



# Meeting Agenda

## City Council

City Hall  
601 4th Avenue E  
Olympia, WA 98501  
Information: 360.753.8441

---

Tuesday, May 19, 2026

6:00 PM

Council Chambers, Online and  
Via Phone

---

Watch the meeting at [www.olytv3.com](http://www.olytv3.com)

Register for virtual public comment:

[https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_8NXH11V-SjCgYDsOD-oSpg](https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_8NXH11V-SjCgYDsOD-oSpg)

### 1. ROLL CALL

#### 1.A ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### 1.B APPROVAL OF AGENDA

### 2. SPECIAL RECOGNITION

- 2.A [26-0358](#) Special Recognition - Proclamation Recognizing May as Olympia Heritage Month

Attachments: [Proclamation](#)

### 3. PUBLIC COMMENT

*(Estimated Time: 0-30 Minutes) (Sign-up Sheets are provided in the Foyer.)*

*During this portion of the meeting, community members may address the City Council regarding items related to City business, including items on the Agenda. In order for the City Council to maintain impartiality and the appearance of fairness in upcoming matters and to comply with Public Disclosure Law for political campaigns, speakers will not be permitted to make public comments before the Council in these two areas: (1) where the public testimony may implicate a matter on which the City Council will be required to act in a quasi-judicial capacity, or (2) where the speaker promotes or opposes a candidate for public office or a ballot measure.*

*Individual comments are limited to two (2) minutes or less. In order to hear as many people as possible during the 30-minutes set aside for Public Communication, the City Council will refrain from commenting on individual remarks until all public comment has been taken. The City Council will allow for additional public comment to be taken at the end of the meeting for those who signed up at the beginning of the meeting and did not get an opportunity to speak during the allotted 30-minutes.*

### COUNCIL RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT (Optional)

### 4. CONSENT CALENDAR

*(Items of a Routine Nature)*

- 4.A [26-0350](#) Approval of May 5, 2026 City Council Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Minutes](#)

- 4.B [26-0379](#) Approval of May 12, 2026 Study Session Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Minutes](#)

- 4.C [26-0348](#) Approval of a Resolution Authorizing Submission of an Application for a National Endowment for the Arts Grants for Arts Projects Grant for the Daley Arts Center

**Attachments:** [Resolution](#)  
[2026 Municipal Art Plan](#)

#### 4. SECOND READINGS (Ordinances) - None

##### 4. FIRST READINGS (Ordinances)

- 4.D [26-0347](#) Approval of an Ordinance Amending Ordinance 7454 (First Quarter Budget Amendment)

**Attachments:** [Ordinance](#)

#### 5. PUBLIC HEARING - None

#### 6. OTHER BUSINESS

- 6.A [26-0360](#) Civilian Police Auditor 2025 Annual Report

**Attachments:** [OMC 2.38.010 - Civilian Police Auditor](#)  
[2026 Police Auditor Work Plan](#)  
[2025 Annual Report Comment Letter](#)  
[Civilian Police Auditor Annual Report](#)  
[2025 Use of Force Cases Index](#)

#### 7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT

*(If needed for those who signed up earlier and did not get an opportunity to speak during the allotted 30 minutes)*

#### 8. COUNCIL INTERGOVERNMENTAL/COMMITTEE REPORTS AND REFERRALS

#### 9. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND REFERRALS

#### 10. EXECUTIVE SESSION

- 10.A [26-0376](#) Executive Session Pursuant to RCW 42.30.110(1)(i); Litigation and Potential Litigation

#### 10. ADJOURNMENT

*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 Council meeting, please contact the Assistant to the City Manager at 360.753.8441 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 Council

### Special Recognition - Proclamation Recognizing May as Olympia Heritage Month

**Agenda Date:** 5/19/2026  
**Agenda Item Number:** 2.A  
**File Number:**26-0358

---

**Type:** recognition **Version:** 1 **Status:** Recognition

---

#### **Title**

Special Recognition - Proclamation Recognizing May as Olympia Heritage Month

#### **Recommended Action**

##### **Committee Recommendation:**

Not referred to a committee.

##### **City Manager Recommendation:**

Proclaim May 2026 as Olympia Heritage Month and encourage all citizens to explore local heritage through online resources, to support Olympia's economy by patronizing local businesses, restaurants and venues in our historic downtown and historic places.

#### **Report**

##### **Issue:**

Whether to proclaim May 2026 as Olympia Heritage Month and encourage all citizens to explore local heritage through online resources, to support Olympia's economy by patronizing local businesses, restaurants and venues in our historic downtown and historic places.

##### **Staff Contact:**

Brittany Gillia, Historic Preservation Officer, Community Planning & Economic Development,  
360.753.8427

##### **Presenter(s):**

Brittany Gillia, Historic Preservation Officer  
Bill Cotter, Olympia Heritage Commission Member

##### **Background and Analysis:**

Each year in May, the City of Olympia celebrates our local history and heritage by declaring May to be Heritage Month. Throughout the year, the Olympia Heritage Commission (OHC) is partnering with local heritage organizations and communities to offer educational programming and community engagement.

Preservation Month began in 1973 with the National Trust for Historic Preservation as 'National Preservation Week'. In 2005, the National Trust extended the celebration to the entire month of May

and declared it Preservation Month to provide local preservation groups, state historical societies, and businesses and civic organizations across the country an even greater opportunity to celebrate the diverse and unique heritage of our country's cities and states.

2026 marks the 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The National Trust for Historic Preservation is using this milestone to reflect on our nation's past and honor the contributions of all Americans and look ahead toward the future we want to create for the next generation and beyond.

### **Climate Analysis:**

The greenest building is the one already built. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) reports that "...all kinds of historic buildings and neighborhoods, archaeological sites, Tribal sites and resources, and culturally important landscapes (both designed and natural) throughout the country (collectively, "historic properties"), as well as associated intangible cultural heritage, are at risk from a broad range of potential climate impacts, including sea level rise; extreme weather events; increased wildfires; drought; melting permafrost and erosion; and temperature changes.

These impacts are both direct and cumulative and threaten not only historic properties but also the terrestrial and aquatic flora and fauna associated with historically and culturally important places.

The loss of or damage to historic properties from such climate impacts can irrevocably change a community's sense of place and erode people's sense of personal identity and cultural stability. About 39 percent of global carbon emissions come from the construction and operation of buildings. This impact can be reduced by reusing existing buildings, thus avoiding the embodied carbon emissions inherent in new construction, including the carbon associated with the manufacturing and transportation of new materials and the removal and disposal of building materials from demolished buildings.

Reuse of existing buildings in urban areas also contributes to climate change mitigation by promoting density, helping to combat urban sprawl and its attendant negative environmental impacts.

Since approximately 40 percent of America's building stock is at least 50 years old, it is critical that reuse and energy retrofit of older and historic buildings (including enhanced electrification and increased energy efficiency standards) be fundamental priorities."

Promoting historic preservation encourages the reuse of Olympia's building stock, thus proactively aiding to the slow the tide of climate change within the City and beyond.

### **Equity Analysis:**

The ACHP also reports that: "...historic properties important to disadvantaged and underserved communities may be disproportionately affected by climate change and that such communities often are ill-equipped to undertake needed interventions." The changing demographics of America pose opportunities as well as challenges for Olympia's historic preservation programming.

The diversity of cultures in our city shape and enrich the community experience, and local government can continue to encourage wider involvement and representation in determining what historic sites are worthy of recognition and preservation; how history and cultural heritage should be valued, interpreted, and preserved; and how we can ensure the American public as a whole can take advantage of the programs and tools created under federal, state, and local laws - in particular, OMC

18.12.

Historic preservation is not limited to historic structures or districts, and the City's preservation efforts are dedicated to representing all stories and heritages that have transpired on this land, including histories from pre-settlement eras, hidden histories, and histories from underrepresented communities.

**Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):**

Historic Preservation is relevant to all communities in Olympia because the histories that have preceded us have shaped Olympia into what it is today. Preservation month may be relevant to folks with lineage tied to the region or who may live and/or work in historic structures or historic districts.

**Options:**

1. Proclaim May 2026 as Olympia Heritage Month.
2. Do not proclaim May 2026 as Olympia Heritage Month.
3. Take other action.

**Financial Impact:**

None

**Attachments:**

Proclamation

**PROCLAMATION**

***WHEREAS, this year marks the 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and establishment of the United States of America; and***

***WHEREAS, the National Trust for Historic Preservation's theme for National Preservation Month 2026 is 'All People Are Created Equal' and the nation is celebrating by sharing historic sites, neighborhoods, and landmarks that tell the full American story; and***

***WHEREAS, embracing the identities, lived experiences, and diverse perspectives of Olympia's growing community enhances the livability and vibrancy of the city for all residents; and***

***WHEREAS, the City of Olympia recognizes that history and heritage are essential components of a community's identity, and equitable opportunities for access and participation in Historic Preservation programming play a large role in painting a fuller picture of the past ; and***

***WHEREAS, the Olympia Heritage Commission is dedicated to providing education and resources that support all residents and community members in learning about Olympia's history by recognizing historic structures and the stories of communities before us; and***

***WHEREAS, educating the community on our shared history and challenges helps all of us contribute to a more positive world for the future;***

***NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Olympia City Council does hereby proclaim the month of May 2026 to be***

***OLYMPIA HERITAGE MONTH,  
Finding new ways to recognize and celebrate our diverse history and heritage and expand access to education and programming for all Olympians.***

***SIGNED IN THE CITY OF OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON THIS 19<sup>th</sup> DAY OF MAY, 2026.***

***OLYMPIA CITY COUNCIL***

***Dontae Payne  
Mayor***



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

## City Council

### Approval of May 5, 2026 City Council Meeting Minutes

**Agenda Date:** 5/19/2026  
**Agenda Item Number:** 4.A  
**File Number:**26-0350

---

**Type:** minutes **Version:** 1 **Status:** Consent Calendar

---

**Title**

Approval of May 5, 2026 City Council Meeting Minutes



# Meeting Minutes - Final

## City Council

City Hall  
601 4th Avenue E  
Olympia, WA 98501  
Information: 360.753.8441

---

Tuesday, May 5, 2026

6:00 PM

Council Chambers, Online and Via  
Phone

---

Watch the meeting at [www.olytv3.com](http://www.olytv3.com)

Register for virtual public comment:

[https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_LS8YbKqNSoCpSj1EVbi4Qw](https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_LS8YbKqNSoCpSj1EVbi4Qw)

### 1. ROLL CALL

**Present:** 7 - Mayor Dontae Payne, Mayor Pro Tem Yén Huỳnh, Councilmember Dani Madrone, Councilmember Robert Vanderpool, Councilmember Clark Gilman, Councilmember Kelly Green and Councilmember Paul Berendt

### 1.A ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilmember Gilman highlighted the Stamp Out Hunger food drive, held the second Saturday in May and organized by the National Association of Letter Carriers since 1993. Residents are encouraged to leave non-perishable food in provided bags for collection, with donations supporting the Thurston County Food Bank.

