

**The Seattle Community Police Commission:
Lessons Learned and Considerations for Effective Community
Involvement**

**Betsy Graef, Consultant (Author)
Seattle Community Police Commission**

**Draft Paper for
Moving Beyond Discipline: The Role of Civilians in Police Accountability
Symposium sponsored by NACOLE and Seattle University
Seattle, Washington, February 6, 2015**

SECTION 1 OVERVIEW

This paper outlines the purpose, role and responsibilities of the Seattle Community Police Commission (CPC) under the City of Seattle's settlement agreement with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and how its structure and charge are similar to and different from what was put in place for communities elsewhere following law enforcement agency settlements, most of which are enforced by courts.

The paper details the policy and other recommendations the CPC has completed and continues to develop, and the contributions it is making to the Seattle Police Department (SPD) reform process. It reviews the deliberative approaches the CPC follows in developing recommendations, its efforts to represent community perspectives, its successes and challenges, and the CPC's upcoming work. After two years in business, many lessons have been learned from the CPC's experience. Critical factors for success in Seattle's model may also prove useful for other cities seeking community input to police reform with an understanding these should be adapted to local conditions and needs.

SECTION 2 THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY IN SETTLEMENTS WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

The mandated role of community in 15 jurisdictions, including Seattle, under settlements or court orders was reviewed. In many instances, interviews with individuals involved in implementation provided additional background to the review of settlement, court and other documents. While there were settlements or court orders in many other jurisdictions, these were excluded due to small or distinct populations or because of limited or dissimilar bases for the settlement. Appendix I is a case summary of the jurisdictions reviewed, details the community role in each case, and for those areas reviewed other than Seattle, identifies individuals who were interviewed. Appendix II lists the names and associations of those interviewed concerning the CPC's role in Seattle.

The jurisdictions reviewed were:

Year of Court Action, Settlement or Consent Decree	Number	Location
1997	1	Pittsburgh, PA
2001	3	Washington, DC; Los Angeles, CA; Riverside, CA
2002	1	Cincinnati, OH
2003	1	Detroit, MI
2004	2	Oakland, CA; Prince George's County, MD
2012	1	Seattle, WA
2013	2	Maricopa, AZ; New Orleans, LA
2014	4	Albuquerque, NM; New York, NY; Portland, OR; Suffolk County, NY

In 3 instances, court orders were related to private lawsuits and in one case the court order concerned a lawsuit brought by a state attorney general. The remaining 12 cases involved litigation filed by the DOJ.

Since community concern is often the genesis of investigations into police misconduct, it is likely that communities have been involved often and made contributions to reform efforts under settlements. However, based on this review, it appears the formal role of community in such cases has generally been limited. Nevertheless, this review is not exhaustive and more research would be useful to determine the full extent and impact of community participation in locales under mandates to reform police practices. For example, while community involvement may not have been dictated in some agreements, it may have been provided through other mechanisms in those cities and it would be helpful to understand more fully how the community contributed in such instances.

- There was no specified role for community in cases involving 4 law enforcement agencies (Washington, D.C.; Detroit, Michigan; Prince George's, Maryland, or Riverside, California).
- In 4 cases, provision was made for the law enforcement agency to consult with, convene or attend meetings of community groups or representatives to share information, and hear community opinions and concerns (Los Angeles, California; Oakland, California; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Suffolk County, New York).
- There were 7 cases in which provision was made for a more substantial community role. Most (5 cases) settled in the last two years (in 2013: Maricopa County, New Mexico and New Orleans, Louisiana and in 2014: Albuquerque, New Mexico; New York, New York; and Portland, Oregon). The jurisdiction with the most experience with community involvement is Cincinnati, Ohio, settled in 2002, followed by Seattle, Washington in 2012. The following summarizes arrangements for community involvement in 6 of those jurisdictions (excluding Seattle):
 - ✓ In Cincinnati, the primary role of community members was to support implementation of the Collaborative Agreement (CA), addressing police accountability and community problem-oriented policing (CPOP). Goals for the CA were articulated in advance of its finalization, following broad police and community outreach in which more than 3,500 participants identified priorities through surveys and interviews. The Community-Police Partnering Center at the Urban League of Greater Southwestern Ohio led the CPOP work in partnership with the police department and it received substantial private funding (\$1M/year for 5 years) to do so. It also solicited individuals from throughout the community to join the Friends of the Collaborative, a loosely organized community advisory group that consulted on CPOP and CA implementation. This group engaged in dialogue with police representatives about problem-oriented policing practices; reviewed use of force statistics; and reviewed investigation statistics of the Citizen Complaint Authority (established with a citizen board under the CA). The Friends of the Collaborative did not meet regularly and was never intended to exclusively review or establish department policies. Subsequently, the City Manager's Advisory Group (CMAG) assumed responsibility for advising the City and police department more informally on general police issues of concern to the community. Its members are appointed by the City Manager without specific terms and there is no defined number of members or representation. CMAG is chaired by the City Manager, meets about 3 times per year, and is not responsible for preparing reports or recommendations.
 - ✓ The New Orleans January 2013 consent decree acknowledged the role of Police Community Advisory Boards (PCABs) established in 2011 in the city's 8 police districts. PCABs are charged with making recommendations and providing counsel to the department on

community policing strategies to meet community priorities; policy changes to improve quality of life; police accountability standards; workforce diversity strategies; and effective ways to share data and information with district residents, including about compliance with the agreement. Candidates who reside in the districts they serve are recommended by the PCABs for appointment by the Police Superintendent. PCAB "actionable" recommendations are provided to district commanders who are required to respond within a short interval with approval or written explanations for denial. Recommendations forwarded for consideration by headquarters also require formal department response. PCABs are supported by the staff and resources of the City's Office of Neighborhood Engagement and by the department. The department also launched a separate Community Outreach and Public Information program which provides for annual meetings to be held in each district to update the community on the status of consent decree progress and receive public comments.

- ✓ The Maricopa County Sheriff's Department is under an October 2013 court order that originated from a private lawsuit. The order mandates the establishment of a Community Advisory Board (CAB) to facilitate regular dialogue between the department and community leaders and to provide specific recommendations on policies and practices to ensure court orders are met and increase public trust. The department appoints 3 CAB members and plaintiff representatives appoint the other 3. The CAB is to meet no less often than every four months and receive information on compliance from department representatives responsible for implementation and relay to them community concerns about department practices related to racial profiling or unlawful stops. The CAB is administratively supported by the department's community liaison officer. The department was to establish a Community Outreach and Public Information program in each of its districts and hold annual meetings to update the community on policy changes taken to implement to court order and receive public comments. At this time, no information is available confirming that the Sheriff's Department has established the outreach program.
- ✓ The New York Police Department is under a July 2014 court order that originated from a private lawsuit, Floyd vs. New York. The order may provide for community involvement, but the particulars have not yet been established. A Facilitator will work with the parties and other stakeholders to develop a set of permanent reforms and, in advance and as part of this work, the Facilitator will convene town hall meetings in each borough to provide a forum for community stakeholders to be heard. Other than that, the order is unspecific with respect to the community component, but it does state that community input is vital to ensure any reforms adopted are perceived as legitimate. In stating that input from those most affected will be at the center of the process of developing reforms, it also suggests that both the Cincinnati Collaborative and models for community involvement in other subsequent DOJ cases might be employed in New York.
- ✓ The Portland City Council approved a settlement in November, 2012 but due to legal challenges, it was not signed by the federal judge until August 2014. The City is now setting up a Community Oversight Advisory Board (COAB) of 15 voting members and 5 advisory members from the police department. Five voting members are to be appointed by City Commissioners, five by the City's Human Rights and Disability Commissions and the remaining five through a public selection process. The group will represent a reasonably broad spectrum of the community. Members serve a two year term, with an option for a

single one-year reappointment. While somewhat independent, the COAB will be chaired by and report to the Community Compliance Officer/Community Liaison (the COCL is responsible for overseeing the settlement in lieu of a monitor). The COAB will be convened by the COCL 4 times yearly, but may meet as often as monthly. It does not have a separate budget or additional staff resources at this time. The COAB has a broad mandate to assess the settlement implementation; make recommendations (undefined); advise on improving police-community relations; inform and receive input from the community; and contribute to the development and implementation of a Community Engagement and Outreach Plan (CEO Plan) which is to be submitted to the Chief of Police and approved in final form by the COAB. The CEO Plan is intended to be extensive, addressing general department community outreach efforts; problem-oriented policing principles, policies and associated resource deployment; workforce diversity; and police accountability standards.

- ✓ Albuquerque's November 2014 settlement will result in the establishment of a Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) and 6 Community Policing Councils (Councils) in each area command. The CPOA will replace another office which also conducted independent investigations of misconduct cases separate from those of the department's internal affairs division. Each Councilmember will appoint a CPOA member and there may be additional at-large and City administration members, as well as an executive director. Specific provisions for representation are not yet defined. The CPOA will be independent but accountable to the Mayor, the City Attorney's Office, the City Council and the department and have a budget of between \$800,000 and \$1.6 million. The CPOA will review misconduct cases, recommend findings to the Chief, and recommend changes to accountability and related policies (use of force, crisis intervention, supervision, training and discipline). It will also implement a community outreach program. The CPOA will hold regular, public meetings but the frequency has not been set. Council members are community volunteers charged with reviewing department community policing priorities, strategies and training; advising on workforce diversity strategies; suggesting ways to collect and share information with the public; and informing and conveying feedback from the community to the department on reform-related matters. There is no set number of individuals who will participate on the Councils; as volunteers they are not appointed, but are expected to be drawn from a cross-section of the community. The Councils are expected to meet monthly or quarterly and the minimal associated costs will be absorbed by the department. The department is also to establish a Community Outreach and Public Information program in each of its districts and hold semi-annual meetings to update the community on progress in implementing the agreement and receive public comments.

Especially under older settlements, community contributions appear to have been primarily consultative and in many cases, the agreements simply provide that the community be given status updates about reform efforts or engaged in a dialogue about concerns, both about police accountability and public safety, with the involved law enforcement agencies. In most cases, the community was not given a mandate or resources to independently and proactively develop specific recommendations for police policy or practice improvements.

The work in Cincinnati has long been a model for community involvement. Most resources, which were privately raised, supported the work of a structured entity that engaged the police and community in support of community problem-oriented policing and to address crime and disorder. While this early work is often cited, there is concern that a renewed commitment to community problem-oriented

policing in Cincinnati is needed today. The Friends of the Collaborative, its other vehicle for community input on reform was loosely organized and did not meet regularly. The current arrangements for counsel are also informal.

