

WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF SHERIFFS & POLICE CHIEFS

3060 Willamette Drive NE Lacey, WA 98516 ~ Phone: (360) 486-2380 ~ Fax: (360) 486-2381 ~ Website: www.waspc.org

Serving the Law Enforcement Community and the Citizens of Washington



June 28, 2010

The Honorable Donna Noski
City of West Richland
3801 W Van Giesen
West Richland, WA 99353

Dear Mayor Noski:

RE: LEMAP Review

The Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) would like to applaud you and the entire West Richland Police Department for taking a step toward excellence by participating in the Loaned Executive Management Assistance Program (LEMAP). WASPC realizes that for a department to subject itself to a complete review of its organizational structure there must be desire to provide quality services to the West Richland community at all levels of department staffing.

Accompanying this letter you will find the complete and final report from the LEMAP review of the West Richland Police Department. The recommendations made in the report are the collective opinions of the LEMAP assessors. Recommendations reflect the best opinions of the evaluators using the information available to them at the time of the review. The LEMAP assessors are available and more than willing to assist you should you have any questions regarding the final report.

The assessment team greatly appreciated the openness and cooperation they received from the Department during the LEMAP review process.

The LEMAP assessment team and WASPC hope that you will find the recommendations both practical and valuable to your Department. If you have any questions about the report or need additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact WASPC at 360.486.2380.

Sincerely,

Donald G. Pierce
Executive Director

CC: Chief Brian McElroy

President
BRUCE BJORK
Chief – WA Fish & Wildlife

President Elect
MIKE HARUM
Sheriff – Chelan County

Vice President
ED HOLMES
Chief – Mercer Island

Past President
JOHN DIDION
Sheriff – Pacific County

Treasurer
TERRY DAVENPORT
Chief – Shelton

ERIC OLSEN
Chief – Kirkland

TOM SCHLICKER
Chief – Swinomish

Executive Board

SAM GRANATO
Chief – Yakima

SUE RAHR
Sheriff – King County

BILL ELFO
Sheriff – Whatcom County

RICHARD LATHIM
Sheriff – Franklin County

RANDY STEGMEIER
Chief – Western WA University

JOHN BATISTE
Chief – WA State Patrol

LAURA LAUGHLIN
SAC – FBI, Seattle

DONALD PIERCE
Executive Director

**WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF
SHERIFFS & POLICE CHIEFS**



LEMAP

Loaned Executive Management Assistance Program

**Review of the
West Richland Police Department**

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) Loaned Executive Management Assistance Program (LEMAP) is to provide management, consulting and technical assistance to Association members. LEMAP is an opportunity for administrators to receive a professional review of their organization's operations and management systems.

The goal of this LEMAP review is to provide the West Richland Police Department with a critical look at the organization through the eyes of peer professionals. The resulting report should serve as a guide to identify areas that need strengthening and highlight positive and innovative programs and practices. It is hopeful the Department may use the information provided from this review to motivate the organization, improve internal and external services, and gain additional community support.

The LEMAP team consisted of the following members:

Rick Campbell—Commander, Cheney Police Department

Rick is a 29 year veteran of law enforcement. He started his career with the Cheney Police Department as a Dispatcher/9-1-1 operator. While employed with the Cheney Police Department, he has also worked for the EWU Police Department as both an officer and dispatcher. Rick has served as a line Officer, Detective, Corporal, Patrol and Investigative Sergeant, Lieutenant and Interim Police Chief for the Cheney Police Department. Currently, Rick holds the rank of Commander of the Cheney Police Department and is responsible for day to day operations.

Rick holds a BS from Eastern Oregon University in Criminal Justice and Social Sciences. He is the Accreditation Manager for the Cheney Police Department, receiving accreditation in 2010. He has been an Associate Member of WASPC since 2004 and sits on the WASPC Model Policy, Accreditation, and Small Agency Committees. Rick has received State Certification in First Level Supervision, Middle Management and Executive/Administration and is a member of FBI Law Enforcement Executive Development Association (LEEDA).

Dave Ruffin—Moses Lake PD

Garry Anderson—Management Services Coordinator for the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs

Garry retired from the Renton Police Department in 2006, after 28 years of service, 8 as the Chief of Police. Prior to his service with Renton, Garry served with the Issaquah Police Department for approximately 7 years.

Garry was on the Executive Board of the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs and co-chaired the Loaned Executive Management Assistance Program for many

years, participating in a number of LEMAP reviews of law enforcement agencies and communication centers. Garry has A.S and A.A. degrees in Criminal Justice, a B.A. degree in Criminal Justice, is a graduate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy, and has attained executive level certification through the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission.

General Observations:

The LEMAP team was generally impressed with the Departments energy and desire to provide quality services to the West Richland community. Department members recognize the pivotal point at which the West Richland Police Department currently stands—get better and meet the challenge of law enforcement best practices, or fall behind and miss the opportunity to be recognized as a community leader and regional partner in providing exemplary law enforcement services.

The community at large displays a healthy awareness about where it is at and where it is going. The Police Department must share this outlook to ensuring they are a part of—not apart from—the community team that is larger than any one department.

The onsite LEMAP team did not observe any findings that should be considered unfixable with appropriate attention and commitment, nor did they observe any issues that would be considered unique to the West Richland Police Department.

Facility:

The police facility is small but provides adequate space for the current functions of the Department. The facility lacks space for expansion or temporary detention of in custody persons who are under arrest and who the Department may want to interview prior to booking into a permanent facility. The Department shares space with the Department of Corrections; corrections personnel have the authority to meet and bring into the police department, persons under community supervision.

Department “Readiness:”

Officers and non-commissioned support staff demonstrate proficiencies in their assignments. They generally appear to be well trained, well equipped, motivated, and willing to provide quality law enforcement services to the community.

Organizational Leadership:

Supervisory staff appears to lack management direction. They have not been held accountable for the performance of subordinate staff. Some supervisory staff are allowed to exemplify a negative and unprofessional attitude towards the Department and its members. These particular supervisory members have not been evaluated on their abilities to promote law enforcement professionalism, nor lead by example. This behavior is unacceptable and should be addressed and corrected at the earliest possible

time. Members of the management team cannot be allowed to negatively impact the performance and reputation of the entire Department.

Policy and Procedure:

The Department has a policy and procedures manual that met has met “best standards” for law enforcement practices. These standards were put in place to voluntarily receive recognition as an “accredited” police department through the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs. Additionally, these practices were recognized as meeting 99 of the core accreditation standards of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. Although the manual is somewhat dated (2000), the majority of the manual still provides excellent direction for Department members, assuming the policy and procedures are followed by all Department members.

Direction:

The Department lacks a clear vision and mission. The Department has not established measureable goals and objectives, therefore officers and supervisors lack a basic understanding of what they should be trying to accomplish.

Staffing:

An informal work-load analysis was conducted during the onsite review. The analysis revealed that adequate resources have been provided for this Department to address calls for service, current law enforcement issues and community demands. However, the manner in which staffing is scheduled and deployed is suspect and should be further addressed.

Organizational Systems:

The Department has established organizational *systems* that are the foundation for Department practice and performance. However, many of the *systems* established by policy and procedure are not being followed. Staff are not currently being evaluated and/or held accountable for meeting *system* expectations.

Organizational systems that will be addressed in further detail in this report include:

- Organizational missions, visions, goals and performance measures
- Management information for planning, direction, and development
- Written direction—policy and procedure
- Performance evaluation and appraisal
- Personnel and training
- Internal affairs

SECTION 1—ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS**Chapter 1—Goals and Objectives**

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 1.1.1 The agency has written vision and mission statements that defines the agency's role; and*
- 1.1.2 The agency has written goals and objectives that are reviewed and updated at least annually and are available to all personnel.*

Findings:

The City of West Richland has authored a Vision Statement, as located in their 2010 budget document:

West Richland is a growing city where family values and community responsiveness are important. The City should grow in a balanced way to produce a safe, inviting community, having good residential and recreation alternatives and a healthy economy.

One of 4 priorities listed in the City's Mission Statement reads, "Maintaining public safety through effective emergency planning and operation of an adequately staffed professional police department".

While onsite, the team found multiple mission statements posted by the Police Department, including:

The primary mission of the West Richland Police Department is to lead and coordinate the efforts within the community to preserve the public peace, protect the rights of persons and property, prevent crime and provide assistance to the citizens in urgent situations. The department is responsible for the enforcement of all Federal laws, Washington State Laws and city Ordinances within the boundaries of the City of West Richland.

The department must enforce the law in a fair and impartial manner, recognizing both the statutory and judicial limitations of police authority and the constitutional rights of all persons. It is not the role of the department to legislate, render legal judgments or punish.

The department serves the people of West Richland by providing law enforcement service in a professional and courteous manner. It is to these people that the department is ultimately responsible.

Another mission statement was observed and documented in the 2009 Department's Annual Report which states:

Ensure a safe community by providing professional law enforcement, leading efforts to preserve the public peace, preventing crime and protecting and defending the rights of all citizens.

Philosophy: In 2006 the Department adopted a philosophy known as CARE. The acronym stands for Commitment, Accountability, Respect and Excellence and each word is a measurement of the department's service to the community.

