

TACOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Intra-Departmental Memorandum



TO: Chief Avery Moore
Chief of Police

FROM: Lieutenant Gary J. Roberts *GJR*
Internal Affairs Section

DATE: June 3, 2022

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT 22COM-0024

Complainant:

Ms. Brendlyne K. Campbell
Mr. Daniel P. Clarke
7424 South Puget Sound Avenue
Tacoma, WA 98409
253.754.5392

On March 28, 2022, Ms. Campbell contacted the Tacoma Police Department regarding the actions of an Animal Control & Compliance Officer and the Animal Control and Compliance Supervisor. The complaint was entered into the Tacoma Police Department's tracking system, processed by the Internal Affairs Section, and assigned complaint number 22COM-0024.

Allegation(s): Courtesy; Unsatisfactory Performance

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Ms. Brendlyne Campbell alleges the Animal Control & Compliance Officer (ACCO) and the Animal Control and Compliance Supervisor (ACCS) were rude and aggressive and tried to seize a dog from her porch.

INVESTIGATION

The complaint was forwarded to the Operations Bureau, which reported the following:

Ms. Campbell is the owner of several dogs. Her dogs escaped her yard in January 2022, were impounded by Animal Control to the Humane Society, and later returned to her in February. Her dogs escaped again on March 9th. ACCOs responded, and her dogs were again impounded. ACCOs had been to the residence on several occasions between January and March 2022. Ms. Campbell initiated a complaint because she said ACCO Supervisor Satter-Hunt was aggressive, intimidating, and rude over the phone to her and in person to her fiancé, Mr. Daniel Clarke, and roommate Ms. Mollie Thompson. She was also concerned that he tried to seize a dog from her porch after the dog had escaped from her yard but returned.

On January 18, 2022, ACCS Satter-Hunt and ACCO Bowerman responded to Ms. Campbell's residence with Officer J. Harris and Officer Jacobson for a loose dogs (all Huskies) complaint. Shortly afterward, ACCS Satter-Hunt, ACCOs Bowerman and Salisbury were dispatched back to the residence as the dogs had gotten back out; five of the dogs were impounded. On March 9, Animal Control officers were dispatched again to the same address for multiple dogs, five large Huskies and a puppy, running loose. On March 30, ACCS Satter-Hunt and ACCO Bowerman responded to the same address to follow up due to the impound and mandatory spay/neuter of the dogs that were impounded. The primary investigation was handled by ACCO Bowerman who, between January 18 and April 8, has made contact at least 39 times either in person, phone, or voice messages which does not take into consideration the numerous follow-ups with the Humane Society to help Ms. Campbell with her dogs. All of ACCO Bowerman's

contacts were thoroughly documented in the ACCO's reporting system, Chameleon. Further, the basis for the ongoing investigation was due to bio-hazard conditions of the house and property that cause disease in dogs and humans as well as securing the property to prevent the dogs from getting out. There was an excess of over 20 puppies and 6 or 7 adult dogs, which far exceeds the allowable standard of 6 pets total, per TMC 17.05.010. These incidents of neglect, along with additional complaints from the neighborhood, are why the ACCOs have ongoing matters to resolve at the residence.

Ms. Campbell and Mr. Clarke were contacted for follow-up regarding their complaint. In regards to the incident in January, Mr. Clarke left a message on the Pet Line. ACCS Satter-Hunt called Mr. Clarke back and then Ms. Campbell got on the line. From that conversation, Ms. Campbell accused ACCS Satter-Hunt of speaking over her and her mother, claiming he "throws his weight around on the phone and in person." Ms. Campbell also stated she is the kind of person who will start yelling if you get in her face. Ms. Campbell accused ACCS Satter-Hunt of yelling in Mollie's face when the ACCOs responded to the residence on March 9 for loose dogs. Ms. Campbell said ACCS Satter-Hunt cornered Mollie on the porch to seize one of her dogs and screamed at her. Ms. Campbell stated she overheard this when speaking with Mollie on the phone. Ms. Campbell said Mollie snatched the dog away from ACCS Satter-Hunt, to which he replied, "No," and got mad at Mollie. Ms. Campbell added that she heard ACCS Satter-Hunt call Mollie a "piece of shit dog owner," and said, "I should just take you to jail." Ms. Campbell also alleges ACCS Satter-Hunt yelled at her over the phone stating her house was atrocious.

Mr. Clarke, who was on the line, stated that Ms. Campbell's mother, Mrs. Cordette Campbell, said ACCS Satter-Hunt was fine with her. He advised that ACCS Satter-Hunt spoke to him in a "matter of fact" tone and was "to the point," and made no accusations of being a negative dog owner. At this time, Ms. Campbell told Mr. Clark, "That is because you and my mother are older," and said she feels ACCS Satter-Hunt "looks and treats younger people like garbage."

Ms. Mollie Thompson's contact information was requested from Ms. Campbell and was told she would ask Mollie to call the investigating supervisor of this complaint. As of May 9, 2022, Mollie has not made contact. The phone number for Mollie was called but is no longer in service.

Ms. Campbell's mother, Mrs. Cordette Campbell, was contacted via phone regarding this complaint. Mrs. C. Campbell said she is not totally impressed with ACCS Satter-Hunt as he never introduced himself to her daughter and was acting like a High Schooler by yelling at her and swearing. Mrs. C. Campbell stated ACCS Satter-Hunt was "going off, yelling and swearing." She said neither ACCS Satter-Hunt nor her daughter were listening to each other, and she finally stepped in to calm them down so they were able to talk. Mrs. C. Campbell said they both were caught up in the heat of the moment. Mrs. C. Campbell stated ACCS Satter-Hunt told her daughter, "I don't really give a shit about your situation, it's not my damn problem." Mrs. C. Campbell said she was not sure or can't recall but thinks ACCO Bowerman said her daughter was a "worthless pet owner." She added ACCO Bowerman became "two-faced" in subsequent contacts telling Ms. Campbell one thing, then later saying another. Mrs. C. Campbell said this occurred on the initial response to her daughter's residence in January.

Ms. B. Campbell was re-contacted for follow-up regarding this complaint who stated she had nothing else to add. She provided Mr. Clarke's direct phone number for follow-up. To date, Mr. Clarke has not returned any calls for follow-up.

ACCS Satter-Hunt was interviewed regarding this complaint. He stated he responded twice to assist ACCO Bowerman on January 18, and again assisted on March 9 and March 30. During the January 18th response, ACCS Satter-Hunt said the priority was to get the dogs inside as there were too many for ACCO Bowerman to control by herself. At that time, no one was at the residence. ACCS Satter-Hunt noted what he described as "deplorable conditions" of the house and property, which initiated his concern for addressing neglect for the dogs. They left after securing the dogs in the house. There was a subsequent response on January 18 at that same address where multiple dogs had gotten back out and were running all over the neighborhood and around the adjacent business off South Tacoma Way. ACCS Satter-Hunt said five of the dogs and a puppy were captured and impounded and citations were issued.

