

BPC# 17-

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

February 10, 2017
13.5

RECEIVED

FEB 08 2017

POLICE COMMISSIONERS

REVIEWED

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

RICHARD M. TEFANK
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DATE

SUBJECT: BIASED POLICING AND MEDIATION – 3RD QUARTER 2016 REPORT TO
THE BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS

RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. That the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE this report.

DISCUSSION

On August 19, 2008, the Board of Police Commissioners directed Internal Affairs Group, Professional Standards Bureau, to report quarterly on biased policing investigations. Attached for your review is the Internal Affairs Group (IAG) report for the third quarter of 2016, which includes updates on the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program.

If you have any questions, please contact Commander Stuart A. Maislin, Commanding Officer, Internal Affairs Group, at (213) 996-2978.

Respectfully,


CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Attachment

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

January 26, 2017
13.5

TO: Chief of Police

FROM: Commanding Officer, Professional Standards Bureau

SUBJECT: BIASED POLICING AND MEDIATION – 3RD QUARTER 2016 REPORT TO THE BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS

On August 19, 2008, the Board of Police Commissioners directed Internal Affairs Group, Professional Standards Bureau, to report quarterly on biased policing investigations. Attached for your review is the Internal Affairs Group (IAG) report for the third quarter of 2016, which includes updates on the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program.

If you have any questions, please contact Commander Stuart A. Maislin, Commanding Officer, Internal Affairs Group, at (213) 996-2978.



DEBRA J. McCARTHY, Deputy Chief
Commanding Officer
Professional Standards Bureau

Attachment

Biased Policing and Mediation Update – 3rd Quarter 2016
February 6, 2017

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC) with an update on the Los Angeles Police Department's (Department) activities related to the investigation of Biased Policing allegations.¹ It includes data on complaints of Biased Policing and adjudications.

This report summarizes the types of contact resulting in Biased Policing complaints as well as the alleged discriminatory conduct and biases, and provides demographic data on the accused employees. It covers Biased Policing complaints initiated in the first three quarters of 2016 and provides comparison data for 2014 and 2015.

This report includes information on Biased Policing complaints referred to the Office of Operations (OO) or the Office of Special Operations (OSO) to determine the final disposition when Internal Affairs Group (IAG) disagreed with the adjudication made by the employee's chain-of-command.

Also included is an update on the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation 36-Month Pilot Program.

In order to provide timely, meaningful information, this report is based mainly on preliminary complaint information rather than complaints completed a year or more after initiation. As a result, tables from the Complaint Management System based on closed complaints are not attached, though selected information is included.

Data

Biased Policing Complaints Initiated

Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2011 through the third quarter of 2016 are shown in the table below. The numbers for 2011 and 2012 are closed cases with Biased Policing allegations.² The data for 2013 represent Biased Policing cases identified at intake or at closing,³ while Biased Policing complaints for 2014 through 2016 were identified manually based primarily on preliminary investigation at the time of intake. During the third quarter of 2016, data for 2015 was updated to include 23 recently closed complaints in which Biased Policing was not alleged at intake but identified during investigation.⁴

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016 (YTD)
263	225	281	283	234	149

¹ On August 19, 2008, the Board of Police Commissioners requested quarterly update reports.

² Generally, complaints are not classified by specific allegation types until the investigations are completed. Consequently, the numbers for 2011 and 2012 are based on Biased Policing allegations identified at closing.

³ The transition to identifying Biased Policing allegations at intake took place in 2013, so Biased Policing complaints in 2013 were identified both at intake and at closing.

⁴ Tables 1-9 were also updated to reflect the additional complaints, but the additional complaints did not have a significant impact on the data.

Tables 1 through 9 discussed below are attached as separate pages. They provide information about Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2014 through 2016 year-to-date. For tables in which a three-year average column is shown, data from 2013 has been included in order to calculate the average. Some complaints involved multiple complainants and/or accused employees, and some complainants alleged multiple discriminatory actions and/or types of bias. As a result, many of the total counts discussed below exceed the number of complainants and complaints initiated.⁵

Table 1 lists the number of Biased Policing complaints initiated by bureau and by geographic Area of occurrence. A summary of the data from Table 1 listing the number of complaints initiated by Bureau appears immediately below.