All but one of the settlements reached in 2013 and 2014 feature more structured community involvement than had been put in place in many jurisdictions under earlier agreements but how effectively these arrangements will work is unclear since it is early in those agreements. Even in Seattle after two years, the full extent of the CPC's contribution to reform is not known.

The arrangement in New York hints at innovation that builds on the experiences of other communities, but what will be put in place remains to be seen. Portland's community involvement may be significant, but it is just getting underway and there is no provision yet for significant independence, including adequate resources. The New Orleans approach requires "actionable" recommendations to be responded to by the police department within set timelines, but the structure seems to emphasize geographically defined interests rather than overarching community standards and is also lightly resourced. Albuquerque's model puts the most emphasis on and provides substantial resources to a civilian oversight body to conduct misconduct investigations and recommend changes to accountability and related policies—will this mean its focus will be on reviewing individual misconduct cases or will it seek to identify important areas for policy changes? In Maricopa County, the community group is to weigh in with specific policy and practice recommendations, but may meet only quarterly and has limited resources and independence—there is little information available on its current work.

The mandated arrangement in Seattle for community involvement does appear unique. The CPC was given a number of discrete responsibilities centered on basic police policies and practices, as well as on the department's accountability system, its training programs and outreach efforts. It also is obligated to stay connected with the community so it can share community views with the police and provide the community with status updates about police reform efforts in Seattle. The federal mandate is codified in City ordinance which embeds the Commission into the structure of City government, and it receives substantial resources to fulfill its responsibilities and maintain its independence.

SECTION 3

SEATTLE COMMUNITY POLICE COMMISSION CHARGE AND STRUCTURE

Background

The 2010 shooting death by Seattle police of First Nations woodcarver John T. Williams, and a series of other serious incidents involving police and people of color, ignited anew longstanding public concerns about bias and the use of excessive force in SPD.

The DOJ, through the US Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington and the Civil Rights Division in Washington, D.C., investigated SPD after being asked to do so by the American Civil Liberties Union of Washington (ACLU/WA) and 34 community organizations. Prior to issuing its findings, the DOJ met with numerous stakeholders, including many community leaders and groups who had worked on the issue of police accountability for years and who had joined in requesting the DOJ investigation. After the DOJ issued its [findings](#), the City of Seattle signed a [settlement agreement](#) in late 2012 with the DOJ to reform SPD practices, as well as a [memorandum of understanding](#) (MOU) that established the work to be done over three years to ensure bias-free policing and address the issue of the use of excessive force. The settlement and MOU were informed by suggestions offered by many community

representatives that were summarized in recommendations of the Minority Executive Directors Coalition Multiracial Task Force on Police Accountability (MEDC Task Force). The groups involved with the MEDC Task Force are identified, along with its recommendations, in a [March 2012 letter](#) to the DOJ.

Among those recommendations was a suggestion for community involvement in overseeing the settlement. The DOJ had become interested in formalizing civilian input to reform agreements and Seattle was viewed as promising for such an arrangement due to, in large part, the presence of well-organized community groups seeking a role. In addition, the DOJ also believed that while diverse, Seattle was also small enough that structuring a manageably sized formal body that was reasonably representative of the community was viable. This belief was bolstered by the fact that Jenny Durkan, the US Attorney for Western Washington, whose office was co-leading the investigation also had a significant involvement in Seattle police issues that likely informed her views of the value of a community role in the settlement. In the past, Jenny Durkan served on several blue ribbon panels that recommended improvements to Seattle's police accountability system. Critically, Mayor Michael McGinn and City Attorney Peter Holmes, Seattle's representatives in the negotiations, were also strongly supportive of a formal community role (and Peter Holmes' own background in police issues as a past member of Seattle's civilian police accountability oversight board likely factored into his strong support).

Encouraged by the community, and with the constellation of conditions right, including all parties in agreement, Seattle's settlement and MOU mandated and defined a distinct role and set of responsibilities for a community police commission in the reform process.

Purpose

The CPC was subsequently established by City [ordinance](#) "to leverage the ideas, talent, experience, and expertise of the community [in the reform process]."¹ "The Commission . . . creates an important opportunity for Seattle's diverse communities to participate in the implementation of the MOU and the Settlement Agreement, and to promote greater transparency and public understanding of the Seattle Police Department."² CPC members convened and began work in March 2013.

Members and Resources

There are 15 members, 13 of whom are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. Members representing two Seattle police unions are appointed by their members. The CPC has permanent professional staff and receives additional consultant support. Its current annual budget is \$862,000.

All members were appointed for the duration of the settlement and the MOU.³ The Commission is broadly representative of the diversity of Seattle's residents, drawn from different racial and ethnic groups, and from the LGBT, youth, faith and business communities. Some represent, or are knowledgeable of the issues of, those who are homeless or who have mental illness and substance abuse disorders. There is one representative each from the Seattle Police Officers Guild and the Seattle Police Management Association. Collectively, members have a deep understanding of community interests and needs, particularly among communities that have had difficulties in their interactions with

¹ Seattle City Ordinance 124021 and Settlement Agreement

² Seattle City Ordinance 124021 and Memorandum of Understanding

³ Vacancies over time have been filled by Mayoral appointments

SPD. All have general knowledge of police accountability matters and some have extensive subject matter expertise, including in the areas of civil rights and civil liberties, and cultural competency.

Responsibilities

The areas specified in both the settlement agreement and the MOU for CPC involvement were incorporated directly or by reference in the City ordinance that established the Commission. The CPC was broadly given authority to issue its own reports and recommendations on the implementation of the settlement agreement, including proposing legislation. It is responsible for bi-annual progress reports to the Mayor and the City Council and for holding regular public meetings to receive community feedback about SPD's progress in complying with the settlement agreement.

The settlement outlined particular areas for CPC involvement, including reviewing and recommending revisions to SPD policies, and on training and training curricula, related to bias-free policing and stops and detentions. These areas of responsibility were subsequently incorporated into the monitor's work plans with specific deadlines for completing the work.

The MOU identified other specific areas for CPC involvement including assessing SPD community engagement activities; reviewing the police accountability system; evaluating SPD investigatory stops data collection and reporting practices; assessing SPD officer mentoring programs; reviewing SPD public disclosure policies and practices; and working with SPD and the City to develop and implement a public education program on filing complaints of officer misconduct.

The CPC's responsibilities were purposefully defined. These areas were viewed as being those most in need of community deliberation, the "hard stuff"—issues that do not have a single clear "right answer", but rather depend on thoughtful discussion and consideration of different perspectives. The intent was that the CPC's ultimate conclusions in these areas would represent consensus positions reflecting and balancing community values.

Organization of Work

The CPC adopted bylaws to govern its activities. Most work is assigned to standing or ad hoc workgroups which report out to the full Commission. Each workgroup and the full Commission have co-chairs who prepare agendas and run meetings.

The standing workgroups generally meet twice monthly in 1 to 2 hour sessions during which they engage with staff and technical advisors in reviewing materials, discussing issues, and preparing materials and recommendations for consideration by the full Commission.

During its first year, the CPC had three standing workgroups (bias-free policing, stops and detentions, and community engagement) and ad hoc workgroups were formed to review SPD in-car video and use of force policies. In 2014, prior workgroups were put on hold and new workgroups convened on the police accountability system, training and SPD community engagement.

The Commission as a whole meets twice monthly in 3 hour sessions to review workgroup status reports and to vote on workgroup recommendations. Other business not assigned to workgroups is also presented at full CPC meetings.

In general, members attend about 10 hours of CPC meetings per month. Members are also often invited to and attend other meetings called by the DOJ, the Monitor Team, various SPD workgroups and leaders, the Mayor's Office and the City Council. In addition, full CPC and workgroup meetings are often attended by stakeholder representatives who provide information and advice and counsel.

SECTION 4

SEATTLE COMMUNITY POLICE COMMISSION ACTIVITIES

Community Engagement

The CPC is charged with being the vehicle for community input into the SPD reform process and to do so it has undertaken substantial engagement in the community.

Prior to finalizing an initial set of policy recommendations in late 2013, the CPC conducted extensive community outreach. A major focus of this effort was to obtain feedback on the CPC's draft recommendations, but the Commission also sought community perspectives about the reform process in general, the role of the CPC, information about community members' experience with the police, and guidance for future community engagement activities.

During this extensive outreach in October 2013, the CPC sought the perspectives of the general public, police officers and their union representatives, and other key stakeholders in the reform process, but it was particularly interested in learning the views of those in Seattle who have had historically troubled relationships with SPD, or who have been traditionally underrepresented in the policy making process. The CPC made a special effort to invite members of underrepresented communities to offer their perspectives in safe forums by contracting with 13 community-based organizations that directly serve hard-to-reach populations, and by reaching out to many more. In all, more than 100 organizations participated in the outreach effort. The Commission and its partners and other supporting organizations brought together more than 3,400 community members at over 150 meetings. Both quantitative and qualitative feedback was received—participants completed over 3,000 survey questionnaires and facilitators extensively documented key themes identified during the meeting dialogues. While most surveys were completed in English, 464 surveys translated into languages other than English were completed.

Some of the survey questions yielded feedback specific to the CPC's draft policy recommendations, with a very large percentage of respondents (75% to 88%) expecting the recommendations to make a difference in improving police practices.

A [Community Outreach Report](#) detailing the results of this community engagement was issued in early January 2014. An [Executive Summary](#) of the report was translated into nine (9) languages (Amharic, Arabic, Chinese-Simplified, Chinese-Traditional, Korean, Somali, Spanish, Tagalog and Vietnamese) and made available to the community through the CPC's partner organizations.

Policy Recommendations

The focus of CPC's work in 2013 was on developing policy recommendations concerning bias-free policing and stops and detentions. These areas and associated deadlines for CPC to submit its

recommendations were identified in the monitor's 2013 work plan. Separately, the monitor asked the CPC to comment on SPD's in-car video recording (ICV) technology and make ICV policy recommendations; and the CPC chose also to comment on SPD's draft use of force policy. The CPC incorporated recommendations in all these policy areas in a [Policy Report](#) issued in November 2013.