This same day, Mr. Clarke left a voice message on the Pet Line and requested a call. ACCS Satter-Hunt called Mr. Clarke back and explained the dogs would not be returned due to the unsanitary conditions at the house. That is when Mr. Clarke put Ms. Campbell on the phone and ACCS Satter-Hunt explained what occurred and advised her of the poor condition of filth and smell of feces and urine, which does not meet the legal standards for adequate care for the dogs (TMC 17.01.166.) The conditions were noted in Chameleon. Ms. Campbell told him there were 15 puppies living inside the house. It was later discovered there were three litters of puppies (approximately 20), plus 6 or 7 adult Huskies living in the house at that time. ACCS Satter-Hunt offered to take the dogs to the Humane Society at no cost to her because the Humane Society charges \$200 each. Ms. Campbell refused his offer. On March 9, ACCS Satter-Hunt again responded to the address to assist ACCOs Bowerman and Salisbury for loose dogs. ACCS Satter-Hunt spoke with Mr. Clarke and his mother. Mollie, who was house sitting the dogs, was there; however, she was at the front door and he was out on the street so they did not speak to each other. On March 30, ACCS Satter-Hunt spoke with Mr. Clarke to explain the law regarding mandatory spay and neuter under TMC 17.01.110. He also expressed concern for the dogs as they are constantly getting loose. ACCS Satter-Hunt denied speaking over Ms. Campbell on the phone on January 18. He stated he allowed her to talk it out and asked if he could speak. When Ms. Campbell did not like the answers to her questions, she began to talk over him. ACCS Satter-Hunt denied cursing or yelling. ACCS Satter-Hunt denied making the statement, "I don't really give a shit about your situation, it's not my damn problem." He did document, however, on January 18 that he told Ms. Campbell that she was still responsible for the puppies since they were in her custody. He did ask Mrs. C. Campbell if she could take the dogs to give Ms. Campbell an opportunity to clean up the urine and feces so the dogs could be returned. ACCS Satter-Hunt denied the allegation of calling Mollie a "piece of shit dog owner," adding he did not speak to Mollie.

ACCO Bowerman was contacted and interviewed regarding this complaint and stated the following: She stated she was in the office when ACCS Satter-Hunt was speaking with Ms. Campbell over the phone on January 18. ACCS Satter-Hunt was polite and did not talk over Ms. Campbell nor did he yell. When the ACCOs responded back to the address on March 9 for a loose dog complaint, ACCO Bowerman was initially behind the house. When she came to the front, ACCS Satter-Hunt was standing outside of the fence near the street and Mollie was on the front porch by the door. ACCS Satter-Hunt asked her who the female at the front door was since he did not know. ACCO Bowerman identified her as Mollie, and stated she did not see or hear them speak to each other. ACCO Bowerman said they did not take any dogs from within the property on any incident responses. One of the dogs that was loose did get back inside the front yard. The dog went up to Mollie who took the dog inside and that was the end of it. She did not hear ACCS Satter-Hunt yell at any point. ACCO Bowerman witnessed ACCS Satter-Hunt speaking very nicely and calm with Mr. Clarke. Mr. Clarke told ACCS Satter-Hunt that he had not installed locks on the gate. ACCO Salisbury also responded on March 9 and impounded three of Ms. Campbell's dogs that were captured off the property, and ACCO Bowerman impounded the other three. Citations were issued to Ms. Campbell for all six; three by ACCO Salisbury and three by ACCO Bowerman. ACCO Bowerman said Ms. Campbell is the registered owner for the dogs and she must direct all clean-up actions and information about the dogs to the registered owner for positive confirmation that the owner had been notified of any action that could result in enforcement. Ms. Campbell accused ACCO Bowerman of refusing to provide her badge number, to which ACCO Bowerman replied they do not have badges as they are not commissioned officers. ACCO Bowerman said she always identifies herself and provides her bug number as noted in her reports. Ms. Campbell was complaining to her and wanted ACCS Satter-Hunt's badge number, to which she replied she did not know and she could call the Pet Line and the "Animal Control Dispatcher" could get that for her. Then Ms. Campbell asked ACCO Bowerman for her badge number which she provided.


ACCO Salisbury was contacted and interviewed regarding this complaint. She said she had captured three of the dogs and only drove around to the front to see if ACCS Satter-Hunt or ACCO Bowerman needed help. She said she saw two females and one male. One was Mollie and the other was likely Mr.

Clarke's mother, and Mr. Clarke. ACCO Salisbury said ACCS Satter-Hunt was standing outside of the gated front yard near the street. ACCS Satter-Hunt was standing near Mr. Clarke's mother. ACCO Salisbury said everyone appeared to be cordial, so she left to the Humane Society with the three dogs in her vehicle.

FINDINGS

An investigation into this complaint was conducted to include interviews of the complainant, ACCS Satter-Hunt, ACCO Bowerman, and witnesses. The investigation was then reviewed by the officers' chain of command. The allegation of Courtesy against ACCS Satter-Hunt is concluded as **Not Sustained**, which is *a final disposition of a complaint when the investigation is unable to substantiate whether or not misconduct or violation of policy or procedures occurred*. The allegation of Unsatisfactory Performance against ACCS Satter-Hunt and ACCO Bowerman is concluded as **Unfounded**, which is *a final disposition of a complaint when the investigation revealed that the facts or actions alleged did not occur*.

I have reviewed the complaint, investigation and conclusion and concur with the findings.



Chief Avery Moore
Chief of Police



Date

/man

TACOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Intra-Departmental Memorandum



TO: Avery Moore
Chief of Police

FROM: Lieutenant Gary J. Roberts *GJR*
Internal Affairs Section

DATE: June 3, 2022

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT 22COM-0027

Complainant:

Mr. Brandon Amos Martin
6015 South Cedar Street
Tacoma, WA 98409
360.999.8919

On April 20, 2022, Mr. Martin contacted the Tacoma Police Department regarding the actions of Tacoma Police Officers. The complaint was entered into the Tacoma Police Department's tracking system, processed by the Internal Affairs Section, and assigned complaint number 22COM-0027.

Allegation(s): Courtesy

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Mr. Brandon Martin alleges the responding officers and sergeant mocked and ridiculed him.

INVESTIGATION

The complaint was forwarded to the Operations Bureau, which reported the following:

Mr. Martin initially called the Criminal Investigations Division and left a voicemail message stating he was mocked and ridiculed by responding officers and a sergeant. He stated he wanted to file a complaint.

This incident originally stemmed from a Welfare Check where a parent was calling South Sound 911 (SS911) concerned their daughter was having a domestic dispute with Mr. Martin.