Bureau (% of City pop. ⁶)	2016 YTD (%)				3-Year Avg. (%)
		2015 (%)	2014 (%)	2013 (%)	
Central (20.5)	27 (18.1)	56 (23.9)	65 (23.0)	70 (24.9)	63.7 (23.9)
South (18.2)	34 (22.8)	64 (27.4)	65 (23.0)	60 (21.4)	63.0 (23.7)
Valley (37.6)	43 (28.9)	60 (25.6)	74 (26.1)	88 (31.3)	74.0 (27.8)
West (23.7)	41 (27.5)	51 (21.8)	76 (26.9)	61 (21.7)	62.7 (23.6)
Outside City/Unknown	4 (2.7)	3 (1.3)	3 (1.1)	2 (0.7)	2.7 (1.0)
Total	149	234	283	281	266.0

- During the first three quarters of 2016, 149 complaints were identified as containing allegations of Biased Policing, with a projected annual total of 199.
- The distribution of Biased Policing complaints initiated among the bureaus in the first three quarters of 2016 is roughly similar to the three-year average, though Operations West Bureau had a higher proportion of such complaints (27.5%) than the three-year average (23.6%).⁷ While Operations Central Bureau had a lower proportion of complaints (18.1%) than the three-year average (23.9%), the percentage of complaints initiated is similar to the percentage of residents in Central bureau.
- When compared to the population data, Operations Valley Bureau had a lower proportion of Biased Policing complaints (28.9%) when compared to the percentage of people residing in Valley bureau (37.6%), while Operations South Bureau had a higher proportion of Biased Policing complaints (22.8%) than the percentage of residents in South bureau (18.2%).

⁵ Because of rounding, percentages do not always equal 100.

⁶ Based on data from the 2010 United States Census, the City has a population of 3.8 million distributed among the four geographic bureaus as follows: Central 20.5%; South 18.2%; Valley 37.6%; and West 23.7%.

⁷ Of the 41 Biased Policing complaints reported against Operations West Bureau officers in 2016, six complaints (14.6%) came from the same complainant, contained the same allegations, and listed the same witnesses, but for different dates and locations within Hollywood Area. Four of the complaints were received on the same day in the third quarter of 2016.

- With respect to the distribution of Biased Policing complaints among the geographic Areas, during the first three quarters of 2016, some Areas had a higher proportion of the City's Biased Policing complaints when compared against the percentage of people residing in the Area. For example, Central Area had 6.7 percent of the Biased Policing complaints while Central Area residents accounted for 1.6 percent of the City population; 77th Street Area had 13.4 percent of the Biased Policing complaints while its residents made up 4.7 percent of the City population;⁸ Hollywood Area had 8.1 percent of the Biased Policing complaints while its residents made up 3.4 percent of the City population;⁹ and Pacific Area had 10.7 percent of the Biased Policing complaints while its residents made up 5.4 percent of the population.

Note: A complainant may not always be a resident of the Area in which he/she initiates a complaint. Central Area for instance, covers the downtown area and has a large daytime population because of people commuting to work downtown, but a smaller residential population. Similarly, Hollywood Area covers the Hollywood Entertainment District, and Pacific Area covers Venice Beach, both of which attract a large number of visitors.

Table 2 shows a breakdown of the accused employees by gender, ethnicity, age, and length of service to the Department. The gender and ethnicity of accused employees could not always be determined based on information provided by complainants.

- Gender representation: In the first three quarters of 2016, of the 217 accused employees for whom gender was known, female employees formed a smaller proportion of those accused in Biased Policing complaints (12.4%) compared to their representation among sworn employees in the Department Deployment Roster (18.6%).¹⁰ This is a decrease from the prior report, when female employees formed 16.5 percent of the accused in Biased Policing complaints. The current underrepresentation of females among the accused is roughly similar to prior years. In 2015, female employees were 10.4 percent of the accused but made up 18.8 percent of all sworn employees, and in 2014, female employees were 10.8 percent of the accused but made up 19.0 percent of all sworn employees.
- Ethnic representation: Data from the first three quarters of 2016 show the ethnic composition of accused employees was similar to that of all sworn personnel.

⁸ During the first quarter of 2016, five Biased Policing complaints resulted from incidents that occurred in 77th Street Area; in the second quarter, the number increased to 10. In the third quarter, the number of Biased Policing complaints dropped to five for a total of 20 in the first three quarters of 2016.

⁹ Of the 12 Biased Policing complaints filed in Hollywood Area, six complaints (50%) came from the same individual whose residence was listed as being within Southeast Area.

