



Office of the Washington State Auditor
Pat McCarthy

Compliance Audit Report

Reviewing Investigations of Police Use of Deadly Force

Valley Independent Investigative Team – The River Hudson Case

**Use of Deadly Force Incident on May 6, 2020, by the Renton Police
Department**

Published July 25, 2024

Report No. 1035303



Scan to see another great way
we're helping advance
#GoodGovernment



Office of the Washington State Auditor

Pat McCarthy

July 25, 2024

Commander Todd Byers
Valley Independent Investigative Team

Report on Use of Deadly Force Investigation Audit

Attached is the official report on our audit of the investigation into the use of deadly force on May 6, 2020, that resulted in the death of River Hudson.

The audit assessed the Renton Police Department and the Valley Independent Investigative Team's compliance with state laws and rules regarding independent investigations of police use of deadly force as defined in WAC 139-12-030.

Our independent audits provide essential accountability and transparency regarding police use of deadly force investigations. These audits are valuable to the Legislature, law enforcement agencies and the public in assessing police accountability efforts.

If you are a member of the media and have questions about this report, please contact Director of Communications Kathleen Cooper at (564) 999-0800. Otherwise, please contact Use of Deadly Force Investigations Program Manager Michael Huynh at (564) 999-0831.

Pat McCarthy, State Auditor

Olympia, WA

cc: Monica Alexander, Executive Director, Criminal Justice Training Commission
Steve Strachan, Executive Director, Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs
Hannah Fauchald, Assistant State Auditor

Americans with Disabilities

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, we will make this document available in alternative formats. For more information, please contact our Office at (564) 999-0950, TDD Relay at (800) 833-6388, or email our webmaster at webmaster@sao.wa.gov.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	4
Background	6
Audit Results.....	8
Recommendations	13
Independent Investigation Team Response	14
Criminal Justice Training Commission Response	16
Appendix A: Authority, Scope, Objective and Methodology.....	17
Appendix B: WAC 139-12-030 Compliance Summary	19
About the State Auditor's Office.....	22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Results in Brief

Valley Independent Investigative Team (VIIT) investigators and officers involved in the use of force incident complied with some requirements to ensure the investigation of the shooting on May 6, 2020, was independent, transparent, credible and communicated to the public timely, as state laws and rules require. These actions included, but were not limited to, securing the scene of the shooting, canvassing the scene for witnesses, and obtaining statements from subjects and witnesses.

The audit found instances where VIIT did not follow state regulations, as well as opportunities to improve its documentation to demonstrate compliance. Specifically, we found VIIT did not:

- Select two community representatives to participate in the investigation. It only assigned one community representative.
- Require three investigators to complete a conflict of interest assessment and include questions in its assessment related to bias
- Maintain documentation to demonstrate that the IIT commander and community representative reviewed the investigators' completed conflict of interest assessments within 72 hours of the start of the investigation
- Limit the information it shared to the investigation's progress during one briefing it held with the involved agency
- Provide public updates on the investigation's progress during two weeks of the 17-week investigation
- Provide Hudson's family with advance notice of three public updates and the community representative of one public update

We also did not find documentation in the case file indicating supervisors directed the involved and witness officers to not speak about the shooting until the officers provided statements to VIIT.

Recommendations

We recommend VIIT:

- Require all investigators to complete a conflict of interest assessment within 72 hours of the start of the investigation
- Ensure the commander and community representatives review all conflict of interest forms within 72 hours of the start of the investigation and maintain documentation demonstrating that it did so

- Provide the community representatives and the family with advance notice of all press releases as required, and maintain documentation to demonstrate that it did so
- Provide weekly public updates during an investigation

We recommend the Criminal Justice Training Commission (CJTC) clarify how an IIT's conflict of interest assessment can meet or exceed the requirements in WAC 139-12-030 when IITs do not use the CJTC's standard conflict of interest assessment.

We also recommend VIIT's member agencies instruct involved and witness officers not to discuss the case before providing statements to VIIT, and maintain documentation that they did so.