City Manager Burney also introduced Hillory Flowers as Interim Fire Chief, following the retirement of Chief Matt Morris.

### 1.B APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

### 2. SPECIAL RECOGNITION

#### 2.A [26-0305](#) Special Recognition - Proclamation Recognizing Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month

The City Council proclaimed May as Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander (AANHPI) Heritage Month, honoring the contributions and cultures of these communities in Olympia.

The proclamation was accepted by Asian Pacific Islanders Heritage Coalition of South Puget Sound Program Director Lin Crowley who invited the community to a celebration taking place on May 23 at the South Puget Community College Lacey Campus.

**The recognition was received.**

- 2.B**     [26-0327](#)     Special Recognition - Proclamation Recognizing Jewish American Heritage Month

The City Council proclaimed May as Jewish American Heritage Month, celebrating Jewish American history, culture, and contributions to Olympia.

Temple Beth Hatfiloh Board President Daniel Farber accepted the proclamation and emphasized continued partnership with the City.

**The recognition was received.**

### **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following people spoke: Shawna Hawk, Javoen Byrd, George Collin, Elijah Rowland, Kael Moffat, C-C Coates, Danny Burrell, Molly O'Neil, Chris Lewis, Annette Ruzicka, Rozkiva Hughes, and David Webb.

#### **COUNCIL RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT (Optional)**

### **4. CONSENT CALENDAR**

- 4.A**     [26-0342](#)     Approval of April 28, 2026 Olympia City Council Meeting Minutes

**The minutes were adopted.**

- 4.B**     [26-0317](#)     Approval of a Resolution Authorizing an Application for a Heritage Capital Projects 2027-2029 Grant for the Olympia Armory Building

**The resolution was adopted.**

- 4.C**     [26-0332](#)     Approval of a Resolution to Amend the Ziplly Fiber Master Use Permit

**The resolution was adopted.**

- 4.D**     [26-0335](#)     Approval of a Resolution Authorizing a Contract with Solid Waste Systems Equipment, LLC for One Waste Collection Truck

**The resolution was adopted.**

#### **Approval of the Consent Agenda**

**Councilmember Gilman moved, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Huỳnh, to adopt the Consent Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:**         7 - Mayor Payne, Mayor Pro Tem Huỳnh, Councilmember Madrone, Councilmember Vanderpool, Councilmember Gilman, Councilmember Green and Councilmember Berendt

#### **4. SECOND READINGS (Ordinances) - None**

#### 4. FIRST READINGS (Ordinances) - None

#### 5. PUBLIC HEARING - None

#### 6. OTHER BUSINESS

- 6.A [26-0307](#) 2026 State Legislative Session Debrief, Interim Planning, and Preliminary 2027 Legislative Agenda Check-in

Legislative Liaison Susan Grisham introduced the City's State Lobbyist Team from Capital Path, Principal Kyla Shkerich Blair and Senior Associate Daniel Pailthorp who presented a briefing on the outcomes of the 2026 Legislative Session.

They also discussed interim session planning to include meetings with 22nd legislative delegation and other legislators, tours and planning for the 2027 legislative session. Councilmembers shared preliminary thoughts to begin shaping priorities for the 2027 legislative agenda. Initial feedback includes requests for housing and homelessness support, local funding flexibility, addressing tax regressivity, small business and downtown support, sustainability, and continued support for the Deschutes Estuary.

Councilmembers asked clarifying questions.

#### **The information was received.**

- 6.B [26-0326](#) Approval of Opioid Funding for Pooling with the Opioid Abatement Council

City Manager Burney presented a proposal to allocate more than \$ \$562,714 in opioid settlement funds to join a regional effort through the Opioid Abatement Council. The funds-part of national litigation settlements-will support a \$2 million Thurston County initiative focused on prevention, treatment, and recovery through 2027. Other jurisdictions are also pooling funds, creating a coordinated countywide approach aligned with the Thurston County Opioid Response Plan.

Councilmembers asked clarifying questions.

**Councilmember Gilman moved, seconded by Mayor Payne, to authorize the City's contribution of opioid settlement funds to the regional Opioid Abatement Council pooling fund and direct staff to finalize and transmit the City's funding commitment by June 30th, consistent with the Interlocal Agreement. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Mayor Payne, Mayor Pro Tem Huynh, Councilmember Madrone, Councilmember Vanderpool, Councilmember Gilman, Councilmember Green and Councilmember Berendt

- 6.C [26-0336](#) Discussion of the Downtown Commercial Vacancy Study

Economic Development Director Jennica Machado, along with Leland Consulting Group Managing Principal and Senior Analyst Jennifer Shuch presented the results of a Downtown Vacancy study. The objective of the study is to provide the City with a clear and data-driven understanding of commercial vacancies in downtown Olympia and to identify actionable strategies to reduce vacancies over time.

Potential strategies include reducing development requirements, expanding small business support, increasing flexibility for ground-floor uses, improving sidewalks and façades, streamlining permitting, and expanding downtown events and activations. The City Council noted it may be time to revisit the City's downtown strategy, which was created approximately a decade ago.

Councilmembers asked clarifying questions.

**The discussion was completed.**

**7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENT**

**8. COUNCIL INTERGOVERNMENTAL/COMMITTEE REPORTS AND REFERRALS**

Councilmembers reported on meeting and events attended.

**9. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND REFERRALS**

The City Manager had no reports.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:11 p.m.



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

## City Council

### Approval of May 12, 2026 Study Session Meeting Minutes

**Agenda Date:** 5/19/2026  
**Agenda Item Number:** 4.B  
**File Number:**26-0379

---

**Type:** minutes **Version:** 1 **Status:** Consent Calendar

---

**Title**

Approval of May 12, 2026 Study Session Meeting Minutes



# Meeting Minutes - Draft

## City Council

City Hall  
601 4th Avenue E  
Olympia, WA 98501  
Information: 360.753.8441

---

Tuesday, May 12, 2026

6:00 PM

Council Chambers, Online and Via  
Phone

---

### Study Session

Watch the meeting at [www.olytv3.com](http://www.olytv3.com) or via Zoom at  
[https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85025844085?  
pwd=0qdN4MBfh3LML0B0RFVG9ipjB5eLax.1](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85025844085?pwd=0qdN4MBfh3LML0B0RFVG9ipjB5eLax.1)

## 1. ROLL CALL

**Present:** 7 - Mayor Dontae Payne, Mayor Pro Tem Yén Huỳnh, Councilmember Dani Madrone, Councilmember Robert Vanderpool, Councilmember Clark Gilman, Councilmember Kelly Green and Councilmember Paul Berendt

## 2. BUSINESS ITEM

### 2.A [26-0349](#) Discussion of Municipal Court Services Transition to Thurston County District Court

Assistant City Manager Debbie Sullivan; Thurston County Court Executive Officer Frankie Peters; District Court Judge Sam Meyer; Commissioner Paul Wohl; City of Olympia Prosecutor Bryanna Pinkston; and Public Defense Coordinator Diane Whaley provided an update on the transition of Olympia Municipal Court services to the Thurston County District Court following approval of the Interlocal Agreement in 2025. They reviewed key transition milestones, operational updates, financial impacts, and progress on the comprehensive rate study.

The presenters also outlined 2027 priorities, including development of therapeutic court programs such as Community Court, Veterans Court, and Mental Health Court to support equitable justice outcomes and reduce recidivism. The discussion will inform negotiations for a new Interlocal Agreement beginning January 1, 2027.

Councilmembers asked clarifying questions.

**The study session was completed.**

## 3. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.



## City Council

### Approval of a Resolution Authorizing Submission of an Application for a National Endowment for the Arts Grants for Arts Projects Grant for the Daley Arts Center

**Agenda Date:** 5/19/2026  
**Agenda Item Number:** 4.C  
**File Number:**26-0348

---

**Type:** resolution **Version:** 1 **Status:** Consent Calendar

---

#### **Title**

Approval of a Resolution Authorizing Submission of an Application for a National Endowment for the Arts Grants for Arts Projects Grant for the Daley Arts Center

#### **Recommended Action**

##### **Committee Recommendation:**

Not referred to a committee.

##### **City Manager Recommendation:**

Move to approve a resolution authorizing submission of an application for an National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) Grants for Arts Projects (GAP) grant for public art at the Daley Arts Center.

#### **Report**

##### **Issue:**

Whether to approve a resolution authorizing submission of an application for an NEA GAP grant for public art at the Daley Arts Center.

##### **Staff Contact:**

Stephanie Johnson, Arts Program Manager, Parks, Arts & Recreation, 360.709.2678

##### **Presenter(s):**

None - Consent Calendar item.

#### **Background and Analysis:**

Because the Armory project is considered a renovation and not new construction, it does not trigger the 1% for Art ordinance. Staff wish to pursue a public art project in the large drill hall, one that both creates an immediate visual presence and can help with acoustics in the room. Once funding is established, staff will work with the Arts Commission to develop a Call for Art and selection process. Intent to pursue grant opportunities is included in the 2026 Municipal Art Plan.

The NEA GAP grants provide funding for public engagement with the arts and arts education, for the integration of the arts with strategies promoting the health and well-being of people and communities,

and for the improvement of overall capacity and capabilities within the arts sector.

Projects by local arts agencies (including municipal government) supported by GAP grants include those related to public art, such as creation, installation, and preservation. Cost share/matching grants range from \$10,000 to \$100,000, with a minimum cost share/match equal to the grant amount. \$40,000 from the Municipal Art Fund, would serve as a match for the \$80,000 grant request.

**Climate Analysis:**

While the public art component will not positively or negatively impact climate and the environment, Armory renovation is taking place through the DES Energy Program and Ameresco. As such, all building improvements for the Armory Creative Campus are approached through an Energy Conservation Lens.

**Equity Analysis:**

Planning for the Daley Arts Center is based on community engagement work done previously through the 2022 Concept Plan with a strong foundation in equity, inclusion and belonging. If funded, planning for the public art will involve the Daley Arts Center Anchor Partners and the Olympia community.

**Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):**

A community arts center has been identified in multiple planning documents as a community priority. The Olympia Armory project has generated strong public interest, with community members actively engaged in shaping its vision as a future arts center. In 2021, the Armory was added to the City's Heritage Register with support from the Eastside Neighborhood Association, reflecting its historical significance and neighborhood support.

**Financial Impact:**

\$40,000 from the Municipal Art Fund, would be used as match for an \$80,000 grant request should the grant be awarded.

**Options:**

1. Move to approve a resolution authorizing submission of an application for an National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) Grants for Arts Projects (GAP) grant for public art at the Daley Arts Center.
2. Do not approve application for an NEA GAP Grant for the Daley Arts Center Public Art Project. If not approved, the next opportunity for funding through the NEA would be February 2027.
3. Take other action.