¹⁰ Sworn Department employee makeup - Gender: Male 81.4% and Female 18.6%; Ethnicity: American Indian 0.3%; Asian 7.6%; Black 10.4%; Filipino 2.3%; Hispanic 46.1%; White 32.9%; and Other 0.3% (Source: Sworn and Civilian Personnel by Sex and Descent, September 4, 2016).

- Age and length of service: Since summarized information on employee age and length of service is not available in the Department rosters, 3,480 police officers in positions likely to have public contact were chosen as a comparison group (See Table 2, Part 2). The distribution of the accused employees among the age and tenure categories reported remains relatively similar to that of the comparison group. Consistent with prior years, data from the first three quarters of 2016 show that accused employees were most frequently in their thirties and forties with less than ten years of service.

Table 3 shows the accused employees' assignment types at the time the Biased Policing complaints were initiated, along with data on the number of Department employees in each assignment type as of April 2016. Part 1 of Table 3 focuses on the assignments types in which Biased Policing complaints were initiated while Part 2 focuses on the gender of accused employees within those assignment types.

Part 1 – Accused Employee and Assignment Types

- Included in Part 1 of Table 3 is the number of employees in each assignment type who were the subject of Biased Policing complaints and comparison data on the general distribution of employees in each assignment within the Department.

During the first three quarters of 2016, of the 236 employees accused of Biased Policing, employees assigned to the general Patrol function were the subject of the most Biased Policing complaints, making up 50.8 percent of the accused while in comparison, 21.8 percent of Department employees are assigned to the general Patrol function. Employees assigned to Metropolitan Division were the second most numerous, making up 9.3 percent of the accused through the third quarter of 2016 while in comparison, 3.1 percent of sworn officers are assigned to Metropolitan Division. This was followed by employees assigned to Gang Enforcement (7.2 percent of the accused compared to 3.4 percent of the Department), Patrol - Specialized Enforcement¹¹ (7.2 percent of the accused compared to 2.8 percent of the Department), and Traffic Enforcement (7.2 percent of the accused compared to 1.9 percent of the Department).

The representation of employees in the various assignment types through the third quarter of 2016 is generally similar to prior years, though their ranking order changes slightly. The table below summarizes the five assignment types with the most Biased Policing complaints based on number of accused employees, from 2014 to the present.

¹¹ Officers assigned to Patrol – Specialized Enforcement are assigned to patrol duties with a special enforcement purpose, such as those assigned to the Hollywood Entertainment District or the Safer Cities Initiative.

	2016 (YTD)		2015		2014	
1	Patrol	50.8%	Patrol	47.4%	Patrol	57.4%
2	Metropolitan Div.	9.3%	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	11.0%	Gang Enforcement	9.5%
3	Gang Enforcement	7.2%	Gang Enforcement	9.3%	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	9.0%
4	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	7.2%	Metropolitan Div. ¹²	5.5%	Traffic Enforcement	6.5%
5	Traffic Enforcement	7.2%	Traffic Enforcement	5.5%	Traffic Collision Inv.	2.7%

- Also included in Part 1 of Table 3 is data on the number of Biased Policing complaints initiated by assignment type. Comparing the number of Biased Policing complaints initiated for each assignment type against the number of employees in each assignment type in the comparison group shows that traffic enforcement officers were the subject of more Biased Policing complaints than employees in other assignments. Based on the number of complaints per 100 officers in each assignment type, officers assigned to Traffic Enforcement had 5.9 Biased Policing complaints per 100 officers during the first three quarters of 2016. This was followed by officers assigned to Patrol – Specialized Enforcement (3.7), Metropolitan Division (2.8), Patrol (2.6), and Gang Enforcement (1.9).

In prior years, Traffic Enforcement and Patrol – Specialized Enforcement were consistently the two assignment types with more Biased Policing complaints than other assignment types. The table below lists, for 2014 to the present, the five assignment types with the most Biased Policing complaints per 100 officers.