The CPC policy workgroups benefited from the contributions and technical assistance of many stakeholder representatives who actively and consistently participated in their deliberations, particularly from SPD (especially members of its Compliance team and Audit, Policy and Review staff). Representatives from the DOJ, the Monitor Team and the City Attorney's Office were also often engaged in the policy workgroup discussions.

- **Bias-Free Policing Policy**

The bias-free policing policy approved by the federal court was significantly influenced by CPC recommendations. A groundbreaking provision proposed by the CPC and adopted as part of the policy requires the collection and analysis for disparate impact of SPD arrests, stops and detentions, citations and use of force data. The results of the analysis will provide the basis for exploring equally effective law enforcement alternatives to mitigate disproportionate impact. The CPC was responsible for crafting language included in the final policy that explicitly cites historical inequality and institutional bias as factors that may result in disproportionate enforcement even in the absence of intentional bias. The language acknowledges the value of undertaking an analysis of disparate impact and seeking alternative approaches and it avoids a "blame-oriented" frame of reference concerning police contact data which provided the basis for broad support of this portion of the policy among all stakeholders.

- **Stops and Detentions Policy**

The CPC was instrumental in framing language for the new policy that more clearly defines the rights and obligations of both the police and those stopped and that sets standards for searches by the police. The prior SPD policy did not distinguish well between social and Terry stops and did not provide sufficient guidance to officers. The CPC's work on this policy involved extensive discussions between its police union representatives and other members with substantial knowledge of case law and "real life" experience of individuals stopped by the police. One important contribution the CPC made was in flagging the legal issues raised in one early draft of the policy that required supervisors to be called on site when stopped individuals claimed bias. As a result, this requirement was dropped. By engaging in discussions of such concrete examples, the CPC as a whole reached consensus—including its police union representatives—on an improved policy supported by SPD and other stakeholders and approved by the federal court.

- **Use of Force Policy**

While excessive use of force was a primary finding of the DOJ, the settlement agreement and MOU did not assign the CPC responsibility to review SPD use of force policies. The parties deliberated three months before reaching agreement on a draft policy tentatively approved by the Monitor in early August 2013 and due for filing with the court by mid-November 2013. Upon receiving a copy of the draft, the CPC decided to offer comments and sought and received court approval for a time extension to do so. The CPC had limited time to thoroughly review the 70+ page draft, but in the time it had, it cited concerns with the unclear, inconsistent and redundant organization of the policy and with its overall length and complexity. The CPC believed these

issues might make it challenging for both officers and the public to understand the policy and might make training officers to it difficult. The CPC also found that some definitions in the policy were vague and/or in conflict with state law and court rulings. Finally, the CPC also endorsed the idea of developing standards on use of force that could be adopted statewide, providing consistency across law enforcement jurisdictions.

Several very specific CPC recommendations related to definitions and conventional terms were incorporated into the final policy and the parties agreed that those changes improved the final adopted policy. However, the final policy remained very long, and from the CPC's point of view the revised version did not address the need for concision and clarity. Such revamping was not undertaken partly because time constraints did not allow for major revisions, but also because the parties were under no obligation under the settlement to take into account CPC recommendations in this area.

While the CPC did not initially substantially influence the use of force policy, it has played an important subsequent role in this area. Some SPD officers filed suit against the City claiming the policy unreasonably restricted their ability to defend themselves and protect the public. The Seattle police unions did not participate in the suit (which was ultimately rejected by a US District Court judge), but believed the CPC could be the most effective conduit of officer concerns to the monitor and other settlement parties. When the new policy became subject to review 180 days after adoption, it asked the CPC to supplement the evaluation efforts of SPD and the City Attorney's Office by reaching out to line officers for feedback on how the policy works in practice. The CPC held listening sessions with officers and forwarded their feedback directly to the monitor, the DOJ and the Seattle City Attorney.

- **ICV Technology and Policy**

The Commission's involvement in reviewing SPD's ICV technology and policy exemplified an effective early collaboration between the monitor and the CPC in an area not identified for CPC engagement in the settlement or MOU. At the time SPD was installing new ICV technology in its vehicles, the monitor asked the CPC to review and make recommendations about the automatic "triggers" to be used in the updated system, and to make other ICV policy recommendations. The monitor was inclined to support the installation of many automatic "triggers", while SPD took the position that some automatic "triggers" would generate unneeded or redundant video at significant expense and supported use of only those "triggers" it had originally planned for to activate video recording (patrol car lights, audio activation, in crash situations, and at certain speed thresholds). The CPC was open to SPD's judgment and benefited from its counsel as it deliberated. In the end, the CPC endorsed SPD's position, even though others—including Seattle's Human Rights Commission—recommended a different course. In the end, the monitor did not require SPD to install additional "triggers".

While the CPC's policy recommendations were substantive and often added materially to the content, the expectations of the DOJ and monitor were driving forces that dictated what was contained in the final adopted policies.

Perhaps the most important role played by the CPC in the policy arena was in flagging potential issues and encouraging their resolution prior to finalizing policy. The CPC is well positioned to continue its role of flagging and facilitating discussion of policy issues and is doing so now on the topic of body-worn cameras which SPD is piloting. The CPC has identified a range of critical issues involved with the use of

this technology, including the importance of reconciling the need for accountability with the need to protect privacy and ensure victim/witness safety.

Accountability System Recommendations

Most of the CPC's work in early 2014 involved reviewing and recommending changes to the police accountability system. The Commission's [Accountability Recommendations](#) were issued in April 2014.

The current police accountability system is a four-pronged system comprised of the Office of Professional Accountability (OPA), led by a civilian director but with primarily sworn staff, which conducts investigations and prepares recommended findings and discipline; the independent civilian OPA Auditor who reviews the work of the OPA; a civilian review board (OPARB) responsible for community engagement and oversight; and the police department itself which is responsible for managing employee performance.

The CPC issued 55 policy and practice recommendations ranging from how complaints are gathered and handled, to the scope of OPA's authority, the need for consistent and supported SPD line supervisor involvement in lower-level misconduct cases, revisions to finding classifications, reform of appellate processes, and improved mechanisms for ensuring systemic improvements. The CPC also issued recommendations for structural changes to the system, calling for increased independence of OPA and its Director, for increased OPA responsibility for ensuring access to and transparency of the system, and for community oversight of the system to be transferred to the CPC and with a substantially wider charge than provided the current board.

The extensive technical contributions of the OPA Director and OPA Auditor were crucial in helping the CPC identify specific priority areas for reform. In addition, the CPC collaborated closely with the Mayor's staff and with his special assistant on police, Dr. Bernard Melekian, seeking consensus on needed reforms. With only a few exceptions, the CPC's accountability recommendations have been endorsed by the Mayor.

While some of the recommendations have been or may be implemented readily, a number are subject to police union negotiations and others require or would benefit from codification in law. Therefore, the CPC has also apprised City Councilmembers of its recommendations and the rationale for them since some share responsibility for establishing the City's labor negotiations agenda and all are key to approving needed legislation. In order to support the timely updating of the key City ordinance on police accountability, the CPC also recently drafted legislation incorporating many of its accountability recommendations for consideration by the Mayor and Council. Legislative action is expected in early 2015.

Training Recommendations

The CPC issued its [Training Recommendations](#) in March 2014. Rather than commenting on details of particular training curricula, the CPC focused on highlighting principles that should be the basis of all SPD training practices and key elements critical to ensuring SPD's trainings and training program are effective in the short-term and over time:

- A philosophy of Constitutional policing should be the foundation of all SPD training curricula;
- Effective communications and fairness should be fundamental in all SPD training curricula;

- All officers should be trained to effectively respond to a range of critical incidents;
- Command staff commitment is essential to effective training;
- Sergeants play a critical role in ensuring successful training; and
- A performance management system is required to achieve effective training.

In the summer of 2014, the CPC worked with the SPD Education and Training Section to contribute to its training curriculum for the updated bias-free policing and stops and detentions policies. The eight-hour training of SPD's 1,300 sworn officers was conducted in 40 sessions held between October and late December 2014.

In addition to providing input on the curriculum, the SPD Education and Training Section asked the CPC to directly participate in its bias-free policing training sessions. At least one Commissioner participated in most of the sessions, making a 20-minute presentation about their backgrounds, why they are involved with the CPC and why the issue of bias-free policing matters to them. They also provided background on the CPC's role in the reform process and answered officers' questions.

The participation of Commissioners was viewed by training staff as very positive, serving well the purpose of putting the training content into a personal context so officers would be more receptive to it. By putting faces to Commissioners, introducing their personal stories, and allowing some space for dialogue, it also furthered a goal of helping officers have a better and more accurate understanding of the CPC.

SPD Community Outreach Assessment

In early 2014, the Commission began its work to assess and report on SPD's community activities, and to identify strategies SPD might employ to increase its community engagement and the public's confidence in SPD. The CPC's work in this area has benefited from the full and collaborative support of SPD leaders.

The CPC chose to focus first on SPD's outreach to racial, ethnic and immigrant and refugee communities and its first report related to these communities is due in the summer of 2015.

In this first assessment, a detailed gap analysis will be conducted primarily by Commission staff, with some support from consultants. The assessment will include both analysis of "hard data" and of information gathered in listening sessions and focus groups held in the community. The gap analysis will focus on three areas:

- The recruitment, hiring, basic training, promotion, and retention of officers from targeted communities;
- SPD relationships with members of these communities; and
- The quality of communications by SPD with these communities.

After completion of the gap analysis, the Commission will work with SPD on an implementation plan, identifying actions to narrow gaps, establishing deadlines for doing so and providing mechanisms for assessing progress.

While the MOU charges the CPC with an assessment, it does not define its scope or structure, calling only for the CPC to conduct a survey of both police and community members' experiences with and perceptions of SPD's community outreach activities, and to subsequently prepare an assessment report, outlining potential strategies SPD might take to increase community engagement and public confidence in it.

The CPC believed the assessment was a potentially major and vitally important project. However, without clear guidelines for it, the Commission sought advice and technical support in developing a robust plan for the project by reaching out to a number of City partners, including SPD.

CPC staff conferred with Department of Neighborhood (DON) staff to identify concerns people in different parts of the city might have about SPD's community activities. This was useful because DON staff have deep and regular involvement in communities throughout the city. Then CPC staff met with City Auditor staff to brainstorm approaches to scoping and structuring the assessment. The City Auditor staff suggestions were helpful in confirming and organizing areas of focus, and in developing plans for a thorough gap analysis in each area. The CPC also convened a discussion with about 20 frontline police officers to hear their perspectives on SPD community outreach activities which helped inform the eventual scope of the project.