**Attachments:**

Resolution  
2026 Municipal Art Plan



RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, APPROVING SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION FOR A NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS GRANT FOR THE DALEY ARTS CENTER PUBLIC ART PROJECT**

**WHEREAS**, Grants for Arts Projects (GAP) is a program funded by the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and supports local arts agencies in projects related to public art, such as creation, preservation and installation, among others; and

**WHEREAS**, the Daley Arts Center rehabilitation project is not new construction and therefore City 1% for Art funding does not apply; and

**WHEREAS**, public art for the Daley Arts Center remains part of the Arts Commission work plan, specifically a commission for the west wall of the Drill Hall that also functions as sound abatement; and

**WHEREAS**, because NEA GAP funding is a matching grant program with implications on the City's budget, it is necessary for the City Council to approve submission of the NEA grant application;

**NOW, THEREFORE, THE OLYMPIA CITY COUNCIL DOES HEREBY RESOLVE** as follows:

The Olympia City Council hereby approves submission by the City Manager, or their designee, of an NEA GAP application between the City of Olympia and the NEA for the Daley Arts Center Public Art Project, understanding that the City will be required to provide matching funds of \$40,000 if the City's application is selected and the grant awarded.

**PASSED BY THE OLYMPIA CITY COUNCIL** this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2026.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SENIOR DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY

# A Five-Year Municipal Art Plan for the City of Olympia

## Introduction: Mission and Goals of the Olympia Arts Commission

1. The Municipal Art Plan: What and Why
2. Planning for Public Art
3. Project List for 2025
4. Planning Context
5. Other Activities
6. Summary Spreadsheet



Caption: Students from Thurgood Marshall Middle School Citizen Science Institute (CSI) Program with Teacher Tom Condon, visiting **Recomposing** by Abe Singer at Grass Lake Nature Park. CSI students participated in the development of the public art concept for the park.

## **The Olympia Arts Commission advises City Council on the art experiences of diverse communities of this region, through programs and opportunities that pro-actively foster arts and cultural activity for every segment of the community.**

The Commission's purpose is to promote and encourage public programs that further development, public awareness, and interest in fine, literary and performing arts and cultural heritage, and to advise City Council in connection with these. The Olympia Arts Commission (OAC) was created to provide expertise regarding the visual and performing arts and cultural heritage, and to reach out within and beyond the community to expand artistic and cultural programs and services for the community members of the Olympia area. (Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) 2.100.100, 2.100.110)

Supported by City staff, the OAC pursues this mission through a public art program that includes programming and events, services, outreach, education and networking, and the purchase, placement and maintenance of works of art in the community.

### **1. Municipal Arts Plan (MAP): What and Why**

The MAP is the annual budget and spending plan for the Municipal Arts Fund, and it provides direction and accountability for the use of public resources in support of the arts.

City Ordinance calls for the OAC to "prepare and recommend to the City Council for approval a plan and guidelines to carry out the City's art program," (OMC 2.100.140) and notes that a municipal arts plan should prescribe the projects to be funded from the municipal arts fund. "*Municipal Arts Plan* means a plan outlining the City expenditures of designated funds for public art projects for a one-year period." (OMC 2.100.160)

Olympia's public art programs and purchases are funded through two sources: a \$1 per capita allocation from the City's General Fund that was initiated in 1990, and a 1% for Art set-aside for new City construction projects over \$500,000 in value. Funds from these sources are deposited in a Municipal Arts Fund (MAF). The MAP establishes budgets for public art projects undertaken by the City, whether in conjunction with new capital projects or independent of them. Projects range from small (less than \$15k) to major (over \$50k) installations involving design teams, and may include visual, literary and performing arts.

### **2. Planning for Public Art**

The OAC develops an Annual Work Plan that details program initiatives and activities of the City's art program to promote the work of local artists and the arts within our community, and for the purchase of public art (including paid performances) to enhance and enliven the community. These public art investments are the focus of the MAP.

To develop funding projections for the MAP and budgets for individual projects, City Arts staff work with Parks and Public Works staff to identify projects that trigger the 1% for Art set-aside. These projects and their locations, impacts, and estimated public art budgets are reviewed and considered by the Arts Commission. The Commission generates a complete project list that includes planned capital-funded purchases as well as other projects identified in the Commission's Annual Work Plan.

This project list forms the core of the Municipal Art Plan, which the Commission then recommends to City Council for approval.

In developing plans for public art projects, a number of conditions and values are considered to determine the best use of available resources for the benefit of the arts and the community. As a starting point, capital project-generated funds are considered for art projects at or near the site of the construction to enhance the public improvement, or to mitigate for the impact of the improvements. For large design/build projects, staff has piloted a process where the consultant has been required to bring a public artist into the design team. This approach eliminates redundancies in the process and ensures the participation of a public artist at the ground floor of complex design/build projects. The 1% for Art Funds are maintained and used for public art in those specific design/build projects. The Arts Commission reviews and provides comment on the developing art component as part of the general project community outreach, and City Council approves the art design as a seamless part of the overall construction design. Current design/build projects include West Bay Park, Jolene Unsoeld Community Park, Rebecca Howard Park and Percival Landing.

The funding for art generated by small capital projects is often too small to be very effective. In these cases, funds from multiple projects may be combined, or \$1 per capita funds added when available, to create a viable public art project budget. Balancing opportunities for multiple small projects versus fewer, more significant projects is an important planning consideration. Combining funds can bring a significant installation of public art to a capital improvement project that is too small to generate funds on its own, but which may be desirable because of location or community access. Until complete, priority for smaller projects or transportation related project funds will be directed toward completion of the eight projects that make up the Art Crossings Project. In selecting projects, programs and works of art, the OAC will consider how proposals accomplish the following:

- **Contribute to broad distribution of public art throughout Olympia.**  
Commissioners will consider the relative representation of art among City neighborhoods, and seek to distribute public art broadly throughout the community.
- **Provide for diverse forms of art within the public collection.**  
A wide range of style, media, subjects and viewpoints will offer perspective and interest for everyone.
- **Bring new ideas, innovation, or thinking to the community.** Encourage community conversation with focus on broader art experiences and culture and heritage focus.
- **Achieve a balanced City collection that includes a strong local base but also has regional and national reach.**
- **Ensure artwork is maintainable and safe.**
- **Ensure artwork is well-suited to chosen site or venue.**

### 3. Equity, Inclusion and Belonging

As an organization, the City of Olympia understands the power and influence government has to impact the daily lives of our residents, and the power to shape policies and practices that reduce inequities stemming from institutional and structural racism and oppression. In addition, the Parks, Arts and Recreation Department is committed to deepening engagement with underrepresented community members through creativity, innovation and relationship building to better provide a

parks, arts and recreation system where all Olympians feel they belong. For the public art program, this includes:

- Building jury panels where members bring diverse perspectives and/or life experience.
- Continuing to provide opportunities for any member of the public to help select artwork through community voting on Traffic Box Wraps and through the Percival Plinth Project.
- Pursuing additional outreach to underserved communities in public art planning processes, including most recently, Arts Crossing #3 and the Grass Lake Nature Park Project.
- Providing projects at multiple skill levels, so artists can grow into more complex projects.

#### 4. Project List for 2026

The following slate of projects is diverse in arts disciplines and are located throughout Olympia. These investments in the arts support current and future endeavors, care for the collection we have and offer opportunities for local and regional artists, from youth through professional, to benefit the community and shared built environment. Together, this slate of initiatives will contribute to the creative and cultural arts in Olympia in the following ways:

- Expanding a diversity of the arts deeper into our neighborhoods and beyond the downtown core,
- Investing in the future of the arts and artists in our community, and showcasing their talent,
- Continuing with successful programs that are embraced by the community.

Squaxin Island Tribe Representation - \$36,000 - “Mother of Restoration” Həʔapus̓sqʷəbay” (Ha-push Squay-bay) by Andrea Wilbur Sigo was approved by City Council in 2024, and will be installed in downtown Olympia following site improvements to the location in 2026.

Traffic Box Wraps - \$18,000 - In 2025, 10 new traffic wraps were installed in Olympia, with 10 more planned for 2026.

Music Out Loud - \$3,000 - Funding for 9 street performances during the summer months. These originally were tied to three sidewalk mosaics in downtown Olympia, and have evolved into a partnership with the Olympia Downtown Alliance’s LoveOly event, keeping all three performances in their festival area.

Percival Plinth Project - \$42,000 - This ongoing project hosts loaned sculpture (up to 18) for an exhibition of one year along Percival Landing. During the month of July, the public is invited to vote for the sculpture they wish for the City to purchase. Following the exhibition, that sculpture moves to City Hall for one year and then into a City park or facility.

Olympia Art Crossings - Sited at key “gateway” locations surrounding the downtown, creative works of art that reflect Olympia’s neighborhoods and community, and mark passage between downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. This budget launches project #4 in 2026, which will complete half of the eight total locations in the project. Acceptance of an NEA matching grant applied for in 2025 would allow for Art Crossing #5 to be developed at the same time.

Poet Laureate - \$3,400 - Biennial Poet Laureate program, to promote poetry as an art form, expand access to the literary arts, connect the community to poetry, and promote poetry as a community voice that contributes to a sense of place. Funds cover an annual honoraria and small fund for

insurance, materials and supplies. Increased funds proposed for 2025 provides a small increase for reimbursable expenses of \$250 a year, and a stipend increase of \$400 a year.

Artist-In-Residence Program - \$4,950 - Increased budget covers 3, three month drumming workshops over the course of a year, by three different instructors, to serve residents of Drexel House, Lotus Court and Unity Commons. Program to move forward in partnership with the PARC Foundation.

Murals in Parks Pilot Project - \$10,000 - First pilot projects to take place at Yauger Park and Sunrise Park.

City Hall Exhibitions - \$500 - This line item remains open to respond to costs for community exhibitions that arise. Recent exhibitions include Hummingbird Studios Quilt Exhibition, Welcome Blanket Project and Rebecca Howard portrait and planning documents. Staff have been approached by the Washington State University Extension office about a United Nations International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralists planned in 2026.

Arts Walk Cover Art - \$2000 - Via competitive process, artists are selected each year to create a new artwork for use in marketing materials for spring and summer Arts Walk. The framed artwork becomes part of the City's public art collection. Budget increase would bring compensation for each image to \$1000.

Kaiser Woods - \$30,000 - This park is currently undeveloped but is slated to be Olympia's first park to have dedicated mountain biking trails. Project to engage youth of the Squaxin Island Tribe working under a master carver to create cedar sculptures interspersed throughout the site.

Daley Arts Center - The Armory Building is undergoing renovation for energy efficiency and public safety, 2025-2027. Renovation does not qualify for 1% for Art funding, so staff will apply for grants to develop public art on the site, as available.

#### **4. Planning Context**

Beginning in 2015 the OAC adopted a five-year budget planning horizon to allow a longer look ahead, facilitating planning for prospective capital projects that will be phased over several years, and for ongoing costs associated with others.