	2016 (YTD)		2015		2014	
1	Traffic Enforcement	5.9	Traffic Enforcement	8.5	Traffic Enforcement	10.2
2	Patrol – Spec. Enf.	3.7	Patrol – Spec. Enf.	7.2	Patrol – Spec. Enf.	8.0
3	Metropolitan Div.	2.8	Gang Enforcement	4.3	Gang Enforcement	5.9
4	Patrol	2.6	Patrol	3.9	Patrol	5.7
5	Gang Enforcement	1.9	Metropolitan Div.	3.4	Traffic Collision Invest.	5.5

Part 2 – Gender of Accused Employee and Assignment Type

Part 2 of Table 3 breaks down the gender of accused employees in each assignment type. Also included for comparison is data on the gender of all Department employees in each assignment type. With the exception of the patrol functions, the number of accused employees, when broken down by assignment type, is generally very small. Because the number of accused female officers is even smaller, slight changes in the number of female officers among the accused result in large fluctuations in terms of percentage, making it difficult to assess changes in the representation of accused female officers within each assignment type.

¹² In mid-2015, because of an increase in violent crime, Metropolitan Division was expanded to flexibly deploy specially trained officers in high crime areas. At the end of 2014, the Department had 255 officers deployed at Metropolitan Division. By the end of 2015, 471 officers had been assigned to Metropolitan Division, an increase of 216 officers from the prior year. As of April 2016, there were 471 officers deployed to Metropolitan Division, with 388 of them assigned to field operations.

However, for the general patrol function, in which the number of accused employees is larger, the representation of female patrol officers among the accused in the first three quarters of 2016 (10.0%), is similar to the representation of female patrol officers among the accused in 2015 (12.7%) and 2014 (11.7%). This is similar to the overall representation of female officers assigned to the general patrol function in the comparison group (12.9%).

Table 4 shows the types of contact or police encounter that resulted in Biased Policing complaints along with a breakdown of the complainants by gender and ethnicity. For comparison, also included is data on the total number of officer contacts with the public and the percentage of those contacts that resulted in Biased Policing complaints.

- Based on the number of public contacts during the first three quarters of 2016, Biased Policing complaints were initiated 0.013 percent of the time. This is similar to 2015 (0.014%) and 2014 (0.016%).
- Consistent with prior years, the type of contact that most frequently resulted in Biased Policing complaints during the first three quarters of 2016 continues to be the traffic stop, accounting for 55 of the 149 complaints (36.9%) initiated. In 2015, traffic stops accounted for 41.0 percent of Biased Policing complaints, and 42.4 percent of the Biased Policing complaints in 2014.
- The second most common type of contact in the first three quarters of 2016 was radio calls, accounting for 42 of the 149 complaints (28.2%), followed by pedestrian stops, which accounted for 23 of the 149 complaints (15.4%). This ranking order differs slightly from prior years when pedestrian stops were the second most frequent type of contact followed by radio calls.
- The remaining Biased Policing complaints fall into the generic “Other” category, used for all other types of contacts. During the first three quarters of 2016, “Other” contacts accounted for 29 of the 149 complaints (19.5%).¹³

Table 5 shows the distribution of discriminatory conduct reported. This refers to the law enforcement actions or conduct alleged to have been based on bias. Also included is a breakdown of complainants by gender and ethnicity.

- In the first three quarters of 2016, the three most commonly complained of discriminatory actions or types of conduct were detentions, arrests, and discourtesy. With the exception of the generic “Other” category,¹⁴ this is consistent with the past two years, when

¹³ “Other” types of contact in the third quarter of 2016 included the following situations: complainants flagging down or approaching officers, complainants being interviewed as part of an investigation, a complainant who believed a police officer engaged in Biased Policing after her car was issued a parking ticket and impounded, complainants calling into a police station, and situations in which complainants would not specify how they came into contact with officers.

¹⁴ “Other” alleged discriminatory conduct reported in the first three quarters of 2016 included: improper investigations, the issuing of citations, officers favoring the other party in disputes, issuing a warning, being asked to

detention, arrest, and discourtesy were also the most commonly complained of discriminatory conduct. The remaining types of allegedly biased conduct appeared less frequently.

- **Stop/Detention:** The most commonly complained of conduct continues to be the stop or detention itself. During the first three quarters of 2016, it appeared in 73 of the 149 Biased Policing complaints (49.0%) initiated and accounted for 39.2 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. In 2015, it appeared in 142 of the 234 Biased Policing complaints (60.7%) and in 2014, it appeared in 148 of the 283 complaints (52.3%).
- **Arrest:** Arrest was the second most complained of conduct during the first three quarters of 2016. It appeared in 24 of 149 complaints (16.1%) and accounted for 12.9 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. In 2015, arrest appeared in 43 of 234 complaints (18.4%), and 42 of the 283 complaints (14.8%) in 2014.
- **Discourtesy:** Prior to 2015, ethnic or otherwise objectionable remarks were included in the “Was Discourteous” category. In 2015, “Objectionable Remark” was distinguished as a separate category of discriminatory conduct to isolate ethnic, racial and otherwise derogatory or discriminatory remarks. In the first three quarters of 2016, 22 of the 149 complaints (14.8%) alleged discourtesy, accounting for 11.8 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. In 2015, discourtesy appeared in 31 of 234 Biased Policing complaints (13.2%), and in 53 of 283 Biased Policing complaints (18.7%) in 2014.