BACKGROUND

Use of Deadly Force Incident

The following summary of events is based on the investigation's case files:

On May 6, 2020, at about 11:05 p.m., a 911 caller reported her son, River Hudson, had assaulted her and her boyfriend. Renton Police Officer Halley Jackson and two other officers responded to the caller's apartment complex.

The officers found Hudson's family in the parking lot and briefly spoke to them before heading to the family's third-floor apartment. Finding the front door partially open, an officer pushed it open, announced police presence, and asked Hudson to come out from where he was. The officers heard rapid footsteps before Hudson appeared naked and rushed toward them with a knife in his hand. Jackson yelled "stop," and then shot Hudson two times in the chest. Hudson fell forward and landed about a foot away from the front door.

Hudson still had the knife in his hand, and officers told Hudson to drop the knife so they could provide medical aid. After a few minutes, additional officers arrived, removed the knife from Hudson's hands, handcuffed him and provided aid. After firefighters arrived, the officers removed Hudson's handcuffs and pulled him outside the apartment where there was more space to provide aid. Paramedics arrived shortly after and asked the firefighters to bring him down to the parking lot to continue medical care, but he was pronounced dead once he was taken down. Police asked Hudson's body be brought back to the crime scene so firefighters placed Hudson on the landing outside of the apartment.

The Valley Independent Investigative Team (VIIT), an independent investigation team (IIT) that investigates police use of deadly force incidents in southeast King County, responded to the shooting. Investigators from the Auburn Police Department led the investigation with assistance from the Kent, Tukwila, Port of Seattle, Federal Way and Des Moines police departments.

On September 2, 2020, VIIT submitted its completed investigation to the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office. A prosecutor reviewed the case and wrote in a memo on December 9, 2020, that he would not file charges against Jackson.

Independent Investigation Teams

Voters approved Initiative 940 in 2018. It ensures that one of an IIT's key functions is to investigate police use of deadly force incidents. The initiative requires an agency completely independent of the one with the involved officer(s) to conduct investigations of police use of deadly force. Regional IITs allow law enforcement agencies to respond quickly to use of deadly force incidents while keeping the involved agency out of the investigation. IITs are made up of command staff, detectives and other crime scene investigators from law enforcement agencies in a given region.

An IIT also consists of volunteers, called non-law enforcement community representatives, who provide perspective to the community during an investigation.

Washington has 17 IITs throughout the state. Many of these teams existed before recent police reform and accountability laws, including Initiative 940, and allowed law enforcement agencies to pool resources for major investigations. Prohibiting the involved agency from participating in these investigations was intended to improve the agency's impartiality and independence by preventing people who are more likely to have a personal relationship with the involved officers from investigating the incident.

The initiative tasked the Washington State Criminal Justice Commission (CJTC) with adopting rules to govern these investigations. The CJTC adopted Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 139-12-030, which requires independent use of deadly force investigations to meet four key principles:

- Independence – the involved agency cannot have undue influence or the appearance of undue influence on the investigation.
- Transparency – community members are able to assess whether the investigation is conducted in a trustworthy manner and complies with the standards defined in state laws and rules.
- Communication – the IIT must communicate the investigation's progress to the public and family of the person killed or harmed by police use of deadly force.
- Credibility – use of deadly force investigations follow best practices for criminal investigations, and investigators meet necessary training requirements and demonstrate ethical behavior and impartiality.

Audit Objective

State law (RCW 43.101.460) requires the Office of the Washington State Auditor to audit all investigations into police use of deadly force resulting in death, substantial bodily harm or great bodily harm.

To determine whether the Renton Police Department and VIIT complied with state laws and rules in the investigation of the death of River Hudson, we reviewed investigative files related to the case, reviewed training records held by the CJTC and member police agencies, and interviewed IIT members. We assessed the involved agencies and IIT's compliance with each of the requirements under the key principles in WAC 139-12-030. This included whether the IIT followed the CJTC's published best practices for conducting homicide investigations.