Taken together with the efforts described in the 2026 Work Plan, this 2026 budget and MAP reflect a continuing effort to build supportive social and practical infrastructure for the arts and artists in Olympia, supporting the creative energy that the arts bring to our community.

#### **5. Other Activities**

Maintenance and conservation efforts are necessary to preserve the integrity of the City's collection for the benefit of the community. 2025 saw major cleaning and resealing of "Walking on Land by Water" on West Bay Drive. Vehicular accidents caused damage to "Triumph of the Vegetables" and "Crossroads of Connection: Fruits" (Art Crossing #3), and in 2025 insurance and contracting processes began for repair and replacement, which will be completed in 2026. Two contracted foundation/pedestals are planned for 2025. Annual art cleaning/maintenance is completed with assistance of a part-time parks seasonal staff person.

Budget Summary and 5-Year Prospective (for Planning Purposes)

<b>FIVE YEAR MUNICIPAL ART PLAN</b>	<b>2025 Actual</b>	<b>2026 Budget</b>	<b>2027 Budget</b>	<b>2028 Budget</b>	<b>2029 Budget</b>	<b>2030 Budget</b>
Available Fund Balance	352,724	337,738	93,986	91,606	71,226	50,846
<b>Revenue Total</b>	94,443	111,470	57,970	57,970	57,970	57,970
Interest Earnings	11,137					
\$1 per Olympian	56,900	57,970	57,970	57,970	57,970	57,970
LBA Field 2 Renovation (1% for Art)	6,182					
Blvd Road Trail Crossing (1% for Art)	6,179					
Kaiser Woods (1% for Art)	14,045					
Art Crossing #3 (Restitution)		53,500				
Triumph of the Vegetables (Restitution)						
<b>Expense Total</b>	110,553	355,222	60,350	78,350	78,350	60,350
Admin/Maintenance Expenses	6,383	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Project Costs	104,170	351,222	56,350	74,350	74,350	56,350
Squaxin Island Tribe Representation	8,000	36,000				
Murals in Parks		10,000				
Traffic Box Wrap (Fabricator search in 2024, 2027)	15,423	18,000		18,000	18,000	
Music Out Loud	1,100	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Percival Plinth Project	37,209	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000
Olympia Art Crossings		110,000				
City Hall Rotating Exhibition		500	500	500	500	500
Arts Walk Cover Purchase	1,500	1,500	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Poet Laureate	2,750	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400
Artist in Residence	1,088	4,950	4,950	4,950	4,950	4,950
Kaiser Woods Park Improvements		30,000				
Grass Lake Nature Park	22,000					
Contracted Conservation/Construction	13,476	91,372				
Insurance	500	500	500	500	500	500
<b>Revenue - Expense</b>	(14,986)	(243,752)	(2,380)	(20,380)	(20,380)	(2,380)



## City Council

### Approval of an Ordinance Amending Ordinance 7454 (First Quarter Budget Amendment)

**Agenda Date:** 5/19/2026  
**Agenda Item Number:** 4.D  
**File Number:** 26-0347

---

**Type:** ordinance **Version:** 1 **Status:** 1st Reading-Consent

---

**Title**

Approval of an Ordinance Amending Ordinance 7454 (First Quarter Budget Amendment)

**Recommended Action**

**Committee Recommendation:**

Not referred to a committee.

**City Manager Recommendation:**

Move to approve the proposed Ordinance amending Ordinance 7454 (First Quarter Budget Amendment) on first reading and forward to second reading.

**Report**

**Issue:**

Whether to approve the proposed Ordinance amending Ordinance 7454 (First Quarter Budget Amendment) on first reading and forward to second reading.

**Staff Contact:**

Joan Lutz, Budget & Fiscal Manager, Finance Department, 360.753.8760

**Presenter(s):**

None - Consent Calendar Item.

**Background and Analysis:**

The City Council may revise the City's Budget by approving an ordinance. Generally, budget amendments are presented quarterly to the City Council for review and approval, however, they may be made at any time during the year. The amended ordinances appropriate funds and provide authorization to expend the funds.

The ordinance includes recommended amendments to the 2026 Operating Funds, Special Funds and Capital Funds for:

1. Department requested carry-forward appropriations include requests representing 2025 obligations for purchase orders and contracts not completed in 2025 as well as capital project related appropriations. The carry-forward appropriation requests total \$62,287,555.

2. Department requests for budget amendments for the 1st quarter of 2026 represent new budget adjustments and associated transfers requested by departments. The appropriation requests total \$15,101,764.

Department requests for budget amendments for the first quarter of 2026 are specified in Exhibit B of the attached Ordinance.

**Climate Analysis:**

The Climate Analysis framework will be completed by staff, if applicable, for the individual work items funded by Council.

**Equity Analysis:**

The Equity Analysis framework will be completed, if applicable, for the individual work items funded by Council.

**Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):**

Members of the community may have an interest in this agenda item as it deals with City finances and fiscal governance.

**Financial Impact:**

Total increase in appropriations of \$77,389,319. Funding sources are noted in Exhibit B of the attached Ordinance.

**Options:**

1. Move to approve the proposed Ordinance amending Ordinance 7454 (First Quarter Budget Amendment) on first reading and forward to second reading.
2. Approve the proposed ordinance with amendments based on City Council feedback.
3. Do not approve the proposed ordinance amending Ordinance 7454. Staff will not have authorization to expend the funds.

**Attachments:**

Ordinance

Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, APPROVING THE CONSOLIDATING BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS MADE BETWEEN JANUARY 1, 2026, AND MARCH 31, 2026, REFLECTING A TOTAL BUDGET INCREASE ADJUSTMENT OF \$77,389,319 AND AMENDING ORDINANCE 7454**

**WHEREAS**, the Olympia City Council adopted the 2026 Operating, Special Funds and Capital Budgets and 2026-2031 Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) by passing Ordinance No. 7454 on December 21, 2025; and

**WHEREAS**, throughout the year, budget updates are required to recognize changes relating to adopted budget expense authority; and

**WHEREAS**, the CFP meets the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act, including RCW 36.70A.070(3); and

**WHEREAS**, the following changes need to be made to Ordinance No. 7454;

**NOW, THEREFORE, THE OLYMPIA CITY COUNCIL ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:**

**Section 1.** The 2026 annual budget is amended to include necessary budget adjustments for the first quarter of 2026 from January 1 to March 31, as summarized and set forth in Exhibit “A” and Exhibit “B” which is attached and incorporated into this ordinance. Except as amended by this ordinance, all terms and provisions of the 2026 annual budget Ordinance No. 7454 shall remain unchanged.

**Section 2.** The 2026 FTE is amended to include necessary FTE increases for the first quarter of 2026 from January 1 to March 31, as summarized and set forth in Exhibit “C” which is attached and incorporated into this Ordinance.

**Section 3.** It is anticipated that the funding source and the construction schedule for projects identified in the CFP may be changed over the next year. Such changes shall not constitute an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for purposes of RCW 36.70A.130.

**Section 4.** The Director of Finance is hereby authorized to bring forward into fiscal year 2026 all appropriations and allocations not otherwise closed, completed, or deleted from prior fiscal years’ capital budgets.

**Section 5. Severability.** The provisions of this Ordinance are declared separate and severable. If any provision of this Ordinance or its application to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of this Ordinance or application of the provision to other persons or circumstances shall be unaffected.

**Section 6. Ratification.** Any act consistent with the authority and prior to the effective date of this Ordinance is hereby ratified and affirmed.

**Section 7. Effective Date.** This Ordinance shall take effect five (5) days after passage and publication, as provided by law.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

Mark Barber  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY ATTORNEY

**PASSED:**

**APPROVED:**

**PUBLISHED:**

**EXHIBIT A**  
**City of Olympia, WA**  
**First Quarter Expenditure Budget Adjustment Ordinance**  
**January 1, 2026, through March 31, 2026**

<b>Fund</b>	<b>Adopted Budget</b>	<b>Carryover</b>	<b>1st Q BA</b>	<b>Amended Budget</b>
FND_001 GENERAL FUND	121,777,100	690,419	2,493,151	124,960,670
FND_003 SPECIAL ACCT CONTROL FUND	3,248,893	3,653,634	2,610,998	9,513,525
FND_006 DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE	9,220,030	13,065	-	9,233,095
FND_007 PARKING FUND	2,085,959	121,959	-	2,207,918
FND_026 MUNICIPAL ARTS FUND	261,950	-	93,272	355,222
FND_132 LODGING TAX FUND	1,913,779	47,540	14,625	1,975,944
FND_135 PARKING BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AREA	22,805	-	21,275	44,080
FND_137 HANDS ON CHILDRENS MUSEUM	563,689	1,342,411	1,069,267	2,975,367
FND_138 TRANSPORTATION BENEFIT DISTRICT	1,680,196	3,051,208	-	4,731,404
FND_140 REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX	4,352,700	4,989,129	250,000	9,591,829
FND_142 HOME FUND	5,150,673	2,159	-	5,152,832
FND_143 CULTURAL ACCESS PROGRAM	3,798,170	1,376,218	-	5,174,388
FND_148 TBD Sales Tax	4,449,000	1,787,109	-	6,236,109
FND_220 NON-VOTED GO DEBT FUND	4,493,493	-	2,343,943	6,837,436
FND_317 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND	0	186,341	290,000	476,341
FND_318 HOME FUND CAPITAL	2,202,871	-	350,000	2,552,871
FND_320 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND	10,738,333	27,916,850	250,000	38,905,183
FND_335 GENERAL FACILITIES CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND	4,744,675	5,002,449	160,000	9,907,124
FND_340 PARKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND	46,872,500	1,204,334	270,000	48,346,834
FND_401 DRINKING WATER UTILITY OPERATING	17,947,364	125,877	-	18,073,241
FND_402 WASTEWATER UTILITY OPERATING	28,073,173	92,720	60,000	28,225,893
FND_404 STORMWATER AND SURFACE WATER OPERATING	9,244,782	187,750	143,750	9,576,282
FND_461 DRINKING WATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT	5,822,666	466,384	2,974,940	9,263,990
FND_462 WASTEWATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT	9,396,117	2,545,146	-	11,941,263
FND_464 STORMWATER AND SURFACE WATER CAPITAL IMPRO	1,995,463	1,541,736	-	3,537,199
FND_501 EQUIPMENT RENTAL	3,969,630	11,248	-	3,980,878
FND_502 EQUIPMENT RESERVE	6,625,000	-	657,325	7,282,325
FND_505 WORKERS COMPENSATION	2,553,956	-	44,542	2,598,498
FND_506 FACILITIES	6,000,177	247,774	-	6,247,951
FND_750 Parks Sidewalk Utility Tax	5,505,763	-	554,676	6,060,439
FND_751 Transportation Sidewalk Utility Tax	900,000	4,989,531	-	5,889,531
<b>Total</b>		<b>62,287,555</b>	<b>15,101,764</b>	

