees, and had activated a fire extinguisher. OPD located the subject and by using a K-9 as an assist was able to take the man down. OPD found that the level of resistance and threat justified the uses of force, IPA concurred. However, in an apparent misguided effort to ensure a finding of "justified force", the reviewing supervisor noted that the man had a pair of eyeglasses in his hand, that could have been used as a "stabbing implement". In addition to being unnecessary to justify the use of force, the suggestion that the man's glasses presented any significant threat to responding officers undermines the other factors that did warrant the use of force.

Similarly, some reports characterized an attempt to flee as "active resistance," even where the attempt consisted of taking just a few steps before stopping or even turning back. While ignoring officer command to stop and continuing to walk away can be an indicator of resistance, officers should avoid automatic conflation of the two, especially as the mere presence of a uniformed officer does not require immediate cessation of activity; citizens are often unaware that officers may lawfully order them to stop for investigation of a crime.

Use of Disfavored Term "Excited Delirium"

In one use of force review, officer reports described the man they used force upon as in a state of "excited delirium". The term "excited delirium" is not recognized as a valid medical diagnosis by major medical associations like the American Medical Association or the American Psychiatric Association. While at one time the term was regularly used by law enforcement to describe individuals who went into distress (or even died) when

resisting efforts to be taken into custody, it has subsequently been disfavored, is no longer listed in the DSM-5 (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders) and is largely considered a controversial, non-scientific, or legally charged term rather than a recognized medical condition. Instead of using a conclusory and questionable construct to describe a person's condition, officers should be instructed to focus and report on actual observations – perspiration, focus of eyes, heart or pulse rate, etc. OPD supervisors should also ensure that the term “excited delirium” not be used by officers to describe an individual's condition in their reporting.

RECOMMENDATION TWELVE: OPD should advise its officers that the term “excited delirium” has run into disfavor as a useful term and to focus on the actual observations of a person when reporting any unusual symptoms.

Avoiding Unnecessary Destruction of Personal Property

When a person is taken into custody, it is incumbent upon law enforcement to reasonably protect any property possessed by that individual. In one case, the individual's backpack straps were cut in order to facilitate the handcuffing process. Based on the body-worn camera video, it did not seem necessary to cut the backpack strap in order to successfully complete the handcuffing process. While this interaction may seem unimportant to the involved officers, such unnecessary destruction of personal property may be critical to individuals who are of limited means, as was the apparent case in this incident. Officers should be encouraged to avoid such actions, unless absolutely necessary.

RECOMMENDATION THIRTEEN: OPD officers should be encouraged to avoid the unnecessary destruction of personal property.

Addressing Use of Profanity and Derogatory Language

Olympia's current policy largely prohibits the use of profanity

320.5.9 CONDUCT Use of obscene, indecent, profane, or derogatory language while on-duty or in uniform. Profane language outside of this policy for the purpose of de-escalating a deadly force situation may be used.

Despite this prohibition, we observed a number of occasions where responding officers used profanity. These fell into two main categories: as emphasis in the direct context of the physical struggle, and extraneous remarks that seemed disrespectful, scolding, or angry.

After a takedown, as officers attempted to handcuff the subject, one officer told the man to: "Get your fucking hands behind your back, dude".

After a man was tackled by the officers, he inquired about a missing watch. One of the responding officers advised: "If you didn't fight and run from cops, you wouldn't lose your shit".

After another take down, responding officers said: "Get down on fucking ground" and "Get on your fucking stomach."

For the most part, these statements were not formally acknowledged by OPD in its review of the force incidents, despite the prohibition set out by policy.¹² The current policy recognizes that the use of profanity is not aligned with principles of progressive professional policing, suggests that the officers are out of control and frustrated, and does nothing to advance or ameliorate the situation.

In conversations with the Department, we learned that there is a practice of acknowledging as "understandable" the profanities that arise in specific contexts (including injury, surprise, de-escalation, and the purposeful effort to underscore commands). To the extent that this reality is mis-aligned with policy, it is important for the Department to revisit the relevant language in its manual, determine the exceptions that it considers acceptable, and ensure that line officers and supervisors are aware of and accountable for the agency's expectations.

Our understanding is that the policy is currently in the process of being revised. We look forward to that finished product. In the meantime, we hope the Department will reconsider its current exception for "de-escalation" efforts in the specific context of a deadly force encounter.

As noted above, there is an exception in the policy for use of profanity to de-escalate deadly force situations. Because none of the officers reported that the incidents in which profanity was used involved a deadly force situation, the policy exception is not applicable to these incident.

Moreover, with regard to the "exception" language, the use of profanity is not regarded as a de-escalation technique by police leaders, researchers, or members of the public. De-escalation techniques work by reducing the the emotion and conflict in the encounter. The use of profanity often does the opposite. OPD should refine its profanity policy that suggests otherwise.

¹² There was one exception we noted that was forwarded on to Professional Standards for further review. It resulted in a finding that policy had been violated, and the officer received an appropriate consequence.

RECOMMENDATION FOURTEEN: OPD'S policy on profanity should be modified to clarify the agency's current expectations, limit the recognized exceptions, and promote greater accountability.

In addition to the strictures relating to profanity, OPD policy also prohibits, "discourteous, disrespectful, or discriminatory treatment of any member of the public or any member of this department or the City while on-duty or in uniform." However, in our review, we also observed on several occasions OPD officers using derogatory, discourteous, and disrespectful language.

After detaining a person and endeavoring to secure him on scene officers stated "I'm wrapping you up like a burrito". An officer in another incident similarly told the subject that if he didn't stand up, he'd be "wrapped up like a burrito and it's not fun."