This report outlines the steps the investigation team took to meet each of these key principles. Appendix A contains information about our methodology.

AUDIT RESULTS

Appendix A outlines our Office's authority and methodology for this audit. In short, state law (RCW 43.101.460) requires the Office of the Washington State Auditor to audit all investigations into police use of deadly force resulting in death, substantial bodily harm or great bodily harm. Our charge is to assess whether the investigations complied with relevant rules and laws. The audit only reviewed the investigation. It did not assess the incident itself or whether the use of force was justified.

Independence

To help ensure the investigation was conducted independently of the involved agency, VIIT investigators assumed control of the scene of the shooting upon arrival and excluded investigators from the Renton Police Department. We reviewed investigative reports from VIIT's case files and found that an officer reported Hudson was down at 11:20 p.m. The Renton Police Department notified VIIT of the shooting at 11:35 p.m. and requested their response. VIIT investigators arrived at the Renton Police Department by 1:20 a.m. After being briefed by a Renton Police Department sergeant, VIIT investigators arrived at the apartment around 1:45 a.m. and assumed control of the investigation. We did not find any evidence that any member of the Renton Police Department took part in the remainder of the investigation.

VIIT held one briefing with the Renton Police Department one week after the shooting. We found the type of information VIIT provided to the Renton Police Department was not allowed by the WAC. The code prohibits IITs from sharing investigative information with an involved agency, except for limited information about the investigation's progress. During the briefing, VIIT provided the Renton Police Department with the information it had gained up to that point, including information from witness interviews.

Transparency

VIIT only assigned one community representative to the investigation, but involved the community representative in all required investigative processes. WAC 139-12-030 requires IITs to include at least two community representatives in each investigation. Community representatives are volunteers, not law enforcement agency employees, who provide community perspective on key processes in use of deadly force investigations. They must complete a confidentiality agreement, be present at any briefings with the involved agency and have access to the completed investigation file.

VIIT assigned one community representative to the investigation the day after the shooting, who signed a confidentiality agreement the same day. VIIT only assigned one community representative instead of two because investigators thought the WAC only required one.

VIIT held one briefing with the Renton Police Department during the investigation, which the community representative attended. After VIIT submitted its completed investigation to the prosecutor, it presented the investigation to the community representative. The VIIT commander told the community representative she could ask questions and review any documents or evidence from the case file.

We attempted to interview the community representative, but she did not respond to our request.

Communication

VIIT communicated with the public and Hudson's family frequently throughout the investigation. The WAC requires IITs to communicate with the public and family of the person against whom deadly force has been used. The involved agency or IIT is required to notify the family of the use of force incident, and the IIT is required to update the family on all significant developments throughout the investigation. The WAC also requires an IIT to post, at minimum, weekly public updates on the investigation's progress. The IIT must provide the family and community representatives with advance notice of each press release.

VIIT assigned a family liaison on the day of the shooting, but other VIIT members communicated with the family. VIIT did not need to notify Hudson's family of the shooting because they were already at the apartment complex when it occurred. The lead investigator returned the family's calls and emails, answered their questions and provided them with investigation updates. The VIIT public information officer also updated the family on the status of the investigation.

VIIT issued public updates about the investigation's progress in 15 of 17 weeks during investigation. VIIT provided the family with a copy of 11 weekly public updates and the community representative with 13. The family did not receive notice of two public updates because VIIT had inaccurate contact information for the family during the first two weeks of the investigation. We also found VIIT did not provide the community representative or the family with notice of its update in week 15. During each week, on the day it issued the weekly public update to the media, VIIT emailed a copy of it to the community representative and the family. The case file included documentation showing that VIIT emailed two updates to the community representative and one update to the family before releasing the update to the media, but we were unable to determine if this happened in every other week.

