

### **FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Contact Person/Phone:</b>	<b>CBO Analyst/Phone:</b>
Legislative	Mike Fong/5-1675	N/A

**Legislation Title:** A RESOLUTION stating the City Council’s intent to review, analyze and consider ways to strengthen civilian oversight within the City’s police accountability system and requesting the Community Police Commission to consider recommendations from the Independent Police Oversight Review Board as part of the Commission’s review of the accountability system, as called for in the settlement agreement between the United States Department of Justice and the City of Seattle.

**Summary of the Legislation:** This resolution outlines Council intent related to advancing efforts related to police accountability as follows:

1) Stating their policy intent early in the process in order to lay a foundation for meaningful dialogue with the City’s labor partners.

- Through its role on the City of Seattle’s Labor Relations and Policy Committee (LRPC) in establishing parameters for labor negotiations, the City Council intends to evaluate options for strengthening the City’s police accountability system, and in particular to enhance the role of civilian oversight.
- To the extent these options are subject to mandatory bargaining, the City will negotiate these issues in good faith with the Seattle Police Officers Guild and the Seattle Police Management Association.

2) Requesting the Community Police Commission to consider the recommendations contained in the Independent Police Oversight Review Board’s (IPORB) report, “Transparency, Accountability, Effectiveness and Independence: Recommendations Regarding Civilian Oversight of the Seattle Police Department.”

- In particular, the City Council is interested in exploring opportunities for additional independent civilian oversight within the current or a newly proposed police accountability system framework.
- The commission is requested to specifically consider the IPORB’s recommendations concerning opportunities for civilian review of investigatory findings before a final disposition is determined.

## Background:

In June of 2012, the IPORB released a policy report recommending changes to enhance the police accountability system. That report and examination was initiated by IPORB following the Department of Justice investigation and subsequent findings related to alleged excessive use of force and biased policing by the Seattle Police Department (SPD). This resolution recognizes their recommendation for restructuring and strengthening civilian oversight within the police accountability system. It also recognizes that the Community Police Commission created out of the City of Seattle's settlement agreement with the DOJ will be examining the police accountability structure and future changes may require negotiations with the City's labor partners.

A companion ordinance is also proposed that begins to implement some of the recommendations in the June 2012 report to clarify and modify the role of the civilian review board.

Please check one of the following:

☒ **This legislation does not have any financial implications.**

(Please skip to "Other Implications" section at the end of the document and answer questions a-h. Earlier sections that are left blank should be deleted. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each question.)

**NOTE:** Though this legislation does not have any direct financial implications, the policy guidance provided relating to the Labor Relations and Policy Committee suggests that the potential for changes to the police accountability structure may have implications on labor negotiations with Seattle Police Officers Guild and the Seattle Police Management Association in the future. Any financial implications associated with yet to be determined proposals related to police accountability are unknown at this time. As a result, there may or may not be a fiscal impact.

☐ **This legislation has financial implications.**

(If the legislation has direct fiscal impacts (e.g., appropriations, revenue, positions), fill out the relevant sections below. If the financial implications are indirect or longer-term, describe them in narrative in the "Other Implications" Section. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each title and question.)

## Appropriations:

(This table should reflect appropriations that are a direct result of this legislation. In the event that the project/programs associated with this ordinance had, or will have, appropriations in other legislation please provide details in the Appropriation Notes section below. If the appropriation is not supported by revenue/reimbursements, please confirm that there is available fund balance to cover this appropriation in the note section.)

Fund Name and Number	Department	Budget Control Level*	2013 Appropriation	2014 Anticipated Appropriation
<b>TOTAL</b>				

\*See budget book to obtain the appropriate Budget Control Level for your department.

Appropriations Notes:

**Anticipated Revenue/Reimbursement Resulting from this Legislation:**

(This table should reflect revenues/reimbursements that are a direct result of this legislation. In the event that the issues/projects associated with this ordinance/resolution have revenues or reimbursements that were, or will be, received because of previous or future legislation or budget actions, please provide details in the Notes section below the table.)

Fund Name and Number	Department	Revenue Source	2013 Revenue	2014 Revenue
<b>TOTAL</b>				

Revenue/Reimbursement Notes:

N/A

**Total Regular Positions Created, Modified, or Abrogated through this Legislation, Including FTE Impact:**

(This table should only reflect the actual number of positions affected by this legislation. In the event that positions have been, or will be, created as a result of other legislation, please provide details in the Notes section below the table.)

Position Title and Department	Position # for Existing Positions	Fund Name & #	PT/FT	2013 Positions	2013 FTE	2014 Positions*	2014 FTE*
<b>TOTAL</b>							

\* 2014 positions and FTE are total 2014 position changes resulting from this legislation, not incremental changes. Therefore, under 2014, please be sure to include any continuing positions from 2013.

Position Notes:

N/A

**Do positions sunset in the future?**

(If yes, identify sunset date)

**Spending/Cash Flow:**

(This table should be completed only in those cases where part or all of the funds authorized by this legislation will be spent in a different year than when they were appropriated (e.g., as in the case of certain grants and capital projects). Details surrounding spending that will occur in future years should be provided in the Notes section below the table.)

Fund Name & #	Department	Budget Control Level*	2013 Expenditures	2014 Anticipated Expenditures
<b>TOTAL</b>				

\* See budget book to obtain the appropriate Budget Control Level for your department.

Spending/Cash Flow Notes:

N/A

**Other Implications:**

- a) **Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?**

No. See earlier comments.

- b) **What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?**

N/A

- c) **Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?**

OPA Auditor, the OPA Director, SPD, Community Police Commission, and LAW

- d) **What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?**

N/A

- e) **Is a public hearing required for this legislation?**

No

- f) **Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?**

No

- g) **Does this legislation affect a piece of property?**

No

- h) **Other Issues:**

**List attachments to the fiscal note below:**