The development of this project demonstrates how effectively the CPC has learned to leverage its relationships. Originally viewed as potentially of limited scope, the current assessment plan is extensive, a well thought out project that benefited from the input of many City partners. Particularly notable was the positive reception by officers in SPD's community outreach section who were highly supportive of and collaborated closely on the project because they were familiar with and had long term relationships with a number of CPC members and staff. The CPC also brought the DOJ and the Monitoring Team on board with the more extensive project because its staff met frequently with these stakeholders as the project was being formulated and kept them apprised of the work CPC was doing with its partners to develop a more comprehensive approach. They have endorsed it, as has the Chief of Police who was especially appreciative of the CPC's detailed plans to assess barriers to recruitment, hiring and retention and eager to partner with it in finding solutions.

Future Work

Much of the CPC's initial mandated work involving recommendations on policies, the accountability system and training has been completed, but its responsibility for overseeing implementation of reforms in these areas will continue throughout the settlement. It continues to have responsibility for seeking and sharing the views of the community about SPD and its compliance with the settlement.

It is also likely the CPC will assume substantial new responsibilities, unrelated to the settlement, to oversee the City's policies and practices on police accountability which require it to develop and implement a comprehensive associated work plan for monitoring activities, patterns and progress in this area. This new role may also provide the CPC an opportunity to gather information on the experiences of other police departments, from academic research and national experts to identify issues, trends and potential "best practices" relevant to Seattle that deserve attention.

Areas of monitoring and follow-up under the CPC's current mandated responsibilities include:

- Support for the codification and adoption of other practices recommended by the CPC that support a strong accountability system, including provisions that require changes in the police labor union contracts;
- Regular review and comment on the effectiveness of SPD policies and training in bias-free policing, stops and detentions, use of force, and in other critical areas related to police accountability; and
- Aid the City, OPA and SPD in developing materials and channels that educate and facilitate public access to, and the transparency of, the systems responsible for receiving and reviewing police misconduct cases. The CPC is also charged with helping SPD and OPA to educate the public on the accountability system and how to access it.

The following three areas are also key continuing activities associated with the CPC's current responsibilities:

- **SPD Community Outreach Assessment**

The CPC's initial assessment is due mid-2015, but work in this area will continue well beyond that date. The CPC intends to replicate the initial assessment since its focus was limited to outreach to certain Seattle communities (racial and ethnic minorities, and immigrants and refugees). Similar assessments are planned concerning SPD outreach to other groups, particularly LGBTQ, street and other youth, and those who are homeless, mentally ill or challenged by substance abuse issues.

- **Officer Survey**

Early in 2015, the CPC will administer its first survey of SPD officers to obtain their views about the reform process. Prepared in collaboration with the OPA Director and Auditor, and with SPD, this survey is intended to provide a baseline measurement of police attitudes about how well mandated changes have been implemented, what difference they are making, the effectiveness of civilian oversight and the police accountability system, and the impact of reform in the communities served by the police.

- **Data Collection, Analysis and Identification of Law Enforcement and Other Alternatives**

SPD is responsible for collecting and analyzing data on disparate impact and to consult with the CPC and others in identifying alternative practices to reduce such disparities when they occur. The CPC looks forward to collaborating with SPD in this area next year. This is especially relevant since SPD, the City Attorney's Office and the CPC will also review in 2015 a separate data analysis on the racial/ethnic disparities associated with public consumption citations (alcohol and marijuana) and arrests for obstruction. A University of Washington consultant hired by the CPC is conducting this analysis, which also involves identifying alternative practices that may mitigate disparate impact while preserving public safety.

- **Community Engagement**

The CPC's extensive community outreach work in 2013 was viewed as highly effective both in the community and by parties to the settlement. The involvement of so many trusted organizations and individuals gave community members a sense of ownership of the process and allowed the CPC to get in touch with and hear from many people who might not otherwise have been reached.

A similarly extensive community outreach activity is planned in late 2015, timed to occur two years after the initial effort, and including a second satisfaction survey to obtain community views of the police, individual experiences with the police, and perceptions about the reform process. The CPC's regular community satisfaction surveys are part of a baseline on community attitudes towards the police that—along with a survey periodically conducted by the monitor—provide data on how well SPD is making progress under the settlement.

SECTION 5

KEY LESSONS FROM SEATTLE'S COMMUNITY POLICE COMMISSION EXPERIENCE

Tailor Community Involvement to Meet Local Needs

Every community is different and what may work in Seattle will not be right for other cities.

In the end, the essential elements for successful community involvement depends on the unique conditions in each given city such as its size and demographics, its political structures, the arrangements in place that govern and oversee police, and the context of both historical and current issues with police practices.

Seattle is a mid-sized city with a history of police issues and with well-organized community activists who sought to address those issues over many years. Demographically it has become a much more diverse city. SPD operates as a City Department, with the Chief of Police reporting to the Mayor and no other governing structures in place. Prior to the establishment of the CPC, the only official role for civilians was through a small board charged with oversight of police accountability which was given a narrow charge and operated with limited resources. Key parties to the settlement in Seattle had previously been deeply involved in SPD issues and there was broad political support to involve community members who had significant knowledge and expertise on the issue.

This context in Seattle determined the scope and scale of responsibilities assigned to the CPC under the settlement and MOU. Some key factors may have been: 1) Seattle is a moderate-sized city whose diversity could be reasonably represented on a 15-member Commission; 2) there were no substantial competing sources of civilian participation (such as a governing Police Commission or a strong community-based police oversight body); and 3) political leaders and stakeholders supported and understood how effective the community role could be—thoughtful community representatives had already proven themselves—and saw a real opportunity for engaging such leaders in a range of policy areas suited to balancing community values with police needs and expectations.

Lessons from Seattle—Factors of Success and Critical Challenges

Critical factors in the CPC's successes thus far and challenges it continues to face may be germane to other cities as they too seek to benefit from community input to police reform.

- **Institutionalize Community Involvement**

Seattle has a history of strong community involvement in police issues through the work of a number of well organized and coordinated groups which was foundational to establishing the CPC. These community representatives brought the DOJ investigation to Seattle and many of their views were incorporated in the agreements ultimately negotiated by the parties, including the provision for a community-based commission with defined responsibilities.

The specific charge of the CPC in the settlement and MOU documents was further formalized and its structure set by City ordinance. Together, these provisions provide a mandate for the CPC's work, establish its specific role, and gave the CPC resources to do its work. Since its current role is institutionalized in the settlement agreement, the MOU and City ordinances, the CPC's scope of activities are not subject to revision due to changing priorities of elected officials. Pending legislation to establish an expanded and ongoing oversight role for the CPC is designed to further provide it with a broad mandate that is sufficiently flexible to allow response to new conditions while also protecting it from the vicissitudes of changing political priorities. These formalized provisions also better ensure that the CPC has and will receive recognition from key City leaders, including the Mayor, the City Council, the Chief of Police, and the City Attorney.

- **Understand Different Roles and Frames of Reference**

On one level it might be expected that the monitor and the DOJ should be natural allies and partners with a formal organization set up to represent community interests in police settlements. However, differing roles and frames of reference may contribute to disagreements, some significant.

As elsewhere, in Seattle both the DOJ and the monitor are vested in ensuring the settlement terms are met, and the monitor's role is to oversee compliance on behalf of the court. They and the City of Seattle, the involved jurisdiction, are likely to see their obligations as set forth in the settlement, in court-approved work plans and deadlines, and in expectations voiced by the federal judge. This frame of reference is different from the CPC's which is an advisor but not a party to—or contracted agent responsible for—the settlement agreement.

Not being a party to the agreement has been in the past a source of tension between the CPC and other key stakeholders. In addition, due to fundamental differences in the roles and perspectives among the CPC and the settlement parties (and the monitor), priorities may not align and points of contention are inevitable.

Understanding the different positions, and recognizing that disagreements and friction are likely to occur, it's important to accept those dynamics and keep communication channels open (see "Relationships Matter—Give Them Attention" below).

- **Ensure Broad, Knowledgeable and Credible Representation**

Most CPC members have deep professional or experiential knowledge of and expertise on Constitutional policing. Importantly, a number have been involved in police issues for many years and are associated with the community groups responsible for requesting the DOJ investigation. The CPC also has other representatives from the business, faith and youth communities. The inclusion of police union representatives has been critically important, signaling recognition of the police as equal community members whose voices should be heard. CPC members are broadly representative of Seattle's diverse populations and all are respected members of their communities. Many CPC members have activist backgrounds and/or are highly influential and connected; these backgrounds and skills have been important aids to gaining political support for the CPC's positions and agenda.

- **Provide Sufficient Professional Staff and Resources**

The City of Seattle recognized that staff and resources were required for the CPC to meet set deadlines for recommendations, to fulfill its community engagement obligations and to establish and maintain effective relationships with other partners. The CPC is financially supported by allocations from the City's General Fund.

These funds allow the CPC to be staffed with 3.0 FTE, including the Executive Director, a policy analyst and an administrative assistant. A contracted technical advisor provides additional support in policy development, representing the equivalent of about .50 FTE. The CPC will hire another 1.0 FTE staff member in 2015 to support communications and its community outreach functions.

The CPC was substantially challenged in its first year due to delays in getting permanent staff in place. It relied on temporary and part-time staff throughout that period to support CPC policy development work groups, organize and conduct extensive community engagement, and provide administrative support. Significant support from contracted professional consultants aided during that period of time. Staffing stabilized when the permanent Executive Director began in February 2014 and the policy analyst was hired in April 2014.

Sufficient professional staff resources are critical to ensure the CPC produces quality work products and meets its obligations in a timely way.

- **Relationships Matter—Give Them Attention**

The CPC was fortunate that the resources it had in 2013, while minimal, were adequate for it to meet product delivery deadlines which earned it credibility for completing quality work on time and for delivering recommendations informed by public input. However, as a newly organized group with a heavy workload and limited staff support, the CPC's bandwidth for building relations with key stakeholders was constrained during 2013. Neither Commissioners nor staff members met regularly during this period with the Mayor or the City Attorney or their representatives, the DOJ, the monitor or his team, or SPD leaders to discuss the role of the CPC, their shared priorities and concerns, or issues held in common.

While stakeholders may disagree fundamentally on some particulars, frequently consensus positions can be reached if regular communications are maintained and relationships

established. This allows parties to understand and consider different perspectives, and can provide clarity about expectations.