The Renton Police Department and VIIT did not provide criminal background information about Hudson to the media. The WAC prohibits IITs and involved agencies from providing to the media criminal background information about the person who was killed or injured by police use of deadly force. We reviewed online news articles and the social media pages for the Renton Police Department and the lead investigating agency, the Auburn Police Department, and did not find any indication that either the involved agencies or VIIT provided criminal background information to the media.

Credibility

Crime Scene Investigation

Responding and witness officers secured the scene of the shooting. Officers told Hudson's neighbors to stay in their apartment for several hours while the scene was investigated, and officers stood guard in the parking lot. Officers placed crime scene tape, photographed the scene, located evidence, and maintained a log of those who entered and exited the scene.

VIIT investigators located and preserved evidence from the scene of the shooting. Investigators photographed the scene and used a scanner to map it. Investigators canvassed the scene for witnesses and collected evidence, including Hudson's knife and two shell casings. They also collected audio and video footage captured by the witness officers' patrol vehicles. The footage did not capture the video of the shooting but did capture the audio.

Investigators photographed the involved and witness officers at the Renton Police Department and counted the remaining rounds in their firearms. Investigators later collected two bullets the medical examiner found in Hudson's body.

Interviewing Involved Officers and Witnesses

Jackson was removed from the scene after the shooting, but we were unable to determine whether any of the officers discussed the case with each other before they provided statements to VIIT investigators. The CJTC had not yet published its best practices for conducting homicide investigations at the time of this investigation. These practices now require involved agencies to separate involved officers after an incident and instruct them not to discuss the case with other witnesses. We found the Renton Police Department's policy aligns with the current best practices. The policy states that supervisors should give each involved officer an administrative order not to discuss the incident with other involved officers or members of the department. The policy also states that involved officers should not consult or meet with a representative or an attorney collectively or in groups prior to being interviewed.

After the shooting, Jackson was removed from the scene, and she provided a public safety statement to a responding Renton Police Department sergeant in the parking lot. An uninvolved Renton Police Department officer later transported Jackson to the Renton police station. A peer support officer stayed with Jackson until she met with her attorney, and VIIT met with Jackson shortly after. The case file did not include documentation that described how the witness officers got back to the station and if they were separated from one another while there. VIIT investigators wrote in their narrative that they processed the witness officers individually, with the officers' attorney present.

We did not find any documentation in the case file that supervisors gave the involved or witness officers administrative orders not to discuss the shooting, and we found officers likely discussed the shooting after the scene was safe. After the witness officers helped to establish scene security

and canvass for witnesses, they went to the parking lot where Jackson was still present. Audio from body camera footage revealed a witness officer had a brief conversation with another officer about the shooting. They talked about where Hudson was hit, how many shots were fired and if they were each recording at the time of the shooting. The conversation was not captured on video, so we were unable to confirm the identity of one of the officers.

VIIT investigators interviewed Hudson's family members who were at the scene during the shooting, and they recorded the interviews with audio and video. Investigators also obtained audio recorded statements from Hudson's neighbors and collected footage from nearby apartments' doorbell cameras. None of the videos captured the shooting. The day after the shooting, investigators recorded audio statements from two firefighters who were at the scene.

On May 12, 2020, six days after the shooting, the lead investigator contacted the officers' attorney about their written statements. The attorney emailed Jackson's and both witness officers' statements to the lead investigator later that day.

Case File Integrity

We found VIIT restricted the Hudson case file during the investigation. During an active investigation, the WAC requires IITs to restrict the case file from everyone except for IIT members involved with the investigation. We reviewed access logs to the Hudson case files and found that only IIT members involved in the investigation or support staff accessed it.

We did not find any evidence that any VIIT members received prohibited information during the investigation. The WAC prohibits IIT members from remaining on an investigation if they receive compelled information that could contaminate the investigation.

