

Submissions as of 11:00am June 1st

Dawn Daniels - Chief of Police

mdaniels@wsu.edu

Washington State University Police Department

Proposal 1

The University Police Departments for years have been forgotten when it comes to legislation. Currently, the state is offering the police grants, but it is designated for local agencies or tribal. Since the Universities are state entities, we are often not qualified to compete for funding. The wellness grant by CJTC which our department has received in the past is currently going through review with OFM to see if we qualify as a "local agency". Our agencies are becoming more and more limited in the alternative funding opportunities as most grants go to municipal, county, or state (WSP). Our university police departments are suffering as the state cuts funding to the universities, and we are not able to find grants we qualify for that other law enforcement is able to obtain.

Jeffrey Beazizo - Chief

jbeazizo@lakestevenswa.gov

Lake Stevens Police

Proposal 1

"Public Disclosure ACT - There is discrepancies in when a juvenile's or non-disclosure witness can be redacted and it's only when on BWC and not when captured on other digital evidence systems including video from victim's home camera, interview rooms, etc. Need to update to include footage from all video recordings not just BWC.

Body Cam redactions vs. standard video redactions

There is specific language in the PRA related to footage captured on body cam that doesn't apply to recordings captured in other ways i.e., interview room recordings or recordings provided by citizens. The specific exemption is RCW 42.56.240(14)(a)(vi). This is the exemption parsed out:

RCW 42.56.240(14)(a)(vi) which states: The following investigative, law enforcement, and crime victim information is exempt from public inspection and copying under this chapter: ... (14) Body worn camera recordings to the extent nondisclosure is essential for the protection of any person's right to privacy as described in RCW 42.56.050, including, but not limited to, the circumstances enumerated in (a) of this subsection. A law enforcement or corrections agency shall not disclose a body worn camera recording to the extent the recording is exempt under this subsection.

(a) Disclosure of a body worn camera recording is presumed to be highly offensive to a reasonable person under RCW 42.56.050 to the extent it depicts:

(vi) The identity of or communications from a victim or witness of an incident involving domestic violence as defined in RCW 10.99.020 or sexual assault as defined in RCW 70.125.030, or disclosure of intimate images as defined in RCW 9A.86.010. If at the time of recording the victim or witness indicates a desire for disclosure or nondisclosure of the recorded identity or communications, such desire shall govern

RCW 70.125.030(7)(a) states: The definitions in this section apply throughout this chapter unless the context clearly requires otherwise.

(7) ""Sexual assault"" means one or more of the following:

(a) Rape or rape of a child;

....

Here is an example of why this is problematic...

PD interviewed a witness to child abuse case. The interview was held in the interview room at the PD but recorded on body cam. Because it was recorded on body cam, we were

able to redact the identity and the communications because of the above RCW (so the face, the personal info and everything they said). If that interview was captured by the recording device in the interview room, we would only have been able to redact the face and personal info if they had requested non-disclosure and the words would have remained unredacted."

Andy Illyn - Chief of Police

a.illyn@mukilteowa.gov

Mukilteo Police Department

Proposal 1

"The state of Washington currently faces a critical procedural gap in the recovery of missing or runaway minors. Under existing statutes, law enforcement officers often lack the necessary legal threshold to obtain a search warrant for digital records when a child disappears under mysterious circumstances but without immediate evidence of a crime or exigency. Because the first 24 to 72 hours are the most volatile and dangerous for a missing minor, the delay caused by the ""Probable Cause"" requirement can result in the loss of vital location data and communication logs that could prevent victimization or human trafficking. It is not uncommon for officers to turn to the parents, asking the parents to reach out to the social media companies directly. Asking a parent(s) in a crisis to do investigative and administrative work is unrealistic and not aligned with a professional, community-focused law enforcement agency. The proposed Child Safety Emergency Access Act seeks to bridge this gap by establishing a Custodial Subpoena process, allowing for the rapid recovery of children while maintaining strict constitutional and privacy safeguards.