After a force incident, one of the officers referred to the person as "you idiot", and told another officer "we have our knuckleheads here".

In another case, the subject was called an "idiot," and in another case, a "sister abuser."

While monitoring a newly arrested subject at the hospital, the officer responded to the person's incoherent statements by saying "This is why people shouldn't drink" – a comment that a third-party challenged as being antagonistic.

In another case, an officer told the subject, "Move that arm or I'll break it."

The identified comments were unhelpful. Regarding the use of profanity and discourteous treatment, we are not suggesting the need to conduct a formal investigation into every such comment. Yet, as discussed above, we consider every use of force as an opportunity to review the incident holistically and address any collateral performance issues in addition to the force itself. When such unhelpful comments are identified through OPD's own force review, an intervention providing counseling to the involved officers will often be sufficient to address the sub-optimal performance. On the other hand, to ignore the activity and not respond to it is to condone it by silence.

RECOMMENDATION FIFTEEN: When a review of the force incident reveals profane or discourteous comments made by responding OPD personnel, those comments should be flagged and an appropriate intervention should be devised to correct the performance issue.

RECOMMENDATION SIXTEEN: OPD'S policy prohibiting profanity should be modified to recognize that profanity is not an accepted de-escalation tool.

It should be noted that we also reviewed a number of cases where officers showed commendable restraint, made significant efforts to de-escalate, and treated subjects with respect and compassion.

Effective Use of Body-Worn Cameras

The advent of body worn cameras have significantly changed the landscape of review and evaluation of force incidents. Whereas in the past, an agency would usually have to rely on the observations of witnesses and officers to determine the legitimacy of any use of force, body worn cameras will generally capture the force incident. While there are exceptions, for example, when body worn cameras are dislodged during a physical struggle, most force events have some sort of video/audio capture of the event.

That was our experience during our review of the OPD force incidents. The body worn camera was often dispositive regarding the appropriateness of the use of force. And by promptly activating their cameras, officers generally captured the event.

However, OPD's body worn camera policy provides an exception that allows muting of body-worn cameras.

Consistent with this policy, members may deactivate the BWC during an incident when exchanging information with other members or when engaged in an operational or tactical discussion with other members. If the BWC is deactivated during a contact to exchange information or discuss operation details with another member, the member shall state the reason the BWC is being turned off and the member should promptly reactivate the BWC before resuming duties related to the incident.

During our reviews, we saw numerous examples of officers muting their body-worn cameras for no apparent reason. As a result, explanations for the use of force and other aspects of the operation were often not recorded. And there were times in which one on scene one officer muted the body-worn camera while others allowed their cameras to run, showing inconsistency on application of this exception.

There are extremely few circumstances when a body-worn camera should be muted during an encounter with the public. OPD has allowed this exception to be used too liberally, losing the ability for supervision (and auditors) to review how scenes are managed after the fact.

The prior auditor had recommended reconsideration of the muting practice that she had similarly identified. We make the same entreaty. One approach would be to eliminate the muting exception for incidents in which officers use force.

We also noted a number of examples in which officers – and sometimes supervisors – had left their body-worn cameras back at the precinct to charge or download – and several in which the cameras were ‘accidentally in sleep mode.’ We know that perfect compliance isn’t possible, and laud the fact that the absence of footage was noted in the report, but would recommend continued training, reinforcement, and vigilance re the policy.

We also noted one incident in which an OPD officer deployed his police canine during a multi-agency operation. In that case, while the OPD officer’s body-worn camera footage was available, there was no apparent effort to learn whether other law enforcement personnel had additional camera footage of the incident. It would have been a helpful investigative step to attempt to learn this, especially since the deployment of the canine in this case was questionable.

RECOMMENDATION SEVENTEEN: OPD should change policy to prevent the muting of body-worn cameras after a use of force incident.

RECOMMENDATION EIGHTEEN: OPD should advise its supervisors of the need to seek any recorded footage of a force incident, including body worn camera footage from other on-scene agencies.

Use of WRAP Restraint System

Our review raised questions in several cases about the policy, training, and practices involved with use of the “WRAP” restraint system, in which a handcuffed individual is placed in a body wrap – and sometimes helmet – attached via multiple straps. A person in a WRAP restraint cannot walk, and must be carried.

OPD’s policy around use of the WRAP total restraint is in General Order 71 on Prisoner Transportation. Section F states: “The use of a total restraint when transporting prisoners is permissible when such restraint is deemed necessary for the safe conduct of the transport. Factors to be considered before using these restraints include:

- (1) Nature of the charges;
- (2) Escape potential
- (3) The risk of harm to self or others
- (4) Court requirements.

In multiple use of force reports involving use of the WRAP, we found no articulation of the standard and justification, though it may be inferred that officers were relying on factor (3), risk of harm to self or others.

In one case, the WRAP was applied after the subject – who had been very verbally abusive - was restrained and subdued. One of the officers made a comment to the effect that the subject had “earned” the application of the WRAP, which may have been a reference to the subject’s prior resistance, but could also be interpreted as a retaliatory application.

In another case, a WRAP was used on a mentally ill subject who was later committed involuntarily. The subject appeared fully subdued but would not pull his legs into the patrol car, triggering application of the WRAP.

Similarly, in another case a “man in crisis” at a shelter was placed in the WRAP restraint for transport to hospital for evaluation, then again when transported from the hospital to the jail.

We also reviewed a case in which the WRAP was used on a 15-year old boy. The boy had been verbally abusive but appeared fully restrained and subdued before the WRAP was applied.