2009 Department accomplishments were documented in the City's budget document. Police Department goals were listed as:

- Pursue opportunities for additional funding
- Improve technology and training
- Provide Parenting with Dignity courses
- Expand data availability by further development of the records management system
- Improve and address quality of life issues

There were no Department goals or objectives documented in the Department's Annual Report. Additionally, no current goals and objectives are adequately defined and no review of accomplishments or progress towards completion of goals has been conducted.

Recommendations:

- 1.1 The Department should develop a current mission statement that defines its role. The Department should include input from officers, as well as considering input from a committee that could be made up of members from the community including concerned citizens, high school students, business owners, service club members, etc.
- 1.2 The Department should develop goals and objectives that are reviewed annually, available to all personnel and are annually evaluated to determine if agency goals were attained.
- 1.3 Organizational goals established should be *measurable*. The Department should establish a system of establishing goals and then measuring the Department's success in achieving those goals on an annual basis.

Chapter 2—Role and Authority

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 2.1.1 *The agency requires all law enforcement personnel to take and abide by an Oath of Office;*

- 2.1.2 *Statutory authorization exists for the agency to perform law enforcement services by local ordinance;*
- 2.1.3 *The agency has policies specifying legal requirements and procedures for any physical arrest completed with or without an authorized warrant;*
- 2.1.4 *The agency has policies assuring compliance with all applicable constitutional requirements for in custody situations;*
- 2.1.5 *The agency has policies governing search and seizure;*
- 2.1.6 *The agency has policies for conducting strip and/or body cavity searches;*
- 2.1.7 *The agency has policies and procedures concerning the arrest or detention of foreign nationals.*

Findings:

The Department requires all law enforcement personnel to take and abide by an Oath of Office, as reflected in Department policy 1.1.3. Officers take and abide by an oath of office that is administered by the city clerk.

West Richland Municipal Code 2.08.040 addresses the statutory authorization for the Department to perform law enforcement services.

Department policy 21.27 addresses constitutional requirements for in custody situations

Physical arrests with or without a warrant are addressed by Department policy 1.1.13.

Strip searches are only to occur at the Benton County Jail and are addressed by Department policy 21.26

There does not appear to be current policy or procedure addressing the arrest and detention of foreign nationals.

Recommendations:

- 2.1 The Department should revisit all of its policies and procedures, specifically those that may have been addressed by recent court decision and/or legislative mandate.
- 2.2 The Department should ensure that its policy pertaining to legal requirements and procedures for any physical arrest completed with or without a warrant is up to date.
- 2.3 The Department should revisit and more clearly define constitutional requirements for in custody situations with current policy and procedure.
- 2.4 The Department should implement policy and procedure concerning the arrest or detention of foreign nationals

Chapter 3—Use of Force

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 3.1.1 *The agency has policy directing personnel to only utilize that force necessary to effect lawful objectives and authorizing use of force options and their appropriate application;*
- 3.1.2 *The agency has policy stating Washington State Peace Officers shall only utilize deadly force when necessary and justified to effect lawful objectives;*
- 3.1.3 *The agency has policy governing the use of warning shots;*
- 3.1.4 *The agency has policy governing the use of less-than-lethal weapons;*
- 3.1.5 *The agency has a policy requiring the request of appropriate medical aid after the use of force by personnel when an injury is known, suspected or is alleged;*
- 3.1.6 *The agency has a policy requiring personnel to submit a use of force report to the Chief Executive or designee when a firearm is discharged or personnel take any action that results in injury to another person;*
- 3.1.7 *The agency has a formal response in place to investigate and review officer-involved shootings;*
- 3.1.8 *The agency has a policy that addresses authorized weapons and ammunition.*

Findings:

The Department's policies and procedures governing the use of force provide a good foundation. The policies appear to have been adopted in 1999. Revisions to the policy are provided, but according to staff, have not been formally adopted. It is unclear to the onsite team which policies are current and which policies have yet to be implemented.

One of the Department's senior officers has collateral duties as a Use of Force Instructor who, when interviewed, appeared to be well trained and up-to-speed on his role and responsibility. The Department dedicates eight training days annually to use of force issues, including firearms training, defensive tactics, and less lethal force applications. Department policy 1.2 addresses use of force issues. The Department prohibits the use of warning shots, per policy 1.2.12.

During the onsite review, team members were made aware that the Department utilizes a use of force report form, per policy 1.2.2. It is unclear how this form is used by Department management after it is completed.

Recommendations:

- 3.1 The Department should revisit its use of force policies and procedures to ensure they are accurate, current, and are being trained to staff during in-service use of force training days.
- 3.2 The Department might choose to revisit their prohibition against warning shots and revise the policy authorizing warning shots under specific circumstances.

- 3.3 The Department should address the use of force reporting requirement by policy and ensure that any force used that is capable of causing injury is recorded and that a formal review process is established ensuring incidents are in compliance with existing policy and law. The collection of the use of force incidents should be analyzed to determine if there are training, equipment, or policy issues that should be addressed.

Chapter 4—Management, Staffing, Organization and Utilization of Personnel

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 4.1.1 *The agency has protocol and procedures for Officer in Charge and exceptional situations;*
- 4.1.2 *The agency requires personnel to obey lawful orders of superior officers;*
- 4.1.3 *The agency reviews Pursuits, Use of Force events, and Internal Investigations.*
- 4.1.4 *The agency has a system of written directives.*

Findings:

The Department's current organizational structure, relating to command staff, includes the chief, one administrative sergeant, and two patrol sergeants. In a significant portion of documents reviewed, the Department refers to the position of lieutenant. The lieutenant position is not funded in the 2010 budget, nor is it authorized by the City Council and Mayor.

There appears to have been a period of a leadership vacuum in the West Richland Police Department. While senior command staff has been either unwilling or unable to provide the appropriate leadership necessary for the successful functioning of the Department, the rank and file appears to be quite willing and able. Additionally, line level employees of the Department seem to have been patient with leadership lapses and at the same time, excited about their future and the future of the Department. It is possible that senior command staff have not been comfortable or knowledgeable about their role and responsibility in this law enforcement organization. Without appropriate coaching, counseling and mentoring, this scenario is all too often the case.

It does not appear that the position of sergeant in the West Richland Police Department is being used at the most efficient or effective capacity. There are a significant number of operational and administrative duties that could be assigned to the position of sergeant that would lessen the burden of day to day tasks forwarded to the chief or handled at the officer level; and improve the sergeant's readiness level with the experience of administrative roles and responsibilities.

Budget documents and interviews with Department personnel identify lack of adequate staffing as an organizational issue. It appears the perception of a staffing shortage is more accurately identified as a minimum staffing issue, versus a work-load issue.

Basically, there is currently enough staff to complete the work required of the West Richland Police Department. However, there may not be enough staff to mandate a two-officer minimum, given the number of positions currently authorized.

Sergeants are in charge in the absence of the chief. In the absence of a sergeant, the officer in charge is the senior officer, as addressed by Department policy. Members of the Department are required to obey lawful orders by policy

The Department's written directive system identified in Department policy 6.1 is a quality system. However, it does not appear the system is always being followed as described by policy. For instance, revisions and up-dates in Department policy have not been formally adopted, yet officers may be held accountable for the revisions.

The Department does not appear to conduct a formal, annual review of pursuits, use of force incidents and internal affairs complaints.

Recommendations:

- 4.1 The Department should research options, acceptance and funding of staffing plans and include such decision-making in a long range, strategic plan that includes elected officials and other city staff who are on the budget and finance team. This research should include how the Department might better utilize current staffing, such as including sergeants in minimum staffing allocations, to better augment patrol needs. The Department should not justify staffing by using ratios or formulas such as cops per thousand population. Justifications should be based on policing philosophy, policing priorities, number of calls for service, stability, transiency and composition of population (specifically age), citizen demand for crime control and municipal resources.
- 4.2 The Department should formally review, on an annual basis, all uses of force, pursuits, and internal affairs complaints. This review should occur in addition to the chain of command review that occurs immediately following such incidents and should be used to identify policy and training needs, as well as potential trends.
- 4.3 The Department should recognize that the documentation of having no internal affairs complaints for the past several years may be an issue unto itself. (See Chapter 14 for further information).
- 4.4 The Department should use the system of written direction that is currently articulated in their policy and procedure manual, chapter 6.1.
- 4.5 The Department should consider the position of sergeant not only as a command staff position, but in the minimum staffing allocation for patrol purposes.

Chapter 5—Records Management

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 5.1.1 *The agency has a central Records Function.*
- 5.1.2 *Agency employees using the ACCESS system are appropriately trained and certified.*
- 5.1.3 *The agency has a system to record and maintain a record of every call for service.*
- 5.1.4 *The agency protects the privacy and security of agency records in a manner that assures that only authorized personnel with the appropriate need to know – and the right to know – can access those records.*
- 5.1.5 *The agency complies with Washington State Law governing criminal history receipt, dissemination and destruction of records.*
- 5.1.6 *The agency complies with ACCESS requirements.*
- 5.1.7 *The agency has procedures for processing and maintaining traffic citations.*
- 5.1.8 *The agency has systems to separate files, fingerprints, and photos relating to juvenile offenses from those relating to adult offenses.*
- 5.1.9 *The agency has guidelines to address the release of public information.*
- 5.1.10 *The agency has procedures for community notifications of registered sex offenders.*
- 5.1.11 *The agency has policy and procedure for completing seizures and forfeitures in compliance with state law.*
- 5.1.12 *Officer safety files include a copy of the signed order authorizing entry into the records management system by an authorized person.*
- 5.1.13 *Missing Person Verification – The agency has a process to verify the status of missing persons and update the data base.*
- 5.1.14 *Vehicle Impounds – The agency attempts to notify vehicle owners when a stolen vehicle is recovered.*
- 5.1.15 *Uniform Crime Reporting – the agency participates in Uniform Crime Reporting by reporting to WASPC in a timely fashion.*

Findings:

The West Richland Police Department has a Centralized Records Function. Hardcopy files are maintained in an area open to all employees. Electronic files are locked by supervisors and cannot be modified once they are accepted.