Multiple attempts were made to contact Mr. Martin. When he returned the call, he left a voicemail as the investigating supervisor was unavailable at the time. In summary, he thanked the supervisor for the call and explained he is currently enrolled in a heavy equipment operator school in Woodlawn, Washington. Prior to leaving for his schooling, he stayed at a Motel 6 and his vehicle was stolen. Mr. Martin said he called several times to report his vehicle being stolen and no one responded to take a report. Mr. Martin stated that his school is 6 am to 6 pm every day and he is nearly impossible to reach. Mr. Martin stated, "I don't really care about the other thing that happened to me," he is really upset that he has been "blown off," referring to not being contacted about his stolen vehicle.

Another message was left for Mr. Martin with suggestions on how to report his vehicle being stolen. He was provided with the work hours of the investigating supervisor and was told to call for any further assistance. At this time, Mr. Martin has not reached out.

The body worn camera (BWC) footage was reviewed of the officers involved. After reviewing all related videos, there was no observation of any supporting evidence of Mr. Martin's complaint of being "mocked or ridiculed." Both officers and sergeant were extremely professional given Mr. Martin's demeanor (verbal barrage of hateful and insulting speech). This is noted on three of the six BWC footage captured while the officers were on scene. There were no written reports for this incident; however, notes were added to the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system.

Regarding Mr. Martin's frustration of not being able to report his vehicle as stolen, South Sound 911 (SS911) was contacted. The records showed Mr. Martin called SS911 on April 21, 2022, to report his vehicle as stolen under CAD #2211100862, which confirms what he stated in his voice message. During his interaction with SS911, Mr. Martin did not have the proper information to report his vehicle as stolen. Mr. Martin was uncooperative and hung up on the SS911 operator. SS911 cancelled the call, and it was never dispatched to an officer. On June 7, 2022, Mr. Martin called SS911 again to report his vehicle stolen; however, the vehicle in question is not in Mr. Martin's name so a motor vehicle theft report was not taken. This call was not dispatched to Patrol.

FINDINGS

An investigation into this complaint was conducted to include voice message communication of the complainant as well as review of the body worn camera footage. The investigation was then reviewed by the officers' chain of command. The allegation of Unsatisfactory Performance against the involved officers is concluded as **Unfounded**, which is *a final disposition of a complaint when the investigation revealed that the facts or actions alleged did not occur.*

I have reviewed the complaint, investigation and conclusion and concur with the findings.


Avery Moore
Chief of Police


Date

/man

TACOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Intra-Departmental Memorandum



TO: Avery Moore
Chief of Police

FROM: Lieutenant Gary J. Roberts *GJR*
Internal Affairs Section

DATE: June 5, 2022

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT 22COM-0028

Complainant:

Reverend Paul Zeigler
Ms. Leanne Tennyson
10333 Bridgeport Way SW
Lakewood, WA 98499
630.514.4555

On April 28, 2022, Reverend Zeigler contacted the Tacoma Police Department regarding the actions of a Tacoma Police Officer. The complaint was entered into the Tacoma Police Department's tracking system, processed by the Internal Affairs Section, and assigned complaint number 22COM-0028.

Allegation(s): Non-Discrimination Policy

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Rev. Paul Zeigler alleges the officer was harassing a homeless person.

INVESTIGATION

The complaint was forwarded to the Operations Bureau, which reported the following:

On April 28, 2022, Officer Hauswirth and Officer Ramos-Ocampo responded to a report of an Unwanted Person in Tacoma. The subject of the call, Ms. Tennyson, had been evicted by Pierce County Sheriff's Department (PCSD) Deputies the previous day, but she remained parked in front of the residence in the street. The landlord called as Ms. Tennyson was allegedly allowing her dogs the use of the property. Further, the landlord was worried as work was going to be done on the property, and Ms. Tennyson continued to "hover" in the area. Officers made contact with Ms. Tennyson who indicated her car was inoperable but would work on getting a tow out of the area. The call was cleared with no enforcement action taken.

Rev. Zeigler came into Tacoma Police Department Headquarters on Ms. Tennyson's behalf with a handwritten complaint. The first part of the complainant concerned issues with the eviction, which is outside the review of this investigation as it pertains to PCSD. Rev. Zeigler wrote that he is working with Ms. Tennyson and housing services to find her shelter. He alleges Ms. Tennyson was "harassed" by Officer Hauswirth with his threats of taking her dogs away, accusing her of theft, having the vehicle towed, and being arrested and taken to jail. Rev. Zeigler alleged the officer told Ms. Tennyson she would be "under surveillance." He added that Ms. Tennyson was so scared of the officer, she evacuated in her pants.

A review was done of the body worn camera (BWC) footage for both Officer Hauswirth and Officer Ramos-Ocampo. In the viewing, neither officer threatened, stated or implied the dogs would be taken away, nor was the subject accused of theft. Likewise, Ms. Tennyson was not threatened or told she would be taken to jail. Both officers had a calm demeanor and allowed Ms. Tennyson to express her thoughts. The BWC showed Ms. Tennyson explaining to the officers her predicament and that lawsuits had been filed with the Attorney General's Office. She advised the officers her legal advice was to leave the area so as not to jeopardize the

case; however, Rev Zeigler advised her to stay until told to leave. Ms. Tennyson indicated she was scared, but this was due to conflicting advice and past negative incidents with the landlord. Ms. Tennyson added that it was agreed with Rev Zeigler that she would leave “if it came to this” (presumably law enforcement contact). Rev. Zeigler believed Ms. Tennyson was going to be placed “under surveillance.” This was likely due to miscommunication. In Officer Ramos-Ocampo’s BWC, she advised Ms. Tennyson that the landlord had or will emplace cameras to observe the property. There was no law enforcement aspect to that statement; however, the nuance was likely lost in the passage to Ms. Tennyson. It was clear the officers were aware the vehicle was legally parked and did not consider having the vehicle towed. In fact, Officer Hauswirth advised both the landlord and Ms. Tennyson that the vehicle was legally parked. Ms. Tennyson indicated she was working on having the vehicle towed and would leave the area after that was done.

Rev. Zeigler was contacted regarding this complaint. He offered that he was upset with the performance of law enforcement in this instance. He confirmed he was not on scene during the event. He stated that what he knew of the event came from Ms. Tennyson. When he was advised the video footage did not support what he had been told, he was taken aback and said he had known Ms. Tennyson for five years and knew her to have developmental disabilities.

Ms. Tennyson was contacted by phone regarding this complaint. After the incident, her vehicle was moved to Rev. Zeigler’s church address. She remains living out of her vehicle awaiting more permanent housing. She said the “female officer” was appropriate but the “male officer” was not. She indicated Officer Hauswirth “laughed” at her and called Rev. Zeigler “a piece of shit.” She called Officer Hauswirth “cocky” and “heartless” and did not believe she was treated well. The BWC footage refutes these claims.

The demeanor of a person can often be open to interpretation. A person’s tone, volume, particular expressions, stance, and movement can all convey certain traits of communication. In reviewing the BWC, aggressive or even assertive tone on the part of Officer Hauswirth was not seen. The officer maintained spacing away from Ms. Tennyson and allowed her to speak and explain her perspective. From the BWC footage, neither Officer Hauswirth nor Officer Ramos-Ocampo used profanity.