Finally, in one report reviewed that did include reference to why the WRAP was utilized by a responding supervisor, we had questions about the justification. Just one of the incident reports by the officers on the scene mentioned application of the WRAP, and that report suggested it was applied because the subject had spit “in the officers’ general direction.” However, in review of BWC footage, the subject could be seen lying on his side, handcuffed, and facing a wall; no officers were in range. There is no indication that the use of the WRAP had been discussed among the officers, suggesting a reflexive rather than incident-specific use.

RECOMMENDATION NINETEEN: OPD should consider whether more guidance and training should be provided regarding when the use of the WRAP restraint system should be used and how the decision to use should be documented in the use of force report.

Takedowns

Many incidents of the force we reviewed involved “takedowns,” which mean exactly what the name implies: taking a subject to the ground to gain control and handcuff.

In a number of cases, the resistance leading to the takedown was quite minor or to otherwise not heed orders of officers.

While we are not second-guessing the officers in the field, nor the scrutiny applied to the application of force by subsequent reviewers, we do see benefit to further examination and review of takedowns by the defensive tactics instructors at OPD.

We also observed that in virtually all cases in which a takedown was used, the incident reports note that the subject was referred to the prosecutor for consideration of obstruction charges. We saw this in several cases where the justification for an obstruction charge was notably weak, where the subject was mentally ill (in fact in one case, crying for officers to shoot him), and in another, in a mental crisis at a shelter.

One study that OPD could do is review the aftermath of the force incidents and determine to what degree the “obstruction” charges are actually filed by the County Prosecutor. If there is a significant disconnect between those referrals and cases actually filed, it would suggest recalibration of whether such charges are included too liberally and routinely.

RECOMMENDATION TWENTY: OPD should refer a sample of its takedowns to its defensive tactics instructors to determine whether the use of that force option is in sync with the agency’s overall approach to detaining resistive subjects.

RECOMMENDATION TWENTY-ONE: OPD should review the “filing rate” of obstruction charges by the County Prosecutor to ascertain whether the charge is too routinely included by arresting officers.

Use of Crisis Response Unit (CRU)

The Crisis Response Unit Program is described in OPD Policy 343. The statement of Purpose and Scope set forth in 343.1 includes: CRU members have experience and training interacting with, de-escalating, stabilizing, and transporting individuals in crisis, those who may be under the influence of intoxicating substances, and who might be experiencing mental health challenges.

The Policy states at 343.2 that: “It is the OPD’s policy that CRU members, when available, will respond to calls involving a person in crisis and will attempt to provide crisis services.”

We reviewed a number of reports where such circumstances were plainly present yet there was no indication of a call out or even consideration of a call out, despite obvious indications that the subject was experiencing a mental health crisis, was unhoused, or was a juvenile.

We reviewed cases with no reference to CRU despite calls where a subject was described as “mentally ill, with PTSD, and transient;” “mentally ill and unhoused;” subject described by family as “bi-polar and not taking medication,” and further noting that this information wasn’t shared with responding officers; in a response to a call describing a “man in crisis who asked a citizen to call 911 for him;” a “man in crisis at a shelter,” and when a 15-year old detained for fighting (and resisting/obstructing)

reported that his stepfather had tried to run him over the previous day (the child was returned to his home without apparent follow-up of the reported abuse, even though officers who called the boy's mother reported that they could hear a man yelling in the background).

We know that there may be limitations on CRU availability, and that certain calls require a speedy response such that waiting for CRU support isn't a viable option. Most importantly, we also note the limitation in 343.2 that states: "CRU members are not expected to respond to violent or dangerous situations prior to the scene being stabilized by officers."

As we move forward with our auditing responsibilities, we intend to take a deeper dive into whether CRU is being used to its maximum potential for these calls. To that end, we may request a sample of what events CRU is called to as part of that assessment as we develop our future work plans.

Policy re Reporting Race of Subjects

We noted several cases where a subject of what appeared to be obvious Latin or Hispanic descent, i.e., primarily Spanish speaking or with clearly Latin names, were marked on the incident report as "White." We recognize that being Hispanic or Latino is a cultural, not racial, category, and many such individuals (and many official data tracking mechanisms) consider "White" to be the most accurate available descriptor. However, because of concerns that Hispanics are overrepresented in their contacts with police, many agencies request officers to describe such individuals as "Latino or Hispanic" as opposed to "white" in an effort to ensure that potentially meaningful distinctions are captured and considered.

RECOMMENDATION TWENTY-TWO: When reviewing use of force reports, supervisors should assess whether the recorded demographic information matches up with the observations made in the field, and/or should seek mechanisms for describing subjects with relevant specificity.

IPA No.	OPD No.	UoF Type/Summary	Race/Gender/Age/ MH/Unhoused	Inj.	Investigation	Disposition
1	25-0119	Response to report of criminal trespass in alcove of apartment complex. Used takedown to effectuate arrest when subject resisted handcuffing.	White Female (41) Mentally ill; unhoused	Complaint of wrist pain	No BWC footage of interaction with subject because arresting officer failed to grab camera from the charging station Supervisor reviewed footage post-arrest and interviewed subject; called out discrepancy between report and BWC footage from second officer; arresting officer issued supplemental report explaining that he may have conflated two incidents.	OPD found force within policy; IPA concurred. No mental health services or shelter called.
2	25-1110	Officers conducted narcotics investigation and used takedown and CED to effectuate arrest. Subject's legs then wrapped.	White Male (41)	Complaint of pain to wrists, shoulders, ankle, face. No injuries observable	No summary of subject statement. No CED download information. Interview with subject was accusatory, confrontational, and lecturing.	OPD found force within policy. IPA concurred as to takedown. ECD was not effective and not the most appropriate force option. While bringing into custody, comments of one officer escalated the situation: "if you kick me, I'm going to kick you back". "I'm