Department employees using ACCESS systems are appropriately trained and certified as verified in the 2009 ACCESS Audit.

SECOMM utilizes ILEEDS as their CAD program. The Department utilizes PCSNET. The two software programs are not integrated. In order to generate a list of all calls for service each day, records staff accesses ILEEDS and generates a query of all calls for service, which they then in turn manually enter into the PCSNET program, sometimes requiring up to two hours to complete.

Because of the location of the records and the manner in which they are stored, anyone with access to the building can access a police record and review it, regardless of their need/right to know.

Interviews indicate the Department is not currently housing any criminal intelligence or confidential informant files.

Both civilian staff handling records management are LEIRA trained. The Records Section maintains a destruction log and dissemination log. However, the Department does not destroy electronic versions of records when orders to destroy are received, only the hard copy version. It was indicated during interviews that records staff do not receive destruction orders therefore additional direction is sought before destruction is completed.

The Department maintains records from 2003 to the current date. Permanent records, not subject to destruction (sex offenses, homicides, etc), are maintained in an offsite storage location.

The 2009 ACCESS Audit findings addressing six listed requirements have been corrected. Compliance reports were sent to and received by ACCESS.

The Department has a process for maintaining and processing traffic citations. Additionally, the Department utilizes SECTOR for e-ticketing and e-collision reporting. SECTOR provides its own internal controls to assist in meeting this requirement.

The Department currently merges all case reports into the Department's Records Section. Juvenile and adult cases are co-mingled and not specifically categorized. Additionally, the PCSNET records management system is housed on the City server system and is addressed in more detail under Chapter 6.

The Department does not conduct criminal fingerprinting and thus does not house criminal fingerprints, either adult or juvenile.

Public Records Requests are handled within the Department, including pertinent redaction and logging of records disseminated.

Registered sex offenders are handled in the Investigations Unit and coordinated with the Benton County Sheriff's Office.

The Department handles forfeitures and seizures through the Records Section manager, who is responsible for filing the required paperwork with the State. The Department uses a private attorney, on a contractual basis, as a hearing officer for these activities. According to interviews, this is not done on frequent basis.

The Department does not currently have any officer safety files entered into the WACIC system thus has no files to maintain. Given ACCESS requirements, records staff has indicated they would follow the ACCESS requirements for such files.

Missing person investigations are handled through the Investigations Unit.

WACIC/NCIC files are validated in compliance with ACCESS requirements. Vehicle impound owner notifications are handled in coordination between SECOMM and the officer recovering the vehicle. Department policy is somewhat ambiguous in assigning responsibility for this function, presenting as a potential liability to the Department.

The Department submits Uniform Crime Reports to WASPC and has plans underway to begin NIBRS training.

Recommendations:

- 5.1 Secure case files by modifying the file storage system to restrict access.
- 5.2 Maintain ACCESS certifications.
- 5.3 Integrate PCSNET into the ILEEDS program and/or consider upgrading the RMS to minimize personnel time required to data enter the ILEEDS information into the PCSNET system.
- 5.4 The ease of accessibility of the existing records storage system does not preclude unauthorized persons from accessing the records. Electronic records cannot be modified, but can be accessed. Restriction of access to records, both hardcopy and electronic needs to occur.
- 5.5 Maintain adherence to the ACCESS standards and findings as described in the 2009 ACCESS Audit.
- 5.6 Clear direction concerning records retention, destruction, processing of criminal and traffic citations needs to be given so that state retention/destruction laws may be better adhered to.
- 5.7 Juvenile and adult records, both hardcopy and electronic, need to be immediately segregated. Additionally, police and criminal records need to be further segregated from City servers.
- 5.8 Consideration should be given to transferring some of the public records dissemination logging and reporting to the Office of the City Clerk so that there is only one point of access to public records for the City.
- 5.9 Strengthen ties with the Benton County Sheriff's Office to streamline the RSO processes that are currently in place.

- 5.10 Modify current policy to address Vehicle Impound owner notification.
- 5.11 Progress in the implementation of the NIBRS reporting system that will be required by WASPC/FBI in January 2012.

Chapter 6—Information Technology

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 6.1.2 *Electronic File Security – Access to the agency’s computer server for electronic files is locked at all times with restricted access to those who are authorized and who have passed background investigation.*
- 6.1.3 *Security – The agency’s network is not connected to any external network, either directly or indirectly, without a firewall.*
- 6.1.4 *The agency has no dialup modems or workstations with dialup modems connected to a network without additional authentication techniques beyond login name and password.*
- 6.1.5 *Controls – The agency has policies governing appropriate use of agency technology.*
- 6.1.6 *Computer Viruses – Each fixed and mobile computer workstation as an up-to-date copy of agency approved, anti-virus software installed and running while the equipment is in use.*
- 6.1.7 *Electronic information is routinely backed up at least once a week. Back up media is kept in secure storage and is completely destroyed when no longer needed.*

Findings:

Electronic File Security for the Department is currently contained in a general access room within the confines of the secured area of the Police Department. This room serves as both the IT server room and the Department coffee/break /copy room. The room is not locked and there is limited, if any, control restricting access to those who have passed background investigations. The City IT manager has the ability to access the Police Department computer system from another City Building, which may or may not be secured against possible unauthorized use by persons who have not passed a background check. Further, while conducting the onsite, janitorial staff entered the Department and was afforded complete and unaccompanied access to the building.

The Department utilizes the City network for access to the internet and is not connected to external networks without a firewall. However, during the 2009 ACCESS audit cycle, there were two Technical Audit Findings concerning criminal records “end to end encryption” that have not been addressed. Corrective measures were initially planned to be purchased and installed by prior departmental administration. However, according to the TAC and IT manager, these upgrades have been ordered but not yet received and/or

installed. These findings could, therefore, restrict the ability of the Department to maintain access to Criminal Records, ACCESS, DOL, etc., if not immediately corrected.

The second finding in the technical audit addressing robust passwords has been corrected.

According the City IT manager, the City maintains no external connection to any network through a dial up network.

Patrol vehicles, which utilize cellular dial-up modems, access Benton County through a Virtual Protected Network (VPN) maintained by Benton County, to facilitate connectivity to their CAD system.

Department policy regarding computer use is limited and relates directly to the City Computer use Policy, which was not reviewed during the onsite. The policies concerning ACCESS, CJIS, DOL, PCSNET, are in place and the audit findings from ACCESS concerning logging and recording of criminal records requests have been corrected.

The City network uses a Symantec Anti-Virus program on the servers and individual computers.

Electronic information is backed up daily and weekly. The hard drive maintaining backup information is removed from the premises and stored off site, in a vault, on a weekly basis.

Recommendations:

- 6.1 Immediately secure access to the server room either by closing and locking the door or by building a securable partition between the commonly used area of the room and the network.
- 6.2 Segregate the PCSNET, Police Records system from the remainder of the City Network and restrict access to computers that can access the system to those who have passed background checks.
- 6.3 Comply with ACCESS Audit findings by making needed modifications to the City Network.
- 6.4 Restrict access to the building to those with background investigations unless accompanied by an employee who meets those requirements.
- 6.5 Verify with Benton County that the air-card technology and VPN being utilized by the Communications Center is in compliance with CJIS, ACCESS and FBI encryption protocols.

- 6.6 Maintain and upgrade as appropriate, all anti-virus software and hardware as necessary.

Chapter 7—Unusual Occurrences

WASPC Accreditation standards for the chapter include:

- 7.1.1 *Every sworn member of the agency has completed the National Incident Management System introductory training course.*
- 7.1.2 *The agency has contingency plans for responding to natural and man-made disasters, civil disturbances, and other unusual occurrences.*
- 7.1.3 *The agency consults with the County and/or regional agencies in developing a county or regional plan. The agency participates in county, regional and/or statewide plans when designated by the county, regional or statewide mobilization plans.*
- 7.1.4 *The agency has a policy for requesting and providing mutual aid.*

Findings:

Interviews conducted with personnel concerning National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the introductory Incident Command System (ICS) training indicated that personnel are not currently trained to this standard. Policy 24.1.1 indicates that all members of the Department will receive this training.

Contingency plans for natural and man-made disasters, civil disturbances and other unusual occurrences exist but are not well known or distributed throughout the Department.

While the Department has a copy of the Benton County Hazard Mitigation Plan, indications are that the manual has not been reviewed since March of 2004. Department policy 24.1.3 indicates the plans are to be reviewed annually by Department command staff. The Department is a co-signature on the County Mitigation Plan, but indication from line-staff is that administratively, the Department did not participate in county, regional and/or statewide plans and training in this area.