FINDINGS

An investigation into this complaint was conducted to include interviews of the complainant, the community member who was the subject of the complaint, as well as review of the body worn camera footage. The investigation was then reviewed by the officer’s chain of command. The allegation of Non-Discrimination Policy against the involved officer is concluded as **Unfounded**, which is *a final disposition of a complaint when the investigation revealed that the facts or actions alleged did not occur.*

I have reviewed the complaint, investigation and conclusion and concur with the findings.


Avery Moore
Chief of Police


Date

/man

TACOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Intra-Departmental Memorandum



TO: Avery L. Moore
Chief of Police

FROM: Lieutenant Gary J. Roberts *GJR*
Internal Affairs Section

DATE: June 24, 2022

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT 22COM-0030

Complainant:

Ms. Renee Marie Roewer
1719 South 94th Street
Tacoma, WA 98444
253.861.6401

On May 16, 2022, Ms. Roewer contacted the Tacoma Police Department regarding the actions of Tacoma Police Officers. The complaint was entered into the Tacoma Police Department's tracking system, processed by the Internal Affairs Section, and assigned complaint number 22COM-0030.

Allegation(s): Unsatisfactory Performance

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Ms. Roewer alleges officers took her gun without cause and told her it was safe to return to her residence; however, Ms. Roewer did not feel it was safe.

INVESTIGATION

The complaint was forwarded to the Operations Bureau, which reported the following:

On May 14, 2022, Ms. Roewer went to a neighbor's house and claimed that someone had broken into her home. Ms. Roewer was suffering from recent brain injuries and was apparently severely intoxicated. She was armed with a handgun and asked a neighbor to search her house. The neighbor called emergency dispatch, at which point officers responded. Officers summoned medical aid for Ms. Roewer and conducted a safety search of her residence with her permission. Officers then advised Ms. Roewer to return to her home as they had rendered it safe. Due to her condition and behavior, officers placed her handgun into property for safekeeping. Ms. Roewer complained that officers took her weapon for safekeeping. She complained that it was not safe for her to return home as she did not have a functioning phone or computer.

Ms. Roewer was re-contacted by phone for follow-up regarding this complaint. She confirmed that she had been attacked in her home. At that time, she had armed herself with a handgun and gone to the house of her neighbor, Mr. Henry. Although she had wanted Mr. Henry to help her search her home, he believed her to be drunk and had called emergency dispatch. The officers arrived and contacted Ms. Roewer. They then searched her house and had the Tacoma Fire Department (TFD) respond to evaluate her. The officers attempted to get Ms. Roewer to go to the hospital, but she stated she did not want to because she is afraid of COVID. The officers told her that if she did not want to go to the hospital, she was free to return home as they had rendered it safe. The officers told her they would be placing her handgun into property for safekeeping and that she would be free to retrieve it. Ms. Roewer said she felt unsafe because the officers had taken her handgun for safekeeping and that there was neither a phone

nor a computer in the residence for her to communicate with the outside world. Ms. Roewer then confirmed that she did indeed have both a working laptop and cell phone in the house; however, she had lost them at the time of the incident and had to put the batteries back in both devices.

Mr. Henry is the neighbor and witness to this incident. He was contacted and interviewed regarding this complaint. Mr. Henry related that he had known Ms. Roewer since about 2010. At that time, she had received a craniotomy after suffering a stroke and/or a brain aneurysm. Mr. Henry and his wife had been friends with Ms. Roewer up until the time of this incident. On the evening of the incident, Ms. Roewer had come through a gate into the back yard of Mr. Henry. She was carrying a handgun and stated that she had been attacked in her home by a large male. Ms. Roewer was “wobbly” and “extremely drunk” upon entering the yard. Upon examination of the weapon, Mr. Henry found it to contain one spent round. Mr. Henry then called emergency dispatch. Mr. Henry had been there for the interaction among the police officers, TFD personnel, and Ms. Roewer. He stated the officers were “extremely professional.” He specifically cited the conduct of Officer Dupleich as “exemplary.”


Of the officers interviewed by the investigating supervisor, Officer Dupleich confirmed the reasons for placing Ms. Roewer’s handgun into property for safekeeping. She cited the erratic behavior of Ms. Roewer after suffering one and possibly two brain injuries, her combining alcohol with painkillers, her apparently very intoxicated state, and her entering the property of her neighbor unannounced while armed, as the reasons for taking the weapon.

The body worn camera footage was then reviewed of each responding officer. The behavior of Ms. Roewer was found to be erratic as she was hostile toward Officer Dupleich and affectionate toward Mr. Henry. Ms. Roewer stated in the videos that she had been kicked out of a restaurant earlier in the evening. Her speech was slurred, and her statements had long pauses as she appeared to lose her train of thought. Ms. Roewer was also confrontational with TFD personnel.

FINDINGS

An investigation into this complaint was conducted to include interviews of the complainant, Officer Dupleich, and a witness, as well as review of the body worn camera footage. The investigation was then reviewed by the officers’ chain of command. The allegation of Unsatisfactory Performance against the involved officers is concluded as **Exonerated**, which is *a final disposition of a complaint when the investigation revealed that the facts or actions alleged were substantially correct; however, the conduct of the Officer was proper given the circumstances.*

I have reviewed the complaint, investigation and conclusion and concur with the findings.



Avery L. Moore
Chief of Police



Date

/man

TACOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Intra-Departmental Memorandum



TO: Avery L. Moore
Chief of Police

FROM: Lieutenant Gary J. Roberts *GJR*
Internal Affairs Section

DATE: June 24, 2022

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT 22COM-0035

Complainant:

Mr. Steven Davenport
jetcitytraders@gmail.com
206.396.4418

On May 22, 2022, Mr. Davenport contacted the Tacoma Police Department regarding the actions of a Tacoma Police Officer. The complaint was entered into the Tacoma Police Department's tracking system, processed by the Internal Affairs Section, and assigned complaint number 22COM-0035.

Allegation(s): Vehicle Operations

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Mr. Davenport alleges an officer was driving over the posted speed limit.

INVESTIGATION

The complaint was forwarded to the Operations Bureau, which reported the following:

On May 22, 2022, Mr. Davenport filed a complaint through the City of Tacoma's Customer Support Center. He reported he observed a Tacoma Police Department vehicle #2830 speeding on SR 410 eastbound between Valley Avenue and the intersection of Sumner-Buckley Highway and Angeline Road. He observed the vehicle travelling at approximately 63 miles per hour, which is 8 miles per hour over the posted speed limit. Mr. Davenport reportedly caught up to the vehicle at Veterans Memorial Drive East where it went northbound, and then he paced the police unit at 32 miles an hour in a 25 mile-an-hour zone. He also then allegedly observed the police vehicle tailgating another vehicle with just a 2-second following distance.

