



## OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Closed Case Summary

**Complaint Number: 14-IS-0101**

**Issued Date: 02/11/2015**

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (IV.E) Standards & Duties – Communication & Confidentiality (Policy was issued prior to 7/16/14)
OPA Finding	<b><u>Not Sustained</u></b> (Lawful & Proper)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (VI.A.1) Standards & Duties – Conflicts of Interest (Policy was issued prior to 7/16/14)
OPA Finding	<b><u>Not Sustained</u></b> (Unfounded)
Allegation #3	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (VI.A.3) Standards & Duties – Misuse of Authority (Policy was issued prior to 7/16/14)
OPA Finding	<b><u>Not Sustained</u></b> (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

#### **INCIDENT SYNOPSIS**

The named employee, a command-level SPD employee, has been involved with a not for profit corporation (non-profit) that benefits all SPD employees by providing supportive services in times of crisis. Contact was made with a variety of SPD employees both in-person and by broadly distributed email messages. These contacts had the purpose of informing SPD employees about the work of the non-profit and asking them to consider making or increasing their donation.

#### **COMPLAINT**

On February 24, 2014, OPA received an unsigned and undated complaint regarding the named employee's communication with SPD employees on behalf of the non-profit corporation. The

complainant alleged that the named employee improperly solicited donations from SPD employees, in-person, by e-mail and appearances at roll calls, and that the named employee's rank was intimidating and inappropriate.

## **INVESTIGATION**

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint letter
2. Review of email messages sent by the named employee seeking funding
3. Phone interview with the Executive Director of the Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission
4. In-person interview of the named employee
5. Written questions and answers from the employee's Chain of Command

## **ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION**

Based on the past practice of SPD regarding supporting non-profit corporations that directly benefit SPD employees, combined with the wording of the emails sent by the named employee, there is no basis to believe that said correspondence was other than lawful, appropriate and professional. These emails and visits to roll calls are very similar to the sort of communications employers routinely permit for United Way campaigns and related employer-endorsed charities.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Named Employee #1**

**Allegation #1:** The evidence supported a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful & Proper) for *Communication and Confidentiality*.

**Allegation #2:** The weight of the evidence showed that the named employee derived no unique personal benefit or advantage from his activities related to the involvement with the not for profit corporation and supported a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) for *Conflicts of Interest*.

**Allegation #3:** The evidence to support this allegation showed that the named employee did not expect or receive any personal gain and supported a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) for *Misuse of Authority*.

*NOTE: The Seattle Police Department Manual policies cited for the allegation(s) made for this OPA Investigation are policies that were in effect during the time of the incident. The issued date of the policy is listed.*