Functionally, Department personnel train, albeit informally in most cases, with neighboring agencies covering situations such as “active shooter”, dynamic entry, etc.

Policy 24.8 addresses mutual aid and mobilization consistent with best practice. This was observed while engaged in a ride along during the dayshift: a dayshift officer requested assistance from a Richland Police Department officer on a case that potentially had impact to both cities. Due to the close proximity of the other jurisdictions, a close working relationship between line-officers of the varying departments was observed. During interviews with personnel, it was determined that when WSP was requested for assistance concerning the state highway system, the WSP was willing and able provide the necessary assistance.

Recommendations:

- 7.1 Initiate a training program concerning National Incident Management System and Incident Command Systems. Introduce all employees to the program and partner with neighboring agencies to practice implementing the systems.
- 7.2 Review the Benton County Hazard Mitigation Plan with an emphasis on West Richland's specific responses. Build partnerships with the greater Benton County Emergency Services community to ensure hazard mitigation plans are the most current available. Review annually and update as appropriate and in accordance with Department policy.
- 7.3 Integrate Hazard Mitigation Plans into the Department, at least as far as first line supervisors, to ensure personnel are aware of the plan in the event of a disaster.
- 7.4 Develop partnerships into the greater Benton County, Tri-City area and participate in training with those agencies. In the event of a disaster, experiences have taught us that a city's resources are drastically and rapidly overwhelmed. Partnerships built before a disaster occurs will provide a faster and more efficient integration of supplemental resources when they are needed. Additionally, requests for those scarce but needed resources become easier when calling upon partner agencies as compared to requesting them from "strangers".

Chapter 8—Health and Safety

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 8.1.1 *The agency has guidelines that inform employees of the threats and hazards associated with airborne and blood borne pathogens.*
- 8.1.2 *The agency provides personal protective equipment to minimize exposure to potentially infectious material including sharps.*
- 8.1.3 *The agency provides soft body armor and requires its use.*
- 8.1.4 *The agency provides reflective clothing and requires its use.*
- 8.1.5 *The agency has procedures for disposal and decontamination when there is an event or contact involving biohazard material including blood or bodily fluids.*
- 8.1.6 *The agency has procedures for post-exposure reporting and follow-up after suspected or actual exposure to infectious diseases.*

Findings:

The Department has a policy outlining exposure to blood borne pathogens but does not address airborne pathogens. Interviews with personnel indicated the plan control officer, who handles the follow up and reporting requirements in the event of an exposure, has been assigned to the METRO task force and the plan control officer duties need to be reassigned.

Access to Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) is evident throughout the Department in that gloves and disinfectant, etc., are visible in areas of the squad room and evidence collection areas. These types of materials and PPE are available in at least some of the patrol vehicles, though an entire inspection was not conducted. PPE is most available for blood borne as opposed to airborne pathogens.

Policy 21.13 addresses soft body armor and is worded such that ALL members of the Department MUST wear soft body armor. However, non-uniformed personnel, such as administration and investigations were not wearing soft body armor during the onsite review.

Recommendations:

- 8.1 Update policy to address both blood borne and airborne pathogens and train all employees appropriate to their work areas as indicated in policy.
- 8.2 Appoint an Exposure Control Officer to ensure area supervisors are trained to control and report exposures within their area of control in compliance with policy.
- 8.3 Ensure the Exposure Control Officer is completing an annual review and update of the Exposure Plan as required by existing policy.
- 8.4 Department policy meets WASPC standard but is too restrictive given current Department practice. The policy should be modified to require uniformed personnel to wear soft body armor during the course of routine duties; administrative and investigative personnel to be given the option of wearing soft body armor unless in the performance of duties, such as warrant execution, that may require its use. In this way, current practice and policy can be synchronized without significant impact to the Department.

Chapter 9—Fiscal Management

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 9.1.1 *Budget Control – The Chief Executive Officer has the authority to spend funds in the approved budget for day-to-day operation of the agency.*
- 9.1.2 *Budget Control – The Chief Executive Officer makes regular reviews of the agency budget.*
- 9.1.3 *Budget Control – The agency has a system for review and approval of expenditures.*
- 9.1.4 *Payroll – The agency has a policy requiring supervisory approval of all overtime.*
- 9.1.5 *Payroll – The agency has a policy requiring non-exempt employees to complete a timesheet listing the number of hours worked during the pay period.*
- 9.1.6 *Payroll – The agency has a policy requiring timesheets to be approved by a supervisor prior to payment.*

9.1.7 *Cash Control – The agency has a system to document and record the use of cash funds that include receipts, supervisory approval, and periodic audit.*

Findings:

The City of West Richland has adopted Washington State's BAARS system for budget preparation and tracking. The chief has the authority to spend funds. The Finance Department provides monthly budget summaries for review of the Department's budget.

The chief has the authority to spend funds in the approved budget for day to day operations of the Department. It appears prior expenditures for major items such as vehicles and radios were not appropriately discussed with the Mayor's office and/or the Finance Director. \$21,000 was expended on radio equipment that is not, and has not been used by Department members. Vehicles have been purchased with no replacement cycle or plan for repair. Although the Department may have been authorized to replace vehicles, the Department should have communicated what they were planning and when they were going to carry out this plan to elected officials and those in charge of managing City finances.

Chapter 11 of the Department's policy manual governs fiscal activities. The policy refers to the lieutenant as having the authority and responsibility to purchase. There is no lieutenant position in the command structure of the Department.

The Department's fiscal policy does not require supervisory approval of all overtime, nor does the policy manual require the completion and approval of time sheets by Department members.

The Department's system documenting cash control is covered by Department policy 11.8

Recommendations:

- 9.1 The chief needs to communicate budget decisions, such as the purchase of new vehicles, with Mayor's office.
- 9.2 The Department should work with members of the Finance Department and other city staff to prepare and present an equipment replacement program for major items such as vehicles and radio equipment.
- 9.3 The Department should implement a procedure requiring supervisory approval for all overtime.
- 9.4 The Department should require all employees to complete time sheets that are approved by Department supervisors prior to submittal to the Finance Department.

- 9.5 The Department should be audited periodically by the Finance Department to ensure that cash control activities, such as fingerprint cards, concealed pistol licenses and animal control activities are conducted in the approved manner.

Chapter 10—Recruitment and Selection

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 10.1.1 The agency has written standards and hiring criteria for sworn and non-sworn employees and, if applicable, reserve, part-time, or limited commission personnel.*
- 10.1.2 The agency requires that background investigations be conducted on each candidate for a sworn position prior to appointment, and requires that proof is submitted to the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission.*
- 10.1.3 The agency requires that medical examinations, including drug screening, be performed by a licensed physician for each candidate for a sworn position, prior to appointment.*
- 10.1.4 The agency requires that a licensed psychologist or psychiatrist conduct a psychological fitness examination for each candidate for a sworn position, prior to appointment.*
- 10.1.5 The agency requires that a polygraph examination be administered by a licensed technician for each candidate for a sworn position, prior to appointment.*
- 10.1.6 Applicant files are secured and available only to those who are authorized to participate in the selection process.*
- 10.1.7 Employee personnel files are separate and secure from other files. Medical tests, psychological evaluations and polygraph results are kept separate from personnel files in secure locations.*

Findings:

The City of West Richland does not have a Human Resources Department. All City departments appear to be responsible for their own personnel issues, with the assistance of the City Attorney's Office.

The City of West Richland has in place an active Civil Service Commission that has adopted standards for hiring criteria for sworn and non-sworn employees. The Department performs background investigations for all candidates, including, mandated medical, psychological and polygraph examinations.

Recommendations:

- 10.1 Personnel files must be stored separate and secure from other files. Medical tests, psychological evaluations and polygraph results must be kept separate from personnel files and in secure locations. The Department appears to be keeping all recruitment and personnel information, it is necessary that they are diligent in appropriately maintaining two separate filing systems.

- 10.2 It is difficult for most agencies to maintain the confidentiality of personnel information. The Department and its membership should make every effort to keep confidential information that is learned about potential candidates and insist that only those with the right to know and the need to know are privy to such information.

Chapter 11—Training

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 11.1.1 The agency requires all full-time, sworn members to successfully complete the Basic Law Enforcement Academy or Equivalency Academy, as certified by the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission prior to assuming law enforcement duties, and requires that they begin attending the Academy within six months of their date of hire.*
- 11.1.2 The agency has established a formal Field Training program for all newly sworn officers.*
- 11.1.3 The agency maintains and updates training records of all employees.*
- 11.1.3 The agency maintains records of formal training it conducts.*
- 11.1.5 The agency requires all sworn members to successfully complete an annual in-service training program that includes material on Federal and Washington State Court cases, legal updates, and as required by the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission, or at least 24 hours.*
- 11.1.6 Agency Personnel are required to demonstrate satisfactory skill and proficiency with agency authorized weapons before being approved to carry and/or use such weapons.*
- 11.1.7 Staff members who are designated as full-time supervisors or managers have earned the appropriate certification by the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission.*
- 11.1.8 At least annually, agency personnel receive in-service training on the agency's use of force and deadly force policies. In-service training for less-than lethal weapons shall occur at least every two years.*

Findings:

The Department does not have an established training officer and struggles with maintenance of training records and consistency of standards.

