

Office of Professional Accountability Review Board (OPARB) Minutes of Wednesday, February 4, 2009 Meeting 11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.

| Patrick Sainsbury, Chair: | Р | Steve Freng, Member: | Ρ |
|---------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|---|
| Tina Bueche, Vice Chair | Р | Martha Norberg, Member: | Р |
| George Davenport, Member | : A | David Wilma, Member: | Ρ |
| Sharon Dear, Member: | Р | Michael Pendleton, Consultant: | Р |
| Nancy Roberts, Staff | Р | | |

(Absent = A, Present = P, E = Excused, U = Unexcused, * = Present by Phone)

Guest(s): Kathryn Olson, OPA; Jeff Ball, Seattle University Student

Old Business/Administrative:

The meeting was convened at 11:30 a.m.

The January 7 and January 15 minutes were approved with amendments.

Kathryn Olson discussed reporting requirements. The ordinance expects each of the three OPA-related entities to release at least two reports per year. It does not dictate whether they are joint reports, and it does not require that the reports be issued at the same time. While not always successful, the OPA Director and Auditor attempt to coordinate the timing of the release of their reports. The OPA is now working on a statistical report to be released by late February/early March. They will provide copies to the Mayor and Council, and will post the report on their website. These reports are usually presented at a Public Safety Committee. Later this year OPA plans to report on SPD policies, outlining recommendations OPA has made regarding training and other policies and practices.

There was discussion about types of reports – subject matter, timing, and discrete reports from each entity vs. blended/joint reports. The ordinance discusses subject areas, such as the work of the OPA, case processing, and national trends; otherwise the scope is pretty broad. Michael advised that if any of the entities issues a report, the other entities should be ready with their opinions or comments, because you most likely will be asked.

There was discussion of the Board's purpose and focus – the term "review board" (and "auditor", as well) are misleading. However, the term does allow a great deal of flexibility in choosing an approach or approaches.

The Board decided that they would issue a status report in March, recapping their first six months. Pat will draft the report for comment by the entire Board.

The board voted to adopt the bylaws, replacing the current policy and procedure.

Tina expressed interest in the notes from the last meeting, where Jennifer Shaw of the ACLU discussed that group's interest in the subject of SPD allocation of resources. Pat asked that if anyone has ideas for OPARB, OPA, or the OPA Auditor to review, particularly the Auditor's areas of emphasis for 2009, to please email them to Nancy and Pat, so we have them for discussion at the March 4 meeting.

Report on the visit to the North Precinct Advisory Council – Those members attending were impressed by what a large, active, well represented group this was. They asked great questions – they expressed concern that oversight not impede SPD officers, but also expressed that they wanted OPARB to maintain balance in their view of SPD.

Office of Professional Accountability Review Board (OPARB)

Contact list – there was a discussion of how to keep the list manageable, how to make it representative, and how to limit their focus. Tina will check with Maggie Olson to see if the Asian groups are adequately represented by the SPD Asian Advisory Council; otherwise, there are almost twenty various Asian groups. The first approach to the SPD Advisory Groups will be made through the SPD Citywide Advisory Council. Tina and Nancy will coordinate this with Maggie Olson.

The group narrowed the group down to about 11 "Number 1" groups, and the rest are "number 2". Letters will be sent out to each group by the end of the week.

The group adjourned at 1:30 pm.

Notes taken by Nancy Roberts

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, February 19 from 6 - 8 pm in the Boards & Commissions Room, City Hall.