Under this act, if a child under the age of 18 is reported missing or as a runaway under unusual or mysterious circumstances, the legal parent or guardian may sign a sworn affidavit and release form. This document grants law enforcement the authority to act as the guardian's agent to issue an administrative subpoena to telecommunications and social media providers. Unlike a standard warrant, this subpoena is triggered by parental consent and is specifically designed to bypass the time-consuming judicial hurdles that

currently prevent officers from accessing a child's recent digital breadcrumbs during an active search.

The scope of this subpoena would include not only subscriber information and GPS location data but also the specific contents of text messages and private chat messages. These communications are often the only way to identify "grooming" behaviors, specific meet-up locations, or the identities of individuals who may be harboring the minor. By gaining immediate access to these conversations, investigators can move from a reactive posture to a proactive recovery mission, identifying threats before they escalate into victimization.

To ensure this tool is not used for invasive surveillance or to damage the trust between parent and child, the act includes significant privacy protections. All information obtained through a Custodial Subpoena is strictly for law enforcement use in the recovery of the minor; officers are legally prohibited from sharing the raw contents of private messages or browsing history with the parent or guardian, except for specific details necessary to assist in the rescue. Furthermore, this act respects the Fourth Amendment by requiring that if law enforcement discovers evidence of criminal activity within these records, they must apply for a formal search warrant within 72 hours. This "warrant bridge" ensures that while the initial recovery is expedited, any subsequent criminal prosecution is held to the highest legal standards, balancing the child's right to safety with their right to privacy.

Proposal 2

"The Washington State Public Records Act was created to ensure that the government remains accountable to the people. However, without common-sense guardrails, the system is currently being slowed down by broad, open-ended requests that often lack a clear purpose. These "any and all" filings-which demand every email or video without a specific date or topic-force police departments to spend hundreds of staff hours on a single inquiry. This administrative bottleneck doesn't just drain public resources; it actively hurts transparency. When public records offices are buried under these massive "fishing expeditions," bona fide researchers, local journalists, and victims of crimes are forced to wait months or even years for the information they need to inform the public or find closure.

To restore balance and ensure that the queue moves for everyone, we propose a "Specificity Standard." Under this rule, a requester would need to provide a clear topic and a date range of no more than two years. This shift allows agencies to move away from exhaustive, aimless searches and toward finding the exact documents the public is looking

for. By narrowing the scope, we can cut down on the unnecessary ""noise"" in the system and ensure that information is released while it is still timely and relevant.

In addition to specificity, we propose a ""Fair-Share"" cap to prevent any single individual from monopolizing an agency's time at the expense of others. This rule would limit a requester to three to five active requests at any given time. If someone wishes to file more, they simply wait until one of their current requests is completed before the next one enters the queue. This prevents ""vexatious"" requesters from paralyzing a department, ensuring that a single person cannot ""jump the line"" ahead of reporters or citizens with urgent needs. These limits would not apply to individuals seeking their own personal records or to the news media. By adopting these reasonable changes, we can stop the weaponization of public records and ensure that the system once again serves its true purpose: providing the public with timely access to the truth."

Rob Martin - Bureau Chief

robert.martin@snoco.org

Snohomish County Sheriff's Office

Proposal 1

"Adding to LEOFF 2 retirement for prior military service would benefit current employees as well as create a great recruitment tool for military service members considering the profession. This is currently offered in a few states (see Pennsylvania Statute Title 53.770). LEOFF 2 already covers service credit for military members called back for intervening military service.

Example language:

RCW 41.26.190: Credit for Military Service

(b) Establishing the LEOFF 2 pension fund may provide full-service credit for each year of military service or fraction thereof, not to exceed five years, to any certified peace officer who was not employed by the political subdivision or municipal police force prior to such military service. The amount due for the purchase of credit for military service other than intervening military service shall be computed by applying the average normal cost rate for

LEOFF 2, but not to exceed ten percent, to the member's average rate of compensation over the first three years of county or municipal service and multiplying the result by the number of years and fractional part of a year of creditable non-intervening military service being purchased together with interest at the rate of four and three-quarters percent compounded annually from the date of initial entry into county or municipal service to the date of payment.