Officer Wallin was contacted regarding this complaint. Officer Wallin advised he was keeping with the flow of traffic. Officer Wallin was off duty during the time of this complaint, presumably driving home. Due to this, his body worn camera was not activated and therefore unavailable for review.

Attempts were made to re-contact Mr. Davenport via phone for follow-up, with negative results.

FINDINGS

An investigation into this complaint was conducted to include a review of the written complaint and interview with the involved officer. The investigation was then reviewed by the officer's chain of command. The allegation of Vehicle Operations against the involved officer is concluded as **Not Sustained**, which is a final disposition of a complaint when the investigation is unable to substantiate whether or not misconduct or violation of policy or procedures occurred.

I have reviewed the complaint, investigation and conclusion and concur with the findings.

[Signature]
Avery L. Moore
Chief of Police

[Signature]
Date *6/27/22*

TACOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Intra-Departmental Memorandum



TO: Avery L. Moore
Chief of Police

FROM: Lieutenant Gary J. Roberts *GJR*
Internal Affairs Section

DATE: June 24, 2022

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT 22COM-0039

Complainant:

Mr. Frank N. Hadaway
4810 Military Road East
Tacoma, WA 98446
253.273.6007

On May 29, 2022, Mr. Hadaway contacted the Tacoma Police Department regarding the actions of a Tacoma Police Officer. The complaint was entered into the Tacoma Police Department's tracking system, processed by the Internal Affairs Section, and assigned complaint number 22COM-0039.

Allegation(s): Vehicle Operations

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Mr. Hadaway alleges an officer, while driving, was struggling to maintain its lane of travel and speeding.

INVESTIGATION

The complaint was forwarded to the Operations Bureau, which reported the following:

On May 29, 2022, Mr. Hadaway was traveling on Norpoint Way NE in Tacoma and was stopped in one of two left turn lanes for the traffic signal controlling the intersection at Marine View Drive and State Route 509. A Tacoma Police SUV occupied the other left turn lane. Mr. Hadaway could not describe the driver but documented the vehicle number to be 2871 and a partial license plate of 7061D. It was determined the SUV was assigned to Sergeant Jeff Thiry.

Mr. Hadaway reported as he and Sergeant Thiry made their left turns onto southbound SR509, the patrol vehicle crossed over into his lane for a brief moment before correcting back. Mr. Hadaway continued to observe the patrol vehicle drift lazily back and forth within its lane as they continued southbound on SR 509 up to Alexander Avenue E, where they entered the posted 60 MPH zone. Mr. Hadaway specified that Sergeant Thiry never crossed out of his lane again after the initial left turn from Norpoint Way NE, and was just slowly drifting back and forth within the fog line and skip line making up his lane of travel. Mr. Hadaway noted there were no other vehicles traveling nearby at the time. Mr. Hadaway further reported the patrol vehicle then appeared to travel in excess of the posted 60 MPH speed limit since he was traveling at approximately 70 MPH and the SUV was slowly pulling away from him. Eventually, Sergeant Thiry and Mr. Hadaway crossed the bridge leading into downtown Tacoma onto South 21st Street, where Sergeant Thiry pulled his vehicle off the roadway and came to a stop. Mr. Hadaway later called the South Sound 911 (SS911) non-emergency line to report the observed driving. Mr. Hadaway confirmed he was alone in his vehicle and there were no other witnesses to the incident.


Sergeant Thiry was contacted and interviewed regarding this complaint. After reviewing his Unit History, he was able to identify an incident that triggered his memory of his drive from Norpoint Way NE at SR 509 into downtown Tacoma. On May 29, 2022, at approximately 1007 hours, Sergeant Thiry was dispatched to make phone contact with the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) regarding an ongoing investigation. Sergeant Thiry recalled he was on his cell phone speaking with the investigator from the PPB while executing the left turn from Norpoint Way NE to SR 509, but did not recall drifting out of his lane into the other left turn lane. Sergeant Thiry was confident he was using the Bluetooth (hands free) feature while on his cell phone during his entire trip down SR 509. Sergeant Thiry did not believe he ever drifted within his lane or otherwise struggle to maintain his lane, nor did he believe he ever traveled at an excessive speed. Sergeant Thiry confirmed he pulled over after crossing the bridge into downtown Tacoma into Don Pugnetti Park, located at South 21st Street and Pacific Avenue, in order to utilize his in-car computer to access additional information for the PPB investigator. Sergeant Thiry confirmed he was alone in his patrol vehicle during his shift.

A review of Sergeant Thiry's body worn camera (BWC) footage for this date confirmed there were no videos recorded during that time frame that would have captured his driving.

FINDINGS

An investigation into this complaint was conducted to include interviews of the complainant and Sergeant Thiry. The investigation was then reviewed by the Sergeant's chain of command. The allegation of Vehicle Operations against the involved officer is concluded as **Not Sustained**, which is *a final disposition of a complaint when the investigation is unable to substantiate whether or not misconduct or violation of policy or procedures occurred.*

I have reviewed the complaint, investigation and conclusion and concur with the findings.


Avery L. Moore
Chief of Police


Date

/man

TACOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Intra-Departmental Memorandum



TO: Avery L. Moore
Chief of Police

FROM: Lieutenant Gary J. Roberts *GJR*
Internal Affairs Section

DATE: June 24, 2022

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT 22COM-0040

Complainant:

Mr. Milton Thomas
1907 North Pearl Street
Centralia, WA 98531
360.888.7007

On June 2, 2022, Mr. Thomas contacted the Tacoma Police Department regarding the actions of a Tacoma Police Officer. The complaint was entered into the Tacoma Police Department's tracking system, processed by the Internal Affairs Section, and assigned complaint number 22COM-0040.

Allegation(s): Courtesy

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Mr. Thomas alleges the detective was rude during a warrant service.

INVESTIGATION

The complaint was forwarded to the Operations Bureau, which reported the following:

Mr. Milton Thomas filed a complaint stating a multi-agency warrant was served at his residence on June 1, 2022. Mr. Thomas noted during the warrant service and searching process, a shower curtain rod was damaged, which he observed while being escorted out of the residence in his underwear by Detective Welsh. While Detective Welsh was escorting him out, he asked Detective Welsh why officers damaged his curtain rod during the searching process. He stated Detective Welsh was dismissive, rude, and would not engage with him in conversation. At one point, while Mr. Thomas was speaking quickly, saliva accidentally flew from his mouth. At which point, Detective Welsh grabbed him and stated, "I'm not going to stand here and let you spit on me." Mr. Thomas stated Detective Welsh should have known the saliva was unintentional and should have been more understanding. Mr. Thomas stated he was not the subject of the warrant service and felt the residence owner should have been treated more professionally by Detective Welsh. Mr. Thomas stated all the other officers on the scene were polite and professional to him throughout the entire process.

Tacoma Police Department Detective Jimmy Welsh, as a part of a federal taskforce for human trafficking and child exploitation, was participating in a search warrant in Centralia, Washington, on the morning of June 1, 2022. The law enforcement group was a multi-disciplinary team from multiple agencies. Detective Welsh was the only member from Tacoma PD. During the encounter, Detective Welsh assisted in detaining a subject inside the house and escorted him outside.