The Department requires all full-time sworn members to successfully complete the CJTC's Basic Law Enforcement Academy or an Equivalency Academy before assuming law enforcement duties. The Department requires that all new hires enter the Academy within six months of their hire date. If the Department hires an officer already certified as a reserve officer the Department allows the officer to work under reserve commission until he or she is able to attend the Academy.

The Department has established a formal field training officer program (FTO) and requires new officers to complete the program after successfully completing the Academy. At the end of the 14-week program, a board of field training officers convenes to discuss the officer's progress. Upon review of the officer's training progress, a determination is made to clear the officer for solo patrol, or not. The Department documents the review with a letter to be retained in the officer's training records. Inconsistencies in the review process were reported to the LEMAP team. Field training officers were recently informed they would no longer be compensated for review meetings, and any participation would be voluntary. On at least one occasion, to cut costs, a sergeant conducted the review and made the final decision.

The field training officer program is managed by the chief. Training records of individual officers were not kept in a centralized location. Some records were maintained by the trainee's supervisor, while others were apparently maintained by the trainee's last training officer. The Department could locate only one of the last three recruit training files.

The Department's administrative assistant is responsible for updating and maintaining training records. The Department utilizes the Microsoft Excel program as the training records data base. Every Department employee has full access to the data base. The process for recording completed officer training is inconsistent. Individual officers submit training requests through their respective sergeants. The training is then approved or disapproved by the administrative sergeant. If the training is approved, officers make their own travel arrangements. When officers return from training, they are to email the administrative assistant to update training records. Currently, some officers do this, while others turn in their certificates to either the administrative assistant or the administrative sergeant. Other times, the officers fail to notify anyone of the completed training.

The Department utilizes in-house instructors for EVOC, firearms, Taser, defensive tactics and first aid. The Department does not maintain course outlines, rosters, attendee performance, test results and instructor credentials in a centralized location. Information received through officer interviews, indicates that while some individual trainers consistently maintain records in compliance with this standard, others do not.

The Department requires all commissioned officers receive a minimum of twenty-four hours of annual training. The Department also requires all commissioned officers to receive annual training on Washington State and federal case law and legal updates. The Department has met this standard the last two years.

The Department ensures that all commissioned officers demonstrate satisfactory skill and proficiency with agency authorized weapons 3-4 times per year.

The current chief of the Department has attained executive level certification. Training records do not reflect that all of Department sergeants are certified. Upon reviewing electronic training files, it seems that all sergeants have enough training hours for

certification; however, hard copy files do not contain the appropriate documentation for certification.

The Department provides in-service training on use of force and deadly force policies. This training generally occurs in conjunction with defensive tactics or firearms training.

The Department utilizes 12-gauge less lethal shotguns. Commissioned officers receive training on this weapons system one to two times per year. Although the Department does not issue lethal shotgun ammunition, there are no distinguishing characteristics on the weapon system to indicate it is for less lethal ammunition only. This presents a potentially dangerous situation when working with other agencies or task force members that use the shotgun coupled with lethal ammunition.

Recommendations:

11.1 The Department should consider assigning one field training officer to oversee the FTO program. All records should be kept in a central location. The Department should ensure the final review process is consistent to avoid the appearance of partiality.

11.2 The Department's training files need to be secure, to ensure officers cannot add, modify or delete training files. The Department needs to establish a clear, consistent process to ensure all completed training is recorded.

Note: Prior to completing the onsite review, the administrative assistant was able to secure the training files data base. While officers will now have access to review their training file, they will not be able to add, modify or delete training records.

11.3 The Department should require one officer to oversee the training function. This officer should maintain all training records for the Department. If this person is to be the administrative assistant, that person should maintain all Department training records.

11.4 Require first level supervisory staff to show proof of certification, and maintain the appropriate documentation in training files.

11.5 The Department should mark the less lethal shotgun in a manner symbolizing it is a less lethal shotgun and distinguishes it from neighboring agency shotguns.

Chapter 12—Performance Evaluation

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

12.1.1 The agency has an evaluation policy that requires formal written review of the work performance of each employee and is conducted annually.

12.1.2 The agency has a system for evaluating the performance of all probationary employees.

Findings:

The Department has policies governing performance evaluation and appraisal. These policies are found in Chapter 20 of the Department's policy and procedure manual.

Department policy requires annual performance evaluations for all employees and requires instruction for anyone having greater responsibilities. Current Department policy is appropriate. However, it does not appear the Department is following its own policy regarding the performance appraisal system.

To be meaningful and credible, objective critique of performance must be documented. Employees need to be aware of those issues that need improvement. Employees should be rated on their ability to improve performance. Supervisors should be held accountable for their ability to appropriately rate subordinate personnel and their ability to improve performance that does not meet standards.

Supervisors need to be held accountable for their performance and rated not only on their ability to supervise, but their ability to rate subordinate personnel and improve subordinate personnel with the use of the Department's performance appraisal system.

When supervisory personnel are not objectively rated by the chief; if supervisory personnel are allowed to operate using "double standards;" and when supervisory personnel are not required to perform consistent with Department policy, the personnel "systems" within the Department collapse and lose credibility.

Based on interviews conducted, it appears that supervisory personnel may have been held to different standards relating to performance and performance appraisals. Not all personnel were evaluated on an annual basis. When evaluations were completed, subordinate personnel were not measured on an objective, consistent scale. Supervisors were not provided adequate instruction on how to use the agency's evaluation system and supervisors were not rated on their abilities to rate.

Recommendations:

- 12.1 The Department should strictly follow its current policy and procedures regarding performance evaluation for all employees.
- 12.2 Supervisors should be trained on how to provide appropriate, meaningful performance appraisals for subordinate personnel.
- 12.3 Supervisors should be rated on their ability to objectively rate subordinate personnel and should be rated on their abilities to improve performance.

- 12.4 The Department should be less concerned about the evaluation form, and more concerned about the effort and credibility of the evaluation process.
- 12.5 The chief should receive an annual evaluation from the Mayor

Chapter 13—Code of Conduct

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 13.1.1 The agency has a code of conduct that outlines specific conditions of work that apply to all agency personnel.*
- 13.1.2 The agency has a policy prohibiting sexual and any other forms of unlawful or improper harassment or discrimination in the work place. The policy provides guidelines for reporting unlawful or improper conduct, including how to report if the offending party is in the complainant's chain of command. The policy includes "whistleblower" protection.*
- 13.1.3 The agency has a policy prohibiting biased-based policing, also known as "racial profiling."*
- 13.1.4 The agency has a written policy and procedure for responding to and investigating allegations of domestic violence involving employees of law enforcement agencies.*
- 13.1.5 The agency requires all personnel to use safety restraint/seat belts while operating agency vehicles.*

Chapter 16 of the Department's manual addresses the code of conduct. The policies and procedures addressed in this chapter provide an appropriate road map on how Department personnel should perform and how the Department will address and investigate allegations of misconduct.

Recommendations:

- 13.1 The Department's harassment policy is somewhat outdated. The Department should research, implement and train an updated harassment policy, including sexual harassment including whistleblower protections.
- 13.2 The Department has a policy prohibiting biased based policing, also referred to as racial profiling. It is unknown if the Department is reporting this information to WASPC, as required.
- 13.3 The Department's policy addressing officer-involved domestic is outdated. The Department should research, implement and train Department members on the current, legislative required, officer-involved domestic violence policies and procedures.

Chapter 14—Internal Affairs

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 14.1.1 The agency requires the documentation and investigation of all complaints of misconduct or illegal behavior against the agency or its members.*
- 14.1.2 The agency identifies which complaints supervisors investigate and which types of complaints are investigated by an internal affairs function.*
- 14.1.3 The agency has procedures for relieving a member from duty during an internal investigation*
- 14.1.4 The agency has a policy regarding providing complainants with written notification concerning the conclusion of fact and disposition of their complaint.*
- 14.1.5 The agency requires that records of complaints and dispositions be maintained.*

Findings:

Chapter 26 of the Department's manual addresses the internal affairs function. The Department requires the documentation and investigation of all complaints of misconduct and/or illegal behavior against the Department or its members

The Department utilizes a complaint form and requires use of the form in those cases where the complaint is not resolved at the initial level or where the allegation is of more serious nature. Sergeants can determine how complaints are processed and which complaints are investigated. This can lead to an inconsistent method of assigning or investigating complaints, depending on which sergeant a member may work for.

Policy 26.3 states the lieutenant will be responsible for supervising and controlling any internal affairs investigation. The Department does not employ a lieutenant.

Recommendations:

- 14.1 The Department should review chapter 26 of their manual and address those sections to bring them into compliance with current Department policy. Department personnel should be trained and aware of their responsibilities, such as reporting member misconduct, as it pertains to their own policy and procedure manual.
- 14.2 The Department should ensure that all allegations of misconduct are addressed in a consistent fashion by requiring supervisory personnel to document and investigate all allegations of misconduct in a consistent manner.
- 14.3 The Department should not require the completion of any complaint report form if a complainant does not want to complete such a form. All allegations of misconduct should be investigated, regardless of whether or not a complainant completes a form.