(c) Any certified peace officer shall be eligible to receive service credit for intervening or non-intervening military service as provided in subsections (a) and (b) provided that he is not entitled to receive, eligible to receive now or in the future or is receiving retirement benefits for such service under a retirement system administered and wholly or partially paid for by any other governmental agency with the exception of a member eligible to receive or receiving military retirement pay earned by a combination of active duty and nonactive duty with a reserve or national guard component of the armed forces which retirement pay is payable only upon the attainment of a specified age and period of service under 10 U.S.C. Ch. 67 (relating to retired pay for non-regular service).

Eligibility:

- Honorable Discharge: Veteran must have received an honorable discharge from their military service.
- State Employment: Individuals must be currently employed by the state or a participating political subdivision covered by the state's retirement system.
- Membership in State Retirement System: The veteran must be a member of the state's retirement system.
- Minimum Service Requirement: The veteran must be employed by the state or a participating political subdivision covered by the state's retirement system for minimum of (5 or 10 years?)
- Purchase or Contribution: Veterans must purchase or contribute funds to the state retirement system to receive credit for their military service. The cost is typically based on actuarial calculations."

Dave Ellis - Chief of Police

djellis@spokanecounty.org

Spokane County Sheriff's Office

Proposal 1

State funding for Washington State Aviation Units. This funding would reimburse counties operating rotorcraft aviation units for the hundreds of mutual aid requests they receive from other jurisdictions. These missions include search and rescue, fire suppression, surveillance, pursuit management, natural disaster, and fugitive apprehension.

Jonathan Ventura - Chief

jventura@arlingtonwa.gov

Arlington Police Department

Proposal 1

"Targeted Legislative Reform to Address Operational Impacts of Senate Bill 6062 on ALPR Effectiveness"

This proposal recommends that the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC), in coordination with public safety partners and technology providers, pursue targeted amendments to Washington Senate Bill 6062 to restore critical law enforcement capabilities related to Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) systems.

While SB 6062 was enacted with the intent of strengthening privacy protections, several provisions have unintentionally limited the effectiveness of ALPR technology in time-sensitive and victim-centered investigations-particularly those involving missing and abducted children. This proposal outlines practical, balanced reforms that preserve civil liberties while restoring essential public safety tools.

1. Overbroad ""Sensitive Location"" Restrictions SB 6062 imposes restrictions on ALPR deployment and use in designated ""sensitive locations,"" including schools and courthouses. While well-intentioned, these limitations create operational blind spots in areas that are:

- Statistically relevant to child safety incidents
- Common transit points for custodial interference and abductions
- Locations where rapid identification of suspect vehicles is critical

In particular, schools represent a paradox within the statute: they are explicitly protected as sensitive locations yet are also environments where children are abducted.

Restriction on Access to National Crime Databases The bill's limitations on integrating ALPR systems with national criminal information systems-most notably the National Crime Information Center-undermine one of the most critical functions of ALPR technology:

- Identifying vehicles associated with AMBER Alerts
- Locating missing or abducted children
- Detecting stolen vehicles and wanted persons across jurisdictions

NCIC is the primary repository for entering and querying missing persons and abducted children nationwide. Restricting ALPR systems from interfacing with NCIC creates a disconnect between detection technology and the very data needed to act on it.

Limitations on Interstate Data Sharing Current interpretations and constraints under SB 6062 also limit or create ambiguity around sharing ALPR data across state lines. This is operationally problematic because:

- Criminal activity frequently crosses jurisdictional and state boundaries
- Organized retail theft, auto theft rings, and human trafficking networks operate regionally or nationally
- Neighboring states often have more permissive and interoperable systems

Without clear authorization for interstate data sharing (within lawful bounds), Washington agencies are isolated from broader investigative ecosystems.