In early 2013, individual CPC members, if known at all by key stakeholders, were mostly known by reputation rather than directly. This lack of relationship, coupled with a failure to institute regular communications, caused problems.

Two flashpoints occurred in close order during 2013 that demonstrate why relationships matter.

First, the CPC chose in late August 2013 to review and make recommendations on the use of force policy even though it was not charged with doing so in the settlement. The CPC requested (and the court approved) time for the CPC to comment which postponed the monitor's filing of the final policy with the court.

Second, the Commission misunderstood the timeline it was under for submitting other policy recommendations to the monitor in advance of his filing these with the court. The original timeline placed the CPC at risk of failing to obtain timely community input prior to submitting its policy recommendations. As in the case with the use of force policy, while a time extension was granted to the CPC, all involved were unhappy with the friction, the delay and confusion.

Commissioners felt disrespected by these situations. They were concerned that the CPC had to "fight for everything" and believed, given the importance of use of force, that the CPC should have an opportunity to weigh in on that policy. The CPC also felt it was always "chasing and not catching the rabbit" due to unreasonable and arbitrary deadlines. In turn, the monitor, the DOJ and SPD and other City stakeholders felt the CPC "overreached" by getting involved with use of force, disrupted the schedule for getting SPD into compliance and failed to manage its affairs by not planning its community outreach to coincide properly with the filing timeline.

Such fraught situations are less likely to occur today because CPC staff and Commissioners have improved communications and built stronger relationships with the monitor and parties (and with other key stakeholders). Regular communications means many problems and issues that surface can be jointly attended to and with fewer misunderstandings—while inevitable differences in points of view may still arise.

With its permanent staffing complement, the CPC is now able to focus time and energy on maintaining critical relationships. The Executive Director meets regularly with a member of the Monitoring Team and the DOJ's representative, and with a Deputy Mayor and the Mayor's Public Safety staff for both high level and detailed discussions. The CPC co-chairs and the Executive Director also have regular scheduled meetings with the Chief of Police. Most important, staff communicates daily, and as needed, with these and other stakeholders, including Councilmembers and City attorneys on issues as they arise.

Individual Commissioners have also strengthened their relationships. Much of this has been a function of time and familiarity. After nearly two years, the players know each other better, they better understand each other's perspectives, and they recognize the value each brings as individuals and as representatives of critical groups working together to achieve police reform.

- **Be Outcome-Oriented and Pragmatic**

The CPC has been outcome-oriented in its work, focused on finding solutions to issues. It has collaborated with a wide range of parties, taken into account myriad interests and been respectful of differing perspectives. In the view of many stakeholders, the CPC's work products to-date demonstrate that it has balanced different interests well, compromising when necessary, in an effort to find common ground. In doing so, the CPC has demonstrated an understanding and appreciation of "all sides of the equation"—the need for police accountability, the need for public safety, the need to honor community values and the need to support police in meeting their responsibilities. This orientation is the primary basis of the CPC's current credibility and why the CPC's "stamp of approval" is increasingly sought.

This outcome and pragmatic orientation was particularly evident in the CPC's deliberations and conclusions about the accountability system. In this work, the CPC was methodical and deliberate in its review of many complex issues, including taking into account a host of past recommendations for reform. Extensive discussions were held over more than 5 months with key advisors, including the OPA Director, OPA Auditor, the Mayor's special advisor on police and Mayor's Office staff to understand different perspectives on the issues surfaced. While there were disagreements, all engaged in this review focused on the "big picture", were open to persuasion by their colleagues and sought consensus. In a number of instances, concessions were made—both by individual Commissioners and the CPC as a whole, and by those advising the CPC.

The CPC took the time necessary to fully explore all areas in accountability that needed review, it took the time necessary to fully consider competing views about how to address problems, and it took the time necessary to engage in substantive dialogue with its partners to largely achieve agreement. Its accountability system recommendations are extensive and sweeping and they have been broadly endorsed.

- **Critical Challenges**

Manage Expectations

The CPC has gained a reputation for credibility and integrity over the course of its first two years of work. The Mayor's fundamental support, as well as that of the City Council, of nearly all of the CPC's accountability recommendations, including the CPC's expanded and permanent role in police accountability shows it has gained respect among many of Seattle's elected officials.

The CPC has also benefited from greater stability in SPD. During a critical year, from May 2013 through June 2014, SPD was led by two interim chiefs and a rotating set of senior command staff and SPD staff assigned responsibility for follow through on activities under the settlement. As a result, it was often trying for the CPC to establish durable collaborative partnerships within SPD.

The new Chief of Police joined the department in July 2014, establishing more consistency in staff and making clear her commitment to not just the letter, but the spirit, of reforms required under the settlement. She has embraced the CPC, welcoming it as a partner in reform and is now turning to it for extensive advice and counsel on both topics under its current mandate and beyond the scope of its current responsibilities. The Chief has expressed a particular interest in collaborating with the CPC on the issue disparate impact and potential alternative approaches

and ways to deepen its connections to line officers that support the exchange of views and joint problem-solving. The latter effort is especially important to building trust and a sense of shared purpose between the community and the police.

In addition to the Chief, other SPD leaders and managers, as well as key police union leaders have expressed appreciation for the CPC's past work and have indicated that they look forward to ongoing collaboration with the Commission. It is clear that in Seattle, there is a sense of partnership—increasingly, there is a shared attitude that "we are in this together".

Finally, the relationships between the CPC, the monitor and the DOJ are also much stronger than before and evidence indicates that CPC is well regarded by community leaders who believe it has effectively sought out and fairly represented community concerns.

As a result of its track record thus far, there may be very high expectations for the CPC to deliver police reform on behalf of the community. But it is important to acknowledge its limited role.

While the CPC has and will continue contributing to improvements in SPD, it is primarily an advisory body, with a "dotted line" relationship to SPD (and to the Mayor and others in City government). The CPC cannot dictate, instead its members must rely on political connections and moral authority, the latter derived from a reputation for fairness and objectivity. The Commission must rely on these to influence the outcome of crucial policy and practice reforms it has recommended that must be ratified in police union labor negotiations and codified in new legislation. Its informal authority will continue to be required even as it assumes new and broader responsibilities for police accountability.

Finally, there is the hard truth that true police reform depends on a culture shift within SPD that it alone must drive. The DOJ, the monitor, the court, the CPC and others can't make this happen. Much depends on the Chief of Police and her actions, particularly in revamping the command staff, setting up systems to measure progress, providing ongoing training, setting expectations, and supporting employee excellence through an effective performance management system.

Maintain Diversity, Cohesion and Commitment

The Commission was originally appointed by a previous mayor, but the current mayor is now putting his stamp on the Commission. He has already filled three vacancies in 2014 and will soon appoint another three new Commissioners. The reasons for the turnover are varied, but the turnover highlights the need to maintain the full strength of the Commission. Delays in filling vacancies can be problematic—the CPC needs a balanced and full bench that supports occasional leadership rotation. New commissioners will also need to be oriented to the CPC's work, receiving useful background information so they can "hit the ground running".

While the CPC is broadly representative of Seattle's diversity, some are concerned that it may need to somewhat shift the cast of its membership, adding members who bring different skills, backgrounds and perspectives, especially given that the Commission's responsibilities will soon be expanded.

The turnover and new representation is an opportunity to gain expertise ideally suited to the CPC's work, but it also brings risks. The original set of Commissioners included knowledgeable

and highly committed individuals, willing to devote significant hours to demanding work. The CPC also enjoyed substantial cohesion following group values that emphasized the need for frank and open exchange of different views, and for compromise and consensus positions.

As the Commission changes over time, it is important that it continues to benefit from diverse members with a range of perspectives, needed skills and expertise and strong commitment to the work, all of whom support its group values and work together to agree on concrete suggestions for improvements to SPD.

Stay Focused, Nimble and Connected

The CPC is evolving from an advisory to a permanent oversight entity. Not only are its current mandated responsibilities shifting, it will assume new responsibilities soon, although in many ways these are simply an extension of its current duties. What is different is that increasingly the Commission will be the focal point for all police/community issues—so, regardless of the specific areas of its responsibility spelled out in City ordinance, the CPC will be where many turn to voice issues, ask for counsel and seek solutions on controversies or issues concerning the police.

All of these responsibilities and expectations represent significant challenges to the Commission to maintain focus, prevent burnout of volunteer members and staff and avoid "overreach".

There is a host of activities that the CPC is responsible for under its current mandate which could take up much of its time in 2015, including completing an initial assessment of SPD's community outreach activities, conducting community and police surveys, delving into disparate impact and evaluating mitigating alternatives, and managing a second extensive community outreach effort.

To successfully meet current obligations and assume new responsibilities, the Commission will need to set goals, make strategic choices, prioritize how it spends its time, and develop realistic work plans that are roadmaps to effectively doing more.

It is important that the CPC establish principles, set priorities and establish mechanisms for how it will engage in three key areas:

- ✓ The CPC needs to retain flexibility and be positioned to selectively respond to emerging issues or specific "hot button" events. For example, just recently the CPC decided to sponsor a public forum obtain community feedback on policy issues related to police use of body-worn cameras; it is also seeking community feedback on concerns about how SPD handled post-Ferguson protests in Seattle. Such issues will surface over time, and CPC involvement in many—like these—will be endorsed or requested by the Chief of Police or others who increasingly depend on the CPC to provide a ready channel to community views. Making the right choice to intervene or not engage may be challenging—how will the CPC decide an issue is so important it deserves attention, and also make sure that if it chooses to do so, it can still attend to other critical priorities and commitments?
- ✓ The CPC has a major role as the voice and conscience of the community, and in building bridges between the community and the police. It should foster police/community relationships and be able to articulate with some authority what the community really

values and cares about. A major community outreach effort every few years is invaluable, but it is infrequent and resource-intensive. The CPC needs to determine other ways to maintain more regular connections with both affected communities and the broader public, and with front line officers. One option may be in holding standing meetings with an advisory council of patrol officers to share insights on community and police concerns, but what other mechanisms should the CPC employ to support sustained dialogue, understanding and improved police/community relations?