						wrapping you up like a burrito”.
3	25-1527	Officers responded to a call from a thrift store relating to shoplifting. Subject ran into business establishment and pursued by officer. Officer pushed subject to the ground; another officer arrived and took subject into custody.	Hispanic Male (35)	No observable injuries or complaints from subject.	Terse interview of subject with involved officer present. Interviews of witnesses conducted with involved officer present.	OPD found force within policy. IPA concurred.
4	25-1708	Officers responded to a possible domestic violence incident. Female struck officer with fist and placed in handcuffs. Female head butted officer, pulled fire alarm, and taken to ground.	White Female (25)	Abrasions that may or may not have occurred as a result of force.	No interview of subject due to intoxicated state and lack of coherence.	OPD found force within policy. IPA concurred.
5	25-1796	Officer attempted to stop man on bicycle for no back reflector. Subject fled on bicycle and officer used patrol car to effectuate a collision. Subject then apprehended.	White Male (27) Homeless	Various scrapes.	Sergeant expressed skepticism when subject alleged that officer hit him with car. “Make sure you are telling the truth”.	OPD found force outside of policy. IPA concurred. OPD also found that officer failed to use loudspeaker to command man to stop and other tactical missteps.
6	25-1856	Officer arrived at a parking lot where private parties were physically detaining a	White Male (41) Possible drug intoxication.	Scratch on face/neck; cleared by	Interview under Miranda but answers were unfocused.	OPD found force within policy. IPA concurred.

		man for theft. Takedown to overcome resistance.		medical at scene.		
7	25-1914	Officers responded to call of subject who had started fire. When contacted by officers, subject walked to bathroom in nearby park. Officers detained subject, and when he physically resisted, they took him to the ground in a controlled takedown.	White Male (36) Evidence of mental illness.	Complaint of pain to fingers, no observable injuries.	Sergeant who observed use of force of two officers interviewed subject. Subject complained that bending of fingers was not necessary; not documented in report.	OPD found force within policy. IPA concurred. Decision to place wrap on subject when appeared cooperative after being handcuffed.
8	25-1940	Park rangers requested assistance with a man who was trespassing, and who confronted officers by throwing rocks. Taken into custody after a Taser deployment.	White Male (33)	Complaint of pain to wrists due to handcuffing; no other reported injury.	Uncooperative with interview.	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred. Question as to whether WRAP was needed based on compliance after cuffing.
9	25-2044	Response to disturbance call; subject tased twice as first probe was reported ineffective.	White Male (31) Mentally ill and unhoused.	Subject had prior injury; judged not due to force.	Supervising sergeant who completed review was a witness, possible victim at scene.	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred. Limitations on BWC footage as one officer left BWC on mute; BWC of another officer was in sleep mode. No call out to CRU.

10	25-1997	Officer was part of a multi-agency response to a large disturbance in a parking lot. Soon after arrival, he took down one subject and then tased a second who approached aggressively.	Subject # 1: Pacific Islander Male (48) Subject # 2: Pacific Islander Male (23) Alcohol involved.	Minor injuries to Subject # 2 from probes.	Subject # 1 was released at scene by other agency. Subject # 2 interviewed at the jail.	OPA found force within policy, but referred extensive officer profanity for investigation. IPA concurred.
11	25-2218	Response to disturbance/theft at convenience store. Three officers used takedown techniques to effectuate arrest.	White Male (62) Alcohol involved.	No subject injuries. Officer had cut to ear.	Supervisor interviewed non-English speaking witness with reasonable, open-ended questions. In-store video was identified but not reviewed.	OPD found force within policy; IPA concurred. Officer waited for additional officers to arrive and gave multiple warnings prior to force.
12	25-2225	Officers visited residence after call of child abuse/endangerment. Individual taken to ground.	White Female (38)	Slight amount of blood around mouth. Examined by medics at scene.		OPD found force within policy. IPA concurred.
13	25-2356	Response to DV call; suspect attempted to flee; officer used takedown.	White Male (37)	None.	Supervisor interviewed subject and witnesses and reviewed BWC footage.	OPD found force within policy; IPA concurred.
14	25-2396	Two officers combined to take down and cuff an individual who tried to flee to avoid detention.	Black Male (33) Signs of drug intoxication	No injury	Supervisor interview under Miranda; subject somewhat agitated and unfocused.	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred.

15	25-2558	Individual suspected of theft from thrift store, ran from officer and was taken to ground.	White female (21) Mental health crisis (self-reported) and Unhoused	Complaint of pain to wrist	At scene, subject alleged that she was in a mental health crisis but no apparent effort to have CRU respond, sergeant cross-examined subject about her decision to run and not heed instructions to stop. Backpack unnecessarily cut off of subject with a knife. Sergeant attempted to talk subject out of her request to be examined at hospital but eventually authorized transport.	OPD found force in policy. IPA concurred.
16	25-2640	Officers responded to a trespassing call of a subject upset over his property being forfeited at a storage facility over lack of payment. Take down to overcome resistance after refusal to leave.	Black Male (28) Signs of mental health crisis	Minor abrasions; refusal of medical care though medics were on scene.	Subject was actively agitated and refused to cooperate with interview.	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred. Profanity not addressed. WRAP utilized.
17	25-2699	Officer pulled female subject to the ground in response to assaultive behavior as she sat in a	White Female (19) Signs of extreme alcohol intoxication and	Cut to mouth from contact with ground.	Interview not possible due to subject's incapacity at jail.	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred, while noting unhelpful dialogue from officers while