Proposed Legislative Fixes

1. Allow ALPR to be used in or near schools and similar locations when tied to specific public safety purposes, including:

- Missing or abducted persons investigations
- AMBER Alert activation
- Credible threats to public safety
- Replace categorical restrictions with purpose-based limitations and audit requirements
- Maintain prohibitions on generalized surveillance while enabling targeted, lawful use

2. Restore Access to NCIC and Related Databases Explicitly authorize ALPR systems to interface with:

- National Crime Information Center
- State and regional "hot lists" derived from NCIC data
- Missing persons and stolen vehicle databases

This restoration should include:

- Strict use limitations (criminal justice purposes only)
- Full audit logging and accountability controls
- Compliance with existing Washington privacy and data-use laws

Without this integration, ALPR systems are significantly degraded in their ability to locate missing children-the very use case SB 6062 intends to preserve.

3. Clarify and Authorize Interstate Data Sharing Amend statute to clearly permit:

- Data sharing with out-of-state law enforcement agencies
- Participation in national ALPR networks for legitimate criminal justice purposes
- Reciprocal agreements with neighboring states Safeguards should include:
- Explicit prohibition on use for immigration enforcement, consistent with Washington law
- Data-sharing agreements that require equivalent privacy protections
- Access controls and audit trails

Crime does not respect state boundaries; Washington's public safety systems must be able to operate accordingly.

Restoring NCIC access and enabling ALPR use in high-risk environments directly improves outcomes for missing and abducted children, where minutes matter.

Law enforcement requires tools that align with how crime actually occurs-mobile, networked, and often interstate. Balanced Approach These reforms do not eliminate privacy protections; they refine them. Moving from blanket restrictions to purpose-driven use ensures both civil liberties and effective policing. Consistency with Legislative Intent SB 6062 explicitly preserves ALPR use for missing persons. The proposed changes correct internal inconsistencies that currently undermine that goal.

WASPC should lead a focused legislative effort that includes:

- Partnering with technology providers (e.g., Flock Safety) for technical expertise
- Engaging victim advocacy groups, particularly those focused on missing and exploited children

- Providing case studies demonstrating missed opportunities under current restrictions
- Developing narrowly tailored amendment language for legislative sponsors
- Conducting proactive outreach to address civil liberties concerns

Targeted amendments to Washington Senate Bill 6062 are necessary to correct unintended consequences that currently limit law enforcement's ability to protect the public, especially children at risk. By restoring access to National Crime Information Center, enabling responsible interstate data sharing, and refining overly broad sensitive location restrictions, Washington can achieve a balanced framework that upholds privacy while delivering effective, modern public safety outcomes.

Brian Smith - Chief of Police

bsmith@cityofpa.us

Port Angeles Police Department

Proposal 1

"Support HJR 4211 ""Creating an Interbranch Commission on Court Rules""

Issue: The WA Supreme Court through the process of Court rules has (as the Judicial Branch) and will continue to impact public safety in a manner that crosses into areas that should be purview of the Legislative and Executive branches of government> Specifically, the indigent defense caseload standards are in effect and have the potential to significantly reduce over the next 8 plus years the number of criminal cases that can be filed and prosecuted. A reduction by, say 2/3 of the allowed case load for public defenders significantly impacts what cases can be filed and has huge cost implications for local and county government. This decision was made by the Court and outside of the Legislature or other elected bodies and outside the Executive branch. The pending ""guidance"" to the lower courts on misdemeanor bail has the potential to create essentially no bail for anything other than DV or DUI . This proposal has huge implications for public safety. HJR 4211 proposes that in the next general election the Secretary of State shall submit to the voters an amendment to the Constitution that would create an interbranch commission on Court rules that would provide governance of Court procedure thereby restricting Court

rules that abridge and encroach upon the powers of the Legislative and Branches and violate the separation of powers among the three coequal branches. Any recent Court rules that impact the other branches would be required to go through this process. What we hear is that after misdemeanor bail restrictions under Court rules we will then see felony bail restrictions.

Rafael Padilla - Chief of Police

rpadilla@kentwa.gov

Kent Police Department

Proposal 1

Adjustments and clarification to HB 6002.

Proposal 2

Civil Litigation Reform for In-custody Death that result from drug overdose.