- ✓ The CPC's new responsibilities as the civilian oversight body for police accountability are crucial. Success will depend on the CPC being clear about its priorities in this area and having systems, protocols and processes in place to address those priorities. Such priorities may include:
 - Supporting and monitoring the adoption of City policies and practices related to the police accountability system;
 - Setting up schedules and conducting regular reviews of relevant SPD policies to identify issues that recommend revisions to policy, practice and training;
 - Establishing a plan for review of OPA or other SPD data to identify patterns of problems that can be resolved with changes in policies or practices; and
 - Identifying areas of interest and scanning the experiences in other police departments, national trends and academic findings in order to highlight opportunities to improve SPD policies or practices.

SECTION 6 CONCLUSION

The CPC's early record in Seattle is positive. Depending on their unique circumstances, other cities that seek effective community involvement in police reform may find elements of the Seattle CPC model, its structure and experience, promising to consider for their own communities.

Much more work lies ahead—for Seattle's CPC and for other community members around the country who seek to achieve culture change in police departments and improvements in police practices that will be sustained over time.

In preparing for that continuing work, it is valuable to review the merits of the Seattle structure for community involvement under its settlement and MOU, the scope of the CPC's responsibilities, the manner in which the CPC has undertaken its responsibilities, its successes thus far, the lessons learned in its first two years and the challenges it faces.

The broad representation of interests on the CPC and its focus on partnering with SPD and other stakeholders demonstrate a commitment to inclusivity. There is an understanding that the issues are complex, and a host of different perspectives on them are valid. Many issues cannot be resolved easily, but there is increasingly a shared belief that "we are all in this together" and agreement that genuine collaboration is of value in surfacing important issues, identifying options and reaching consensus.

The CPC has gained credibility because it has sought to build a bridge between the police and community, and shared and honored the values and expectations of both. As its role expands, it will need to stay focused on addressing critical overarching policy and practice issues, find effective ways to build trust and further deepen its relations with line officers and with community members, and respond to emerging issues.

None of the CPC contributions to-date would have been possible without support by SPD, other stakeholders and community leaders. The CPC has also benefited from the financial support of Seattle's political leaders who have provided resources that underpin the work of an independent and productive Commission.

**APPENDIX I
CASE SUMMARY**

Department	Albuquerque Police Department (Population 556,495; US Census Bureau 2013) Settlement Agreement: November 2014
Source of Information	Settlement Agreement (SA) documentation Bill Slauson, Executive Director, Administrative Support Bureau, Albuquerque Police Department
Case Description	A pattern or practice of conduct related to excessive use of force, including against those who are mentally ill or in crisis.
Key Stakeholders	Chief of Police: Gordon Eden, Jr. (current) Monitor: None yet (to be named 1/14/15) Judge: Robert Brack, US District of New Mexico
Community Entity	Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) Community Policing Councils (Councils)
Community Mandate	Settlement Agreement
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	<u>CPOA</u> : About 9-12 with 9 City Council members each appointing 1 member and likely additional at-large and City administration representatives to be drawn from broad cross-section of city, with demonstrated commitment to impartial, transparent and objective adjudication. <u>Councils</u> : 6, with 1 for each area command, but members are all volunteers and not appointed. Settlement intended for representation by cross-section of community members and department officers, including representatives of social services providers and diverse neighborhoods; leaders in faith, business or academic communities; and youth. Members to possess qualifications necessary to perform duties, including completion of Citizens Police Academy.
Independence Budget/Staff	<u>CPOA</u> : Accountable to, but independent from Mayor, City Attorney's Office, City Council and department with own budget of \$800,000 - \$1.6 million, staffed by Executive Director, with authority to hire investigative staff, who works under direction of the CPOA. <u>Councils</u> : No independent budget or staff; minimum costs are absorbed by the department.
Responsibilities	<u>CPOA</u> : Review misconduct complaints, serious uses of force and officer-involved shootings (it will have subpoena power); and to review and recommend changes to accountability (e.g., complaint handling) and associated policies (e.g., use of force, crisis intervention, specialized units, supervision, training and discipline). Staff case findings and any recommended disciplinary actions are reviewed by the CPOA prior to being forwarded to the Chief who makes final decisions. It is responsible for implementing community outreach program to obtain public input. <u>Councils</u> : Facilitate regular communication and cooperation between department and community leaders, including collaboration on comprehensive community policing that identifies and implements strategies to address crime and safety issues. Councils will review and assess department community policing priorities and related strategies, materials, and training; review and assess concerns or recommendations about specific policing tactics and initiatives; advise the Chief on recruiting a qualified, diverse workforce; advise the Chief on ways to collect and publicly disseminate data and information, including department compliance with the SA; and inform and convey feedback from the community to the department on reform-related matters.
Meetings	<u>CPOA</u> : Regular, public meetings but the frequency for holding them has been set. <u>Councils</u> : At minimum, each must meet every six months but they are expected to meet monthly or quarterly.
Other	The department is to establish Community Outreach and Public Information program and to hold public meetings in each command area semi-annually to inform the public about settlement requirements, provide progress updates in meeting requirements and address community concerns.
Reports/Recommendations	<u>CPOA</u> : Semi-annual reports to City Council on complaint and incident statistics; policy changes recommended and implemented; trends or issues with use of force, policies or training; and its public outreach efforts. <u>Councils</u> : Annual public report of recommendations.

Department	Cincinnati Police Department (Population 297,517; US Census Bureau 2013) Memorandum of Agreement: April 2002 - April 2007 and Collaborative Agreement: April 2002 - August 2008
Source of Information	Memorandum of Agreement and Collaborative Agreement documentation S. Gregory Baker, former Cincinnati Police Department Compliance Coordinator, responsible for compliance with both agreements; current Executive Director, Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence Professor John Eck, University of Cincinnati and current CMAG member Lt. Colonel James Whalen, current Assistant Chief, Cincinnati Police Department, formerly responsible for compliance with both agreements
Case Description	A pattern or practice of conduct related to excessive use of force and associated management practices, including policies, training curriculum, supervisory procedures and the discipline system. The Collaborative Agreement (CA) was separate from the City's memorandum of agreement (MOA) with the DOJ. It was an innovative settlement of a separate and private racial profiling lawsuit with similar concerns. The CA's focus was to engage the police with community members as proactive partners in implementing problem-oriented policing, establishing the Citizen Complaint Authority and evaluating implementation of the agreement. The MOA terminated in 2007 when the City was judged in compliance with most provisions. To ensure requirements related to problem-oriented policing were in place, a CA transition period extended through August 2008.
Key Stakeholders	Chief of Police: Jeffrey Blackwell (current) Monitor: Saul A. Green Judge: Susan J. Dlott, US Southern District of Ohio
Community Entity	Community-Police Partnering Center, Urban League of Greater Southwestern Ohio (Partnering Center) and Friends of the Collaborative (FOTC) City Manager's Advisory Group or CMAG (current)
Community Mandate	Collaborative Agreement
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	The Partnering Center has a board of 15, including a police union representative; it solicited individuals to participate as FOTC which was not a formally organized body, but included a range of interested community members. CMAG members are appointed by the City Manager; there is no specific number of members, representation or designated terms. There are 15-20 individuals serving, including attorney representatives of the original plaintiffs, police union, department leaders, academics, and respected civic and community leaders. The federal judge still occasionally attends.
Independence Budget/Staff	The Partnering Center originally received \$1M/year for 5 years in private funds for CPOP work and some FOTC support. CMAG is chaired by the City Manager and is essentially a committee of that office. It has no separate budget or staff.
Responsibilities	The primary role of the Partnering Center and the FOTC was to support implementation of the CA, addressing police accountability and community problem-oriented policing (CPOP). This was achieved by structured engagement with a wide range of community members who provided input through surveys and other means to the department. The Partnering Center led the work of CPOP in partnership with the police department. The FOTC was a loosely organized community advisory group of Cincinnati individuals and organizational representatives that consulted on CPOP and CA implementation. This group engaged in dialogue with police representatives about problem-oriented policing practices; reviewed use of force statistics; and reviewed investigation statistics of the Citizen Complaint Authority (established with a citizen board under the CA). The FOTC was never intended to exclusively review or establish department policies. Subsequently, the CMAG has assumed responsibility for advising the City and police department more informally on general police issues of concern to the community.
Meetings	The FOTC did not meet regularly; CMAG previously met monthly, but it now meets @ 3 times per year.
Other	Extensive CA activities to support problem-oriented policing did not start until 2006. An assessment by academics in April 2014 urged a renewed commitment, including re-engaging the community in the effort, citing leadership turnover as a factor undermining its use in Cincinnati today. CMAG is currently struggling with the question: "What is our purpose?"
Reports/Recommendations	No community group has been responsible to exclusively review department policies or to prepare reports or make recommendations. The City Manager reported to the judge on advisory group activities during the period the CA was in effect.

Department	Detroit Police Department (Population 688,701; US Census Bureau 2013) Consent Judgments: June 2003
Source of Information	Consent Judgments documentation Chief Charles Reynolds, Police Performance Solutions
Case Description	A pattern or practice of conduct related to excessive use of force, false arrests, illegal detentions and unconstitutional conditions of confinement. Two consent judgments were issued, one associated with use of force and arrests and detentions, the other with conditions of confinement. Now in transition to closure.
Key Stakeholders	Chief of Police: James E. Craig (current) Monitor: Robert Warshaw, Police Performance Solutions (appointed in 2009) Judge: Julian Abele Cook, Jr., US Eastern District of Michigan (until spring 2014) Judge: Avern Cohn, US Eastern District of Michigan (assigned just prior to the DOJ moving to dismiss)
Community Entity	None
Community Mandate	N/A
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	N/A
Independence Budget/Staff	N/A
Responsibilities	N/A
Meetings	N/A
Other	The focus was exclusively on internal department corrections with no provision for community involvement. Since the transition agreement, there has been an effort to involve community with two town halls held with groups of advocates and plans to hold more community meetings.
Reports/Recommendations	N/A

Department	Los Angeles Police Department (Population 3,884,307; US Census Bureau 2013) Consent Decree, June 2001 - July 2009
Source of Information	Consent decree documentation Gerald Chaleff, former Special Assistant for Constitutional Policing, Los Angeles Police Department
Case Description	A pattern or practice of conduct related to excessive use of force, illegal stops and management failure to establish checks against possible corruption. A transition agreement was in place as of July 2009.
Key Stakeholders	Chief of Police: Charlie Beck (current) Monitor: Michael Cherkasky Judge: Garry Feess, US Central District of California
Community Entity	N/A
Community Mandate	N/A
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	N/A
Independence Budget/Staff	N/A
Responsibilities	N/A
Meetings	N/A
Other	The department was charged with conducting a Community Outreach and Public Information program in its 18 geographic areas to inform the public about settlement provisions, how to file complaints, and present other department information. It was to hold one public meeting each quarter in each of its geographic areas during the first year of the settlement and annually thereafter and to continue to meet with its community advisory groups in each of those geographic areas. The department was also to establish a media advisory working group to facilitate disseminating information to Los Angeles residents of multiple ethnicities and cultures.
Reports/Recommendations	N/A

