

# Seattle Community Police Commission

SENT VIA EMAIL

November 23, 2021

## **Request for information regarding complaint by former OIG employee**

Inspector General Lisa Judge,

During the October 20, 2021, Community Police Commission (CPC) meeting, commissioners expressed interest in formally asking for information regarding a complaint made by a former Office of Inspector General (OIG) Investigations Supervisor. That employee, who has resigned, claims that OIG has failed to provide independent oversight of the Office of Police Accountability (OPA) and engaged in a pattern of concealing the truth and avoiding public disclosure request requirements.

We understand the complaint was referred to the Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission, who found the issues raised were not within their purview to investigate. We have also heard that it was referred to the Seattle Department of Human Resources, but no action was taken.

Most recently, a public article was released that detailed the apparent misconduct of an OIG auditor to properly certify cases and the appearance of OIG leadership failing to take swift action to discover and correct the mishandling of OPA investigation cases. The article described several cases that were improperly reviewed and closed within minutes of their access time. This is of great concern to the CPC and the community in terms of how the accountability system and partners can uphold the power and duty granted by the consent decree and the 2017 Accountability Ordinance.

In the interest in full transparency with our community and to ensure we are fulfilling our oversight responsibilities as described in the Consent Decree and 2017 Accountability Ordinance, we would appreciate answers to the following questions:

- Can you provide the number of cases OIG has reviewed, as well as how many OIG has fully certified, partially certified, and null certified since January 1, 2020?
- What are the OPA case numbers for any partially certified or null certified investigations?
- Can you please detail what recourse there is for complainants or the OIG itself when it finds an investigation is not either timely, objective, or thorough?
- The former employee said OIG employees were “forbidden from sending any email which is critical of OPA or could be misinterpreted as being critical of OPA.” Is that OIG policy or practice?
- The former employee said they were instructed to only provide negative feedback concerning OPA via phone call or during staff meetings. Is that OIG policy or practice?
- The former employee references a letter from OIG to OPA expressing concern about a complainant’s medical information being published in an OPA case summary for 2020OPA-0344. Was that letter officially sent to OPA and have they responded?

# Seattle Community Police Commission

- The former employee claims concerns were raised internally by staff about the “subpar level of review another OIG employee was exercising in conducting OPA case assessments.” The former employee says they conducted a follow-up review of the allegedly “subpar” work. Will you share that review with us?
  - What action has been taken to re-review said cases that received subpar review?
  - What steps has OIG taken to ensure that kind of case review misconduct is not repeated?
- Can you update us on the OIG’s process and progress for filling its Investigations Supervisor vacancy?
- What policies or practices, if any, has OIG changed regarding OPA oversight since this complaint was made?

Sincerely,

Katherine Seibel, Douglas Wagoner, Rev. Harriet Walden – Co-Chairs

Brandy Grant – Executive Director



Douglas E. Wagoner