John Unfred

Senior Business Services Analyst

junfred@tacoma.gov

Tacoma Police Department

Proposal 1

"Stabilization and Implementation Period for Law Enforcement Legislation (2027-2029)

Executive Summary

Washington law enforcement agencies have spent the past five years implementing major statutory reforms related to training, use of force, pursuits, decertification, accountability, and investigation standards. However, law enforcement agencies, the Criminal Justice Training Commission (CJTC), and the State Auditor's Office (SAO) all indicate that existing mandates are not yet fully implemented, and compliance timelines will extend well beyond 2027.

This policy brief proposes a temporary pause-limited to the 2027-2029 biennium-on creating significant new law enforcement mandates. This stabilization period will give agencies time to meet current requirements and allow the Legislature to make informed, data driven decisions.

Problem Statement

1. Many officers are not yet meeting legally required training mandates.

The 2026 State Auditor's performance audit on the Law Enforcement Training and Community Safety Act (LETCSA) found:

- Only 16% of veteran officers and 14% of new officers have completed the required 40 hours of LETCSA continuing training.
- At current training capacity, half of all officers will be noncompliant by 2028.
- CJTC and agencies face barriers including travel costs, limited scheduling capacity, and inconsistent communication.

2. Washington has the lowest police staffing level in the U.S.

WASPC reports Washington has ranked 51st in the nation in officers per thousand residents for 15 consecutive years, with staffing dropping to 1.37 officers per 1,000 population in 2025, the lowest in the country. Chronic understaffing makes absorbing new legislative mandates nearly impossible.

3. Agencies face budget constraints and competing demands.

Local governments anticipate cuts in next biennium, worsening the strain on agencies struggling to implement complex new requirements. A vast amount of change has already been imposed, and agencies need more time to absorb recent reforms.

4. The SAO recommended creating a formal workgroup to address the training compliance shortfall.

The audit recommends the Legislature convene a statewide workgroup to address barriers, resource shortfalls, and statutory conflicts in order to meet the full requirements of the law.

Why a Temporary Pause Is Needed

A stabilization period will enable:

- CJTC to finish developing outstanding training topics and improve project management, communication, and data systems.
- Agencies to schedule and complete LETCSA training for thousands of officers.
- Legislators to evaluate which reforms are working, which need modification, and which require funding before expanding requirements.
- A unified statewide approach, informed by WASPC, WACOPS, CJTC, tribal partners, and community stakeholders.
- This is not a retreat from accountability. It is a strategic pause to ensure existing laws achieve their intended impact.

Policy Proposal

1. Enact a 2027-2029 Pause on Creating Significant New Law Enforcement Mandates

For two years, the Legislature would refrain from passing bills that:

- Add new mandatory officer training hours
- Create new reporting or administrative requirements
- Change use of force, pursuit, investigation, or certification statutes in ways requiring new training
- Require CJTC to design or deliver additional training curricula

(Exemptions allowed only for federal compliance or bills certified as having no fiscal or staffing impact.)

2. Establish a LETCSA Training Workgroup

Membership: CJTC, WASPC, WACOPS, Washington State Patrol, municipal and county representatives, tribal law enforcement, and community stakeholders.

Tasks:

- Evaluate training system bottlenecks
- Review audit findings and needed statutory improvements
- Identify funding and staffing requirements
- Recommend when statewide compliance with existing mandates is achievable
- Report due December 2028.

3. Fiscal Impact: Minimal

This proposal would need minimal support from the state to facilitate the LETCSA Training Workgroup and their final report.

Benefits of the Stabilization Period

- Ensures public safety reforms already passed are fully implemented
- Avoids overwhelming local agencies already struggling with staffing shortages
- Improves statewide training quality and consistency
- Rebuilds officer capacity, retention, and morale
- Increases the effectiveness and credibility of future policy proposals
- Allows for robust data collection before additional reforms are considered

Conclusion

Washington has enacted some of the most ambitious police accountability and training reforms in the nation. Agencies are working to implement these changes, but current compliance levels highlight the need for a temporary, focused stabilization period. A temporary pause on significant new mandates is the most responsible path to ensure reforms are effective, sustainable, and equitable statewide.