Department	Maricopa County Sheriff's Department, Melendres v. Arpaio (Population 4,009,412; US Census Bureau 2013) Court Order, October 2013
Source of Information	Court Order documentation
Description	The court order originated from a private lawsuit claiming the department engages in racial profiling of Latinos and unlawfully stops, detains and arrests Latinos.
Key Stakeholders	Sheriff: Joe Arpaio Monitor: Robert Warshaw, Warshaw and Associates Judge: G. Murray Snow, US District of Arizona
Community Entity	Community Advisory Board (CAB)
Community Mandate	Court order
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	The department was to select 3 and plaintiff representatives were to select 3 CAB members. None were to be department employees or associated with the case. There were no terms identified and no specifics provided on CAB member representation.
Independence Budget/Staff	There is no independent budget or staff.
Responsibilities	The CAB was established to facilitate regular dialogue between the department and community leaders, provide specific recommendations about policies and practices to increase community trust, and ensure provisions of court orders are met. During its meetings, the CAB receives information from department representatives responsible for implementation on matters pertaining to compliance with the order and gathers and relays community concerns about department practices related to the order. CAB meetings are coordinated by a Community Liaison Officer who provides it with administrative support; the meetings are held in space provided by the department.
Meetings	At regular intervals of no more than four months
Other	The department was to establish a Community Outreach and Public Information program and to hold annual public meetings, organized by a Community Liaison Officer, in each patrol district to inform community members of policy changes or other significant actions taken by the department to implement the order. These meetings are also an opportunity for department representatives to listen to community members' experiences and concerns about its practices, and there is an expectation that the department will make reasonable efforts to address such concerns. The Community Liaison Officer is routinely available to community members and is responsible for compiling complaints, concerns and suggestions from the public, responding to complainant concerns, and communicating public concerns at regular meetings with the Monitor and department leaders and in semi-annual written reports.
Reports/Recommendations	N/A

Department	New Orleans Police Department (Population 378,715; US Census Bureau 2013) Consent Decree, January 2013
Source of Information	Consent Decree and Police Community Advisory Board documentation Danny Murphy, Compliance Manager for Police Community Advisory Boards and New Orleans Police Department community engagement
Case Description	A pattern and practice of conduct related to excessive use of force, illegal stops, searches, arrests and discriminatory policing.
Key Stakeholders	Police Superintendent: Michael S. Harrison (current) Monitor: Jonathan Aronie Judge: Susie Morgan, US Eastern District of Louisiana
Community Entity	Police Community Advisory Boards (PCABs)
Community Mandate	Consent Decree acknowledges PCABs were established in 2011 and details areas of PCAB responsibility under the agreement.
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	There are 8 district-based PCABs, each with 7 community volunteer members and an assigned department Community Coordinating Sergeant (CoCo). No specific representation cited, although PCAB members are to reside in the district they serve. Appointments are for 2 years, subject to a single re-appointment for a total of 4 years under staggered terms. PCABs recommend appointees who are reviewed by department district staff and by the Office of Neighborhood Engagement, with the Superintendent of Police making the final decision on appointment.
Independence Budget/Staff	PCABs are supported by the staff and resources of the Office of Neighborhood Engagement and by the department.
Responsibilities	Department and community representatives acted jointly to create PCABs to facilitate regular communication and cooperation among department, City, and community leaders, including youth leaders. The department works collaboratively with PCABs to develop and implement public safety strategies that respect and reflect each community's public safety priorities and concerns about particular police tactics. The Department seeks PCABs' counsel to build community consensus on recommendations on community policing strategies, including special task forces and required resources, to meet community priorities; policy changes to improve quality of life; police accountability standards; workforce diversity strategies; and effective ways to share data and information with district residents, including about compliance with the agreement. PCABs are expected to inform and convey feedback from the community on police issues and concerns.
Meetings	PCABs meet quarterly and command/executive level staff attend the meetings. The Deputy Superintendent of Field Operations and/or the Superintendent of Police meets annually in separate meetings with PCAB leadership and with the full PCAB membership.
Other	The department is to establish Community Outreach and Public Information program and to hold public meetings in each district annually to inform the public about settlement requirements, provide progress updates in meeting requirements and address community concerns. A community-based restorative justice project is tied to the City's Community/Police Mediation Project, the status of which is unknown.
Reports/Recommendations	PCABs vote to forward recommendations to department districts for action. District commanders are to provide a written response within 20 days and cite approval, denial, need for more information, or referral to headquarters for consideration. Headquarters is expected to respond within 45-60 days to recommendations sent to it.

Department	New York Police Department, Floyd v. New York (Population 8,405,837; US Census Bureau 2013) Remedial Orders: August 2013 (original) and July 2014 (revised)
Source of Information	Remedial Order documentation
Description	The court order originated from a private lawsuit claiming unconstitutional stop and frisk practices by the department that unfairly target certain groups.
Key Stakeholders	Police Commissioner: William J. Bratton (current) Monitor: Peter Zimroth Facilitator: Nicholas Turner, Vera Institute Judge: Shira Scheindlin, US Southern District of New York (August 2013) Judge: Analisa Torres, US Southern District of New York (July 2014)
Community Entity	None
Community Mandate	N/A
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	N/A
Independence Budget/Staff	N/A
Responsibilities	N/A
Meetings	N/A
Other	The community's role under this court order is unclear. The facilitator will work with the parties and other stakeholders to develop a set of permanent reforms and, in advance and as part of this work, will convene town hall meetings in each borough to provide a forum for community stakeholders to be heard. The facilitator will consult with interested groups in setting agenda for those meetings. Other than that, the court order is unspecific with respect to the community component, but it does state that community input is vital to ensure reforms are perceived as legitimate. In stating that input from those most affected will be at the center of the process of developing permanent reforms, it also suggests that both the Cincinnati Collaborative and models for community involvement in other subsequent DOJ cases might be employed in New York.
Reports/Recommendations	N/A

Department	Oakland Police Department (Population 406,253; US Census Bureau 2013) Settlement Agreement: February 2004
Source of Information	Settlement Agreement documentation Joyce Hicks, Executive Director, San Francisco Office of Citizen Complaints and formerly with Oakland Citizen's Police Review Board Chief Charles Reynolds, Police Performance Solutions
Case Description	The agreement settled the private "Riders" lawsuit that claimed violations of plaintiffs' constitutional rights by defendant officers and that claimed department indifference or negligence concerning the behavior of these officers, and also general indifference or negligence in the hiring, training, supervision and discipline of all department officers which contributed to a pattern and practice of unconstitutional policing.
Key Stakeholders	Chief of Police: Sean Whent (current) Monitor: Robert Warshaw, Police Performance Solutions (2010-2014) Judge: Thelton E. Henderson, US Northern District of California
Community Entity	None
Community Mandate	N/A
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	N/A
Independence Budget/Staff	N/A
Responsibilities	N/A
Meetings	N/A
Other	The department was charged with developing and implementing a plan to strengthen its relationships with local communities which involved hosting community meetings, developing mechanisms to measure its community policing and problem-solving activities, and reporting at "Crime-Stop" meetings statistics on community policing and problem-solving activities, citizen complaints and use of force. The department was responsible for hosting a community meeting each quarter in each of its service areas, attended by precinct supervisors and officers. The department was also responsible for meeting with any organization or community group expressing concerns about specific police personnel or practices.
Reports/Recommendations	N/A

Department	Pittsburgh Police Department (Population 305,841; US Census Bureau 2013) Consent Decree: April 1997 - June 2005
Source of Information	Consent Decree documentation
Case Description	A pattern and practice of conduct related to excessive use of force.
Key Stakeholders	Chief of Police: Regina McDonald (current acting) Monitor: James Ginger Judge: Robert J. Cindrich, US Western District of Pennsylvania
Community Entity	None
Community Mandate	N/A
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	N/A
Independence Budget/Staff	N/A
Responsibilities	N/A
Meetings	N/A
Other	The consent decree recognizes that department representatives attend community group meetings, and expects the department to continue to make every effort to participate in these meetings, including those organized by or oriented towards minorities. The Office of Municipal Investigations will continue to use television to inform the public about its function and its representatives will continue to attend community meetings to increase public awareness of it. The City will continue to publish and distribute at various places throughout the city pamphlets describing the complaint process.
Reports/Recommendations	N/A

Department	Portland Police Bureau (Population 609,456; US Census Bureau 2013) Settlement Agreement: August 2014
Source of Information	Settlement Agreement documentation Mary Claire Buckley, staff member, DOJ Compliance Team, Portland Police Bureau
Case Description	A pattern or practice of conduct related to unnecessary or unreasonable force during interactions with people who have or are perceived to have mental illness.
Key Stakeholders	Chief of Police: Larry O'Dea (current) Monitor: None (see COCL role below) Compliance Officer/Community Liaison (COCL): Dennis Rosenbaum & team including Oregon Chief Justice DeMuniz who will chair COAB meetings Judge: Michael Simon, US District of Oregon
Community Entity	Community Oversight Advisory Board (COAB)
Community Mandate	Settlement Agreement
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	The COAB has 15 voting members and 5 sworn officer advisory (non-voting) members selected by the Chief of Police. One member is selected by each member of the City Council for a total of 5; a Human Rights Commissioner is appointed by the Chair of the Human Rights Commission; a Commissioner on Disability is appointed by the Chair of the Portland Commission on Disability; 3 mental health community representatives with expertise in the field are appointed jointly by the Chairs of the Human Rights Commission and the Disability Commission; and 5 community representatives are selected by through a public application and screening process. Members are appointed for two year terms, and may be reappointed for one year. The COAB is to come from a reasonably broad spectrum of the community, such as: areas of expertise, advocacy experience, community involvement, profession, education, race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, national origin, religion, mental or physical disability and geographic identification.
Independence Budget/Staff	The 15 voting members are independent of the City and the department and may not be currently employed by the City. The COAB reports to and is chaired by the COCL. The COCL may remove members for misconduct after consulting with the DOJ. The City provides administrative support to the COAB and it has no separate budget or staff resources at this point in time.
Responsibilities	The COAB has a broad mandate to assess the settlement implementation; make recommendations "on other actions"; advise on improving police-community relations; inform and receive input from the community on matters related to the settlement; and contribute to the development and implementation of a Community Engagement and Outreach Plan (CEO Plan). The COAB is to provide input to the CEO Plan by consulting with community members and the Human Rights Commission about the department's outreach activities, holding several public hearings about those activities, reviewing the results of a department community outreach survey, and assessing the department's prior outreach efforts. It may also provide additional related information on problem-oriented policing principles, policies and associated resource deployment; factors affecting workforce diversity; and the police accountability system. The COAB's recommendations to the department are to be used by the department in developing its final CEO Plan which the COAB is to approve within 8 months of the agreement. The COAB is to participate with the COCL, the department and the DOJ in developing metrics to evaluate outreach activities.
Meetings	COAB is to be convened by the COCL 4 times a year, but may meet as often as monthly. It is required to meet at least twice yearly with the Chief of Police, the Police Commissioner, precinct commanders, neighborhood response teams and a representative of the Office of Neighborhood Involvement in Crime Prevention to comment on department community outreach, engagement and problem-solving policing activities.
Other	The department will meet each year with the City Council and with each precinct area to present an annual report on its problem-solving and community policing activities which will also inform the public about its policies and their rights and responsibilities related to bias-free policing, stops and detentions, and use of force.
Reports/Recommendations	Reports and recommendations are expected, particularly related to elements associated with the CEO Plan.