		wheelchair prior to transport to jail from hospital (where she had assaulted staff).	possible mental instability			monitoring the subject at the hospital.
18	25-2946	Response to call; minor resistance by subject; minimal force used in takedown.	Male (30s) Note: Subject had surname indicating Hispanic ethnicity and only spoke Spanish but was marked as "White" on report.	Minor scrapes.	Supervisor called Spanish-speaking officer to scene assist with interview.	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred. See Note on report of subject's race/ethnicity.
19	25-3121	Motor vehicle stop for no front plate and expired tabs. Officer sought to detain passenger for not wearing seatbelt; passenger fled. Chase and takedowns to effectuate arrest.	White Female (44) Subject intoxicated and has substance use disorder.	Subject had possible broken nose with bleeding; was taken to hospital.	Responding supervisor advised arresting officer to turn off his BWC audio. Supervisor interviewed witness at scene but did not record contact info. Driver was interviewed and reported officer "beat up" subject, but was determined to have not witnessed the takedown.	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred but noted that force after chase was quite forceful - subject flipped over by one arm – and appeared likely to result in injury.
20	25-3172	This was a simple takedown of a subject whom the	Black Male (36)	No injury.	Interview outside of Miranda, and	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred.

		officer recognized and sought to detain for violation of a "stay away" order.			straightforward. Cuffs adjusted at subject's request.	
21	25-3309	Officers took down a resistant subject as they tried to detain him for his role in a bar fight that prompted a call for service.	White Male (45) High level of alcohol intoxication.	Abrasion on cheek from contact with ground.	Supervisor interview under Miranda; subject was largely uncooperative.	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred. Man was placed in WRAP; verbally antagonistic but seemingly not physically resistive.
22	25-3378	Single officer chased and took to ground a subject who ran from attempted detention based on warrant.	White Male (29)	Complaint of pain to ribs, but refused medical treatment	Supervisor interview outside Miranda; subject was cooperative.	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred.
23	25-3391	Officers responded to call from OFD of a fight near where OFD was tending to a patient. Site known to officers as a place where transients assemble and where drugs are used. Subject identified as the aggressor (later determined to be mutual) was located and asked to stop; subject said he wasn't the aggressor and attempted to walk away so takedown was used to	White Male juvenile (15)	Subject had cut lip and abrasions.	Responding supervisor was witness to tail-end of incident and supplied the WRAP restraint. Supervisor clarified he was only asking the subject about the takedown, not the underlying incident. Supervisor sought to confirm that the subject had tried to run away from officer.	OPA found force within policy; OPA concurs, noting that the officers remained calm and did not retaliate for subject's verbal abuse, but with the following notes: Subject's attempts to walk away from officer was described as "active resistance." Application of WRAP seemed excessive because the subject – who had been very verbally abusive –

		effectuate arrest. Subject also restrained via "WRAP."				<p>appeared fully restrained and subdued.</p> <p>Further note about the return of the juvenile to his home, where the report noted the juvenile said his stepfather had "run over his foot" the day before, and officers could hear a man yelling in the background during a call to the subject's mother.</p>
24	25-3703	Response to report of shoplifting. Subject initially attempted to flee then returned voluntarily but seem to resist handcuffing so takedown performed.	White Male (22) Subject under influence of narcotics.	Subject complained of injury but was cleared by OFD.	Supervisor gave Miranda rights then attempted to interview.	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred but noted that an officer – who appeared to have been training a new officer – told the subject that if he "didn't standup you're going to get wrapped like a burrito."
25	25-3711	Response to commercial burglary; subject briefly attempted to flee; takedown to effectuate arrest.	White Male (31) Mental illness.	Subject had knee abrasion; complained of aggravation to prior knee injury.	Supervisor asked leading questions, seeking only to confirm that the subject knew that he was fleeing from police officers. Supervisor asked "Why didn't you comply?" and	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred based on report, but noted that BWC of the officer who did the takedown was not available due to being in sleep mode.

					<p>cut subject off when he responded that he did comply and that the officers gave inconsistent demands.</p> <p>When subject complained of injury, the supervisor said, "The officers didn't cause that."</p>	
26	25-3724	Officer chased a wanted subject into a private residence, and then into a back yard, where he attempted a tasing before tackling subject to the ground.	White Male (34)	Subject medically cleared at hospital but had no claim or sign of injury.	Subject not cooperative with interview.	OPA found force within policy based on "danger to public" posed by subject. IPA concurred. Muting of cameras at scene.
27	25-3743	Officers struggled to handcuff a subject with history of assaultive behavior as they sought to detain him for a hit and run investigation. He was taken to ground and then tased as resistance continued.	Hispanic Male (23) Subject categorized as "white" in Department review.	Subject agitated and complaining of chest pain; medically cleared.	Minimal cooperation with interview; subject claimed he was taken down for no reason.	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred. Subject categorized as "white" in Department review.
28	25-3780	A man was stopped by officers for a moving violation on a bicycle; one officer recognized him as	White Male (41) Subject very talkative and agitated, possibly	Subject claimed injury, but would not elaborate.	Subject answered some questions but ultimately refused to cooperate with interview.	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred.