Proposal 2

Protect Local Control: Oppose Expansion of Attorney General Authority & Mandatory Model Policies

Washington Is a Home Rule State

Washington's constitution grants cities and counties the inherent authority to ""make and enforce...local police...regulations"" without needing permission from the state. Local jurisdictions already possess their own governmental authority and act unless state law expressly prohibits an action.

Home Rule means:

- Local decisions are made locally
- Local authority exists independently of state agencies
- One size fits all state directives violate the constitutional framework

The Problem: State Interference Through the Attorney General

Recent legislation has expanded the Attorney General's authority to issue Attorney General Model Policies, which prescribe mandatory policies for local police departments-such as use of force rules. These laws encroach onto local jurisdiction rights and impose state crafted operational policy on local departments. This contradicts Washington's Home Rule principles and effectively replaces local judgment with centralized control.

Why It Matters

1. Local Democracy Is a Core Washington Value

Washington intentionally built a system of local self governance to prevent concentration of power and ensure decisions are made ""close to home"" by those who understand community needs.

2. Model Policies = State Interference, Not Local Partnership

State interference harms communities by removing their ability to adapt policies to local conditions. Mandatory AG policies create exactly the kind of centralized policymaking the Home Rule authors sought to prevent.

3. Voters Trust Local Government More Than State Government

National and state level research highlighted in the Association of Washington Cities Home Rule Report shows strong voter support for local authority, local decision making, and local

democracy-and a clear expectation that local communities, not state officials, should shape local policies.

Proposal

1. Stop the Expansion of Attorney General Policymaking Authority

Local law enforcement policies should be developed by local chiefs, sheriffs, and elected officials, not appointed statewide officials.

2. Reinforce Washington's Constitutional Home Rule Standards

Advocate that operational control of policing-use of force, training methods, local deployment strategies-remains a local authority unless the Legislature explicitly states otherwise.

Bottom Line

Attorney General Model Policies override constitutionally protected local authority and impose state interference on matters Washington's constitution reserves for local governments.

Protect Washington's Home Rule tradition. Keep policing decisions local.

Proposal 3

We strongly support adjustment to the new ALPR/SB6002 law to address the specific items in WASPC's ALPR Interim Guidance, at a minimum.

Michael Morrison - Sheriff

michael.morrison@co.chelan.wa.us

Chelan County SO

Proposal 1

"We so reintroduced the Aviation Support Bill. Its a practical, fiscally responsible investment in Washington's statewide emergency response and aerial search-and-rescue capabilities. After multiple attempts at this, and additional input received, along with legislative refinement, this third version should address many of the concerns raised in prior sessions and return as a stronger, more balanced proposal. Importantly, the bill has evolved into a largely non-partisan public safety measure focused less on law enforcement expansion and more on disaster response, search and rescue, wildfire support, and lifesaving aviation services for communities across Washington which should make it more palatable (I know LE is not popular in the house).

As we already know the bill creates a sustainable funding structure to help local aviation support units (King, Snohomish, Chelan and Spokane) manage the substantial costs associated with maintaining operational readiness. Appropriated funds would be distributed equally among recognized units to support training, maintenance, insurance, pilot and crew expenses, and equipment upgrades. The remaining funds would reimburse direct mission and training costs such as fuel and pilot time, with any unused balance supporting the Aviation Section.

To ensure statewide access and accountability, participating offices would have to agree to provide mutual aid anywhere in Washington without charging aircraft-use fees. The proposed legislation should also require compliance with policies consistent with the state's Keep Washington Working Act, which we have all already confirmed / comply with. This effort should complement broader aviation and emergency preparedness efforts already advancing in the Legislature, including integration into the state Military Department and long-term aviation funding reforms. I believe together, these measures reflect growing bipartisan recognition that aviation assets are essential to Washington's emergency response infrastructure, particularly in rural and undeserved areas. LETS GO !!!
ROUND THREE !!!

