

Advisory committees are beneficial to agencies while oversight committees are rarely utilized.

3. There is little or no history of issues indicating racist behavior or inappropriate behavior from PAPD.

Creating an oversight committee when no long termed systemic problems exist is like putting a person on parole or probation when they have not been committed a crime. You would be telling public servants who have not only done nothing wrong but have also excelled at interacting exceptionally with their constituency that you do not trust them, and for no identifiable reason. You would also be changing the relationship of this board from supportive to adversarial which would undermine a collaborative benefit to the department.

If you start telling good employees that they are flawed and need extraordinary supervision, soon those good employees will become employees that need extraordinary supervision.

4. Essentially this petition is a solution looking for a problem when one does not exist. What budgetary impacts will result from creating this oversight committee?
5. What evidence has been presented showing problems within PAPD? Any evidence of racism, excessive use of force, harassment, bullying, failure to hold employees accountable? Anything?
6. If you need to find problems where none exist, create a committee whose purpose is to find problems and they will. They must justify their existence and of course passing on the cost of numerous investigations to whomever created them, in this case, you.
7. Ultimately, I must ask, if the primary purpose of this petition was to increase diversity on the advisory board, why didn't somebody just come in and ask? Why a petition? Why sweeping changes to existing ordinances? Why so many signatures from non-residents? Whomever drafted this petition wants power, and they will want to keep it.
8. Why are 35% of the signatures on this petition from people who aren't even living on the Olympic Peninsula?

241 signatures on petition

158 people from Olympic Peninsula 65% (Includes Jefferson County)

83 people not living on Olympic Peninsula 35%

Mississippi, Florida, California, New Mexico, Nebraska, Virginia, Maryland, New York, Georgia, and more. (Out of state signatures)

PAPD is an accredited agency. What that really means is that of over 250 law enforcement agencies in Washington State only 58 (23%) are accredited. Some of the standards that PAPD must comply with to receive that honor are as follows:

2.4 The agency has policies assuring compliance with all applicable constitutional requirements for in-custody situations including: •Interviews and interrogations •Access to Counsel; and •Search and seizure Purpose: Interviews and interrogations, questioning, or any other term used to describe in-custody verbal examinations are conducted in compliance with constitutional requirements. These constitutional requirements, federal and state, are vital to the role and function of law enforcement in a free society. By complying with these requirements, law enforcement officers and agencies ensure fair, legal, and equitable treatment of all people.

2.5 The agency has search and seizure policies that adhere to state and federal law. Purpose: To provide clear and basic guidelines for evaluating search and seizure issues and conducting searches within existing legal parameters that
Copyright © 2020 Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs7 LAW
ENFORCEMENT ACCREDITATION STANDARDS ensure the constitutional right of persons to be free from unreasonable government intrusion. Proof of compliance may include copies of incident reports that detail stop and frisk incidents; search by consent, search of a vehicle and searches that are part of a crime scene or are part of an inventory process.

3.1 The agency has policies directing personnel to only utilize the amount of force which is necessary to affect lawful objectives, to include any amount of force up to and including deadly force. Purpose: To establish policies and procedures for the necessary, reasonable, and legal use of force that ensures those decisions to use force are made in a professional, impartial, and safe manner, and that there is an understanding and appreciation for the limitations on the authority to use force.

3.6 The agency has an officer involved shooting/deadly force response policy that includes steps for first responders and includes a comprehensive independent investigation and review of the event. Purpose: To ensure the agency has in place a formal response, review and investigative process for officer involved shootings that result in injury or loss of life, that comply with state law and protect interests, rights, and mental health of involved officers.

4.3* The agency has a policy that requires an annual management review and analysis, with final review approved by the chief executive officer, of the following incidents: •Vehicle pursuits •Use of force events •Internal investigations •Biased based profiling incidents Purpose: It is the intent that agencies require ongoing first level supervisory and administrative review of these high liability incidents. Additionally, an annual review and analysis of these incidents shall be conducted at the command level, with approval by the CEO, and can be used as an early warning system. Agencies

should address policy, procedure, training and/or personnel issues that are identified during this review process.

13.3 The agency has a policy prohibiting biased-based profiling, which also has been known as “racial profiling.” Purpose: Biased-based profiling, which also has been known as racial profiling, is any traffic stop, field contact, vehicle search, asset seizure/forfeiture, or enforcement action based solely on a common trait of a group. Common traits include, but are not limited to race, ethnic background, gender, sexual orientation, religion, economic status, age, or cultural group

14.1 The agency requires the documentation and investigation of all complaints of misconduct or illegal behavior against the agency or its members. Purpose: To establish procedures for the reporting, investigation, and disposition of complaints received against the agency or any employee of the agency

14.4 The agency has a policy where complainants are provided with notification concerning the disposition of their complaint.

Purpose: To establish procedures for the reporting, investigation, and disposition of complaints received against the agency or any employee of the agency.

14.5 The agency maintains records of complaints and their dispositions in accordance with Washington State Retention Guidelines. Purpose: To ensure the agency retains complaint/disposition records for at least the minimum retention period appropriate for any particular complaint category

Every 4 years PAPD is meticulously inspected by a team of 6 law enforcement professionals to determine that each and every standard has been lived and followed for the prior 4 years, if you fail on any one standard, you are not accredited. What makes untrained citizens with no law enforcement training better at holding a department accountable than professional law enforcement experts through accreditation? Would you want untrained citizens directing your doctor before they perform surgery on you? I suspect not, however, if citizens are available to “advise” the doctor about things they like or dislike about his practice, that would improve his service. For that reason, an advisory board has value and an oversight committee has a totally different purpose and is rarely used.

I URGE TO YOU REJECT THE PREMISE OF THIS PETITION AND SIMPLY DIRECT THE APPOINTING AUTHORITY FOR THE CURRENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO INCREASE THE DIVERSITY ON THE CURRENT COMMITTEE.

I have included a copy of the petition with the objectionable sections highlighted.

Thank you,

Respectfully,

Ron Peregrin