Mr. Milton Thomas was re-contacted regarding his complaint. Mr. Thomas acknowledged the difficult job law enforcement has and admitted that his adrenaline the morning of the search warrant may have been fairly high due to being awoken at 0630 hours to law enforcement in his home. Mr. Thomas

asserted that after being detained and cuffed by Detective Welsh, he was escorted outside to be passed off to other law enforcement officers. Just before exiting the house however, Mr. Thomas noticed a curtain rod had been damaged, presumably by the law enforcement team. Mr. Thomas then pressed Detective Welsh on why it had happened and if it needed to happen. Mr. Thomas stated that Detective Welsh essentially ignored him and refused to converse with him about it, being very short with him. Mr. Thomas felt Detective Welsh was rude, dismissive, and exhibited a lack of courtesy.

Detective Welsh was then contacted and interviewed regarding this complaint. Detective Welsh asserted he did answer Mr. Thomas on the curtain rod matter. He disagreed with Mr. Thomas, however, that officers would intentionally damage property. In response, Mr. Thomas called him an asshole and liar. Detective Welsh told Mr. Thomas he was not going to continue to argue and so did not, and he handed Mr. Thomas off to Sergeant Greer of Washington State Patrol (WSP) and other officers.

A review was done of the body worn camera (BWC) footage. The video showed the initial finding of Mr. Thomas in bed by the clearing team. Detective Welsh took over commands to Mr. Thomas, giving him calm, clear directions. At one point, Detective Welsh offered to help Mr. Thomas get dressed. Mr. Thomas was eventually escorted out of the bedroom by Detective Welsh, and interaction up to this point was matter-of-fact and displayed nothing out of the ordinary. Once at the exterior door, however, Mr. Thomas noticed the damaged curtain and asserted that officers must have done it. Detective Welsh did not agree that it was intentional, however, and asserted that he had not seen the condition of the curtain before the search warrant and therefore could not comment on how it was done. Mr. Thomas in response became verbally angry, raised his voice, and eventually called Detective Welsh unflattering names.

FINDINGS

An investigation into this complaint was conducted to include interviews of the complainant and Detective Welsh, as well as review of the body worn camera footage. The investigation was then reviewed by the officer's chain of command. The allegation of Courtesy against the involved officer is concluded as **Unfounded**, which is *a final disposition of a complaint when the investigation revealed that the facts or actions alleged did not occur.*

I have reviewed the complaint, investigation and conclusion and concur with the findings.


Avery L. Moore
Chief of Police


Date

/man

TACOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Intra-Departmental Memorandum



TO: Avery L. Moore
Chief of Police

FROM: Lieutenant Gary J. Roberts *A/L.R. ss*
Internal Affairs Section

DATE: July 15, 2022

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT 22COM-0041

Complainant:

Christopher F. Iriarte
14521 69th Avenue Ct. SW
Lakewood, WA 98439
253.625.9882

On June 2, 2022, Mr. Iriarte contacted the Tacoma Police Department regarding the actions of a Tacoma Police Officer. The complaint was entered into the Tacoma Police Department's tracking system, processed by the Internal Affairs Section, and assigned complaint number 22COM-0041

Allegation(s): Courtesy

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Mr. Iriarte alleges the officer asked inappropriate questions and was rude to him during a contact.

INVESTIGATION

The complaint was forwarded to the Operations Bureau, which reported the following:

Mr. Christopher Iriarte called in a complaint stating that on June 1, 2022, he was contacted at the Tacoma Mall by Officer Terwilliger reference a report of harassment by an employee of Nordstrom. He stated he was upset when Officer Terwilliger, who did not know his name at the time, addressed him by the clothing he was wearing. Mr. Iriarte felt his constitutional rights had been violated when he was asked for his identification. Officer Terwilliger also asked him where he was from and if he had warrants, which Mr. Iriarte felt was inappropriate.

Attempts to re-contact Mr. Iriarte for follow-up were unsuccessful. The phone number previously given was no longer in service.

In review of this case, Officer Terwilliger was working off duty at Nordstrom at the Tacoma Mall. He was approached by Mr. Iriarte asking for directions. Officer Terwilliger made note of the complainant and watched him out of the corner of his eye. He saw Mr. Iriarte contact a female employee and talk but could not hear what was being said. Later, the female employee approached Officer Terwilliger and said that the man (Mr. Iriarte) just touched her shoulder and said he wanted to rape her straight. Officer Terwilliger learned the female employee is gay. Officer Terwilliger contacted Mr. Iriarte who denied saying that and trespassed him off the property.

Officer Terwilliger was interviewed regarding this incident. His description was of a routine and basic contact.

There were two associated body worn camera videos of this incident, which were reviewed. The first was his contact with the female employee, and the second is the interview with Mr. Iriarte. In the second

video, Officer Terwilliger made contact with Mr. Iriarte in a neighboring business (T-Mobile). Officer Terwilliger conducted his investigation in a civil and professional manner, never once raising his voice or using any kind of rough or slang language. The entire interview of Mr. Iriarte went very calmly, and both men accommodated each other by being quiet when the other was talking. All questions were asked professionally. All answers were given with calm voices. The routine contact and calm interview did not raise the attention of bystanders.

FINDINGS

An investigation into this complaint was conducted to include an initial interview of the complainant and Officer Terwilliger, as well as review of the body worn camera footage. The investigation was then reviewed by the officer's chain of command. The allegation of Courtesy against the involved officer is concluded as **Unfounded**, which is *a final disposition of a complaint when the investigation revealed that the facts or actions alleged did not occur.*

I have reviewed the complaint, investigation and conclusion and concur with the findings.


Avery L. Moore
Chief of Police


Date

/man

TACOMA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Intra-Departmental Memorandum



TO: Avery L. Moore
Chief of Police

FROM: Lieutenant Gary J. Roberts *A/LT. SS*
Internal Affairs Section

DATE: July 15, 2022

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT 22COM-0048

Complainant:

Mr. Marcus Gonzales
1914 South L Street
Tacoma, WA 98405
253.287.2853

On June 11, 2022, Mr. Gonzales contacted the Tacoma Police Department regarding the actions of a Tacoma Police Officer. The complaint was entered into the Tacoma Police Department's tracking system, processed by the Internal Affairs Section, and assigned complaint number 22COM-0048.

Allegation(s): Unsatisfactory Performance

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

Mr. Gonzales alleges a collision investigation was not completed properly.

INVESTIGATION

The complaint was forwarded to the Operations Bureau, which reported the following:

Mr. Gonzales is the father of a driver involved in a non-injury motor vehicle collision. He was not involved or witness to the collision and had arrived on scene after the incident. Mr. Gonzales did not agree with the outcome of Officer Dow's investigation and chose to file a complaint.