**EXHIBIT B**  
**City of Olympia, WA**  
**First Quarter Expenditure Budget Adjustment Ordinance**  
**January 1, 2026, through March 31, 2026**

FND 001 General Fund:

Carryover Requests

- Purchase orders in progress \$ 515,419
- Artesian Commons Project \$ 75,000
- Leland Consulting Downtown Vacancy Project \$ 40,000
  - Funding from Economic Development Reserve in Fund 003
- Multifamily EV Charging Installations \$ 60,000

Carryover Requests total: \$ 690,419

Amendment Requests

Additional appropriation for:

- Arts Walks Lodging Tax Advisory Committee (LTAC) Award \$ 14,625
  - Funding from LTAC Fund
- Increase of project funded CARES Program Specialist 0.5 FTE to 1.0 FTE \$ 50,650
  - Funding from amendment to Tumwater CARES ILA
- Continued funding for Climate Resilience Coordinator position \$ 146,878
  - Funding from Thurston Climate Mitigation Collaborative Partners
- Climate Planning Grant Code Updates \$ 150,000
  - Funded by Department of Commerce Grant
- Appropriation for Municipal Court employee separation agreements \$ 980,998
  - Funding from the 900 Plum sale proceeds in Fund 003
- Appropriation for Thurston County Court ILA one-time improvements \$ 1,000,000
  - Funding from the 900 Plum sale proceeds in Fund 003
- Additional tree maintenance funding for Parks Urban Forestry \$ 50,000
  - Use of fund balance
- Annual Leasing for 6 Police Vehicles \$ 100,000
  - Funding from Equipment Reserve transfer

Amendment Requests total: \$ 2,493,151

FND 003 Special Acct Control Fund:

Carryover Requests

- Purchase orders in progress \$ 53,596
- Transfer of 900 Plum Proceeds for Facility Capital Improvement Projects \$ 3,560,038
- Transfer of Economic Development reserve for Downtown Vacancy Study \$ 40,000

Carryover Requests total: \$ 3,653,634

Amendment Requests	
Additional appropriation for:	
• Transfer of 900 Plum Proceeds for Municipal Court employee separation agreements and Thurston County Court one-time improvements	\$ 1,980,998
• Transfer of 900 Plum Proceeds for Plum St Village move	\$ 350,000
• Transfer of 2026-2027 Climate Planning Grant funds for work performed	\$ 150,000
• Transfer of Economic Development reserves for Westside Landfill clean up	\$ 130,000
Amendment Requests total:	\$ 2,610,998
<u>FND 006 Development Revenue Fund:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Purchase orders in progress	\$ 13,065
<u>FND 007 Parking Fund:</u>	
Carryover Request	
• ADA Assessment Plan Work	\$ 121,959
○ Funded by a transfer from the Capital Improvement Fund	
<u>FND 026 Municipal Arts Fund:</u>	
Amendment Request	
Additional appropriation for:	
• Increase budget to the full Municipal Art Plan budget (\$355,222)	\$ 93,272
<u>FND 132 Lodging Tax Fund:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Purchase orders in progress	\$ 47,540
Amendment Request	
• Art Walk Support LTAC Award	\$ 14,625
<u>FND 135 Parking Business Improvement Area:</u>	
Amendment Request	
• Appropriation to write off uncollected assessments as a bad debt expense	\$ 21,275
<u>FND 137 Hands On Children’s Museum Fund:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Transfers for Forma and Parametrix contract work on HOCM Expansion	\$ 1,342,411

Amendment Request	
Additional appropriation for:	
• Transfer to the Non-Voted GO Debt Fund for interest on 2025B HOCM bond	\$ 1,069,267
 <u>FND 138 Transportation Benefit District:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Transfer funding for Transportation Capital Improvement carryover projects	\$ 3,051,208
 <u>FND 140 Real Estate Excise Tax:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Transfer funding for Transportation Capital Improvement carryover projects	\$ 4,989,129
Amendment Request	
Additional appropriation for:	
• Transfer funding for 4 <sup>th</sup> Ave ADA Improvements Transportation project	\$ 250,000
 <u>FND 142 Home Fund Operating:</u>	
Carryover Request	
• Purchase order in progress	\$ 2,159
 <u>FND 143 Cultural Access Program:</u>	
Carryover Request	
• Purchase orders in progress	\$ 1,376,218
 <u>FND 148 Transportation Benefit District Sales Tax:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Transfer funding for Transportation Capital Improvement carryover projects	\$ 1,787,109
 <u>FND 220 Non-Voted GO Debt Fund:</u>	
Amendment Requests	
Additional appropriation for:	
• Interest on Debt Service for 2025A Parks Bond	\$ 1,274,676
○ Funding from Parks Capital, OMPD, and Sidewalk Utility Tax Funds	
• Interest on Debt Service for 2025B HOCM Bond	\$ 1,069,267
○ Funding from Hands On Children’s Museum Fund	
Amendment Requests total:	\$ 2,343,943

FND 317 Capital Improvement Fund:

Carryover Requests

- Transfer funding for Parking ADA Assessment Plan \$ 121,959
- Westside Landfill HWA Geosciences Clean Up Project budget \$ 64,382

Carryover Requests total: \$ 186,341

Amendment Requests

Additional appropriation for:

- Council Chambers Technology Upgrades \$ 160,000
  - Funding from Facilities Capital Improvement Fund
- Additional appropriation for Westside Landfill Clean Up \$ 130,000
  - Funding from Economic Development Reserves

Amendment Requests total: \$ 290,000

FND 318 Home Fund Capital:

Amendment Requests

Additional appropriation for:

- Plum St Tiny Home Village Move \$ 350,000
  - Funding from the 900 Plum Sale Proceeds

FND 320 Transportation Capital Improvement Fund:

Carryover Requests

- Ongoing Transportation Capital Improvements (28 Projects) \$ 27,916,850
  - Funding from special revenue funds, grants, and fund balance

Amendment Requests

Additional appropriation for:

- 4<sup>th</sup> Ave ADA Improvements Project \$ 250,000
  - Funding from Real Estate Excise Tax Fund

FND 335 General Facilities Capital Improvements Fund:

Carryover Requests

- Transfer to Facilities Operating Fund for non-capital ADA projects \$ 100,000
- City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Renovation, Parking Lot Improvements, and Police Evidence Storage project budgets \$ 3,560,038
  - Funding from 900 Plum Sale Proceeds
- Hands On Children's Museum New Building project design budget \$ 1,342,411
  - Funding from Hands On Children's Museum Fund

Carryover Requests total: \$ 5,002,449

Amendment Requests		
Additional appropriation for:		
• Transfer to Capital Improvement Fund for Council Chambers Technology		\$ 160,000
 <u>FND 340 Parks Capital Improvement Fund:</u>		
Carryover Requests		
• Ongoing Parks Capital Improvements (6 Projects)		\$ 1,204,334
○ Funding from OMPD, State Grant, and Fund Balance		
Amendment Request		
Additional appropriation for:		
• Transfer to Debt Fund for interest payment on 2025A Parks Bond		\$ 270,000
 <u>FND 401 Drinking Water Operating Fund:</u>		
Carryover Requests		
• Purchase orders in progress		\$ 125,877
 <u>FND 402 Wastewater Operating:</u>		
Carryover Requests		
• Purchase orders in progress		\$ 92,720
Amendment Request		
Additional appropriation for:		
• Repair and maintenance for STEP Pump		\$ 60,000
○ Funding from Sewer Capital Improvement Fund		
 <u>FND 404 Stormwater and Surface Water Operating:</u>		
Carryover Requests		
• Purchase orders in progress		\$ 187,750
Amendment Request		
Additional appropriation for:		
• Downtown Flood Mitigation and Olympia Sea Level Rise Collaborative		\$ 143,750
○ Funded in part by partner contributions of \$68,750		
 <u>FND 461 Drinking Water Capital Improvement Fund:</u>		
Carryover Request		
• Ongoing Drinking Water Capital Improvements (7 Projects)		\$ 466,384
Amendment Request		
Additional appropriation for:		
• Transmission Main Seismic Valve Installation		\$ 2,974,940

- Funding from approved FEMA grant

FND 462 Wastewater Capital Fund:

Carryover Request

- Ongoing Wastewater Capital Improvements (6 Projects) \$ 2,545,146

FND 464 Storm and Surface Water Capital Fund:

Carryover Request

- Ongoing Storm and Surface Water Capital Improvements (17 Projects) \$ 1,541,736

FND 501 Equipment Rental:

Carryover Request

- Purchase order in progress \$ 11,248

FND 502 Equipment Reserve Fund:

Amendment Requests

Additional appropriation for:

- Sidewalk Maintenance Team Mini Excavator and Trailer \$ 174,549
  - Funding from General Fund transfer
- Transfer funding to General Fund for Police vehicle leasing \$ 100,000
- Transfer excess Police vehicle replacement savings to the General Fund \$ 382,776

Amendment Requests total: \$ 657,325

FND 505 Workers Compensation Fund:

Amendment Request

Additional appropriation for:

- Ready Rebound Annual Contract \$ 44,542
  - Funding from General Fund transfer

FND 506 Facilities Operating Fund:

Carryover Requests

- Purchase orders in progress \$ 147,774
- ADA Facilities Upgrade that don't qualify as capital projects \$ 100,000

Carryover Requests total: \$ 247,774

FND 750 Parks Sidewalk Utility Tax:

Amendment Request

Additional appropriation for:

- Transfer to Debt Fund for interest payment on 2025A Parks Bond \$ 554,676

FND 751 Transportation Sidewalk Utility Tax:

Carryover Request

- Transfer funding for Transportation Capital Improvement carryover projects \$ 4,989,531

**EXHIBIT C**  
**City of Olympia, WA**  
**First Quarter Expenditure Budget Adjustment Ordinance**  
**January 1, 2026, through March 31, 2026**

No permanent FTE changes requested in the first quarter budget adjustment ordinance.



## City Council

### Civilian Police Auditor 2025 Annual Report

**Agenda Date:** 5/19/2026  
**Agenda Item Number:** 6.A  
**File Number:**26-0360

---

**Type:** report **Version:** 1 **Status:** Other Business

---

**Title**

Civilian Police Auditor 2025 Annual Report

**Recommended Action**

**Committee Recommendation:**

Not referred to a committee

**City Manager Recommendation:**

Receive a briefing on the Police Auditor's 2025 Annual Report.

**Report**

**Issue:**

Whether to receive a briefing on the Police Auditor's 2025 Annual Report.