- 14.4 The Department should ensure all who are assigned internal investigation responsibilities have been appropriately trained. Training should include organizational requirements such as labor agreements, timelines, and file organization. Investigation files should be completed and organized in a consistent manner.
- 14.5 The Department should create a policy requiring written notification to complainants regarding conclusion and disposition of their complaint.
- 14.6 The Department should consider using performance audits, including use of force, injuries to prisoners, arrests for resisting/obstructing, etc. when force is used, firearm discharges, complaints, criminal/civil claims, vehicle pursuits, disciplinary action imposed, automobile accidents, and attendance/absenteeism.

Complaint Intake:

- 14.7 A policy and procedure that oversees the complaint and disciplinary process should be created.
- 14.8 Complaint forms should be simple, straightforward, and prepared in appropriate languages.
- 14.9 Assistance should be available to persons incapable of filing complaints.
- 14.10 Legal counsel for the City should promptly notify the Department whenever civil claims are filed arising out of alleged misconduct. The Department should investigate every significant claim.

Investigation:

- 14.11 All complaints and allegations of misconduct should be investigated, not just reviewed.
- 14.12 Complaint processing should be consistent throughout the Department.
- 14.13 Investigative personnel should receive specific training focused on internal investigative practices that include organizational requirements such as labor agreements and procedures. Investigation files should be completed and organized in a consistent manner, such as:
- Complaint
 - Allegation Summary
 - Findings of Fact
 - Statements
 - Reports
 - Correspondence

- Disposition/Penalty Recommendations
- Classification Summary (i.e. Allegation #1-Sustained, Allegation #2-Not Sustained, etc)

- 14.14 If the City wishes to use an external review system, investigations should be forwarded to the audit authority, whose responsibility is to determine that the investigation is thorough and complete.
- 14.15 Certain investigative practices should not be allowed. Group interviews of officers and pre-interviews before recorded statements should be prohibited.
- 14.16 All interviews should be recorded.
- 14.17 All officers witnessing but not participating in the alleged misconduct should be investigated as to the role they played.

Adjudication:

- 14.18 Initial complaints should be forwarded to the Chief for classification.
- 14.19 Findings that are not sustained are insufficient to administer discipline. However, the complaints should be available for review in future investigations and employee evaluations.
- 14.20 All findings should be available for the purposes of training, counseling and assignment.
- 14.21 All complaints of misconduct should be investigated. Not sustained findings should be minimized. Decisions must be based on all available evidence and a preponderance of the evidence standard, not beyond reasonable doubt standards.
- 14.22 Information should be utilized in performance evaluations and officers should be evaluated on their ability to correct unacceptable behavior.

SECTION 2—OPERATIONAL STANDARDS**Chapter 15—Patrol Function**

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 15.1.1 *The agency provides response to emergency events 24/7 by sworn employees who have completed Basic Training per the Washington State criminal Justice Training Commission.*
- 15.1.2 *The agency has procedures for response to emergency and non-emergency calls that conform to state legal requirements.*

- 15.1.3 The agency provides 24-hour, two-way radio capability providing continuous communication between a communication center and the officer(s) on duty.*
- 15.1.4 The agency has the means to access immediate playback of recorded, emergency telephone and radio communications.*
- 15.1.5 The agency has guidelines for the use of authorized vehicle emergency equipment.*
- 15.1.6 The agency has policies governing motor vehicle pursuits that conform to Washington State Law.*
- 15.1.7 The agency has procedures for response and investigation of domestic violence.*
- 15.1.8 The agency has procedures for response and investigation of missing persons, including procedures specific to missing adults, missing children, and the utilization of the Amber Alert System.*
- 15.1.9 The agency has procedures for the handling of mentally ill individuals, including those pending criminal charges and mental health commitments, pursuant to the Revised Code of Washington.*

Findings:

The Department provides response to emergency events, 24/7 by sworn employees who have been trained by the CJTC. Currently, officers work twelve hour shifts with two officers and a sergeant on duty for each shift, excluding vacation and/or unexpected absences.

The Department has policies in place directing the officers' responses to calls, both emergent and non-emergent in nature.

The Department is a member of the regional dispatch center which provides for 24 hour, 2-way communication for officers. Officers have access to in-car computers allowing non-radio communications between officers of their own Department and neighboring agencies.

While not maintained internally, as a member of the regional dispatch center, the capability to access radio and in-car computer communication records exists.

Policy exists concerning use of patrol vehicles and equipment. The Department has a "take home car" program. There is significant policy concerning authorized use of most, if not all, Department equipment. Policies are spread out in multiple sections of the policy manual making it somewhat cumbersome to read and/or search.

The Department has a pursuit policy that appears up to date and comprehensive.

The Department has a domestic violence policy but may need to be updated to better reflect the WASPC model policy for officer involved domestic violence.

A review of policy and interviews with patrol officers indicate there are policies in place to handle the investigation of missing persons, runaways and Amber Alert situations.

There is limited mention of the mentally ill contained in the Department's policy manual. Interviews indicate departmental awareness of the issue and there are procedures, albeit informal, used by Department members to handle such situations. Elder abuse/child abuse situations, wherein there is a developmental disability or mental illness are addressed under appropriate chapters of the policy manual. Excited delirium is addressed under its own section.

Recommendations:

- 15.1 An overall review of the policy manual should be conducted, making edits and updates where appropriate, in order to meet state and federal requirements. While most standards are covered in the existing manual and personnel are aware of best practice, information contained within the policy manual and current practice may be in conflict with one another, i.e.: officer involved domestic violence.
- 15.2 Consider the incorporation a more formalized "procedures" manual to supplement policy and to provide guidance to personnel. Or, refresh the existing policy manual to capture current practice of personnel.
- 15.3 Refresh information contained within the policy manual to address issues surrounding the mentally ill and to formalize processes used by personnel while addressing issues involving the mentally ill.

Chapter 16—Traffic Function

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 16.1.1 *The agency has procedures for investigating vehicle crashes on public and private property and uses the current Washington State Patrol, authorized accident report forms.*
- 16.1.2 *The agency has procedures for the lawful impounding of vehicles.*
- 16.1.3 *The agency has procedures to take timely action to address hazardous road conditions.*

Findings:

The Department has policies in place that address vehicle crashes on public and private property involving City and Department vehicles, hit and run, etc. The Department utilizes e-ticketing through the SECTOR program, but is not mentioned in policy. By using SECTOR, the Department uses State authorized forms.

The Department has policy concerning authorized impounds and the appropriate forms to be completed.

The Department has policy concerning the reporting, and in some cases, mitigating of hazardous road conditions.

Recommendations:

- 16.1 Formalize, in policy, the acceptance of SECTOR and e-ticketing in the policy manual.

Chapter 17—Investigative Function

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 17.1.1 The agency utilizes a case management system for screening and assigning incident reports for follow-up investigations.*
- 17.1.2 The agency has guidelines for investigating elder abuse;*
- 17.1.3 The agency has guidelines for investigating child abuse;*
- 17.1.4 The agency requires that interviewers of child victims or sexual abuse cases have received the mandated training from the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission.*
- 17.1.5 The agency has guidelines for investigating hate crimes;*
- 17.1.6 The agency has guidelines for investigating identity theft;*
- 17.1.7 The agency has policies and procedures governing the use of informants.*

Findings:

The Department uses an integrated records management system (PS-NET) that allows patrol officers to complete incident reports that are reviewable by the Investigative Division. The investigator is able to review all cases written by Patrol and is able to begin initial investigation in a rapid manner when necessary for timeliness. In other cases, a patrol sergeant reviews and approves an officer's report, submits it through the records section, assesses the solvability of the case and forwards the investigation to the investigator. Of the cases investigated by the Department, approximately 25% of the cases are assigned to Investigations for further follow up. The investigator uses a paper ledger, maintained in his office, to track assigned cases.

The Department has a limited numbers of cases involving reported Elder Abuse, though their policy addresses processes for handling this type of investigation.

The Department utilizes "Kids Haven," a division of the Benton County Prosecutor's Office, for conducting forensic interviews with child sexual assault victims and relies heavily on their training and expertise to minimize the impact on child victims. The current investigator has a good grasp of his role in investigations of this nature and policy exists to support the role.

Policy specifically defines hate crimes and a process to investigate them in support of the standard. According to the current investigator, the Department has very few of these cases annually. Typically, "hate crimes" in this community manifest themselves as graffiti cases and are typically perpetrated by juveniles.

The Department has policy to support the investigation of identity theft. While these cases are typically a lower priority in the investigations division, fraud and ID theft cases are reviewed by the investigator for local leads and follow up.

Department policy provides for the use of confidential informants, however, the Department has not routinely used them. Confidential informant files and funds are maintained in the chief's office.

The Department does not currently maintain any criminal intelligence files. When necessary, files of this nature would be secured in the chief's office.

The Department has recently renewed their participation in the Metro Drug Task Force.

The investigator is often tasked with responsibilities that are not investigative in nature. The investigator, in addition to conducting investigations, is also tasked with duties such as Block Watch and/or Crime Prevention talks and demonstrations. These activities, while beneficial to the overall Department and City reputation and responsibility, detract from the role of investigations.