		someone who also had a warrant. Resisted detention led to takedown.	under the influence.	Minor abrasions noticed.		Good efforts at communication while waiting for backup.
29	25-3912	Response to burglary/malicious mischief call; subject attempted to flee and was pushed against wall then taken to ground to effectuate arrest.	Asian Male (37) Mental illness.	Laceration to forehead from wall.	Supervisor noted witnesses were gone; checked for CCTV footage. Supervisor administered Miranda warnings before seeking to interview; did not delineate that he was investigating force used, not the underlying incident. Subject did not respond.	OPA found within policy; IPA concurred but notes concern with application of WRAP restraint: BWC footage does not document any discussion of need for WRAP, which appears to have been supplied by the responding supervisor without discussion. Only one of the officer's reports mentions application of the WRAP, and that officer said it was applied because the subject had "spit in the general direction of officers." The BWC footage does not clearly support that – the subject may have spit but in direction of wall, not of officers.
30	25-3929	Officers responded to apartment complex and located subject for making a disturbance who ran from them and fell. Subject got	White Male (26)	Laceration to eye that were either caused by initial fall or	Sergeant who used force had BWC in sleep mode so force incident not captured. Apartment surveillance showed	OPD found force within policy. IPA concurred. When subject inquired of his watch's whereabouts, "If you didn't fight and run from

		up and officer tackled him to ground.		officer take down.	incident w/o audio. Sergeant's force evaluated by a peer Sergeant.	cops, you wouldn't lose your shit". On scene officer advised witness: "he fought with officers and tried to hurt us." At jail referring to injury: "That was his own fault."
	25-4362	Subject attempted to push apartment door closed as officers made legal entry pursuant to warrant; he was grabbed, taken to the ground, and handcuffed.	White Male (55)	No injury	Verbally uncooperative subsequent to arrest.	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred.
31	25-4647	Officer observed man whom she believed had a warrant. Short foot pursuit and then takedown	White Male (41)	No observable injuries	Sergeant lectured and then argued with subject instead of interviewing about use of force.	OPD found force in policy. IPA concurred. Profanity and unprofessional language: "Get down on fucking ground" "Get on your fucking stomach" "Put your hand behind your back or I'm going to snap your wrist.
32	25-4651	Officer response to subject with warrant; officer gave verbal commands to stop "or it won't end well for you." Routine takedown to effectuate arrest.	White Male (26)	Minor abrasion treated with bandaid.	Supervisor administered Miranda rights to subject prior to interview; sought to ascertain the subject knew that they were police officers. Did not follow-up on	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred.

					subject's statement that he was cooperative and didn't need to be tackled.	
33	25-4704	Response to report of trespass; subject was told to leave but refused. When told he was under arrest, subject resisted handcuffing; takedown to effectuate arrest.	Asian Male (50) Alcohol intoxication.		Supervisor attempted interview; subject was angry about arrest but did not complain about force.	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred.
34	25-4710	Female called for service due to a male stranger lingering outside her home. Officers responded and found the man responsive to their requests that he leave. Resistance during handcuffing led to takedown.	Asian Male (50)	No injury.	Subject did not respond to requests for interview.	OPA found the force in policy. IPA concurred.
35	25-4811	Officer observed man who was reported harassing a security guard earlier in the day. When officer tried to talk with man, he attempted to flee. Officer used take-down to bring man into custody	White Male (42)	Cut to hand, scrapes	Subject alleges force was excessive. No complaint taken regarding allegation.	OPD found force in policy. IPA concurred.

36	25-4915	Subject was arrested after a domestic disturbance. He asked for handcuffs to be readjusted but then attempted to flee and was taken to the ground.	White Male (26)	Subject began to hyperventilate, but not from injury.	Subject denied attempting to run and said he had not done anything wrong.	OPA found force in policy. IPA concurred.
37	25-5185	Officers respond to domestic violence call. Encounter man in residence who grabs Taser that is placed against him. Sgt. then uses Taser twice and officer follows with another Taser use.	White Male (41) Signs of Mental Illness	Minor injuries from Taser application.	An uninvolved sergeant conducted force review.	OPD found use of Tasers in policy. IPA questions whether use of Taser in stun drive was consistent with current OPD policy. OPD's Taser policy has no restrictions on simultaneous deployment
38	25-5213	Response to disturbance; subject taken to ground to effectuate arrest.	White Male (44) Alcohol intoxication.	None	Supervisor identified and interviewed witnesses; reviewed photos and BWC.	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred.
39	25-2737	Man wanted for robbery. Officer pursued man and used PIT maneuver to disable van. Other officers yell at man to go to ground. Man on ground and other officers order him to get up. Man is on knees and officer deployed K9. Man bitten on arm for several seconds and then brought into custody.	White Male (47)	Dog bite to upper arm	Subject declines interview on date of incident but agrees to be interviewed one month later. No sergeant at scene of force. No BWC obtained from other assisting agencies (Tumwater, SO)	OPD finds deployment of K9 in policy. IPA does not concur. OPD finds that considering conflicting communications from officers it may have been beneficial to give subject additional time to comply. Recommendation to send to K9 team to review training/tactics.