On June 11, 2022, Officer Dow was dispatched to a non-injury motor vehicle collision in the area of South 19th and L Street. The reporting party was the passenger of an involved vehicle who is the mother of the driver. The reporting party relayed her daughter was not licensed or insured. Upon Officer Dow's arrival, involved and uninvolved subjects were arguing with each other at the scene of the collision. Officer Dow asked all parties to remain calm and attempted to separate them as he conducted his initial investigation. He interviewed both drivers as well as passengers of both vehicles.

Shortly after Officer Dow arrived, Mr. Gonzales came to the scene where his daughter had been determined to be the at-fault driver based on statements and evidence of minor vehicle damage. Mr. Gonzales did not agree with the outcome of the investigation and expressed his concern; a supervisor was then summoned to the scene. Mr. Gonzales was then interviewed by the responding sergeant. Mr. Gonzales relayed his opinion on the collision. It was his belief his daughter was not the at-fault driver and stated concern that a proper investigation had not been conducted. He expressly stated, however, that Officer Dow was not rude.


Based on observations by the supervisor of the collision scene and both vehicles involved, the supervisor was in agreement with Officer Dow's collision investigation.

A review of Officer Dow's body worn camera was completed. The footage revealed a proper and professional non-injury collision investigation. Statements from drivers and passengers were obtained, and both vehicles examined. Further, it should be noted the scene of the collision was quite volatile. Subjects related to the involved drivers argued continuously while on scene and at times came close to a physical altercation. Officer Dow displayed consistent professionalism and successfully de-escalated the scene multiple times.

FINDINGS

An investigation into this complaint was conducted to include interviews of the complainant as well as review of the body worn camera footage. The investigation was then reviewed by the officer's chain of command. The allegation of Unsatisfactory Performance against the involved officer is concluded as **Unfounded**, which is a *final disposition of a complaint when the investigation revealed that the facts or actions alleged did not occur.*

I have reviewed the complaint, investigation and conclusion and concur with the findings.


Avery I. Moore
Chief of Police


Date 7/19/22

/man



City of Tacoma
City Manager

September 8, 2022

Mr. Brandon Amos Martin
6015 South Cedar Street
Tacoma, WA 98409

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT #22COM-0027

Mr. Martin,

On April 20, 2022, you registered a complaint about the conduct of an officer from the City of Tacoma Police Department. The complaint was subsequently processed through the City's complaint management system, and the information regarding your complaint was assigned Complaint # 22COM-0027.

Subsequent to its receipt, the complaint was referred to the Internal Affairs Section of the Police Department. This complaint was investigated by the supervisor of the officer in question, and the results of the investigation were then reviewed by the officer's chain of command and ultimately the Assistant Chief of Police, Operations Bureau. Subsequent to this review, the Internal Affairs Lieutenant prepared the attached memorandum to the Chief of Police. This memorandum and the investigation were reviewed by the Chief of Police and the City Manager.

I have personally reviewed the findings of this investigation and the actions recommended by the Chief of Police, and I concur with the finding of Unfounded for the allegation Unsatisfactory Performance. An additional explanation is outlined in the attached Tacoma Police Department memorandum.

If you would like to discuss the investigation of this complaint further, please contact the Internal Affairs Section at (253) 591-5283.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Pauli
City Manager

Attachment

cc: Complaint File
Internal Affairs, Tacoma Police Department



City of Tacoma
City Manager

September 8, 2022

Ms. Brendlyne K. Campbell
Mr. Daniel P. Clarke
7424 South Puget Sound Avenue
Tacoma, WA 98409

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT #22COM-0024

Ms. Campbell and Mr. Clarke,

On March 28, 2022, you registered a complaint about the conduct of an officer from the City of Tacoma Police Department. The complaint was subsequently processed through the City's complaint management system, and the information regarding your complaint was assigned Complaint # 22COM-0024.

Subsequent to its receipt, the complaint was referred to the Internal Affairs Section of the Police Department. This complaint was investigated by the supervisor of the officer in question, and the results of the investigation were then reviewed by the officer's chain of command and ultimately the Assistant Chief of Police, Operations Bureau. Subsequent to this review, the Internal Affairs Lieutenant prepared the attached memorandum to the Chief of Police. This memorandum and the investigation were reviewed by the Chief of Police and the City Manager.

I have personally reviewed the findings of this investigation and the actions recommended by the Chief of Police, and I concur with the finding of Not Sustained for the allegation of Lack of Courtesy. For the allegation of Unsatisfactory Performance, I agree with the finding of Unfounded. An additional explanation is outlined in the attached Tacoma Police Department memorandum.

If you would like to discuss the investigation of this complaint further, please contact the Internal Affairs Section at (253) 591-5283.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Pauli
City Manager

Attachment

cc: Complaint File
Internal Affairs, Tacoma Police Department



City of Tacoma
City Manager

September 8, 2022

Christopher F. Iriarte
14521 69th Avenue Ct. SW
Lakewood, WA 98439

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT #22COM-0041

Mr. Iriarte,

On June 2, 2022, you registered a complaint about the conduct of an officer from the City of Tacoma Police Department. The complaint was subsequently processed through the City's complaint management system, and the information regarding your complaint was assigned Complaint # 22COM-0041.

Subsequent to its receipt, the complaint was referred to the Internal Affairs Section of the Police Department. This complaint was investigated by the supervisor of the officer in question, and the results of the investigation were then reviewed by the officer's chain of command and ultimately the Assistant Chief of Police, Operations Bureau. Subsequent to this review, the Internal Affairs Lieutenant prepared the attached memorandum to the Chief of Police. This memorandum and the investigation were reviewed by the Chief of Police and the City Manager.

I have personally reviewed the findings of this investigation and the actions recommended by the Chief of Police, and I concur with the finding of Unfounded for the allegation Lack of Courtesy. An additional explanation is outlined in the attached Tacoma Police Department memorandum.

If you would like to discuss the investigation of this complaint further, please contact the Internal Affairs Section at (253) 591-5283.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Pauli
City Manager

Attachment

cc: Complaint File
Internal Affairs, Tacoma Police Department



City of Tacoma
City Manager

September 8, 2022

Mr. Frank N. Hadaway
4810 Military Road East
Tacoma, WA 98446

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT #22COM-0039

Mr. Hadaway,

On May 29, 2022, you registered a complaint about the conduct of an officer from the City of Tacoma Police Department. The complaint was subsequently processed through the City's complaint management system, and the information regarding your complaint was assigned Complaint # 22COM-0039.

Subsequent to its receipt, the complaint was referred to the Internal Affairs Section of the Police Department. This complaint was investigated by the supervisor of the officer in question, and the results of the investigation were then reviewed by the officer's chain of command and ultimately the Assistant Chief of Police, Operations Bureau. Subsequent to this review, the Internal Affairs Lieutenant prepared the attached memorandum to the Chief of Police. This memorandum and the investigation were reviewed by the Chief of Police and the City Manager.