Table 6 shows the types of bias alleged along with a breakdown of complainants by gender and ethnicity. Effective January 1, 2016, California Penal Code Section 13012 was amended to require that complaints against peace officers be tracked by specific bias categories. While the Department already tracked Biased Policing complaints by bias categories, new categories were added to be consistent with the new law, including: age, gender identity, religion (previously tracked as part of ethnic bias), physical disability, and mental disability (physical and mental disabilities were previously tracked under the general category of disability).¹⁵

With the exception of the new bias categories created in 2016 for age, gender identity and religion, the types of bias alleged during the first three quarters of 2016 have remained relatively consistent with the types of bias alleged in prior years.

- **Race/Ethnic bias:** Complaints of discriminatory conduct based on race/ethnic bias are overwhelmingly the most frequent, even when religion is separated into its own bias category. During the first three quarters of 2016, 132 of the 149 Biased Policing

move a car from a loading zone, and being told not to move a car until after a parking officer had finished issuing a citation.

¹⁵ A category for “Other” bias is included, though no Biased Policing complaints in the first three quarters of 2016 contained allegations that would have been classified as “Other.” In the past, “Other” biases included such categories as homelessness, appearing to be a criminal street gang member, political affiliation, prior arrests, size, stature, or location of residence. “Other” biases are included in Biased Policing complaints only if alleged in combination with ethnic or another categorized bias.

complaints (88.6%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on race or ethnicity, accounting for 84.6 percent of all biases alleged. In 2015, when ethnic bias included religious bias, 215 of the 234 Biased Policing complaints (91.9%) involved at least one allegation of ethnic bias, accounting for 90.7 percent of all biases alleged. In 2014, 254 of the 283 Biased Policing complaints (89.8%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on ethnicity, accounting for 84.4 percent of all biases alleged.

- Gender bias: In the first three quarters of 2016, eight of the 149 Biased Policing complaints (5.4%) involved an allegation of gender bias, accounting for 5.1 percent of all biases alleged. This has fluctuated in prior years: in 2015, one of 234 complaints (0.4%) alleged gender bias, while in 2014, ten of the 283 complaints (3.5%) involved at least one allegation of discrimination based on gender.
- New bias categories: Of the 149 Biased Policing complaints received in the first three quarters of 2016, four complaints (2.7%) involved allegations of discriminatory conduct based on age, three complaints (2.0%) contained an allegation of gender identity/expression bias, and one complaint (0.7%) involved an allegation of religious bias.

Ethnic Representation of Complainants: Tables 4, 5 and 6 all show that Black males were the most numerous demographic group among the complainants, making up 57 of the 160 complainants (35.6%) in the first three quarters of 2016; 122 of the 244 complainants (50.0%) in 2015; and 149 of the 298 (50.0%) in 2014. Most of their complaints resulted from traffic and pedestrian stops and predominantly involved allegations that the stop or arrest was based on ethnic bias. Also of note is that while discriminatory searches are not as frequently reported as other conduct, allegations relating to discriminatory search were most often reported by Black complainants. In the first three quarters of 2016, seven of the 12 complainants (58.3%) alleging discriminatory searches were Black complainants.

Table 7 compares the ethnicity of complainants, broken down by geographic bureau of occurrence, against the City's ethnic composition based on census data from 2010. During the first three quarters of 2016, Black complainants were the most numerous demographic group. Of the 160 complainants, 84 (53.8%) were Black.¹⁶ This number is slightly lower than in prior years, when Black complainants made up 62.7 percent of the complainants in 2015 and 65.0 percent in 2014. In comparison, the 2010 census data shows that 9.4 percent of the City population is Black.

Table 8 provides a comparison of the ethnicities of accused employees and complainants only for cases involving alleged ethnic bias. As noted in prior reports, in the majority of cases, Black complainants accused Hispanic or White employees. This has remained constant since 2014.