40	25-3375	Man is reported barricaded in commercial building, harassing employees, activating fire extinguisher. OPD responds, breaches window of location of subject, deploys K9 and take down.	White Male (31)	Facial and hip injuries due to making contact with glass shards	Entry plan on BWC. Man had glasses in hand, sergeant reported that glasses could be used as "stabbing implement". Reports used disfavored term "excited delirium" to describe man's condition. Involved supervisor interviewed subject.	OPD finds use of force in policy. IPA concurs.
41	25-4651	Man with a suspected warrant encountered by officer. When man began to walk away, officer used takedown to bring him into custody.	White Male (27)	Minor abrasion to arm	Inappropriate comments to man after arrest: "you idiot", "we have our knuckleheads here".	OPD found use of force in policy. IPA concurred.
42	25-5344	Officers responded to a parking lot fight involving several individuals. One man was assaulting another on the ground; he was Tased by an officer when he refused an order to stop.	Black Male (32) High level of alcohol intoxication	Medically cleared at hospital after Tasing; no claim of injury.	Subject was cooperative but impaired by alcohol and had difficulty focusing.	OPD found use of force in policy. IPA concurred.
43	25-5586	Response to DV call; subject fled, had pants in pockets. Multiple officers took subject to ground, including	Black Male (26) Subject reported by family as bi-polar and not taking medication.	None	Subject was uncooperative with supervisor, though had complained he couldn't breathe and was	OPA found use of force within policy; IPA concurred but noted that information about mental illness was not shared with other officers and there was no call out to

		pinning head to ground. WRAP restraint applied.			restrained "George Floyd style."	CRU. Further, IPA notes concerns about the application of the WRAP restraint as there was no apparent resistance after wristlocks applied, and an officer comment raised questions about whether the application was in retaliation for the subject's verbal abuse of officers.
44	25-5745	Police respond to a domestic dispute and learned that a female at the residence had an outstanding warrant. Woman was taken down and handcuffed.	White Female (44)	Abrasion to right knee	Threats to deploy dog, 40 mm instead of de-escalation. Witness sergeant conducted interview of woman. Did not ask about the propriety of use of force.	OPD found use of force in policy. IPA concurred.
45	25-6502	Trespasser entered a stranger's residence without his consent and went to take a shower. When officers confronted him, he resisted and was taken to the ground.	White Male (30)	No injury.	Suspect was placed in WRAP and but agreed to an interview; however, answers were unfocused.	OPA found use of force in policy. IPA concurred. Body-camera issue identified.
46	25-6243	Officer responded to a trespassing call, and subject was evasive, including giving a false name. When backup arrived, officers went to	Black Male (31)	No injury.	Interview occurred at the jail under Miranda; subject asserted he had been "tackled" and	OPA found use of force in policy. IPA occurred.

		detain him in handcuffs, and a struggle ensued that led to a takedown.			"slammed to the ground."	
47	25-6479	Response to disorderly conduct call; subject resisted handcuffing; takedown; "cross-face" pain compliance technique used.	Black Male (29) Drug intoxication.	None.	Attempts to identify witnesses and good interview by supervisor, asking subject to explain in his own words what happened.	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred.
48	25-6601	Response to report of "man in crisis;" the subject had asked a community member to call 911 on his behalf. Arm bar takedown used; WRAP restraint applied.	Asian Male (37) Impaired mental status and drug intoxication.	None	No mention of attempt to locate/interview person who called 911.	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred. After handcuffing, subject was subdued, crying and asking officers to shoot him. WRAP restraint was applied because subject wouldn't put legs inside patrol car. Subject was involuntarily committed. No record of consideration or attempt to call out CRU.
49	25-6607	Officer responded to report of retail theft; subject had warrant and was tagged in database as "threat to law enforcement." Prolonged	Black Male (18)	Subject and officer both had minor injuries	Thorough supervisory investigation.	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred. Officer used de-escalation tactics and exhibited laudable efforts to stay calm

		struggle as subject attempted to flee; multiple takedown attempts with final effort involving pulling subject down by hair.		attended at scene.		in tense and dangerous situation.
50	25-6933	<p>Response to call from shelter of man in crisis. Subject was in shower at shelter – flooding the floors – and wouldn’t leave.</p> <p>Considerable force by multiple officers necessary to effectuate arrest; “hyperactive delirium protocol” activated.</p>	<p>White Male (24)</p> <p>Mental illness; drug intoxication; unhoused.</p> <p>Note: Subject’s name appears to indicate Hispanic ethnicity.</p>	None reported.	<p>Supervisor at scene; reviewed BWC footage. No apparent witness interviews or review of CCTV footage at shelter.</p>	<p>OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred.</p> <p>Note that reports do not indicate that OFD was advised subject had reported fentanyl injection before subject was sedated by OFD per hyperactive delirium response.</p> <p>No CRU call out to scene or to hospital where subject was transported.</p>



May 12, 2026

Olympia City Council

Honorable Mayor Payne and City of Olympia Councilmembers,

One of the duties of the Community Policing Board is to meet regularly with the Civilian Police Auditor to provide feedback and community perspectives on their work, including their annual report and recommendations. This letter is intended to share with you the Community Policing Board’s conversation regarding the Auditor’s 2025 draft annual report and recommendations, on which the board received a briefing at their March 12, 2026 meeting.

The Community Policing Board discussed the draft annual report with the Civilian Police Auditor and had the opportunity to ask questions about the data presented in the report and the Auditor’s list of recommendations. Community Policing Board members had the following comments related to the Auditor’s draft report:

- Insert comments here

We thank the City Council for the opportunity to review and comment on the auditor’s annual report.

Best Regards,

NAME
Chair, Community Policing Board

:mm



Community Policing Board

2026-2027 Civilian Police Auditor Draft Work Plan

Agenda Date: 3/12/2026
Agenda Item Number: 6.C
File Number:26-0196

Type: discussion **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

2026-2027 Civilian Police Auditor Draft Work Plan

Recommended Action

Move to approve a comment letter for the Police Auditor Draft Work Plan to be forwarded to the Community Livability and Public Safety Committee.