Recommendations:

- 17.1 Update and/or upgrade the existing case management system to electronically monitor cases assigned to the investigator.
- 17.2 Maintain the case assignment tracking either under the administrative sergeant or with command staff to better oversee the Investigative Division.
- 17.3 Update training to all commissioned personnel concerning their roles in child and elder abuse cases.
- 17.4 In the case of ID theft, while there is policy to support the investigation and the reporting thereof, the policy may not be specific regarding current state and/or federal requirements. The taking of complainant/victim fingerprints and the completion of an ID theft affidavit and assignment of a code word is not specifically addressed.
- 17.5 Maintain and develop additional partnerships with surrounding agencies, such as the partnership with the Metro Drug Task Force.
- 17.6 Consideration should be given to utilizing uniformed personnel in crime prevention activities when appropriate.

Chapter 18—Evidence and Property Control Function

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 18.1.1 *The agency has guidelines for the proper collection and identification of evidence. These guidelines conform to the policies and procedures outlined in the current Washington State Patrol Evidence Collection Manual.*
- 18.1.2 *Notification – Property owners are provided the legal reason for the seizure and state law is followed on notification, appeal and disposition.*
- 18.1.3 *Notification- The agency has policies requiring efforts are made to identify and notify owners or custodians of recovered property.*
- 18.2.1 *Booking – Property and evidence is placed under the control of the property and evidence function before the officer completes their shift.*
- 18.2.2 *Booking – The agency has the means to temporarily separate and secure property and evidence while it is waiting processing into the permanent storage facility.*
- 18.2.3 *Booking – The agency has the means to properly preserve and secure perishable property both temporarily and after it is received in the permanent storage facility.*
- 18.2.4 *Booking – The agency has the means to temporarily separate and secure evidence containing hazardous materials while it is waiting processing into the appropriate permanent storage facility.*
- 18.3.1 *Facility Controls – The permanent storage facility has controls to keep property protected from unauthorized entry, fire, moisture, extreme temperature and pests.*
- 18.3.2 *Facility Controls – The permanent storage facility containing biohazards or organic matter has systems in place to prevent the exposure of hazards and noxious odors to agency employees and the public.*
- 18.3.3 *Physical Security – The agency’s evidence and property facilities are alarmed and monitored 24/7.*
- 18.3.4 *Physical Security – Access to the agency’s property and evidence facilities is restricted to authorized employees only.*
- 18.3.5 *Physical Security – The agency records the name, date, time, and purpose of persons who enter and leave the storage facility.*
- 18.3.6 *Physical Security – The agency provides additional security for guns, drugs, cash, jewelry, or other sensitive or valuable property, that is over and above that provided for other property and evidence.*
- 18.4.1 *Tracking – Evidence and property is packaged, individually tagged and logged into a centralized tracking system as soon as possible.*
- 18.4.2 *Tracking – Every piece of property and evidence is related to a report describing the circumstances of the seizure or custody by the agency.*
- 18.4.3 *Tracking – A tracking system accurately describes the current location of every piece of property and evidence.*
- 18.4.4 *Tracking – The tracking system accurately records the movement of every piece of property and evidence by date, location, reason, and person.*
- 18.4.5 *Tracking – Drugs are weighed using a calibrated scale whenever they enter or leave the secure facility.*
- 18.5.1 *Purging – The agency has a policy regarding the release of property.*
- 18.5.2 *Purging – The agency has policies requiring efforts are made to identify and notify owners or custodians of recovered property.*
- 18.5.3 *Purging – Property containing hazardous materials, biological hazards or other materials restricted by State or local health regulations is disposed of properly.*

- 18.5.4 Purging – When property is sold, the disposition of the money received is accounted for and recorded according to State law.*
- 18.5.5 Purging – The agency destroys illegal drugs, contraband and other illegal items by methods that are safe. Documentation of destruction is maintained according to the State’s retention schedule.*
- 18.6.1 Audits – The agency ensures that an audit of the property and evidence is conducted at least annually.*
- 18.6.2 Audits – An audit of property and evidence is conducted whenever a new employee is assigned responsibility of the property and evidence function.*

Findings:

The Department uses a non-commissioned employee, police analyst, as the primary evidence/property custodian. However, this person’s primary job function is to manage the records of the Department. This person has no supervisor and reports directly to the chief. The alternate or secondary evidence custodian is the detective. The evidence room was observed to be organized and the police specialist to be knowledgeable. A small scale audit was conducted on the evidence/property room. The audit consisted of verifying evidence from the following categories (general, guns, narcotics, and property). During the audit, the following deficiencies were noted:

Guns—case number 030185, Item#1, ammunition was stored with the weapon. Item #2 contained no evidence label.

Case number 062600, no evidence label

Case number 032602, no evidence label and evidence should be disposed of.

Drugs—case number 060189, Item #1, no total weight in comments section.

The Department does not have clear guidelines describing the proper collection and identification of evidence and property. The current Department manual describes typical responses by the evidence officer, and contingencies for exceptional evidence. However some of those guidelines are not being followed. For example, the manual speaks about a cooperate agreement with the Richland Police Department for storage of unique or large evidence items. Information gathered from employee interviews indicates the Department does not follow this policy. Additionally, the evidence custodian had limited knowledge of the WSP evidence handbook, and availability of it to the line staff was unknown.

The Department provides persons with a vested interest the reason for the civil seizure and intended forfeiture of money and property. The Department has procedures for notification, appeal, and case disposition; however, the current policy manual does not reflect this. It was apparent that the Department’s does very few civil seizures, if any. In reviewing the one seizure completed in the last three years, the process was thorough and all of the documentation was present. In that particular case, a motorcycle was seized

and ultimately forfeited to the Department. The motorcycle was sold; however, the evidence officer does not know what happened with the proceeds from the sale, and there was nothing in the seizure file about the sale. The seizure file was maintained by the police analyst; however, it was unknown who would maintain the file if that person was not also the evidence custodian. All Department members have access to these files and they are unsecure.

The Department utilizes an outside disinterested hearing officer for asset forfeiture cases.

In checking with the City Finance Department, there is an established system in place for asset forfeitures. The Finance Department does have the ability to distinguish seizures and forfeiture monies from other money sources.

If the Department keeps civilly seized monies in the evidence system, they do not have an identification or computer tracking system that would segregate those monies from other monies that were being retained as criminal evidence.

The Department does not have a policy regarding notification of owners or custodians of property and evidence in the Department's custody. In practice, the Department reports that they are able to locate most known owners of evidence and property by using the computer data base. The Department makes phone contact with those owners and arranges for the property/evidence release. On those occasions, when they cannot contact the owners by telephone, the Department sends a letter notifying owners to claim the item(s) at the police facility.

Only the primary or secondary evidence custodian can release property or evidence. The Department requires owners of released property/evidence to sign a receipt for those items. The receipts for evidence are maintained with the case file. The receipts for property are maintained in a separate file.

The Department requires that property and evidence be placed under control of the property and evidence function before an officer completes their shift, however, there are exceptions to the rule. Evidence that is too large is placed into a separate room in the police facility. The Department reports that on occasion, rifles have been temporarily stored in this room. The key to this room is kept in the Department key box. Officers who need to place evidence into the room, obtain the key, place the evidence inside, lock the door, and then secure the room key into one of the temporary evidence lockers. When the evidence custodian finds the room key in the temporary evidence lockers, this serves to notify the custodian that there is evidence in the storage room. Besides the obvious implications, the evidence custodian does not routinely check the temporary lockers.

Recovered stolen vehicles that must be processed or searched are not being stored in a secure area. Department practice has been to park vehicles in front of the police facility. This area is open to the public and is not secure. On occasion, the city maintenance shop has been utilized. Again this area is not secure nor is access restricted. Additionally,

recovered stolen vehicles that need to be processed for evidence are not entered into the evidence management system. The Department's policy manual instructs officers to use the Richland Police Department as a resource, although it appears that this is not being done.

The Department also utilizes the "Ironton Pump House" to store found bicycles. This is a City owned property and many City employees have access.

The Department does not have a means to store perishable evidence. Interviews with officers indicated one of the facility restrooms has been used to dry green marijuana. The Department policy manual instructs officers to utilize the Richland police Department evidence facility as a resource, which is not currently being done. During the interview process employees were unsure of what to do if they have blood soaked evidence that needs to be dried and stored.

The Department does not have an alternative storage location for hazardous materials while waiting for processing into the appropriate permanent storage facility. During the interview process, employees stated they would try to get the prosecutor's office to authorize the photograph and release such evidence rather than storing the evidence.

The Department has one secure storage facility. Access is restricted by an issued key and coded keypad entry. The storage facility is alarmed. Persons entering the secure storage facility are required to sign in with name, date, and purpose. Upon reviewing records, persons are rarely granted authorization by the evidence custodian to enter the storage facility. Other storage locations that are used, are not alarmed, nor are access restricted. The main storage facility has never incurred any problems from fire, moisture, extreme temperature or pests. The temperature is controlled by the facility's HVAC system.

There is no ventilation or filtration system in the secure evidence facility. During the interview process, it was discovered that in the past there have been problems with odors from storing marijuana and human skin and tissue from a death investigation.

The Department's main storage facility is protected by an alarm system and restricted key and code access. The alarm is monitored by Moon Security, 24 hours a day, and 7 days a week.

The other evidence locations are not protected by an alarm.

The Department's main storage facility requires a key and access code to enter. Access codes are individualistic, and issued to the primary evidence custodian, the alternate custodian, and the chief. Moon Security sends a monthly report to the primary evidence custodian. The report indicates which access codes were used during the month. Keys for the door to the evidence facility are issued to the primary evidence custodian, the alternate custodian, the chief, and the city clerk. The city clerk's key is sealed in an envelope and locked in the safe at the city hall.