I have personally reviewed the findings of this investigation and the actions recommended by the Chief of Police, and I concur with the finding of Not Sustained for the allegation Vehicle Operations. An additional explanation is outlined in the attached Tacoma Police Department memorandum.

If you would like to discuss the investigation of this complaint further, please contact the Internal Affairs Section at (253) 591-5283.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Pauli
City Manager

Attachment

cc: Complaint File
Internal Affairs, Tacoma Police Department



City of Tacoma
City Manager

September 8, 2022

Mr. Marcus Gonzales
1914 South L Street
Tacoma, WA 98405

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT #22COM-0048

Mr. Gonzales,

On June 11, 2022, you registered a complaint about the conduct of an officer from the City of Tacoma Police Department. The complaint was subsequently processed through the City's complaint management system, and the information regarding your complaint was assigned Complaint # 22COM-0048.

Subsequent to its receipt, the complaint was referred to the Internal Affairs Section of the Police Department. This complaint was investigated by the supervisor of the officer in question, and the results of the investigation were then reviewed by the officer's chain of command and ultimately the Assistant Chief of Police, Operations Bureau. Subsequent to this review, the Internal Affairs Lieutenant prepared the attached memorandum to the Chief of Police. This memorandum and the investigation were reviewed by the Chief of Police and the City Manager.

I have personally reviewed the findings of this investigation and the actions recommended by the Chief of Police, and I concur with the finding of Unfounded for the allegation Unsatisfactory Performance. An additional explanation is outlined in the attached Tacoma Police Department memorandum.

If you would like to discuss the investigation of this complaint further, please contact the Internal Affairs Section at (253) 591-5283.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Pauli
City Manager

Attachment

cc: Complaint File
Internal Affairs, Tacoma Police Department



City of Tacoma
City Manager

September 8, 2022

Milton Thomas
1907 North Pearl Street
Centralia, WA 98531

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT #22COM-0040

Mr. Thomas,

On June 2, 2022, you registered a complaint about the conduct of an officer from the City of Tacoma Police Department. The complaint was subsequently processed through the City's complaint management system, and the information regarding your complaint was assigned Complaint # 22COM-0040.

Subsequent to its receipt, the complaint was referred to the Internal Affairs Section of the Police Department. This complaint was investigated by the supervisor of the officer in question, and the results of the investigation were then reviewed by the officer's chain of command and ultimately the Assistant Chief of Police, Operations Bureau. Subsequent to this review, the Internal Affairs Lieutenant prepared the attached memorandum to the Chief of Police. This memorandum and the investigation were reviewed by the Chief of Police and the City Manager.

I have personally reviewed the findings of this investigation and the actions recommended by the Chief of Police, and I concur with the finding of Unfounded for the allegation Lack of Courtesy. An additional explanation is outlined in the attached Tacoma Police Department memorandum.

If you would like to discuss the investigation of this complaint further, please contact the Internal Affairs Section at (253) 591-5283.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Pauli
City Manager

Attachment

cc: Complaint File
Internal Affairs, Tacoma Police Department



City of Tacoma
City Manager

September 8, 2022

Ms. Renee Marie Roewer
1719 South 94th Street
Tacoma, WA 98444

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT #22COM-0030

Ms. Roewer,

On May 16, 2022, you registered a complaint about the conduct of an officer from the City of Tacoma Police Department. The complaint was subsequently processed through the City's complaint management system, and the information regarding your complaint was assigned Complaint # 22COM-0030.

Subsequent to its receipt, the complaint was referred to the Internal Affairs Section of the Police Department. This complaint was investigated by the supervisor of the officer in question, and the results of the investigation were then reviewed by the officer's chain of command and ultimately the Assistant Chief of Police, Operations Bureau. Subsequent to this review, the Internal Affairs Lieutenant prepared the attached memorandum to the Chief of Police. This memorandum and the investigation were reviewed by the Chief of Police and the City Manager.

I have personally reviewed the findings of this investigation and the actions recommended by the Chief of Police, and I concur with the finding of Exonerated for the allegation Unsatisfactory Performance. An additional explanation is outlined in the attached Tacoma Police Department memorandum.

If you would like to discuss the investigation of this complaint further, please contact the Internal Affairs Section at (253) 591-5283.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Pauli
City Manager

Attachment

cc: Complaint File
Internal Affairs, Tacoma Police Department



City of Tacoma
City Manager

September 8, 2022

Reverend Paul Zeigler
Ms. Leanne Tennyson
10333 Bridgeport Way SW
Lakewood, Wa 98499

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT #22COM-0028

Reverend Zeigler and Ms. Leanne Tennyson,

On April 28, 2022, you registered a complaint about the conduct of an officer from the City of Tacoma Police Department. The complaint was subsequently processed through the City's complaint management system, and the information regarding your complaint was assigned Complaint # 22COM-0028.

Subsequent to its receipt, the complaint was referred to the Internal Affairs Section of the Police Department. This complaint was investigated by the supervisor of the officer in question, and the results of the investigation were then reviewed by the officer's chain of command and ultimately the Assistant Chief of Police, Operations Bureau. Subsequent to this review, the Internal Affairs Lieutenant prepared the attached memorandum to the Chief of Police. This memorandum and the investigation were reviewed by the Chief of Police and the City Manager.

I have personally reviewed the findings of this investigation and the actions recommended by the Chief of Police, and I concur with the finding of Unfounded for the allegation Non-Discrimination Policy. An additional explanation is outlined in the attached Tacoma Police Department memorandum.

If you would like to discuss the investigation of this complaint further, please contact the Internal Affairs Section at (253) 591-5283.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Pauli
City Manager

Attachment

cc: Complaint File
Internal Affairs, Tacoma Police Department



City of Tacoma
City Manager

September 8, 2022

Mr. Steven Davenport
Jetcityrader@gmail.com

SUBJECT: CITY CONDUCT COMPLAINT #22COM-0035

Mr. Davenport,

On May 22, 2022, you registered a complaint about the conduct of an officer from the City of Tacoma Police Department. The complaint was subsequently processed through the City's complaint management system, and the information regarding your complaint was assigned Complaint # 22COM-0035.

Subsequent to its receipt, the complaint was referred to the Internal Affairs Section of the Police Department. This complaint was investigated by the supervisor of the officer in question, and the results of the investigation were then reviewed by the officer's chain of command and ultimately the Assistant Chief of Police, Operations Bureau. Subsequent to this review, the Internal Affairs Lieutenant prepared the attached memorandum to the Chief of Police. This memorandum and the investigation were reviewed by the Chief of Police and the City Manager.

I have personally reviewed the findings of this investigation and the actions recommended by the Chief of Police, and I concur with the finding of Not Sustained for the allegation Vehicle Operations. An additional explanation is outlined in the attached Tacoma Police Department memorandum.

If you would like to discuss the investigation of this complaint further, please contact the Internal Affairs Section at (253) 591-5283.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Pauli
City Manager

Attachment

cc: Complaint File
Internal Affairs, Tacoma Police Department