**Staff Contact:**

Margo Morales, Community Engagement Program Specialist, City Manager's Office, 360.753.8150

**Presenter(s):**

Margo Morales, Community Engagement Program Specialist , City Manager's Office  
Chief Shelby Parker, Olympia Police Department  
Stephen Connolly, Police Auditor, OIR Group  
Michael Gennaco, Police Auditor, OIR Group

**Background and Analysis:**

In July 2024, the City Council accepted recommendations from the Social Justice and Equity Commission (SJEC) on Community Oversight of Law Enforcement. The recommendations included enhancements to the role of Civilian Police Auditor (Auditor).

On December 10, 2024, the City Council approved an ordinance repealing Olympia Municipal 2.38, Police Auditor, and replacing the chapter with the City Council approved recommendations from the Commission for the role of Auditor.

The central role of the Police Auditor is to review certain types of investigations completed internally by the Olympia Police Department and provide regular reports to the City Council. This includes recommendations to improve police department operations, policy, and training based on their

findings. The newly added responsibilities include development of an annual work plan, and community engagement.

As has been the case since 2003, the Auditor is independent from the Olympia Police Department (OPD) and reports directly to the City Council. The Chair of the Community Livability and Public Safety Committee (CLPS) serves as the City Council Liaison to the Auditor.

After a robust selection process, the OIR Group was hired by the City Council in May of 2025 to fill the newly expanded role of Civilian Police Auditor. On April 28, 2026, the City Council approved a resolution to extend the OIR Group's contract for Civilian Police Auditor services for an additional year.

Included in the scope of work for the Police Auditor is to meet quarterly with the Community Policing Board (Board) to share their draft reports and recommendations so board members can learn, ask questions, share concerns, and provide the community's perspective regarding recommendations.

On March 12, 2026, the OIR Group presented their draft 2025 Annual Report to the Board. This is OIR Group's first report as police auditor for the City of Olympia and includes an audit of 50 use of force incidents and one misconduct investigation. Their report includes statistical information on subject demographics as well as a description of the circumstances. It also includes 22 recommendations in two basic categories: procedural and substantive.

The March 12 briefing to the Board also included an update from Police Chief Shelby Parker, who shared data from the past year and answered questions from the Board related to department policy and procedures. A letter summarizing the Board's questions and comments for the OIR Group and Chief Parker is attached.

The purpose of this agenda item is for Chief Parker to share a department update, followed by a briefing by the OIR Group on their 2025 Annual Report and recommendations. Chief Parker will also share the police department's plans for implementing the auditor's recommendations.

**Climate Analysis:**

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

**Equity Analysis:**

Community groups, especially those most impacted by policing, and underrepresented community groups have requested community involvement and oversight in law enforcement. The Civilian Police Auditor's expanded scope included in the the Social Justice and Equity Commission's recommendation is responsive to that request and advances social justice and equity in Olympia.

**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.

**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. On April 28, 2026, the City Council approved a one-year extension to OIR Group's contract and approved an additional \$105,000 for the second year. The total value of the two-year contract is \$210,000.

**Options:**

1. Receive a briefing on the Police Auditor's 2025 Annual Report.
2. Do not receive the briefing on the Police Auditor's 2025 Annual Report.
3. Receive the briefing at a future date.

**Attachments:**

OMC 2.38.010 - Civilian Police Auditor  
2026 Police Auditor Work Plan  
2025 Annual Report Comment Letter  
Civilian Police Auditor Annual Report  
2025 Use of Force Cases Index



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

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

**CPA 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 CPA 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. Auditor will select a random sampling of incidents involving integrated response and work with OPD to obtain reports and recordings. These materials, as well as discussions with knowledgeable agency personnel, will form the basis for an evaluation of protocols, policies, and "in-field" dynamics. Auditor findings and recommendations about the program will be included as part of a public reporting cycle.

## 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)



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:

- Addressed the use of acronyms and asked for clarification (IPA – Independent Police Auditor vs CPA – Civilian Police Auditor vs OIR Group – name of company). Acronyms are a barrier to accessibility and recommend avoiding using them or explaining them.
- Discussed what constitutes a “use of force.” OPD Policy 300 defines what is considered a use of force.
- Asked for clarification on how and when it is determined if there were injuries sustained by the subject against whom force was used. Discussed how injury is reported, response to subject complaints of injury, and who determines if there was an injury (Olympia Fire Department assessment, further medical assessment and treatment at hospital)
- Discussed major vs minor injury. Substantial bodily harm and great bodily harm, and how this is defined. This is defined in State law at RCW 9a.04.110
- Discussed the use of the “wrap” device. That this device is not considered a use of force, similarly to the use of handcuffs. Chief discussed the support for officers articulating the basis for the use of the wrap device. The board supports the auditor's recommendations around terminology used in the field about this device.
- Identified that some recommendations address training and attitude for supervisors. Board members asked about how that training will be facilitated, if it will be in house by members of the Olympia Police Department or external trainers. Chief Parker asked for the opportunity to do internal improvement first.
- Discussed recommendation number 12 and retraining officers on incorrect use of the term “excited delirium.” Chief Parker discussed the ongoing training around correcting the misuse of that antiquated terminology. Board members followed up with questions on the reasons for the change in terminology, and clarification that hyperactive delirium is a medical condition. Chief offered the board an opportunity for future training around hyperactive delirium and further understanding of how it is addressed in the field.

- Board discussed the report’s recommendations about profanity and asked for clarification around policy changes and future expectations. Board members shared their agreement with the Auditor’s recommendation. Chief acknowledged the challenges with culture change and commitment to it.
- Board expressed support for OIR’s first recommendation around supervisor interviews of subjects on whom force was used. Board encouraged the being trauma informed in the conducting of interviews. Chief Parker discussed the use of a script for addressing consistent expectations with subject interviews.
- Board expressed concern and curiosity on recommendation #22 regarding the differentiation between self-reported demographics information vs “what is observed in the field” and further discussed with the Auditor and Police Chief the reasons for asking individuals how they identify as opposed to officer observations.
- The board addressed the need for this work to go forward with an emphasis on keeping the community aware of and involved in this work. The board invites and would like to explore further mechanisms for community participation and involvement in the work.

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

Best Regards,



Sarah Nagy  
Chair, Community Policing Board

sn:mm

City of Olympia

# Civilian Police Auditor Annual Report

May 2026

Civilian Police Auditor Team  
Michael Gennaco  
Stephen Connolly  
Sam Pailca



# OIR

---

## GROUP

6510 Spring Street #613  
Long Beach, CA 90815  
[OIRGroup.com](http://OIRGroup.com)

# Introduction

This is the first report prepared by OIR Group<sup>1</sup> in its capacity as the new independent Civilian 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 follows<sup>3</sup>:

- 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.<sup>4</sup>

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

---

<sup>3</sup> One of the incidents involved a force deployment with two different subjects.

<sup>4</sup> 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 follows<sup>5</sup>:

- 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 subject<sup>6</sup>
- 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.

---

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

<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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

---

<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>

**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.

---

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup>

**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.

---

<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.*

---

<sup>11</sup> 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 seemingly light disciplinary consequence provided to the officer for his use of excessive force.

With regard to the impact of the above-noted prior performance issues, OPD apparently takes the view that "progressive" discipline<sup>12</sup> is only relevant if the infraction is of the same nature as the previously identified issues. However, whether as part of a progressive history analysis or not, a more serious consequence should have been considered in light of the seriousness of the conduct at issue.

## 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 and quickly escalated to two

---

<sup>12</sup> In the administrative discipline context, this term of art refers to a consequence that is of increased severity in order to further convey the seriousness of the lapse and the need for correction.

carjackings. 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, the CPA 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 Delerium”

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.<sup>13</sup>

**RECOMMENDATION TWELVE:** OPD should continue to advise its officers that the term “excited delirium” has run into disfavor as a useful term and should therefore be avoided in police reports.

## 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

---

<sup>13</sup> We have been advised that, to its credit, OPD has conducted in-service training on “hyperactive delirium” (which *is* a recognized state) and how best to address individuals who present with such symptoms.

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 the 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.<sup>14</sup> 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.

---

<sup>14</sup> 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.

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.

**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.<sup>15</sup> Certainly, in the appropriate circumstance, the use of the WRAP restraint can be used to more safely transport

---

<sup>15</sup> To be clear, the use of the WRAP, much like unresistive handcuffing, is not considered a “use of force” by both OPD policy and industry standards.

arrestees who have demonstrated or expressed an intent to resist detention by kicking out. The WRAP has reduced injuries to subjects, officers, and damage to patrol cars when used appropriately.

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.<sup>16</sup>

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.

---

<sup>16</sup> We have been advised that OPD’s defensive tactics training cadre routinely reviews uses of force. It may be provident that the group be asked to focus during that review on whether the takedown is being used by OPD members as the best force option as opposed to other alternative ways to bring individuals into custody.

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.

## Appendix A: Chart of 2025 Olympia PD Use of Force Cases Reviewed by Civilian Police Auditor

CPA 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	Subject # 1: Pacific Islander Male (48)	Minor injuries to Subject # 2 from probes.	Subject # 1 was released at scene by other	OPA found force within policy, but referred extensive

		down one subject and then tased a second who approached aggressively.	Subject # 2: Pacific Islander Male (23) Alcohol involved.		agency. Subject # 2 interviewed at the jail.	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/endorsement. 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-	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	OPD found force in policy. IPA concurred.

			reported) and Unhoused		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.	
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 wheelchair prior to transport to jail from hospital (where she had assaulted staff).	White Female (19) Signs of extreme alcohol intoxication and possible mental instability	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 monitoring the subject at the hospital.
18	25-2946	Response to call; minor resistance by subject;	Male (30s)	Minor scrapes.	Supervisor called Spanish-speaking officer	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred. See

		minimal force used in takedown.	Note: Subject had surname indicating Hispanic ethnicity and only spoke Spanish but was marked as "White" on report.		to scene assist with interview.	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 officer recognized and sought to detain for violation of a "stay away" order.	Black Male (36)	No injury.	Interview outside of Miranda, and straightforward. Cuffs adjusted at subject's request.	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred.
21	25-3309	Officers took down a resistant subject as they tried to detain him for his	White Male (45)	Abrasion on cheek from	Supervisor interview under Miranda; subject	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred. Man was placed in WRAP;

		role in a bar fight that prompted a call for service.	High level of alcohol intoxication.	contact with ground.	was largely uncooperative.	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 effectuate arrest. Subject also restrained via "WRAP."	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 – appeared fully restrained and subdued.  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.
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 cut subject off when he responded that he did comply and that the officers gave inconsistent demands.  When subject complained of injury, the supervisor said, “The	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.

					officers didn't cause that."	
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 someone who also had a warrant. Resisted detention led to takedown.	White Male (41)  Subject very talkative and agitated, possibly under the influence.	Subject claimed injury, but would not elaborate. Minor abrasions noticed.	Subject answered some questions but ultimately refused to cooperate with interview.	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred.  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	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

					before seeking to interview; did not delineate that he was investigating force used, not the underlying incident. Subject did not respond.	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 up and officer tackled him to ground.	White Male (26)	Laceration to eye that were either caused by initial fall or officer take down.	Sergeant who used force had BWC in sleep mode so force incident not captured. Apartment surveillance showed incident w/o audio. Sergeant's force evaluated by a peer Sergeant.	OPD found force within policy. IPA concurred. When subject inquired of his watch's whereabouts, "If you didn't fight and run from 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	White Male (55)	No injury	Verbally uncooperative subsequent to arrest.	OPA found force within policy. IPA concurred.

		officers made legal entry pursuant to warrant; he was grabbed, taken to the ground, and handcuffed.				
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 subject's statement that he was cooperative and didn't need to be tackled.	OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred.
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	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.

		takedown to bring him into custody.				
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 pinning head to ground. WRAP restraint applied.	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 restrained "George Floyd style."	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 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.	White Female (44)	Abrasion to right knee	Threats to deploy dog, 40 mm instead of de-escalation. Witness sergeant conducted interview of woman.	OPD found use of force in policy. IPA concurred.