¹⁶ There were 85 Black complainants in the third quarter of 2016, but because one of those complainants was from an Unknown/Outside location, only 84 could be attributed to a specific Area and bureau.

Adjudication

The Department's adjudication process begins with the accused employee's commanding officer and goes through multiple levels of review. Upon completion of a complaint investigation, the employee's commanding officer is responsible for reviewing the investigation, determining whether misconduct occurred, and recommending the disposition and penalty, if applicable. The commanding officer submits the investigation and recommendation up the chain-of-command to the bureau chief.

The bureau chief can concur with the recommendation, or if the bureau chief disagrees with the recommended adjudication, the bureau chief will prepare correspondence to IAG explaining the disagreement, the bureau's recommended adjudication, and the rationale for the bureau recommendation. This is referred to as a Military Endorsement. With Biased Policing complaints, if IAG disagrees with the chain-of-command's recommended adjudication, IAG forwards the complaint to the office director in the employee's chain-of-command for a final disposition. While this is generally the Director of the Office of Operations, when an employee is assigned to Metropolitan Division, for example, the complaint would be forwarded to the Director, Office of Special Operations.

For complaints in which the recommended adjudication is to sustain any allegation with a penalty of an official reprimand or greater, there is an additional level of review. With such complaints, IAG submits the completed investigation and recommendation to the Chief of Police for final adjudication.

Consistent with the standards set in place by the Consent Decree in adjudicating complaints, Department managers must determine by a preponderance of evidence whether misconduct occurred. Preponderance of evidence means the weight of evidence on one side is more convincing than the evidence presented for the other side. The Department manager's determination must be based on factual, reasonable consideration of the evidence and statements presented in the investigation.

Under the Department's long-standing practice, and also consistent with the Consent Decree, Department managers take into consideration the credibility of a witness or involved party when deciding if misconduct has been proven by a preponderance of the evidence. In determining credibility, no automatic preference is given to an officer's statement over the statement of any other witness or complainant. An evaluation of credibility must be based on evidence. If evidence shows that a witness or involved party lacks credibility, such as evidence of false statements or misrepresentation of facts, a determination may be made that the evidence weighs in favor of the other side. When a complaint involves conflicting statements from either side, if credibility cannot be determined, then the Department manager must rely on other evidence to adjudicate and recommend a disposition for the complaint. The adjudication disposition terms used in the following discussion are defined below.

An allegation is "Sustained" when the investigation discloses that the act complained of occurred and constitutes misconduct. When the investigation indicates the act complained of did not occur, the allegation is "Unfounded." "Not Resolved" is used when the evidence disclosed by the investigation does not clearly prove or disprove the allegations made. "Not Resolved"

allegations were fully investigated, but without resolution. An allegation is designated “Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate” when it could not be thoroughly or properly investigated. This may be caused by a lack of cooperation by the complainant or witnesses, or the absence of a critical interview that was necessary to proceed with the investigation, or the available physical evidence or witnesses’ statements being insufficient to adjudicate the complaint.

“Guilty” and “Not Guilty” are used subsequent to a Board of Rights tribunal. “Not Guilty” may also be used to denote the final disposition of a complaint in which a Department adjudication of “Sustained” or a Board of Rights finding of “Guilty” is subsequently overturned, such as by a court of law. The full range of adjudication dispositions is outlined in Department Manual Section 3/820.25.

While the Department’s Training Evaluation and Management System tracks all dispositions, only allegations adjudicated as “Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate,” “Not Resolved,” “Sustained,” and “Guilty” can be considered when evaluating an employee’s history for purposes of disciplinary review.¹⁷

Closed Complaints

In contrast to the section on Biased Policing complaints initiated, which was based on preliminary complaint information, this section presents information on closed complaints drawn from the Complaint Management System.

Table 9, is comprised of two parts. Part 1 provides data on complaints in which officers are accused of taking law enforcement action solely on the basis of a prohibited bias category and shows how the adjudication of those Biased Policing allegations in the first three quarters of 2016 compared to those of the last three years. Part 2 provides data on sustained complaints that did not allege Biased Policing per se, but some of the misconduct alleged and sustained by the Department relates to bias.

Part 1 - Closed complaints with allegations of Biased Policing

During the first three quarters of 2016, 198 complaints involving 356 allegations of Biased Policing were adjudicated.