Proposal 2

Washington State should pursue meaningful tort reform legislation aimed at creating greater predictability, fairness, and long-term stability within the civil liability system for municipalities, counties, and other public entities. Rising litigation costs, escalating settlements, and increasing insurance premiums are placing significant financial strain on

local governments and public risk pools, ultimately diverting limited taxpayer resources away from essential public safety, infrastructure, and community services. Thoughtful reforms focused on reasonable liability standards, clearer damage frameworks, and improved claims management would help stabilize the municipal insurance market, strengthen public risk pool sustainability, and reduce volatility that threatens local government budgets statewide. Balanced tort reform would not limit legitimate access to the courts, but instead provide a more consistent and sustainable framework that protects both public entities and taxpayers while ensuring municipalities and counties can continue delivering critical services efficiently and responsibly.

Gabe Gants - Sheriff

ggants@co.lincoln.wa.us

Lincoln County Sheriff's Office

Proposal 1

Limit PFML leave . This program was designed as a safety net. Limit use of PFML leave to only be available once employer leave has been exhausted. This will cut down on abuse and require skin in the game which in turn will save employers staffing headaches and save money.

Proposal 2

Fund law enforcement officers for agencies without strings attached.

Jeffrey Flohr - Undersheriff

jeffrey.flohr@kingcounty.gov

King County Sheriff

Proposal 1

Resubmitting the law enforcement aviation bill that WASPC has supported during the past two legislative session.

Harry Smith - Assistant Chief of Police

harry.smith@wsu.edu

Washington State University Police Department

Proposal 1

Currently it is against State Ethics Laws for police officers who are employed by State agencies (other than WSP) to work out while on duty as a part of their Officer Wellness Program. I would like to see a law enacted that would allow State-employed officers to work out on duty time as part of an official Wellness Program that is guided by policy and internal oversight in order to ensure safety and protect the program from abuse of time. It has been shown officer wellness programs are needed and currently other public safety employees (local PD, fire fighters, WSP) are allowed to use duty time to exercise. Officer Wellness is important to prevent injuries and physical exercise has been shown to improve mental health.

Mark Berry - Chief of Police

berrym@bonneylake.gov

Bonney Lake Police Department

Proposal 1

Amendment to RCW 10.116.060

Specifically to section 1(d)(ii) For those jurisdictions with fewer than 15 commissioned officers, if a supervisor is not on duty at the time, the pursuing officer requests the on-call supervisor be notified of the pursuit according to the agency's procedures, and the pursuing officer considers alternatives to the vehicular pursuit, the justification for the vehicular pursuit, and other safety considerations, including but not limited to speed, weather, traffic, road conditions, and the known presence of minors in the vehicle.

I would propose we move this to jurisdictions with fewer than 40 (this is not a hard number) commissioned officers. There is a gap for agencies over 15 who do not always have a supervisor working and cannot therefore pursue violent felons such as murder and Assault 1 suspects. For example, we have 33 commissioned personnel with 6 patrol sergeants. Staffing allows us to cover each shift 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, with a supervisor. However, if a Sgt is in training, sick, vacation, etc we can't maintain 24 coverage and cannot pursue in those gaps.

Jeff Salstrom - Chief of Police

jsalstrom@cityofhoquiam.com

Hoquiam Police Department

Proposal 1

Change RCW 46.61.024 Attempting to Elude Police Vehicle to a 1st and 2nd Degree crime with enhanced penalties. Adds Attempting to Elude 1st as RCW 46.61.023.

RCW 46.61.023 Attempting to Elude Police Vehicle 1st Degree

(1) Any driver of a motor vehicle who willfully fails or refuses to immediately bring his or her vehicle to a stop and who drives his or her vehicle in a reckless manner while attempting to elude a pursuing police vehicle, after being given a visual or audible signal to bring the vehicle to a stop, and as a result of or in response to the Attempting to Elude, any person suffers substantial bodily harm shall be guilty of a class A felony. The signal given by the

police officer may be by hand, voice, emergency light, or siren. The officer giving such a signal shall be in uniform and the vehicle shall be equipped with lights and sirens.