Department	Prince George's County (Population 890,081; US Census Bureau 2013) Memorandum of Agreement and Consent Decree: January 2004 - January 2009
Source of Information	Memorandum of Agreement and Consent Decree documents Chief Charles Reynolds, Police Performance Solutions and former member of the monitoring team
Case Description	A pattern or practice of conduct related to excessive force initially by canine section officers and subsequently throughout the department. The memorandum of agreement concerns the issue throughout the department and the consent decree concerns the canine unit.
Key Stakeholders	Chief of Police: Mark Magaw (current) Monitor: Eduardo Gonzalez, The Alexandria Group of MPRI Judge: Roger W. Titus, US District of Maryland
Community Entity	None
Community Mandate	N/A
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	N/A
Independence Budget/Staff	N/A
Responsibilities	There is no provision for community involvement. The only reference in the material is to the department's continuing programs to inform persons they may file complaints regarding officer performance and making complaint forms and informational materials available to the public.
Meetings	N/A
Other	N/A

Department	Riverside Police Department (Population 316,619; US Census Bureau 2013) Stipulated Judgment: March 2001
Source of Information	Stipulated Judgment document Police Review Commission website materials Jose Gomez, Senior Vice-President, California State University who wrote Ph.D. dissertation on the Riverside case
Case Description	Management dysfunction caused breakdown in accountability and undue tolerance of biased language and behavior, and inadequate supervision, training and misconduct investigations. The lawsuit was filed by the California attorney general.
Key Stakeholders	Chief of Police: Sergio Diaz (current) Monitor: Joe Brann Judge: Victor Miceli, California Superior Court
Community Entity	None
Community Mandate	N/A
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	N/A
Independence Budget/Staff	N/A
Responsibilities	N/A
Meetings	N/A
Other	The City established a Community Police Review Commission in 2000 prior to the judgment in an effort to demonstrate its commitment to undertaking reform on its own. The Commission independently reviews complaint investigations, recommends changes in department policy, and conducts ongoing public outreach. There are 9 Commissioners (at least one from each City ward) appointed to four-year terms by the City Council. It is staffed by a manager and an administrative assistant and has a budget of \$300,994 (FY 2013-2014).

Department	Seattle Police Department (Population 652,405; US Census Bureau 2013) Settlement Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding: July 2012
Source of Information	Settlement Agreement, Memorandum of Understanding, and City Ordinance documents Interviews with selected stakeholders - see Appendix II
Case Description	A pattern or practice of conduct related to excessive force and serious concerns about biased policing.
Key Stakeholders	Chief of Police: Kathleen O'Toole (current) Monitor: Merrick Bobb Judge: James L. Robart, US Western District of Washington
Community Entity	Community Police Commission
Community Mandate	Settlement Agreement, Memorandum of Understanding, City Ordinance
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	15 members, broadly representative of the diversity of city residents, drawn from different racial and ethnic groups, and from the LGBT, youth, faith, and business communities. Some represent or are knowledgeable of the issues of those who are homeless or who have mental illness and substance abuse disorders. There is one representative from each of two police unions. Members are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council with terms through the duration of the settlement.
Independence Budget/Staff	\$862,000 annual budget, with 3.0 professional FTE (Executive Director, Policy Analyst, Administrative Support staff) and resources for consultants.
Responsibilities	The CPC was charged under the settlement with making recommendations concerning the department's bias-free policing and stops and detentions policies and practices, and with recommending structural changes to the department's accountability system. The CPC was also charged with making recommendations for changes to the department's bias-free policing and stops and detentions training, as well as with contributing to the department's updated training curriculum for its revised bias-free policing policy. It was also charged with assessing the department's community outreach activities and identifying strategies for improvements. The CPC was also charged with reviewing the department's plans for investigatory stops data collection and reporting and making recommendations on any changes to the data to be collected or procedures for retention, reporting or analysis of the data. In coordination with the CPC, the department is charged with developing and implementing a program to educate the public on how to make misconduct complaints and with revising, as necessary, its public disclosure policies and practices to support transparency. The CPC is also to review and report generally on the status of reform initiatives and the settlement implementation and is responsible for regular engagement with community members to keep them informed and to gather their input on the reform process.
Meetings	Full commission meets twice monthly and standing workgroups also meet twice monthly.
Other	N/A
Reports/Recommendations	Reports and recommendations associated with mandated areas of responsibility, some at intervals dictated by timelines set by the monitor.

Department	Suffolk County Police Department (Population 1,499,738; US Census Bureau 2013) Settlement Agreement: January 2014
Source of Information	Settlement Agreement document Sgt. Christopher Love, Compliance Manager, Suffolk County Police Department
Case Description	Discriminatory policing, discouraging the Latino community from filing complaints and cooperating with police, and failure to investigate crimes and hate-crime incidents involving Latinos. The agreement is between the DOJ, County and department and it is not overseen by a court.
Key Stakeholders	Police Commissioner: Edward Webber (current) Monitor: None Court: None
Community Entity	N/A
Community Mandate	N/A
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	N/A
Independence Budget/Staff	N/A
Responsibilities	N/A
Meetings	N/A
Other	The settlement provides for establishing a process for consulting with Latino community representatives to develop and annually assess, and make improvements to the department's Language Access Plan/Policy (including provisions for collaboration to ensure the policy is effective, to ensure accurate and high quality language assistance services, and to ensure concerns are shared, and ideas and strategies for language access are considered). The structure and arrangements for this consultation remain informal. The Latino Advisory Committee which has been convened to provide input includes about 12 self-selected participants from specific organizations (ACLU and Latino Justice), as well as others from churches, social service agencies and various geographic areas of the county. The Language Access Plan/Policy is in place with the DOJ's approval and was established without prior community input. The Community Response Bureau is charged with developing a plan for engaging the Latino community, obtaining feedback from Latino leaders quarterly on department programs, and annually reporting on issues raised and how the department addresses them. This plan has not yet been implemented. The department has been conducting an ongoing online community survey on general perspectives about the police and language access with more than 1,000 surveys completed) which is providing useful community input. The department holds monthly meetings of community members with Community Liaison Officers assigned to each precinct, and attended by senior command staff and precinct representatives. Community Liaison Officers are routinely available to community members and meet at least every six months with bureau commanders to share community concerns or issues raised in the previous period. The Police Commissioner or designee also is meeting quarterly with Latino and other minority group leaders.
Reports/Recommendations	N/A

Department	Washington, District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department (Population 646,449; US Census Bureau 2013) Memorandum of Agreement: June 2001 - November 2007
Source of Information	Memorandum of Agreement documentation
Case Description	A pattern or practice of conduct related to excessive use of force.
Key Stakeholders	Chief of Police: Cathy Lanier (current) Monitor: Michael Bromwich Court: N/A (not a court-enforced agreement)
Community Entity	None
Community Mandate	N/A
Number/Appointment/Term Representation	N/A
Independence Budget/Staff	N/A
Responsibilities	N/A
Meetings	N/A
Other	The focus was exclusively on internal department corrections with no provision for community involvement.
Reports/Recommendations	N/A

**APPENDIX II
SEATTLE INTERVIEWS**

Pamela Banks	Executive Director, Urban League
Anne Bettesworth	Policy Analyst, Seattle Community Police Commission
Merrick Bobb	Federal Monitor
John Brooks	Training Section, Seattle Police Department
Tim Burgess	President, Seattle City Council
Puneet Cheema	US Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division
Lisa Daugaard	Co-Chair, Seattle Community Police Commission
Adrian Diaz	Community Outreach, Seattle Police Department
J. Michael Diaz	US Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division
Michael Edwards	President, Seattle Police Management Association
Sahar Fathi	Policy Analyst, Office of Immigrant and Refugee Affairs
Melinda Giovengo	Member, Seattle Community Police Commission
Virginia Gleason	Chief Strategic Advisor, Seattle Police Department
Enrique Gonzalez	Member, Seattle Community Police Commission
Jay Hollingsworth	Member, Seattle Community Police Commission
Kate Joncas	Deputy Mayor (previously a member of Seattle Community Police Commission)
David Keenan	Member, Seattle Community Police Commission
Brendan Kolding	Audit, Policy and Review, Seattle Police Department
Anne Levinson	Auditor, Office of Professional Accountability
Fé Lopez	Executive Director, Seattle Community Police Commission
Pierce Murphy	Director, Office of Professional Accountability
Tim Mygatt	US Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division
Kathleen O'Toole	Chief, Seattle Police Department
Stephanie Roth	Deputy Director, Office of Professional Accountability
Jennifer Shaw	Member, Seattle Community Police Commission
Ron Smith	President, Seattle Police Officers Guild
Rich Stolz	Executive Director, One America
Kevin Stuckey	Member, Seattle Community Police Commission
Harriett Walden	Member, Seattle Community Police Commission
Martin Welte	Training Section, Seattle Police Department