- Of the 356 Biased Policing allegations adjudicated, 280 Biased Policing allegations (78.7%) were adjudicated as Unfounded, a slight decrease in comparison to the prior three-year average of 83.5 percent.
- Thirty-one allegations closed with the Mediated disposition during the first three quarters of 2016, or 8.7 percent of all Biased Policing dispositions.

¹⁷ Under California Penal Code Section 832.5(c), complaints and allegations determined to be unfounded may not be considered for punitive or promotional purposes.

- Thirty-six allegations closed in the first three quarters of 2016 with the disposition Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate, a slightly higher rate (10.1%) when compared to the three-year average (7.0%), though the rate has fluctuated from year to year.
- Seven Biased Policing allegations (2.0%) were adjudicated as Not Resolved during the first three quarters of 2016.¹⁸ The current rate of Not Resolved dispositions is slightly lower than the three-year average of 2.8 percent.

Part 2 - Closed complaints with sustained allegations related to discriminatory bias

While the complaints in Part 2 do not contain allegations that officers took law enforcement action on the basis of a prohibited bias category, the sustained complaints reported in Part 2 reflect conduct that may be indicative of bias.¹⁹ In the first three quarters of 2016, the Department sustained six complaints with allegations that indicated possible bias by employees. The sustained allegations fell into the categories of Discourtesy,²⁰ Ethnic Remarks,²¹ Improper Remarks,²² and Unbecoming Conduct. Some of the misconduct occurred in a law enforcement setting, such as a racial remark made during a collision investigation. Other types of sustained misconduct occurred during workplace conversations between employees, or while off-duty, and included the use of racial slurs or other offensive comments and unacceptable behavior. The penalties imposed for these complaints ranged from an admonishment to a 22-day suspension.²³

Video in Adjudication of Biased Policing Complaints

Of the 198 complaints with Biased Policing allegations that closed in the first three quarters of 2016, most occurred in geographic Areas in which Body Worn Video (BWV) and/or Digital In-Car Video (DICV) had not yet been implemented. However, in 71 of the 198 closed complaints (35.9%), the adjudicator had access to video and/or audio recordings during the adjudication process.

Of the 71 Biased Policing complaints with video and/or audio recordings, nine complaints (12.7%) did not go through the adjudication process because the complaints were referred to the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program and closed as Mediated. The remaining 62

¹⁸ Four Biased Policing allegations (from two complaints) reported in the second quarter as closed with Not Resolved dispositions were re-opened because the employees submitted administrative appeals. Because the administrative appeals are still pending, those four allegations have been excluded from the third quarter count.

¹⁹ The information in Part 2 is a count of complaints and not a count of allegations as in Part 1. The data in Part 2 is based on the same information included in the Department's November 10, 2016 report to the BOPC, though the data in that report was sorted by the year the complaint was initiated. Since data in Table 9, Part 1 is sorted by year closed, for this report, the data in Part 2 is also sorted based on the year the complaint closed.

²⁰ Used for Discourtesy with the public and outside entities.

²¹ This allegation type changed to Discourtesy – Ethnic in 2016.

²² Used for allegations of inappropriate comments between Department employees.

²³ Because complaints often contain multiple allegations, the discipline imposed reflects the penalty for all sustained allegations, not necessarily the discipline imposed for the sustained allegations indicating possible bias.

complaints went through the adjudication process, and video or audio recordings assisted in the adjudication of 49 (79.1%) of those. The table below summarizes how the recordings were used in the adjudication process for Biased Policing complaints closed during the first three quarters of 2016, and provides of a breakdown of the types of video available to the adjudicator.

Video in Biased Policing (BP) Complaints-2016 (YTD)	Complaints		Complaints by type of recording			
BP complaints closed	198	%	DICV only	BWV only	DICV+BWV	Other
No video/audio recording available	127	64.1%				
Video/audio recording was available	71	35.9%	46	2	7	16
Closed BP complaints that had video	71	%	46	2	7	16
Not adjudicated (closed as Mediated)	9	12.7%	5	1	3	0
Went through adjudication process	62	87.3%	41	1	4	16
Adjudicated BP complaints that had video	62	%	41	1	4	16
Video did not assist in adjudication/Not stated	13	21.0%	9	0	1	3 ²⁴
Video helped in adjudication of some allegations	44	71.0%	29	1	2	12 ²⁵
Video proved/disproved entire complaint	5	8.1%	3	0	1	1 ²⁶