Conflicts of Interest

VIIT did not comply with some requirements to assess potential conflicts of interest between an involved officer and IIT members. The WAC requires all IIT investigators and community representatives involved in an investigation to complete a conflict of interest assessment within 72 hours of the start of the investigation. This assessment should include questions about work and social relationships with the involved officer, as well as any potential biases that could affect the investigators or community representatives' objectivity. The CJTC developed a standard template conflict of interest form that IITs can use, but the WAC allows IITs to develop their own forms as long as the form "meets or exceeds" the CJTC's standard form.

The community representative and 26 VIIT investigators completed a conflict of interest assessment within 24 hours of the start of the investigation. However, three Auburn Police detectives who participated in the investigation did not. One of the detectives arrived at the Renton Police Department after conflict of interest forms were given to IIT members. The other two detectives were asked to assist in the investigation the day after the shooting. A VIIT commander

said he did not know why the detectives did not complete assessments, but he guessed it was an oversight since the detectives arrived and participated in the investigation after the forms had been completed by the other IIT members.

VIIT's assessment included questions about prior interactions or relationships with the officers it was investigating, but it did not ask IIT members about biases that could potentially affect their objectivity, as the WAC requires. VIIT has since updated its assessment to include questions about bias. However, the CJTC said VIIT's form did not meet WAC requirements. The CJTC should issue guidance clarifying how an IIT's conflict of interest form can meet or exceed the CJTC's standard template form.

We were unable to determine if the VIIT commander and the community representative reviewed the investigators' completed conflict of interest forms within 72 hours of the start of the investigation. The commander who oversaw the investigation said he and the community representative reviewed the completed conflict of interest forms well within the WAC's required 72 hours. However, he could not find any documentation to show when the review occurred, and the community representative did not respond to our request for an interview.

None of the investigators reported having any conflicts of interest with Jackson.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend VIIT:

- Require all investigators to complete a conflict of interest assessment within 72 hours of the start of the investigation
- Ensure the commander and community representatives review all conflict of interest forms within 72 hours of the start of the investigation and maintain documentation to demonstrate that it did so
- Provide the community representatives and the family with advance copies and notice of all press releases as required, and maintain documentation to demonstrate that it did so
- Provide weekly public updates during an investigation

We recommend the Criminal Justice Training Commission clarify how an IIT's conflict of interest assessment can meet or exceed the requirements in WAC 139-12-030 when IITs do not use the CJTC's standard conflict of interest assessment.

We also recommend VIIT's member agencies instruct involved and witness officers not to discuss the case before providing statements to VIIT, and maintain documentation that they did so.

INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION TEAM RESPONSE

CITY OF AUBURN POLICE DEPARTMENT

COURAGE ★ HONOR ★ INTEGRITY ★ PROFESSIONALISM



Valley Independent Investigation Team (Auburn PD)

Response to SAO Report: River Hudson

Ms. Fauchald,

I have reviewed the report completed by the State Auditor's Office regarding the Valley Independent Investigation Team investigation of a Renton Police Department OIS which occurred May 6, 2020, involving River Hudson. The Auburn Police Department was lead on this investigation and our case number assigned was 20-04714.

You explained to me that I had the opportunity to respond to the report and that I needed to address each of the recommendations made by your office in our formal response. The recommendations from your office are as follows:

- 1. Require all investigators to complete a conflict of interest assessment within 72 hours of the start of the investigation:**

I agree with this recommendation and have no explanation for the fact that three Detectives involved in the investigation either failed to complete conflict of interest forms or the forms were lost prior to being documented. We have started confirming that each COI form matches a signature/name on the roster prior to the time that Detectives are released. This is a responsibility of the lead agency to make sure that this occurs, as well as the completion of COI forms by detectives that were not in the original briefing that may become involved as the investigation evolves.

- 2. Ensure the commander and community representatives review all conflict of interest forms within 72 hours of the start of the investigation and maintain documentation to demonstrate that it did so:**

I agree with this recommendation in principle. I would hope that the people performing the reviews/audits of these investigations realize that the investigating entity has no control over the cooperation or availability that we receive from the involved agency community representatives.

The lead agency will usually receive the necessary information to be able to contact the community representatives on the day of the incident. We have learned that e mail is an acceptable form of documentation and provides verification of the date and time the request is made. However, we cannot compel the community representatives to respond to our e mail or telephone requests within the legally mandated 72 HRS.



I have written a protocol for my own agency regarding our responsibilities as lead agency. This requires that the Investigations Commander document the fact that the COI forms have been reviewed by the community representatives and that this documentation be done via RMS supplement.

- 3. Provide the community representatives and the family with advance copies and notice of all press releases as required, and maintain documentation to demonstrate that it did so:**

I agree with this recommendation and acknowledge that this did not occur with every press release that was issued in this incident. VIIT no longer has a different member agency act as the PIO for the incident. This function will be performed by the lead agency in order to guarantee that the notification/information is provided to the family and community representatives prior to general release. This will also create one central repository where the related documentation is stored.

- 4. Provide weekly public updates during an investigation:**

I agree with this recommendation and agree that this was not done twice during the course of this seventeen week investigation. Again, I believe that the change to make this the responsibility of the lead agency as opposed to a separate agency PIO will ensure that the weekly press releases occur as required by law.


Todd Byers

Investigations Commander
Auburn Police Department

CRIMINAL JUSTICE TRAINING COMMISSION RESPONSE



WASHINGTON STATE CRIMINAL JUSTICE TRAINING COMMISSION

Monica Alexander, Executive Director

19010 1st Avenue South • Burien, WA 98148 • Phone: 206-835-7300 • www.cjtc.wa.gov

July 18, 2024

The Honorable Pat McCarthy
State Auditor
Office of the Washington State Auditor
PO Box 40021
Olympia, WA 98504-0021

Dear Auditor McCarthy:

The Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission (WSCJTC) appreciates the opportunity to review and respond to the recommendation in the State Auditor's Office (SAO) compliance audit report "Valley Independent Investigative Team – The River Hudson Case." The recommendation in the report is to have WSCJTC clarify how an Independent Investigation Team's (IIT) Conflict of Interest Assessment form can meet or exceed the requirements in Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 139-12-030, when IITs do not use the WSCJTC's standard conflict of interest assessment.

The purpose of the Conflict of Interest Assessment form is to help identify actual and potential conflicts of interest between any IIT member and those involved in an officer involved use of force incident.

The questions on the WSCJTC Conflict of Interest Assessment form vary in purpose and nature of conflict. If an IIT chooses to use their own Conflict of Interest Assessment form, their questions must, at a minimum, ask questions that address the same conflicts as the WSCJTC assessment form. If questions from the WSCJTC form are modified in any way on an IIT's form, the answers must solicit responses that are identical in nature of the conflict(s) being disclosed. All assigned IIT members, including the non-law enforcement representative(s), complete a Conflict of Interest Assessment form within 72-hours of the start of an investigation.

The WSCJTC appreciates the work of the SAO in auditing the compliance of IITs across the state. These principles are solidified and the WSCJTC continues to improve the Law Enforcement Training and Community Safety Act (LETCSA) IIT program for all impacted stakeholders and Washington residents.

Sincerely,

Monica A. Alexander
Executive Director

cc: Alex Buijs, LETSCA Program Manager
Bart Hayes, Advanced Training Division Manager
Jerrell Wills, Deputy Director

TRAINING THE GUARDIANS OF DEMOCRACY

APPENDIX A: AUTHORITY, SCOPE, OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY

Authority

In 2018, Washington voters passed Initiative 940, which, in part, required investigations of police use of deadly force be conducted by an agency completely independent of one with the involved officer. It tasked the Washington State Criminal Justice Commission (CJTC) with adopting rules to govern these investigations. In 2019, the CJTC created a workgroup, including stakeholders from community groups and law enforcement agencies to adopt rules for independent investigations. The rules were outlined in Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 139-12-030 and took effect in January 2020.

The rules were designed to help ensure investigations are independent, transparent, credible and communicated timely to the public and affected people. The rules define the elements of an independent investigation, and explain the duties of the involved agency and independent investigation team (IIT) after police use deadly force that results in death, substantial bodily harm or great bodily harm. In 2021, the Legislature amended state law (RCW 43.101.460) to require our Office audit investigations into police use of deadly force to ensure compliance with the new rules.

Scope

This audit assessed whether the Renton Police Department and the Valley Independent Investigative Team complied with state laws and rules regarding the investigation of the use of deadly force that resulted in the death of River Hudson. It reviewed whether the law enforcement agencies met the criteria for independent investigations as outlined in WAC 139-12-030.

By law, the audit only reviewed the investigation. It did not review the use of deadly force incident nor assess whether the use of force was justified.

Objective

This audit examined whether the Renton Police Department and the Valley Independent Investigative Team complied with state laws and rules regarding independent investigations of police use of deadly force.

Methodology

To determine whether the Renton Police Department and the Valley Independent Investigative Team complied with state laws and rules regarding independent investigations of police use of deadly force, we reviewed investigative files related to the case and interviewed IIT members. We interviewed IIT members to understand their investigative process and how they documented their

procedures and findings. In the case files, we searched for evidence demonstrating the IIT followed the legal requirements. We also reviewed training records from the CJTC and member police agencies.

One major requirement in the credibility section of WAC 139-12-030 is for IITs to follow the CJTC's published best practices for homicide investigations. The CJTC did not publish best practices until September 2020, leaving the IITs without guidance and our Office with no defined criteria for the first eight months of 2020. While this investigation started before September 2020, we decided to apply the requirements from the CJTC's best practices document, as it is a key piece of the WAC and based on generally accepted practices for criminal investigations that all detectives should know and follow.

Our Office also believes it is in the public's interest to not limit the scope of our audits of investigations that occurred before September 2020.

APPENDIX B: WAC 139-12-030 COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

Independence

Requirement	Compliant?
The involved agency and/or other first responders will provide or facilitate first aid at the scene if necessary.	Yes
The involved agency will relinquish control of the scene.	Yes
The involved agency will not participate in the investigation.	Yes
Any specialized equipment belonging to the involved agency will be approved by the community representatives and the independent investigation team (IIT) commander before it is used in the investigation.	Not applicable
Information shared by the IIT to the involved agency will be limited to briefings about the progress of the investigation.	No
The IIT commander will honor requests from the involved agency to release body cam video or other investigation information of urgent public interest.	Not applicable

Transparency

Requirement	Compliant?
A minimum of two non-law enforcement community representatives will be assigned to the IIT.	No
The community representatives will:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review conflict of interest statements submitted within 72 hours of the commencement of each investigation 	Unable to determine
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be present at the briefings with the chief or sheriff of the involved agency(ies) 	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have access to the investigation file when it is completed 	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be provided a copy of all press releases and communication sent to the media prior to release 	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review notification of equipment use of the involved agency 	Not applicable
The community representatives will sign a confidentiality agreement at the beginning of the investigation.	Yes
The IIT will provide public updates about the investigation at a minimum of once per week, even if there is no new progress to report.	No
When an independent investigation is complete, the information will be made available to the public in a manner consistent with applicable state law.	Yes

Communication

Requirement	Compliant?
A family member of the person against whom deadly force has been used will be notified of the incident as soon as possible.	Not applicable
The IIT will assign a family liaison within the first 24 hours of the investigation.	Yes
The family liaison will keep the family informed about all significant developments in the investigation.	Yes
The family liaison will give the family advanced notice of all scheduled press releases.	No
Neither the involved agency nor the IIT will provide the media with criminal background information of the person against whom deadly force has been used, unless it is specifically requested, and release of the information is required by the Public Records Act or other applicable laws.	Yes
The involved agency will notify the Governor's Office of Indian Affairs (GOIA) in accordance with RCW 10.114.021 if the person against whom deadly force is used is a member of a federally recognized tribe.	Not applicable
A member of the IIT will be assigned as a tribal liaison within the first 24 hours and keep the tribe (or a representative of the tribe's choice) informed about all significant developments of the investigation.	Not applicable

Credibility

Requirement	Compliant?
The involved agency and other first responders will secure the incident scene and maintain its integrity until the IIT arrives.	Yes
The involved agency and other first responders will locate and preserve evanescent evidence.	Yes
The IIT will follow these accepted best practices for homicide investigations published and annually updated by the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Center (CJTC):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Until all statements have been taken, involved and witness officers shall not discuss the case with any other witnesses. 	Unable to determine
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The involved agency or first responders will separate involved officer(s) and remove them from the immediate scene. 	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IIT will obtain statements from subjects and witnesses. Audio and/or video recording is preferred and should be attempted. 	Yes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews of involved officers should follow the policies of their individual agency, collective bargaining agreement and case law. 	Not applicable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with emergency medical personnel, fire department personnel, and first responding officers should address conditions at the incident scene. 	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IIT will canvass the immediate area for potential witnesses who have not come forward and obtain information or statements as available. 	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the event of death, consult with the coroner or medical examiner at the scene and at, or subsequent to, the autopsy. A member of the IIT must attend the autopsy and take all appropriate investigative steps, consistent with other criminal investigations. 	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Until the case file is delivered to the prosecutor, access to the IIT case file should be restricted to the IIT members involved. 	Yes
If any member of the IIT receives prohibited information, the investigator receiving the prohibited information must immediately report it to their supervisor and the member must discontinue participation in the investigation.	Not applicable
Within 72 hours of the start of each investigation, investigators and community representatives must complete a “conflict of interest” assessment tool regarding any connection to the officers being investigated that assesses work and social conflicts and biases.	No
The IIT commander will review the conflict of interest assessment within 72 hours of the start of the investigation.	Unable to determine
The community representatives and the IIT commander will discuss the conflict of interest assessments.	Not applicable

ABOUT THE STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE

The State Auditor's Office is established in the Washington State Constitution and is part of the executive branch of state government. The State Auditor is elected by the people of Washington and serves four-year terms.

We work with state agencies, local governments and the public to achieve our vision of increasing trust in government by helping governments work better and deliver higher value.

In fulfilling our mission to provide citizens with independent and transparent examinations of how state and local governments use public funds, we hold ourselves to those same standards by continually improving our audit quality and operational efficiency, and by developing highly engaged and committed employees.

As an agency, the State Auditor's Office has the independence necessary to objectively perform audits, attestation engagements and investigations. Our work is designed to comply with professional standards as well as to satisfy the requirements of federal, state and local laws. The Office also has an extensive quality control program and undergoes regular external peer review to ensure our work meets the highest possible standards of accuracy, objectivity and clarity.

Our audits look at financial information and compliance with federal, state and local laws for all local governments, including schools, and all state agencies, including institutions of higher education. In addition, we conduct performance audits and cybersecurity audits of state agencies and local governments, as well as state whistleblower, fraud and citizen hotline investigations.

The results of our work are available to everyone through the more than 2,000 reports we publish each year on our website, www.sao.wa.gov. Additionally, we share regular news and other information via an email subscription service and social media channels.

We take our role as partners in accountability seriously. The Office provides training and technical assistance to governments both directly and through partnerships with other governmental support organizations.

Stay connected at sao.wa.gov

- [Find your audit team](#)
- [Request public records](#)
- Search BARS Manuals ([GAAP](#) and [cash](#)), and find [reporting templates](#)
- Learn about our [training workshops](#) and [on-demand videos](#)
- Discover [which governments serve you](#) — enter an address on our map
- Explore public financial data with the [Financial Intelligence Tool](#)

Other ways to stay in touch

- Main telephone:
(564) 999-0950
- Toll-free Citizen Hotline:
(866) 902-3900
- Email:
webmaster@sao.wa.gov