(a) Any person found guilty Attempting to Elude a Police Vehicle 1st Degree shall serve a period of total confinement for a period of no less than 120 months. This sentence shall be consecutive to any other period of confinement imposed by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(2) It is an affirmative defense to this section which must be established by a preponderance of the evidence that: (a) A reasonable person would not believe that the signal to stop was given by a police officer; and (b) driving after the signal to stop was reasonable under the circumstances.

(3) The license or permit to drive or any nonresident driving privilege of a person convicted of a violation of this section shall be permanently revoked by the department of licensing.

RCW 46.61.024 Attempting to Elude 2nd Degree

(1) Any driver of a motor vehicle who willfully fails or refuses to immediately bring his or her vehicle to a stop and who drives his or her vehicle in a reckless manner while attempting to elude a pursuing police vehicle, after being given a visual or audible signal to bring the vehicle to a stop, shall be guilty of Attempting to Elude 2nd Degree, a class B felony. The signal given by the police officer may be by hand, voice, emergency light, or siren. The officer giving such a signal shall be in uniform and the vehicle shall be equipped with lights and sirens.

(a) Any person found guilty Attempting to Elude a Police Vehicle 2nd Degree shall serve a period of total confinement for a period of no less than 60 months. This sentence shall be consecutive to any other period of confinement imposed by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(2) It is an affirmative defense to this section which must be established by a preponderance of the evidence that: (a) A reasonable person would not believe that the signal to stop was given by a police officer; and (b) driving after the signal to stop was reasonable under the circumstances.

(3) The license or permit to drive or any nonresident driving privilege of a person convicted of a violation of this section shall be revoked by the department of licensing.

Summary: If someone suffers substantial bodily harm as a direct result of or in response to (i.e. backing officer) a vehicle pursuit, the driver is guilty of Attempting to Elude 1st Degree, a class A felony, and must serve a period of no less than 120 months in prison. In addition, their privilege to drive is permanently revoked. If someone eludes (current law) and is found guilty, it is now a class B felony, and they must spend a minimum of five years in prison.

I would also propose modifying Murder 2nd Degree to add a section that if someone dies as a result of or in response to an Attempt to Elude, they are guilty of Murder 2.

John Horch – Sheriff

john.horch@clark.wa.gov

Clark County SO

Proposal 1

(Laurel - Is this the correct RCW 9A.42.100:? And any changes to the statement?)

Drug Endangerment statute (RCW 9A.42.100) - This statute only deals with methamphetamine and methamphetamine lab related substances. It does not account for any other drugs.

I would like to see this statute include all Schedule I drugs - we have had multiple fentanyl overdoses and multiple fentanyl deaths in children and infants over the last few years. We also had a cocaine overdose case with a young toddler.

If we can't get all Schedule I drugs listed, we would like to see opiates and synthetic opiates listed at the very least.

Robert Almada - Chief of Police

R.ALMADA@CITYOFLACEY.ORG

Lacey Police Department

Proposal 1

Amend HB2015 Create 2nd path for agencies that are accredited by WASPC to qualify for the 2/10ths public safety sales tax.

- Promotes accreditation, professionalism, 3rd party audit function by WASPC (who are professionally competent vs. Department of Commerce auditors)
- Zero cost to the state budget while providing local jurisdictions with a more achievable path to funding sources to address the trebling of public defense costs, staffing shortages, and establishing and maintaining co-responder mental health clinician programs
- Reduces administrative demands on CJTC by using the existing and funded Accreditation Program,
- No impact to \$100M grant fund established in HB2015

Proposal 2

Allow civilian, non-commissioned police employees to handle low priority Law Enforcement tasks to include: traffic control, documenting minor traffic collisions, documenting minor crimes, parking enforcement, some of the duties in real crime centers, etc.

Current RCW requires a commissioned officer to perform many of these low-level tasks, driving costs up, reducing service delivery levels, and increasing the need for additional officers. Additionally, subject matter experts are often excluded since they do not meet the physical qualifications to be a commissioned officer but can easily perform these tasks at a higher service-level than commissioned officers.