		Woman was taken down and handcuffed.			Did not ask about the propriety of use of force.	
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 detain him in handcuffs, and a struggle ensued that led to a takedown.	Black Male (31)	No injury.	Interview occurred at the jail under Miranda; subject asserted he had been "tackled" and "slammed to the ground."	OPA found use of force in policy. IPA occurred.
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

						<p>because subject wouldn't put legs inside patrol car.</p> <p>Subject was involuntarily committed.</p> <p>No record of consideration or attempt to call out CRU.</p>
49	25-6607	<p>Officer responded to report of retail theft; subject had warrant and was tagged in database as "threat to law enforcement." Prolonged struggle as subject attempted to flee; multiple takedown attempts with final effort involving pulling subject down by hair.</p>	<p>Black Male (18)</p>	<p>Subject and officer both had minor injuries attended at scene.</p>	<p>Thorough supervisory investigation.</p>	<p>OPA found force within policy; IPA concurred.</p> <p>Officer used de-escalation tactics and exhibited laudable efforts to stay calm in tense and dangerous situation.</p>
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>	<p>None reported.</p>	<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>





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

## City Council

### Executive Session Pursuant to RCW 42.30.110 (1)(i); Litigation and Potential Litigation

**Agenda Date:** 5/19/2026  
**Agenda Item Number:** 10.A  
**File Number:**26-0376

---

**Type:** executive session   **Version:** 1   **Status:** Executive Session

---

**Title**

Executive Session Pursuant to RCW 42.30.110(1)(i); Litigation and Potential Litigation



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:

- Addressed the use of acronyms and asked for clarification (IPA – Independent Police Auditor vs CPA – Civilian Police Auditor vs OIR Group – name of company). Acronyms are a barrier to accessibility and recommend avoiding using them or explaining them.
- Discussed what constitutes a “use of force.” OPD Policy 300 defines what is considered a use of force.
- Asked for clarification on how and when it is determined if there were injuries sustained by the subject against whom force was used. Discussed how injury is reported, response to subject complaints of injury, and who determines if there was an injury (Olympia Fire Department assessment, further medical assessment and treatment at hospital)
- Discussed major vs minor injury. Substantial bodily harm and great bodily harm, and how this is defined. This is defined in State law at RCW 9a.04.110
- Discussed the use of the “wrap” device. That this device is not considered a use of force, similarly to the use of handcuffs. Chief discussed the support for officers articulating the basis for the use of the wrap device. The board supports the auditor's recommendations around terminology used in the field about this device.
- Identified that some recommendations address training and attitude for supervisors. Board members asked about how that training will be facilitated, if it will be in house by members of the Olympia Police Department or external trainers. Chief Parker asked for the opportunity to do internal improvement first.
- Discussed recommendation number 12 and retraining officers on incorrect use of the term “excited delirium.” Chief Parker discussed the ongoing training around correcting the misuse of that antiquated terminology. Board members followed up with questions on the reasons for the change in terminology, and clarification that hyperactive delirium is a medical condition. Chief offered the board an opportunity for future training around hyperactive delirium and further understanding of how it is addressed in the field.

- Board discussed the report’s recommendations about profanity and asked for clarification around policy changes and future expectations. Board members shared their agreement with the Auditor’s recommendation. Chief acknowledged the challenges with culture change and commitment to it.
- Board expressed support for OIR’s first recommendation around supervisor interviews of subjects on whom force was used. Board encouraged the being trauma informed in the conducting of interviews. Chief Parker discussed the use of a script for addressing consistent expectations with subject interviews.
- Board expressed concern and curiosity on recommendation #22 regarding the differentiation between self-reported demographics information vs “what is observed in the field” and further discussed with the Auditor and Police Chief the reasons for asking individuals how they identify as opposed to officer observations.
- The board addressed the need for this work to go forward with an emphasis on keeping the community aware of and involved in this work. The board invites and would like to explore further mechanisms for community participation and involvement in the work.

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

Best Regards,



Sarah Nagy  
Chair, Community Policing Board

sn:mm

Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, APPROVING THE CONSOLIDATING BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS MADE BETWEEN JANUARY 1, 2026, AND MARCH 31, 2026, REFLECTING A TOTAL BUDGET INCREASE ADJUSTMENT OF \$77,389,319 AND AMENDING ORDINANCE 7454**

**WHEREAS**, the Olympia City Council adopted the 2026 Operating, Special Funds and Capital Budgets and 2026-2031 Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) by passing Ordinance No. 7454 on December 21, 2025; and

**WHEREAS**, throughout the year, budget updates are required to recognize changes relating to adopted budget expense authority; and

**WHEREAS**, the CFP meets the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act, including RCW 36.70A.070(3); and

**WHEREAS**, the following changes need to be made to Ordinance No. 7454;

**NOW, THEREFORE, THE OLYMPIA CITY COUNCIL ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:**

**Section 1.** The 2026 annual budget is amended to include necessary budget adjustments for the first quarter of 2026 from January 1 to March 31, as summarized and set forth in Exhibit “A” and Exhibit “B” which is attached and incorporated into this ordinance. Except as amended by this ordinance, all terms and provisions of the 2026 annual budget Ordinance No. 7454 shall remain unchanged.

**Section 2.** The 2026 FTE is amended to include necessary FTE increases for the first quarter of 2026 from January 1 to March 31, as summarized and set forth in Exhibit “C” which is attached and incorporated into this Ordinance.

**Section 3.** It is anticipated that the funding source and the construction schedule for projects identified in the CFP may be changed over the next year. Such changes shall not constitute an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for purposes of RCW 36.70A.130.

**Section 4.** The Director of Finance is hereby authorized to bring forward into fiscal year 2026 all appropriations and allocations not otherwise closed, completed, or deleted from prior fiscal years’ capital budgets.

**Section 5. Severability.** The provisions of this Ordinance are declared separate and severable. If any provision of this Ordinance or its application to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of this Ordinance or application of the provision to other persons or circumstances shall be unaffected.

**Section 6. Ratification.** Any act consistent with the authority and prior to the effective date of this Ordinance is hereby ratified and affirmed.

**Section 7. Effective Date.** This Ordinance shall take effect five (5) days after passage and publication, as provided by law.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

Mark Barber  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY ATTORNEY

**PASSED:**

**APPROVED:**

**PUBLISHED:**

**EXHIBIT A**  
**City of Olympia, WA**  
**First Quarter Expenditure Budget Adjustment Ordinance**  
**January 1, 2026, through March 31, 2026**

<b>Fund</b>	<b>Adopted Budget</b>	<b>Carryover</b>	<b>1st Q BA</b>	<b>Amended Budget</b>
FND_001 GENERAL FUND	121,777,100	690,419	2,493,151	124,960,670
FND_003 SPECIAL ACCT CONTROL FUND	3,248,893	3,653,634	2,610,998	9,513,525
FND_006 DEVELOPMENT FEE REVENUE	9,220,030	13,065	-	9,233,095
FND_007 PARKING FUND	2,085,959	121,959	-	2,207,918
FND_026 MUNICIPAL ARTS FUND	261,950	-	93,272	355,222
FND_132 LODGING TAX FUND	1,913,779	47,540	14,625	1,975,944
FND_135 PARKING BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AREA	22,805	-	21,275	44,080
FND_137 HANDS ON CHILDRENS MUSEUM	563,689	1,342,411	1,069,267	2,975,367
FND_138 TRANSPORTATION BENEFIT DISTRICT	1,680,196	3,051,208	-	4,731,404
FND_140 REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX	4,352,700	4,989,129	250,000	9,591,829
FND_142 HOME FUND	5,150,673	2,159	-	5,152,832
FND_143 CULTURAL ACCESS PROGRAM	3,798,170	1,376,218	-	5,174,388
FND_148 TBD Sales Tax	4,449,000	1,787,109	-	6,236,109
FND_220 NON-VOTED GO DEBT FUND	4,493,493	-	2,343,943	6,837,436
FND_317 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND	0	186,341	290,000	476,341
FND_318 HOME FUND CAPITAL	2,202,871	-	350,000	2,552,871
FND_320 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND	10,738,333	27,916,850	250,000	38,905,183
FND_335 GENERAL FACILITIES CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND	4,744,675	5,002,449	160,000	9,907,124
FND_340 PARKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND	46,872,500	1,204,334	270,000	48,346,834
FND_401 DRINKING WATER UTILITY OPERATING	17,947,364	125,877	-	18,073,241
FND_402 WASTEWATER UTILITY OPERATING	28,073,173	92,720	60,000	28,225,893
FND_404 STORMWATER AND SURFACE WATER OPERATING	9,244,782	187,750	143,750	9,576,282
FND_461 DRINKING WATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT	5,822,666	466,384	2,974,940	9,263,990
FND_462 WASTEWATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT	9,396,117	2,545,146	-	11,941,263
FND_464 STORMWATER AND SURFACE WATER CAPITAL IMPRO	1,995,463	1,541,736	-	3,537,199
FND_501 EQUIPMENT RENTAL	3,969,630	11,248	-	3,980,878
FND_502 EQUIPMENT RESERVE	6,625,000	-	657,325	7,282,325
FND_505 WORKERS COMPENSATION	2,553,956	-	44,542	2,598,498
FND_506 FACILITIES	6,000,177	247,774	-	6,247,951
FND_750 Parks Sidewalk Utility Tax	5,505,763	-	554,676	6,060,439
FND_751 Transportation Sidewalk Utility Tax	900,000	4,989,531	-	5,889,531
<b>Total</b>		<b>62,287,555</b>	<b>15,101,764</b>	

**EXHIBIT B**  
**City of Olympia, WA**  
**First Quarter Expenditure Budget Adjustment Ordinance**  
**January 1, 2026, through March 31, 2026**

FND 001 General Fund:

Carryover Requests

- Purchase orders in progress \$ 515,419
- Artesian Commons Project \$ 75,000
- Leland Consulting Downtown Vacancy Project \$ 40,000
  - Funding from Economic Development Reserve in Fund 003
- Multifamily EV Charging Installations \$ 60,000