The other storage locations do not have these protections.

The Department records the name, date, time and purpose of persons who enter and leave the storage facility.

The Department provides additional security for guns and drugs. Upon inspection these items were locked in containers, separated from other evidence. There reportedly was no money in the evidence room. The Department currently does not have additional security measures for cash, jewelry, or other valuable property.

The Department's evidence and property is packaged, tagged and logged into a centralized tracking system as soon as possible. The Department requires all evidence packages to have evidence tape on them. The evidence tape contains the officer's initials, case number and date. The package also contains an evidence label. The label contains the case number, description of the evidence or property, date, submitting officer's name, and the item number. Additional identification by item number might be problematic if two officers enter evidence from the same case at different times, thereby duplicating or skipping an item number.

The Department uses PSNET to record and track property and evidence. Officers are required to enter the evidence or property into the (PSNET) data system prior to the end of their shift. The items are then placed in the temporary storage locker(s) attached to the storage facility. Officers lock items in the temporary locker along with the locker key. When the evidence custodian removes the evidence from the temporary locker, and places it into the secure storage, the computer system is updated with the transfer data. The key is then returned to the outside of the temporary locker to be used again. The Department does not require that the evidence custodian check the temporary lockers on a daily basis. The Department does not require the evidence custodian to run a daily report to see what evidence the officers have logged into the system and match it up against what has been turned into the temporary storage lockers.

The PSNET system does not separate seizures from other evidence. There is nothing in the computer that would indicate that the item in evidence is, or is not, a seizure. Additionally, there are no distinguishing marks on the packaging to indicate if the item contained is a seizure.

All stored property and evidence relates to a report describing the circumstances of the seizure or custody by the Department.

The Department has a tracking system accurately describing the current location of every piece of property and evidence.

The Department has a tracking system accurately recording the movement of every piece of property and evidence by date, location, reason and person. The Department does not require officers to sign out evidence for court or require subsequent court clerks to sign for evidence that is admitted at trial. Since, some evidence signed out for criminal trials

may be admitted into court and other pieces may not, this can be problematic as court clerks are subject to change and leave their jobs and evidence can be retained by the court for lengthy periods of time.

The Department uses one calibrated scale to weigh narcotics. The scale is certified on an annual basis. Drug evidence is weighed whenever it leaves or enters the secure facility.

The Department does not have an effective policy outlining the process for release and disposition of property and evidence, however, their practice is in accordance with industry standards. The evidence custodian receives the releases sent from the prosecutor's office pertaining to evidence. After receiving the disposition, the evidence custodian sends out a letter informing owners that they need to pick the evidence or it will be destroyed. A similar type letter is sent out to property owners. On non-charged cases where this is no disposition notice sent to the Department, the custodian checks with the case officer. All releases and dispositions are attached to the case file.

The Department does not dispose of property containing hazardous materials, biological hazards or other materials restricted by state or local health properly. Currently, the Department destroys property by burning it at the firing range, and other items are taken to the Richland landfill. Whenever the Department destroys property or evidence, the primary evidence custodian is accompanied by the alternate custodian.

The Department ensures that when property is sold, the disposition of the money received is accounted for and recorded according to law. The Department uses Property Room.Com for the sale of some unclaimed property and evidence. The proceeds are sent to the evidence custodian. The evidence custodian delivers the proceeds to the City Finance Department. This transaction is receipted and then recorded by the evidence custodian.

The Department does not dispose of narcotics, contraband, or illegal items in a safe manner. Currently, the Department burns items at the firing range, or uses the Richland landfill. Destruction records are maintained in accordance with the State's retention schedule.

The Department does not conduct evidence and property audits annually. The Department has not had an audit in the past four years.

The Department does not conduct audits of the evidence and property when a new employee is assigned as the custodian. The current custodian has been in this position for four years. The Department did not conduct an audit when the new custodian started and the outgoing custodian left.

Recommendations:

- 18.1 The Department should adopt clear policies, which are reflected in the Department manual, describing the proper collection and identification of

- evidence and property. The Department should incorporate the evidence handbook into the manual, or at least make it available to the custodian(s) and the officers as a reference.
- 18.2 If the Department is going to be involved with seizures and asset forfeitures, a comprehensive process that incorporates the evidence management system, records management and the Finance Department should be developed.
 - 18.3 The Department should require that all evidence, no matter how large, is entered into the evidence management system. The Department should develop another means of storing large pieces of evidence, and ensuring that they are kept in an alarmed secure location.
 - 18.4 The Department should establish a written policy regarding release of evidence and property.
 - 18.5 The Department should develop a secure area where perishables can be dried and stored.
 - 18.6 The Department should develop a policy and location where hazardous materials can be stored, while awaiting processing into the appropriate permanent storage facility.
 - 18.7 The Department should manage other evidence and property storage locations in a similar fashion.
 - 18.8 The Department should ensure that each location used to store evidence or property are protected by an alarm and monitored 24/7.
 - 18.9 The Department should ensure other evidence/property locations have the same safeguards in place.
 - 18.10 The Department should develop a process in which seizures are marked on the package and in the system, denoting them as seizures and not evidence. The Department should consider requiring officers to additionally identify evidence using another process, than an item number. (Example: Officer Initials and numerical sequence DLR #1, DLR #2, etc.)
 - 18.11 The Department should invest in a system which protects employees from noxious evidence odors.
 - 18.12 The Department should designate a separate locked container for cash, jewelry or other valuable property, which is isolated from the other general property and evidence.

- 18.13 The Department should consider having officers and subsequent other entities sign for evidence that removed from the evidence storage.
- 18.14 The Department should develop a formal policy which matches their current practice.
- 18.15 The Department should consider using a commercially regulated incinerator such as the facility in Spokane, Washington.
- 18.16 The Department should conduct an audit of the evidence and property on an annual basis.
- 18.17 The Department should ensure that an audit is conducted when a new evidence custodian is appointed.

Chapter 19—Prisoner Security

WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 19.1.1 The agency has guidelines governing the methods and use of restraining devices used during prisoner transports.*
- 19.1.2 The agency has guidelines for transporting the sick, mentally ill, injured and disabled prisoners*
- 19.1.3 The agency requires transporting officers to conduct a thorough search of prisoners prior to transport.*
- 19.1.4 The agency requires a thorough search of all vehicles used for transporting prisoners before and after transport.*
- 19.1.5 The agency has procedures for officer transporting prisoners for safety and security of firearms, removing restraining devices, delivering documentation to receiving personnel, and advising receiving personnel of any potential medical or security concerns or hazards posed by the prisoner.*
- 19.1.6 The agency's temporary holding facility includes access to shelter, warmth, potable water, and a toilet.*
- 19.1.7 The agency has procedures for using temporary holding facilities.*
- 19.1.8 The agency has procedures for non-secure holding of juveniles who are status offenders.*

Findings:

The Department does not have adequate guidelines governing the methods and use of restraining devices used during prisoner transports.

The Department does not have guidelines for transporting the sick, mentally ill, injured and disabled prisoners.

Officers are not required by policy to search vehicles before and after prisoner transport.

The Department does not have temporary holding facilities. All arrested persons are transported to the appropriate jail or medical facility.

The Department does not have procedures for non-secure holding of juveniles who are status offenders.

Recommendations:

- 19.1 The Department should develop, implement and train Department members regarding the appropriate use of restraining devices that may be used during prisoner transports.
- 19.2 The Department should develop, implement and train Department members of approved methods and recommendations for transporting the sick, mentally ill, injured and disabled persons.
- 19.3 A policy should be implemented requiring all officers to completely search vehicles before and after prisoner transport.
- 19.4 The Department should develop, implement and train officers who transport prisoners to regional receiving areas the particular policy and procedure for each receiving are, relating to (1) the safety and security of firearms, (2) removing restraining devices, (3) delivering appropriate documentation to receiving personnel, and (4) ensuring receiving personnel are advised of any potential medical or security concerns or hazards posed by the prisoner.

Chapter 20—Agency Facilities

The WASPC Accreditation standards for this chapter include:

- 20.1.1 *The agency has a published telephone number that is answered by a trained employee during regular business hours.*
- 20.1.2 *Victim and witnesses are interviewed in locations that are separated by sight and sound from the public areas of the facility.*
- 20.1.3 *Police employees are physically separated from the public by either a three-foot minimum distance or a physical barrier.*

Findings:

The Department facilities are located within a municipal campus where all other city offices are located. The police facility is small, but appears to adequately address the current space needs of Department personnel and their functions, that include animal control, nuisance abatement and code enforcement. In addition, the Department shares space with a community corrections officer with the Department of Corrections.

Recommendations:

- 20.1 Department personnel should remain sensitive and mindful when escorting victims and witnesses into the police facility and practice every effort to maintain privacy and confidentiality.
- 20.2 Department of Corrections and law enforcement personnel should recognize that the police facility does not have appropriate facility protections and people under arrest, on probation, parole, or community supervision and such individuals should not be allowed to be amongst police or civilian personnel, their equipment, or confidential police information that may be posted on walls or adjoining office space. The facility may not be coordinated in such a way to appropriately house those, even when they are escorted by Department members or employees of the Department of Corrections.