Seattle Office of Police Accountability

Closed Case Summary

Case Number: 2025OPA-0328

Issued Date: January 23, 2026

From: Deputy Director Nelson R. Leese (on behalf of Director Bonnie J. Glenn) [1]
Office of Police Accountability

Case Number: 2025OPA-0328

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1:** 5.100 – Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities, III. Patrol Sergeant
   Finding: Not Sustained - Training Referral

This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections may be written in the first person.

Executive Summary:

The Complainant, an SPD lieutenant, alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1), an SPD sergeant, was unavailable and unresponsive to radio or phone communications for several hours while assigned as a field supervisor.

Administrative Note:

On January 9, 2025, Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

On August 20, 2025, the Complainant submitted an OPA complaint via Blue Team, describing the following account. Around 8:50 AM, an acting sergeant notified the Complainant that during first watch, NE#1 had been "unreachable for duty-related matters" and "unavailable and unresponsive to radio or phone communications for an extended period while assigned as a field supervisor." Specifically, NE#1 was logged into computer-aided dispatch (CAD) as being on a meal break but remained unavailable for about two hours despite repeated attempts to contact him. As a result of NE#1's absence, the acting sergeant assumed additional supervisory duties. NE#1 explained to the

Complainant that he was on a wellness hour—a program requiring personnel to be reachable. The Complainant noted that NE#1 had been managing personal family issues and had previously received coaching and mentoring for his performance.

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the CAD call report, performance appraisal system (PAS) entries, wellness hour guidelines, phone and text logs, and West Precinct radio recording. OPA also interviewed NE#1.

On August 20, 2025, a CAD call report indicated that NE#1 logged to a 30-minute meal break at 6:10 AM. During this meal break, CAD marks the employee as "not available" and does not automatically reinstate the employee to service after the 30-minute period, meaning dispatch must be notified when the employee is ready to return to service.

PAS entries regarding NE#1 indicated he had been counseled by supervisors multiple times for issues such as submitting late, incomplete reports, failing to appear for shifts on time without explanation, and sleeping on duty.

OPA reviewed the guidelines the Complainant wrote concerning a pilot "wellness hour" program he implemented. The guidelines provided that officers are permitted to use a wellness hour "as they see fit for their well-being," including working out, cooking, reading, or napping. Hours are divided into four blocks and end at 9:15 AM due to the watch becoming busier. Officers may temporarily log off to avoid being dispatched to a nonpriority call, provided they keep their equipment readily accessible to respond to an emergency. Among other requirements, the officers must not disappear completely, inform someone of their location, keep their radio and cellphone with them so they can be contacted at any moment, refrain from exceeding their allotted time, and be available for service immediately following their wellness hour.

On December 10, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#1. NE#1 said he was logged into dispatch as being on a meal break but forgot to log out of it. NE#1 said he informed a sergeant that he was going to use his wellness hour. NE#1 said he was unable to recall receiving any phone calls but recalled radio requesting a call, so he called radio at around 8 AM. NE#1 confirmed that he was required to keep his phone and radio with him during his wellness hour in case someone needed to contact him. However, NE#1 said he was unaware of anyone attempting to contact him until the Complainant texted him around 8:55 AM requesting a meeting. NE#1 said he was in the West Precinct's parking garage when he received the Complainant's text. NE#1 maintained that no one had attempted to contact him before this text, either by phone or radio. NE#1 said he had no missed calls or texts from any officer and maintained that he was monitoring the radio.

OPA reviewed both a West Precinct radio recording and NE#1's work cell phone records. Both corroborated NE#1's recollection of events. A West Precinct radio recording for August 20, 2025, indicated that when a dispatcher requested a call from a sergeant, NE#1 responded about four

seconds later, saying he would do so. NE#1's work cell phone records corroborated this. NE#1's work cell phone records did not show any missed calls for the relevant time period.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1
5.100 – Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities, III. Patrol Sergeant

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was unavailable and unresponsive to radio or phone communications for several hours while assigned as a field supervisor.

A patrol sergeant is responsible for directly supervising police officers. SPD Policy 5.100(III)(A). A patrol sergeant is also responsible for field supervision, which includes, among other requirements, remaining in the field for a majority of the shift or advising radio when leaving or returning to the sergeant's sector. *Id.*

There was no evidence that NE#1 was unreachable, unavailable, or unresponsive to radio or phone communications during the specified period. NE#1's phone records and the West Precinct radio recording reflected the opposite—NE#1 was available and responsive to communications during NE#1's wellness hour. NE#1's phone records did not reflect any missed phone calls during the relevant timeframe. Moreover, when a dispatcher requested a call from a sergeant, NE#1 promptly replied that he would call. NE#1's phone call was corroborated by his phone records, which reflected a call being placed at around 7:56 AM. OPA reviewed NE#1's CAD records, which did not show any messages to his mobile data terminal (MDT) during the relevant time frame.

Other officers may have been looking for NE#1 during this time. OPA also acknowledges the possibility that other officers may have tried to reach NE#1 by personal cell or text message. But OPA cannot find NE#1 violated the either SPD Policy 5.100(III)(A) or the "Wellness Hour" pilot program guidelines given the lack of any unanswered attempts to reach him by radio, calls to his issued work phone, or MDT. NE#1 timely answered the only official communication he appears to have received.

However, NE#1's apparent unavailability may have stemmed from his failure to relog himself into CAD after his 30-minute meal break—an oversight he acknowledged. This would have marked him as unavailable for service calls, even if the evidence showed he was ultimately responsive when specifically called. Also, taken consecutively with his "wellness hour," this created a significant period of time where NE#1 was physically in his vehicle in the garage and not "directly supervising police officers." The first requirement in listed for the "wellness hour" pilot program read: "Do not disappear completely, someone (preferably a supervisor) must know where they are at and be able to find them without difficulty. Officers are expected to request the wellness hour with a supervisor before taking it." NE#1 stated he informed another sergeant—a supervisor the same rank as himself—of his whereabouts. But the spirit of the policy, written to a non-supervisory "officer,"

appears to have been that NE#1 would "request" to take the wellness hour from his supervisor. OPA recommends NE#1 should undergo retraining and counseling on the importance of relogging himself into CAD after his meal breaks and, given his supervisory position, the importance of his team and supervisor knowing how to reach him during working hours.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Training Referral.

- **Required Training:** NE#1's chain of command should discuss OPA's findings with him, review SPD Policy 5.100(III)(A) with him, and provide retraining and counseling on the importance of relogging himself into CAD after his meal breaks and the importance of his team and supervisor knowing how to reach him during working hours. NE#1's chain of command should provide any other retraining and counseling it deems necessary. Any retraining and counseling should be documented and maintained in Blue Team.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Training Referral**

Footnote 1. The OPA Director may designate a civilian OPA Deputy Director to "perform such duties and have such powers as the OPA Director may prescribe and delegate." Seattle Ordinance 125315, Council Bill 118969, subchapter I, section 3.29.100(B).