Report

Issue:

Approval of a comment letter for the Police Auditor Draft Work Plan to be forwarded to the Community Livability and Public Safety Committee.

Staff Contact:

Margo Morales, Community Engagement Program Specialist, Organizational Development and Performance, 360.753.8150

Presenter(s):

Stephen Connolly, Police Auditor, OIR Group
Michael Gennaco, Police Auditor, OIR Group
Sam Pailca, Police Auditor, OIR Group
Margo Morales, Community Engagement Program Specialist

Background and Analysis:

In July 2024, the City Council accepted recommendations from the Social Justice and Equity Commission on Community Oversight of Law Enforcement. From the recommendations the City established a new Community Policing Board, whose purpose is to ensure Olympia Police Department accountability and transparency, serve as community representatives and provide community perspectives on the work of the Civilian Police Auditor (Auditor).

The recommendations also included enhancements to the role of Auditor. The central role of the Auditor is to review certain types of investigations completed internally by the Olympia Police Department and provide regular reports to the City Council which include recommendations for police department operations, policy and training based on the findings of their audit. One of the enhancements to the role of the Auditor is the requirement of an annual work plan to be approved by the City Council. The work plan should address policies, training, and other issues of interest that the Auditor intends to review that year.

This is the first year the Auditor was required to draft a work plan for the coming year based on findings from

their 2025 draft annual report and that fall within their scope of work. The purpose of this agenda item is for the Community Policing Board (Board) to have an opportunity to review and discuss the draft work plan with the Auditor. This feedback will be used by the Auditor to further refine their workplan.

Once finalized, the work plan will then be considered by the Community Livability & Public Safety Committee (CLPS), alongside other Council-appointed advisory body work plans, for recommendation to the City Council for approval.

The Board will submit a comment letter to accompany the draft work plan to CLPS, and then to City Council reflecting their review and input given to the Auditor, which may include comments on content and format.

Climate Analysis:

No known climate impacts.

Equity Analysis:

The intent of the Community Policing Board is to enhance community involvement in law enforcement. It's also the intent that Board membership be diverse and representative of the community's demographics and lived experiences, including community members who may have been justice-impacted. Having community members provide input on their draft work plan contributes to changes in policies and practices that are in alignment with community needs and interests and contributes more broadly to building trust and legitimacy in the City's public safety system.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

There's broad community interest in community involvement in law enforcement, including the role work of the Auditor. The Auditor meeting regularly with the Community Policing Board and receiving feedback from the Board on their draft work plan supports ongoing transparency and providing a role for community member engagement in community policing.

Options:

1. Approve a comment letter for the Police Auditor Draft Work Plan to be forwarded to the Community Livability and Public Safety Committee.
2. Do not approve a comment letter for the Police Auditor Draft Work Plan to be forwarded to the Community Livability and Public Safety Committee.
3. Direct staff to return at a later date for continued discussion and approval of a comment letter for the Police Auditor Draft Work Plan to be forwarded to the Community Livability and Public Safety Committee.

Financial Impact:

The City contracted with OIR Group for Civilian Police Auditor services for an initial one-year term beginning on May 7, 2025, valued at \$105,000.

Attachments:

Civilian Police Auditor 2026-2027 Work Plan Draft
Draft Work Plan Comment Letter



6510 Spring Street #613
Long Beach, CA 90815
OIRGroup.com

2026-27 Work Plan for Independent Police Auditor, City of Olympia WA

IPA Role: Contribute to the City's model of police oversight by providing outside scrutiny of designated categories of internal investigation by the Olympia Police Department ("OPD"), and by responding to feedback and input from the Community Policing Board, City officials, and community stakeholders.

OIR Group: Based in southern California (and with a Seattle resident as part of the Olympia IPA team), OIR Group has twenty-five years of experience in providing independent oversight of law enforcement agencies in dozens of jurisdictions. It was selected as the City's current IPA in the spring of 2025.

Work Product:

1. Mid-Year and End of Year Reporting re Audits of OPD Investigations

Timeline: Q4 and Q2

A. After completing audit of OPD investigations into force incidents and allegations of misconduct, share draft reports regarding findings and recommendations with the Community Policing Board for feedback and community perspectives

B. Present final reports at agendaized presentation to the full City Council

2. Further Review of specific systemic issues identified in previous reporting period

Timeline: Concurrent with regular reporting cycle

Topic: Review integration between OPD and CRU during calls for service involving persons experiencing a mental health crisis

3. Community Engagement

Timeline: Q1 and Q3, to follow public reporting cycle

Strategy: Collaborate with Community Policing Board and City staff on alternative ways to engage with the community and promote awareness of our work while receiving stakeholder feedback. (Examples may include listening sessions, online data sharing)

DRAFT



March 12, 2026

Olympia City Council

Honorable Mayor Payne and City of Olympia Councilmembers,

One of the duties of the Community Policing Board is to meet regularly with the Civilian Police Auditor to provide feedback and community perspectives on their work, including their annual work plan. On March 12, 2026 the Community Policing Board had the opportunity to meet with the Civilian Police Auditor and discuss their draft work plan for the coming year. This letter is intended to share with you the Community Policing Board’s conversation.

The Community Policing Board discussed the draft work plan with the Civilian Police Auditor and had the opportunity to ask questions. Community Policing Board members had the following comments related to the Auditor’s draft work plan:

- Insert comments here

We thank the City Council for the opportunity to review and comment on the auditor’s annual report.

Best Regards,

NAME
Chair, Community Policing Board

:mm