Carryover Requests total: \$ 690,419

Amendment Requests

Additional appropriation for:

- Arts Walks Lodging Tax Advisory Committee (LTAC) Award \$ 14,625
  - Funding from LTAC Fund
- Increase of project funded CARES Program Specialist 0.5 FTE to 1.0 FTE \$ 50,650
  - Funding from amendment to Tumwater CARES ILA
- Continued funding for Climate Resilience Coordinator position \$ 146,878
  - Funding from Thurston Climate Mitigation Collaborative Partners
- Climate Planning Grant Code Updates \$ 150,000
  - Funded by Department of Commerce Grant
- Appropriation for Municipal Court employee separation agreements \$ 980,998
  - Funding from the 900 Plum sale proceeds in Fund 003
- Appropriation for Thurston County Court ILA one-time improvements \$ 1,000,000
  - Funding from the 900 Plum sale proceeds in Fund 003
- Additional tree maintenance funding for Parks Urban Forestry \$ 50,000
  - Use of fund balance
- Annual Leasing for 6 Police Vehicles \$ 100,000
  - Funding from Equipment Reserve transfer

Amendment Requests total: \$ 2,493,151

FND 003 Special Acct Control Fund:

Carryover Requests

- Purchase orders in progress \$ 53,596
- Transfer of 900 Plum Proceeds for Facility Capital Improvement Projects \$ 3,560,038
- Transfer of Economic Development reserve for Downtown Vacancy Study \$ 40,000

Carryover Requests total: \$ 3,653,634

Amendment Requests	
Additional appropriation for:	
• Transfer of 900 Plum Proceeds for Municipal Court employee separation agreements and Thurston County Court one-time improvements	\$ 1,980,998
• Transfer of 900 Plum Proceeds for Plum St Village move	\$ 350,000
• Transfer of 2026-2027 Climate Planning Grant funds for work performed	\$ 150,000
• Transfer of Economic Development reserves for Westside Landfill clean up	\$ 130,000
Amendment Requests total:	\$ 2,610,998
<u>FND 006 Development Revenue Fund:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Purchase orders in progress	\$ 13,065
<u>FND 007 Parking Fund:</u>	
Carryover Request	
• ADA Assessment Plan Work	\$ 121,959
○ Funded by a transfer from the Capital Improvement Fund	
<u>FND 026 Municipal Arts Fund:</u>	
Amendment Request	
Additional appropriation for:	
• Increase budget to the full Municipal Art Plan budget (\$355,222)	\$ 93,272
<u>FND 132 Lodging Tax Fund:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Purchase orders in progress	\$ 47,540
Amendment Request	
• Art Walk Support LTAC Award	\$ 14,625
<u>FND 135 Parking Business Improvement Area:</u>	
Amendment Request	
• Appropriation to write off uncollected assessments as a bad debt expense	\$ 21,275
<u>FND 137 Hands On Children’s Museum Fund:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Transfers for Forma and Parametrix contract work on HOCM Expansion	\$ 1,342,411

Amendment Request	
Additional appropriation for:	
• Transfer to the Non-Voted GO Debt Fund for interest on 2025B HOCM bond	\$ 1,069,267
<u>FND 138 Transportation Benefit District:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Transfer funding for Transportation Capital Improvement carryover projects	\$ 3,051,208
<u>FND 140 Real Estate Excise Tax:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Transfer funding for Transportation Capital Improvement carryover projects	\$ 4,989,129
Amendment Request	
Additional appropriation for:	
• Transfer funding for 4 <sup>th</sup> Ave ADA Improvements Transportation project	\$ 250,000
<u>FND 142 Home Fund Operating:</u>	
Carryover Request	
• Purchase order in progress	\$ 2,159
<u>FND 143 Cultural Access Program:</u>	
Carryover Request	
• Purchase orders in progress	\$ 1,376,218
<u>FND 148 Transportation Benefit District Sales Tax:</u>	
Carryover Requests	
• Transfer funding for Transportation Capital Improvement carryover projects	\$ 1,787,109
<u>FND 220 Non-Voted GO Debt Fund:</u>	
Amendment Requests	
Additional appropriation for:	
• Interest on Debt Service for 2025A Parks Bond	\$ 1,274,676
○ Funding from Parks Capital, OMPD, and Sidewalk Utility Tax Funds	
• Interest on Debt Service for 2025B HOCM Bond	\$ 1,069,267
○ Funding from Hands On Children’s Museum Fund	
Amendment Requests total:	\$ 2,343,943

FND 317 Capital Improvement Fund:

Carryover Requests

- Transfer funding for Parking ADA Assessment Plan \$ 121,959
- Westside Landfill HWA Geosciences Clean Up Project budget \$ 64,382

Carryover Requests total: \$ 186,341

Amendment Requests

Additional appropriation for:

- Council Chambers Technology Upgrades \$ 160,000
  - Funding from Facilities Capital Improvement Fund
- Additional appropriation for Westside Landfill Clean Up \$ 130,000
  - Funding from Economic Development Reserves

Amendment Requests total: \$ 290,000

FND 318 Home Fund Capital:

Amendment Requests

Additional appropriation for:

- Plum St Tiny Home Village Move \$ 350,000
  - Funding from the 900 Plum Sale Proceeds

FND 320 Transportation Capital Improvement Fund:

Carryover Requests

- Ongoing Transportation Capital Improvements (28 Projects) \$ 27,916,850
  - Funding from special revenue funds, grants, and fund balance

Amendment Requests

Additional appropriation for:

- 4<sup>th</sup> Ave ADA Improvements Project \$ 250,000
  - Funding from Real Estate Excise Tax Fund

FND 335 General Facilities Capital Improvements Fund:

Carryover Requests

- Transfer to Facilities Operating Fund for non-capital ADA projects \$ 100,000
- City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Renovation, Parking Lot Improvements, and Police Evidence Storage project budgets \$ 3,560,038
  - Funding from 900 Plum Sale Proceeds
- Hands On Children's Museum New Building project design budget \$ 1,342,411
  - Funding from Hands On Children's Museum Fund

Carryover Requests total: \$ 5,002,449

Amendment Requests		
Additional appropriation for:		
• Transfer to Capital Improvement Fund for Council Chambers Technology		\$ 160,000
 <u>FND 340 Parks Capital Improvement Fund:</u>		
Carryover Requests		
• Ongoing Parks Capital Improvements (6 Projects)		\$ 1,204,334
○ Funding from OMPD, State Grant, and Fund Balance		
Amendment Request		
Additional appropriation for:		
• Transfer to Debt Fund for interest payment on 2025A Parks Bond		\$ 270,000
 <u>FND 401 Drinking Water Operating Fund:</u>		
Carryover Requests		
• Purchase orders in progress		\$ 125,877
 <u>FND 402 Wastewater Operating:</u>		
Carryover Requests		
• Purchase orders in progress		\$ 92,720
Amendment Request		
Additional appropriation for:		
• Repair and maintenance for STEP Pump		\$ 60,000
○ Funding from Sewer Capital Improvement Fund		
 <u>FND 404 Stormwater and Surface Water Operating:</u>		
Carryover Requests		
• Purchase orders in progress		\$ 187,750
Amendment Request		
Additional appropriation for:		
• Downtown Flood Mitigation and Olympia Sea Level Rise Collaborative		\$ 143,750
○ Funded in part by partner contributions of \$68,750		
 <u>FND 461 Drinking Water Capital Improvement Fund:</u>		
Carryover Request		
• Ongoing Drinking Water Capital Improvements (7 Projects)		\$ 466,384
Amendment Request		
Additional appropriation for:		
• Transmission Main Seismic Valve Installation		\$ 2,974,940

- Funding from approved FEMA grant

FND 462 Wastewater Capital Fund:

Carryover Request	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ongoing Wastewater Capital Improvements (6 Projects)</li> </ul>	\$ 2,545,146

FND 464 Storm and Surface Water Capital Fund:

Carryover Request	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ongoing Storm and Surface Water Capital Improvements (17 Projects)</li> </ul>	\$ 1,541,736

FND 501 Equipment Rental:

Carryover Request	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Purchase order in progress</li> </ul>	\$ 11,248

FND 502 Equipment Reserve Fund:

Amendment Requests	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional appropriation for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Sidewalk Maintenance Team Mini Excavator and Trailer \$ 174,549 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Funding from General Fund transfer</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Transfer funding to General Fund for Police vehicle leasing \$ 100,000</li> <li>● Transfer excess Police vehicle replacement savings to the General Fund \$ 382,776</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Amendment Requests total:	\$ 657,325

FND 505 Workers Compensation Fund:

Amendment Request	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional appropriation for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ready Rebound Annual Contract \$ 44,542 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Funding from General Fund transfer</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

FND 506 Facilities Operating Fund:

Carryover Requests	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Purchase orders in progress \$ 147,774</li> <li>● ADA Facilities Upgrade that don't qualify as capital projects \$ 100,000</li> </ul>	
Carryover Requests total:	\$ 247,774

FND 750 Parks Sidewalk Utility Tax:

Amendment Request	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional appropriation for:</li> </ul>	

- Transfer to Debt Fund for interest payment on 2025A Parks Bond \$ 554,676

FND 751 Transportation Sidewalk Utility Tax:

Carryover Request

- Transfer funding for Transportation Capital Improvement carryover projects \$ 4,989,531

**EXHIBIT C**  
**City of Olympia, WA**  
**First Quarter Expenditure Budget Adjustment Ordinance**  
**January 1, 2026, through March 31, 2026**

No permanent FTE changes requested in the first quarter budget adjustment ordinance.

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, APPROVING SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION FOR A NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS GRANT FOR THE DALEY ARTS CENTER PUBLIC ART PROJECT**

**WHEREAS**, Grants for Arts Projects (GAP) is a program funded by the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and supports local arts agencies in projects related to public art, such as creation, preservation and installation, among others; and

**WHEREAS**, the Daley Arts Center rehabilitation project is not new construction and therefore City 1% for Art funding does not apply; and

**WHEREAS**, public art for the Daley Arts Center remains part of the Arts Commission work plan, specifically a commission for the west wall of the Drill Hall that also functions as sound abatement; and

**WHEREAS**, because NEA GAP funding is a matching grant program with implications on the City's budget, it is necessary for the City Council to approve submission of the NEA grant application;

**NOW, THEREFORE, THE OLYMPIA CITY COUNCIL DOES HEREBY RESOLVE** as follows:

The Olympia City Council hereby approves submission by the City Manager, or their designee, of an NEA GAP application between the City of Olympia and the NEA for the Daley Arts Center Public Art Project, understanding that the City will be required to provide matching funds of \$40,000 if the City's application is selected and the grant awarded.

**PASSED BY THE OLYMPIA CITY COUNCIL** this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2026.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SENIOR DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY