

October 13, 2017, Candidate Forum - City Attorney

NOTE TO READER: This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Realtime captioning is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a verbatim record of the proceedings.

Lisa K. Hutchinson

Certified Realtime Captioner

>>KAREN: Okay, thank you very much for you guys.  
Gave us a five-minute break there.

Thank you very much, both of you, for coming, and we'll start with a one-minute opening statement.

You can introduce yourselves, so if you would like to go ahead.

>>PETE: Where is your timekeeper?

>>CINDI: He will be back.

>>KAREN: All right. So --

>>CINDI: Thank you for that.

>>PETE: I need to be reigned in.

>>KAREN: Feel free to start.

>>PETE: Thank you so much, Katy. I appreciate this opportunity to speak with the Commission, with the

Alliance, and I very much look forward to talking and covering issues that are important to you over the next half hour. I wanted to just very quickly go through the fact that currently, I have been -- I'm Pete Holmes, your City Attorney for the past eight years.

It has been my honor to serve as the leader of the city's Law Department, the city's law firm, if you will. How is that? Is that better?

That's an office of about 102 lawyers, a number of legal professionals that go along with them, and we do all the work for the city. We're the chief legal office for the city as well as the chief misdemeanor prosecutor. But putting that aside, I wanted to talk just for a moment at the opening about my personal philosophy, and that is:

We follow RPC2.1, which is the rule of professional conduct that says, "lawyers shall always advise on law, but also social, economic, moral, and political implications of a client's decision," and I think that the notion that the rule of law should serve our entire community -- everyone -- has been incredibly important to me throughout my career.

After 33 years as a lawyer, I can say that this is the hardest job I have ever had, but the one I love the most. And so, I look forward to talking with you more.

>>SCOTT: Good evening, everyone. My name is

Scott Lindsay, and I'm very proud to be running for City Attorney. For the last three years, I served as Public Safety advisor to the Mayor of Seattle, and before that, worked as special assistant for police reform -- working with our Police Department, City Attorney's Office, the Federal Monitor -- to reform our Police Department.

I, prior to that, served as senior counsel to house Oversight Committee Democrats in Washington, D.C. and served in private practice in both Seattle and Washington, D.C. I am focused in my campaign on improving Public Safety in the City of Seattle by transforming our Criminal Justice System: Really focusing on how the Criminal Justice System interacts with people who are struggling with addiction, homelessness, and mental illness.

I think we can do much better on that front. I think we can do much better to transform and reform our Criminal Justice System. I also have significant plans for the reform of the civil side of the City Attorney's Office. I look forward to discussing that tonight.

I'm proud to be endorsed by *The Seattle Times*, as well as several leaders of the Seattle Community Police Commission. Look forward to getting into all of these issues with you, Karen.

>>KAREN: Great. Thank you very much. So, our first question: How will you work with the Disability

Commission towards designing better policies related to people with disabilities?

>>PETE: As the city's counsel, of course, we do advise all of the city's many commissions, including the Disabilities Commission as well.

And, the way we can do it is -- how I said at the outset that, for instance, I would love to talk more, give you a perfect example, about how, just in June of this year, my office settled a lawsuit brought by Disability Rights Washington over ADA Compliance with curb ramps in this city. It's an exciting project. It's been massive.

In fact, I wanted to call out the lawyer that was the lead for our office, and for the City of Seattle on this -- Lorraine Phillips -- is sitting in the audience today. But that's an exciting example of how we can coordinate with all of the units of the city, the Commissions, the Department of Transportation -- all of the units of the city -- to make sure that the city itself is compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act, just for starters.

In any event, that project alone has enabled us to enter into a contract, 18-year binding commitment -- assuming it's approved by the court on November 1 of this year -- to build a 1,250 curb ramps, every year, for the next 18 years.

That's a commitment that the city has entered into with Disability Rights Washington. It's a contract, a binding Consent Decree, if you will, that was negotiated by my office, and working with all of the constituent parts of the city, including the Commission.

But we have many other ways that we can help as well. We advise on the law, and, as I said earlier, our philosophy is to make sure that the city is not simply compliant. That the city is reaching out and understanding better how to encompass our entire communities.

When I took office eight years ago, for instance, just by way of analogy, no one in the office had been through the race and social justice training. By the end of my first quarter, everyone had. And it has opened the eyes of all of our lawyers. Thank you.

>>SCOTT: Yeah, I think it's important, of course, to work closely with the Disabilities Commission, but also to consult with them early, and coordinate that with the departments. I think it's important to -- not just be there, or win when lawsuits are filed -- but to get upfront, particularly as departments are making critical decisions that can impact people who are mobility impaired -- to actually be there as the legal advisor that is bringing -- helping -- bring multiple perspectives to the table, and that's one of the things that I want to help

accomplish.

At multiple points in my three years in City Hall, I had the pleasure of turning to members of the Disability Commission, Steve Lewis, Cindi Laws, asking for their advice -- asking for counsel on key questions coming before the city that would have potential impacts on mobility, and I would continue to want to really engage with the Commission.

>>KAREN: Great. Thank you very much. There are there are numerous rules that the City of Seattle has proposed regarding encampment removal.

As City Attorney, what accommodations would you consider to be reasonable to ensure that individuals with mental illness, or intellectual disabilities, receive adequate notice prior to an encampment sweep?

>>SCOTT: Let me take this on, because I worked closely on this issue. You know, the City of Seattle did sweeps -- as I'll call them, for the most part -- in the same way, substantially, for 20 years until 2008, made some slight modifications called the Multi-Departmental Administrative Rules, but still had a fairly roughshod approach, as to how it addressed people living in encampments.

I was asked by the Mayor to start to reform this in 2015 and 2016, and we put in place some significant

changes to how those are conducted. So, significant new notice provisions. Significant coordination.

So that the encampment removal efforts are only really prioritized at the most dangerous, the most unsafe, and unhealthy locations.

And then, creating the Navigation Team that paired, for the first time, outreach teams -- outreach workers with police officers -- to actually engage, and get much better results for people who are struggling outside, particularly with mental illness and addiction.

They have been able to really improve the overall result, and get them meaningful shelter. Finally, and most, importantly, we put in place this April, April 2017 for the first time: A new rule written by FAS, shepherded through that process by, with my significant involvement, that actually said, "The City of Seattle can't remove somebody from an unauthorized encampment, except when they have a meaningful shelter -- alternative place -- for them to be.

And then it added that they would make sure that they could return personal property to that person, like an Uber or Lyft type service, wherever that person may be in coordination with them.

But, I do also finally want to say that I have found that there are many locations around this city where

there are actually unauthorized encampments that are blocking sidewalks and blocking mobility.

I think it's important to preserve the ability of the city to remove unauthorized encampments -- remove tents -- that are in dangerous or unhealthy locations, or blocked mobility in the City of Seattle.

>>PETE: This has been an acute issue for the City Attorney's Office, not only in advising the rules, the MDRs that Mr. Lindsey referred to -- but also advising the Seattle Police Department, the Fire Department, when they are called upon to help assist with a cleanup.

And I am -- I guess have mixed feelings -- that the good news for the city is that the effort can continue going, because we have been successful in defending legal challenges to the cleanups, but while the city has had a legal orientation toward this, we are doing things the right way, and with the right legal objectives.

That is, for instance, we make sure that people do have notice, and that they do have -- that their personal property is safeguarded -- so that they can come collect it, and be able to be reunited with their property.

But my concern is -- and not being in the executive, which makes these decisions -- which decides exactly: How do you deploy your resources, your Police Department, your Fire Department, your other First

Responders -- is that, because of the extreme political sensitivity to this -- we need to be, as a city, more focused on making the first priority to look at an encampment as an opportunity to engage with social and other Public Health services, first and foremost, and to have the eyesore be secondary.

And, unfortunately, mayors, and Council Members, and all elected feel that pressure from the public with saying, "Why haven't you cleaned up our right of way? Why are you allowing needles, and garbage, and human feces to be distributed around our city? What can you do?"

I submit that, when we get our act fully together, we'll continue with a program that is less focused on the visual blight, and more concerned with the people that live in these encampments. Thank you.

>>KAREN: Thank you. Next question: What are you going to do to improve things in the court system for people with disabilities accused of low-level crimes and misdemeanors?

>>PETE: You know, we are in the City Attorney's Office, already engaged in a number of initiatives that not only include our Municipal Court System, but other departments as well. So I think that that would be included; encompassed in your question.

Includes, for instance, that we have CART, the

very same technology that we have here today, have that available in more departments for the customers -- the constituents, if you will -- that come in, for assistance, by city departments. The same goes with Seattle Municipal Court.

We need to make sure that they have the resources to provide assistance, so people have true access to justice, regardless of the disability -- and so our office is front and center on making sure that those efforts are compliant with ADA, and that we are also compliant with the Public Records Act, is another example.

Doesn't apply to the courts, necessarily, but there's no reason that someone with a disability should not receive public records that are accessible in the same technology that CART provides.

We are also participating in the citywide Move the City Evaluation. That includes the Municipal Court. Making sure that access is available throughout the city. And we are partners with the Facilities Compliance Team, and that's where all of our city facilities are evaluated for accessibility issues.

And then, frankly, there's a transition plan in place for every one of our departments, including my own. We're working hand and foot -- hand in glove, with these guys -- to make sure that we comply, not only with the

letter of the law, but with the spirit of the law. Thank you.

>>SCOTT: Yeah, it's not enough. And this is one of the main reasons why I'm running for this office. Right? Right now, previously with King County, we ran a project called the King County Seattle Familiar Faces Project.

It looked at the repeat offenders that are in King County Jail right now, and what we saw is the vast majority of them are struggling with addiction, homelessness, and mental illness -- in great numbers. In fact, 88% struggling with addiction, I think almost 40% struggling with mental illness, 60+ percent struggling with homelessness.

So, we know those are the folks who are already in our Criminal Justice System. So, the question is: How is our Seattle Municipal Criminal Justice System, where the Seattle City Attorney is the leader of that system; how is that system oriented, pivoting toward actually getting folks out, breaking them out of that cycle? Too often I see folks in a streets-to-jail cycle, where they are in-and-out of jail. The jail system, the Criminal Justice System itself, sets too high of barriers to access to so many folks.

Folks may be arrested for a car prowl, be

struggling with addiction or mental illness, and the result is they get a court hearing for 20, 30 days out. We know, with great certainty, they will not be able to make that court hearing. They don't make the court hearing. A warrant issues for their arrest. We need to lower these barriers. There is a lot more we can do: Proactive engagement through efforts like the Navigation Team.

Second, really expanding our Diversion programs citywide, making those meaningful; the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion Program. A great example here. Something that should be accessible to the folks arrested on misdemeanor charges -- get them out of the Criminal Justice System.

Third we immediate a low barrier easy access court. San Francisco and other cities are modeling this. We got rid of Community Court, but we need to replace it with something that actually works.

>>KAREN: Thank you. As City Attorney, you work, or would work closely on, the Federal Department of Justice Consent Decree over the Seattle Police Department's biased policing, and use of force. What further changes do you want to see?

>>PETE: Great question, and one very near, and dear to my heart. You know, I first ran for this office eight years ago, after having served for six years on

Police Oversight. I was a member of the city's very first Civilian Oversight Board for the Police Department, and I learned a lot in that experience that I carried over. In fact, it was, again, the prime motivator for me to run for this position.

And who could know, though, that in my very first year, we would continue to have incidents -- like the shooting of John T. Williams -- that would eventually lead, by 2011, to a D.O.J. Investigation, and finally, in 2012, five years ago. The entry of the Consent Decree.

I am the lead counsel on that case. I appeared before Judge Robart myself in that case, and I worked closely with SPD, and the rest of the city, to make sure we obtain compliance. We have -- in fact, I believe -- obtained full and effective compliance with the technical parameters of the decree, but much remains.

If the judge agrees that we are in full technical compliance, then that will start a two-year clock running, during which time SPD must maintain that compliance throughout. We know the cities want to the move forward, and do more than what the Consent Decree requires. I support those efforts.

More importantly, and probably the toughest one, is we need to make sure the contracts that we have with our two Police Unions fully support reform. We have been

almost seven years, with regard to the SPMA, and almost five years with respect to SPOG, since we had ratified contracts with these unions. They need to be brought on board, and those contracts ratified, preferably early in the two-year maintenance period. Thank you.

>>SCOTT: Today, both the Department of Justice, and with the Community Police Commission, agreed that the Seattle Police Department had met the standards for full and effective compliance with the Federal Consent Decree.

That's an important step, and we're now looking for the judges to make the decision so we can actually get into the final review stage of the Federal Consent Decree. But that's only the beginning. There's a lot more, here, that we need to do, and specifically we need to build, and have been building, the Robust Civilian Oversight mechanisms that will sustain us for the long haul -- that make sure that, without the Department of Justice, without the Federal Monitor, that we have folks who are really able to monitor the Labor Contracts, the performance, the auditor -- that we are able to keep these things in check, and keep this reform movement in progress.

Both Mr. Holmes and I have worked extensively on that project of Civilian Oversight, particularly with the Community Police Commission which has been our leader here. I'm very proud to have the endorsement of all five of the

current, and past Co-Chairs of the Community Police Commission. I have worked closely with them. I helped draft the original version of the legislation to actually create that Robust Civilian Oversight.

You know, unfortunately, there was only one elected official that actually said that they had real issues with the version of the new Robust Civilian Oversight System that passed unanimously out of council this June, and that was Mr. Holmes. So, I think that more -- I think there's a record here -- that I hope all of you look at, about leadership on police reform.

>>PETE: Do you allow any rebuttals?

>>KAREN: One minute.

>>PETE: Yes, indeed, I did write a letter to council expressing some concerns about the Accountability Legislation, as did Chief Kathleen O'Toole. Those concerns were, I think, important to articulate, and more importantly:

We are faced, because of that more fundamental problem about labor piece, with the very real challenge that we right now have -- pending litigation with our police unions -- that would invalidate the entire legislative package. Those are the concerns that I have, that I have expressed, and until we take care of that as a practical legal matter, reform is going to be elusive.

>>KAREN: Thank you very much. Next question:  
Nearly half of individuals killed by police have a disability. We have seen, with the killing of Charleena Lyles that escalation, and lethal force, against people with disabilities, even when the police know the person has a mental illness, is still an issue. Do you believe Seattle Police need more De-Escalation Training?

>>SCOTT: Yes. You know, Seattle Police right now have a very robust system of De-Escalation Training, and that's been approved by the monitor, but that can -- but we can go further. But there's more here, and I want to talk specifically about the Charleena Lyles shooting.

She was a repeat victim of domestic violence. She was struggling -- someone who was struggling -- with mental illness, according to her own family, according to police reports. And, what I ask us to look at, is beyond what happened in her kitchen. Let's look back. Let's look back just three weeks. You know, two and a half three weeks prior to her tragic shooting by Seattle Police officers, she was a victim of domestic violence. She called police. She was in a state of frenzy, and very upset. She threatened police officers, and they arrested her. In their arrest report, they said, specifically, she needs mental health help. She needs counseling. She needs support. They then take her, and they bring her, to the

Criminal Justice System.

So the question is: What does the Criminal Justice System do with her? What did it do with her? And the answer is she sat in jail for 10 days. At the conclusion of that, she gets a referral to mental health counseling. I don't think that was enough. I think we can do more. I think our system can do better. I don't think our Mental Health Court served her particularly well. I don't think our City Attorney's Office served her particularly well. I see that happening far too frequently.

And, I think we need to look -- it's important that we get the reform piece right -- for the De-Escalation for Seattle Police officers, but I think we have to also look about how the Criminal Justice System backs up our police, supports our system, and helps address people -- address the underlying issues.

>>PETE: The most direct answer to your question is: Yes, more training is needed. The good news is, that throughout the reform effort, and in particular with the Crisis Intervention Training that the reform effort, and the Consent Decree, has spawned, has demonstrated incredible results. We have seen the uses of force against people in crisis drop orders of magnitude.

We see that the city has training available for

more of the Police Department, more of the basic training, then as well as the specialized training to be a member of the Crisis Intervention Teams that actually can respond. So, that's the good news. We have made progress. But, yes, there is much more to do. I do want to say that the Charleena Lyles Case exemplifies more than what Mr. Lindsey was speaking to, as well. For instance: Had the officers been wearing body cams that would have yielded a lot of information?

I very much supported Mayor Murray's decision to order that, after failed efforts -- months, and months, and months of bargaining -- to get those body cams on Patrol Officers. That would have been very useful, not only in the case of Charleena Lyles, but also understanding more broadly what these interactions looked like, and learning from them so we don't repeat avoidable mistakes.

Charleena Lyles was very special to my office. There's an article you can read from *The Seattle Times* that our Domestic Violence Advocates worked with her closely. They were deeply wounded at her shooting and, you know, the problem is, with all of the encounters with the police -- as she proceeded to decompensate -- this is one of the problems that we do have more work to do. How does the Criminal Justice System intervene with someone that is decompensating like that? I hope that we'll learn from

this tragedy even more.

>>KAREN: Thank you. Would you support changes in the law that make it easier to prosecute police officers, particularly in cases where someone like deaf, First Nations wood carver, John T. Williams, was killed -- or in situations we were speaking about, with Charleena Lyles.

>>PETE: Yes. Our state is an outlier in requiring malice and good faith, if that's the question you are reaching. I endorsed an Initiative, 873, last year, Initiative 940 this year. I would like to have seen the State Legislature do its job, and unfortunately, they did not -- despite the fact that my Criminal Chief, Kelly Harris, was a member of the Legislative Task Force that was exploring ways to amend the statute -- and make it possible to actually prosecute a Law Enforcement Officer.

As it stands now, in order to prosecute an officer -- setting aside individual, you know, headline incidents -- just in general, to prosecute an officer for just simple homicide, for manslaughter, you have to prove Premeditated First-Degree Murder, effectively. And that is simply overkill, if you will. It's -- we do want to give officers the benefit of the doubt in some of these extreme situations, but that goes too far. Washington is an outlier, and malice should not be an element. It's impossible to prove, and good faith is -- should be -- an

objective, not a subjective, standard.

>>SCOTT: And I agree with Mr. Holmes regarding Initiative 873, regarding Initiative 940. Malice is an impossible standard. We need to remove that. But I think, Karen, it sounds like your question was also specific to people, specifically with disabilities, and should there be an even lower barrier for people with disabilities.

And that's something that, I think, is important to explore, but I am just deeply troubled by the numerous instances. Let me take my remainder of my time to promote: Here is the petition for Initiative 940. Now, I think Initiative 940 needs almost 300,000 signatures to get on the ballot.

At this point, they are working hard at that. They are fundraising to get paid signature gatherers, but this is something that, I think, both Mr. Holmes and I have endorsed, supported -- it's the right thing to do. This is would promote additional De-Escalation Training for all Law Enforcement officers around the state, and something that, hopefully, everybody here is willing to sign.

>>KAREN: Thank you. Next question: Do you support funding a Safe Consumption Site in Seattle?

>>SCOTT: Yeah, let me take the lead on this, because I have worked on this fairly extensively. The answer is: Yes. And so, in 2015, I started to

really -- as I got involved in many of the city's Public Safety challenges, it really became apparent that so many people who are involved in the Criminal Justice System are struggling with addiction, and Seattle -- just like Portland, San Francisco, West Virginia, Ohio, Boston -- are really getting slammed by the heroine epidemic. We are losing people, outside, on the streets, every single day. We need to do better to for both Public Health but also Public Safety reasons.

So, I helped create -- I proposed to the Mayor and the King County Executive -- the creation of the Seattle King County Heroin and Opiate Addiction Task Force. I then served on-member of that task force, and helped shepherd it. The task force made significant recommendations around prevention, treatment, getting on-demand treatment availability, and User-Health Services.

I think -- and around User-Health Services -- what that means is a pilot-supervised Consumption Site -- here in the City of Seattle. I think this is important to save lives. I think it's also important to the improve Public Safety right now: Too many people are using IV drugs, using heroin outside in inappropriate places -- in sidewalks, in parks, in Starbucks bathrooms. We need to try to bring that indoors, in order to save those lives, and in order to improve our Public Safety.

>>PETE: I think this is another area that Mr. Lindsey and I agree on. And I would go further. For me, just philosophically, I think that one of my big goals -- the philosophical approach I set at the beginning of my term -- has been that we have got to wean society's addiction from always "call a cop."

We know, as Scott just described it, this is a Public Health problem. It's a Public Health Crisis, and it's not limited to Seattle. It's across this country. And even beyond. And, what the role of the City Attorney is -- the important point here -- and that is to make sure that, first off, you do not lead with a Criminal Justice response to a Public Health problem. And that was established early in my very first term, and it's one of the reasons that it has led to the work that you see, somewhat belatedly, going on now, as we all try to struggle -- we frankly -- it's such a large problem, trying to coordinate all the service providers, and getting everything on the same page.

And I think Scott has done some great work on that, but there's a couple other thing that the Law Department can do: One is that I'm I have now joined the City of Seattle in the litigation to block I-27. That is a County Initiative that would ban Safe Consumption Sites. I think that's wrong. We have got to assist -- this is the

next logical step in rolling back the War on Drugs -- is to start shifting from this Criminal Justice response to a Public Health response.

The second thing that I have done, and that's some of the problems I'm confident that Scott and everyone shares: Is that there are not enough resources to take care of this problem. And so, in conjunction with Attorney General Bob Ferguson just a few weeks ago, I filed suit against the major manufacturers of opioids to help make them pay for the harms that they have caused to this city, and help give us some of those needed resources to help people that are battling with the disease of addiction.

Thank you.

>>SCOTT: Karen, if I can take my one minute, I'm not going to call it a rebuttal. I'm going to call it addendum, which there are some basic steps that the city can take here, and I think we can take pretty quickly.

We actually contract for our Jail Services with King County -- our Misdemeanor Jail Services. Somebody who is arrested on misdemeanor charges right now, whose underlying issue is heroin addiction, unfortunately, when they are in the jail, and they have that window of sobriety -- they are not actually getting real, and meaningful treatment options offered to them in the jail. That is a lost opportunity. It's a moment that we should

be taking advantage of.

We should be offering folks who are in that situation, who are willing, voluntarily, Suboxone treatment. We should get them enrolled in a Methadone program, get them enrolled in Vivitrol. A lot of options we can take to, actually, really help people break out of that cycle right now, because just getting them into the Criminal Justice System and sending them out the back door at midnight, that's not working, that's not helping them break that addiction.

>>KAREN: Do you have an addendum?

>>PETE: I don't disagree. The only other complication is, is we don't have a Drug Court in the Municipal Court, because all drug crimes are felonies, handled by King County Prosecutor, not by this office. I certainly agree in principle with what Scott is saying.

>>KAREN: Thank you very much. Next question: If our city has a Disability Rights Law, but it is not implemented, how can we get help getting this law enforced?

>>PETE: Which law is not -- I'm going to push my hearing aids in further -- and ask what --

>>CINDI: David, that's your question. Oh, it's not your question?

>>PETE: What law was it? I just didn't understand what law.

>>KAREN: To repeat the question: If our city has a Disability Rights Law, but it is not implemented, how can we get help getting this law enforced? It's a question from the audience, so, I'm not exactly sure I can add more information.

>>SCOTT: I guess, I think, neither of us is sure which specific -- what they are referring to by Disability Rights Law.

>>PETE: Maybe a hypothetical, if there was a law? Is that what you were saying?

>>CINDI: I think someone is citing an actual law, but we can move on.

>>KAREN: We can move on to another question that might be a little easier to grapple. Are you willing to hire a qualified person with disabilities in your administration?

>>SCOTT: Absolutely.

>>PETE: I'm sorry, have I what?

>>KAREN: Are you willing to hire a qualified person with disabilities in your administration?

>>PETE: Absolutely.

>>KAREN: We'll see if there are some upcoming questions.

>>SCOTT: It's been great, guys.

Uh-oh, there goes a phone.

>>KAREN: Okay. The Seattle Police Department possesses a database of many citizens' disabilities and mental health diagnoses. Seattle Police Department maintains that this will help them de-escalate situations, but at least in the case of Ms. Lyles, it appears to have done the opposite. Do you agree with the use of this database?

And if so, how do you get around the security problems addressed by accessing this database, by -- on an app? How would you address disabled Seattleites who won't call the police, for fear of having their information added to this Police Department app?

>>SCOTT: I think what you are referring to, here, and for the benefit of the audience, is the Crisis Intervention Team and their Crisis Response Plans. And so, the Crisis Intervention Team is -- what is mandated by the Federal Consent Decree, and has been approved by the monitored Department of Justice -- and what they do is, for people who are repeatedly engaged with Seattle Police officers, and in states of crisis: They create a plan for that individual. Now, the plan is contained on an app that is only available to the Seattle Police officers and to mental health workers who are working, specifically, with the Seattle Police officers. My understanding, and if this is wrong, then I would definitely want to learn more about

it, and engage with the Disabilities Commission about that. But, my understanding is, that that app has been -- has robust security measures -- and basically has the same security measures that all of the rest of Seattle Police data has.

And for the most part, Seattle Police data, which includes a lot of the sensitive information on arrest records, interactions, times -- things that are not otherwise publicly available -- that those records are relatively secure. If the Disabilities Commission, or somebody in the audience, has other information about the lack of security, I would want to know about it. But here's what I want to say: The Crisis Intervention Team, the Crisis Response Plans, have been able to reduce -- to actually, I believe -- save lives.

What it means is that, when officers are called to a scene of somebody who has had repeated, past interactions with Seattle police officers -- they know that there's a plan. They get cues as to what are some of the successful De-Escalation Techniques for that individual: Who the Case Manager might be; who they can refer the person to; who they could call to get further assistance.

That gives Seattle Police officers the ones that are engaging, and that are specifically trained with Crisis De-Escalation Techniques, much greater confidence. They

are not going cold into a scenario where they don't know anything about the person. They know other officers engage with this individual. There is a plan. Here's how we get this resolved peacefully, without harm to the individual.

>>PETE: The problem with security of information is one that, I think, is going to be with us for some time and I appreciate it. I understand, gosh, whether it's City Light, trying to convert to smart-meters for the electrical grid, or trying to capture this critically important information -- it's a challenge that we're all struggling with. It's come up more recently, I want to say, by the way -- in the case of 1490, Initiative 1490, passed last year with Extreme Risk Protection Orders -- is giving a family -- families the ability to get orders to separate people with -- that are in a mental health crisis -- from their guns.

But what we know, and what the teaching is from Crisis Intervention in general, is that if responding officers have information and have local sources -- like a family member, like a care provider, like Scott was talking about -- you can have a better outcome if possible and, again, having a plan for when someone is decompensating, and approaching a crisis situation, again - --

It's a tough problem. It's not unlike the problem we're dealing with, with body cams -- frankly -- generate

rating immense public records. In this case, we can have exemptions that protect this kind of data, and it is beyond my pay-grade -- exactly how you protect the security of this information. So, you know, it's one that is here to stay. We have got to work with it. That's exactly the kind of role that the City Attorney's Office has to be engaged in, in trying to help legislators -- frequently -- try to understand how can we better protect data.

The last component, though, Katy, is about trying to build trust. How do we get the communities to accept, and believe, that every effort is being made to protect their data, and then is it in their best interest? And until you have -- that's exactly what police reform is all about -- it is about rebuilding, restoring that trust.

>>KAREN: Thank you very much. Yes. That was our last question. We'll give you one-minute closing statement, each.

>>SCOTT: Great. Again, I'm Scott Lindsay. I really am happy for the chance to be here tonight, to engage with all of you, and I look forward to continuing to engage with the Disabilities Commission in the years ahead. I think there are really important issues in this race, and obviously, we have an incumbent-challenger scenario. It's important to look at both of our records, and look at the

entrance for the few.

I think the City of Seattle can do more to improve Public Safety, by transforming our Criminal Justice System with progressive Public Health Interventions that really get at the root causes for folks who are struggling with mental illness, struggling with addiction, struggling with homelessness.

Those folks are already in our Criminal Justice System today, and we need to do better by them, and better by the communities, that are struggling with many of the Public Safety issues out there on our streets.

I'm very proud to have the endorsement of the Seattle Firefighters, who are often our first responders out there. I'm very proud to have the endorsement of *The Seattle Times*, and all five of the current and past Co-Chairs of the Seattle Community Police Commission.

I would really appreciate your support in this election. Thank you.

>>PETE: You know, this forum in particular, is important to me because I think disabilities are -- have touched my life in a way -- that, again, reinforced what I said at the outset: That the law is to serve all of us. I have a brother -- my youngest brother -- who has advanced MS, and, watching him, having grown up with him, watch his disease progress, has been a painful experience. But one

that we have been determined to learn about. I built an ADA Compliant mother-in-law apartment for my parents-in-law, back almost 10 years ago, and learned I think a little bit more about what it is like to live the life of an individual, a member of this community, who has disabilities.

If the law cannot serve, then who can it serve if it can't serve our disability communities? I am supported by Governor Jay Inslee, by Attorney General Bob Ferguson, the Lieutenant Governor, Lands Commissioner, Mayor, seven Council Members, and I would be grateful for the support of the Commission as well.

Thank you.

>>KAREN: Thank you very much. Round of applause for both candidates. (Applause.)

NOTE TO READER: This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Realtime captioning is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a verbatim record of the proceedings.

Lisa K. Hutchinson

Certified Realtime Captioner