A total of five Biased Policing complaints were disproven based on video in the first three quarters of 2016, with three of them closing in the third quarter of 2016. The three Biased Policing complaints that closed in the third quarter of 2016 are summarized below:

- In a complaint arising from a traffic stop for expired registration, the driver alleged that officers initiated the stop based on his race, that they immediately put their hands on their guns as if they were about to shoot him, and that the officers were generally rude and discourteous in speaking with him during the stop. The DICV showed that officers were behind the complainant's car when they spotted the expired registration. The complainant's race could not be determined through his car windows because the stop occurred at night and the complainant's windows were heavily tinted. The video did not show the officers with their hands on their guns as they approached the complainant, and the officers were calm and referred to the complainant as "sir" throughout the encounter.
- The second complaint arose from a pedestrian stop, and contained only one allegation that the officers stopped the complainant solely because of his race. The DICV showed that while the officers detained a woman standing in the roadway, the complainant approached the officers and began yelling profanities at them. The officers asked the complainant several times to move back to the sidewalk or he would be cited. When he refused, the officers issued the complainant a citation.

²⁴ Complaints in which "Other" recording types did not assist in adjudication included recordings from a cell phone, an audio recording from an officer's personal recorder, and video from a security camera.

²⁵ Complaints in which "Other" recording types assisted in the adjudication process included video from cell phones, City Council cameras, video found on the internet, and audio/video recordings from the officers' personal recorders.

²⁶ Video recording from the officer's personal video recorder disproved the complaint.

- The third complaint involved a traffic stop on a vehicle with illegally tinted windows. The complainant alleged the officer stopped her because of her race. The officer's personal video recorder captured the incident as the officer approached the complainant's car from the rear and initiated the traffic stop. The video shows that all the windows on the complainant's car were heavily tinted, and that the race and gender of the complainant could not be determined through the windows even though it was a sunny day.

Biased Policing Complaints Referred to the Chain-of-Command Office Director

As detailed in previous reports, IAG continues to forward Biased Policing complaints to the office director in the employee's chain-of-command when it disagrees with a chain-of-command adjudication. In the third quarter of 2016, IAG disagreed with two chain-of-command adjudications. One Biased Policing complaint was referred to the Director, Office of Operations (OO), who agreed with IAG's recommendation that the complaint be adjudicated as Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate. The second Biased Policing complaint involved an employee assigned to Metropolitan Division. It was referred to the Director, OSO, who disagreed with the IAG's recommendation that the complaint be adjudicated as Not Resolved; the complaint was closed as Unfounded. A summary of the dispositions for the 11 complaints referred to the office director during the first three quarters of 2016 appears in the table below.

BIASED POLICING COMPLAINTS REFERRED TO OFFICE DIRECTOR FOR FINAL DISPOSITION			
2016 Quarter	Bureau Recommendation	Internal Affairs Group Recommendation	Office Director Adjudication
1	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate (OO)
	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate (OO)
	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate (OO)
	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate (OO)
	Unfounded	Not Resolved	Not Resolved (OO)
	Unfounded	Not Resolved	Not Resolved (OO)
	Unfounded	Not Resolved	Not Resolved (OO)
2	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Unfounded (OO)
	Unfounded	Not Resolved	Unfounded (OO)
3	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate (OO)
	Unfounded	Not Resolved	Unfounded (OSO)

As noted in the prior report, IAG disagreed with a chain-of-command adjudication of Unfounded for a Biased Policing complaint in the second quarter but did not refer it to the Director because the complaint was too close to the statute date. For training purposes, IAG sent correspondence to the chain-of-command explaining the rationale. Through the first three quarters of 2016, there has been one Biased Policing complaint not referred to the Director because of the statute date.

In total, IAG disagreed with the chain-of-command recommendation for 12 Biased Policing complaints in the first three quarters of 2016. Eleven of those complaints were referred to office director in the employee's chain-of-command; three are pending final closure, and nine now

have a final adjudication. Those nine closed complaints represent 4.5 percent of the 198 Biased Policing complaints closed in the first three quarters of 2016. The table below summarizes, from 2014 to present, the number of complaints in which IAG disagreed with the chain-of-command.

Closed Biased Policing (BP) Complaints	2016 (YTD)	2015	2014
BP complaints closed	198	264	283
Closed BP complaints in which IAG disagreed with adjudication	9 (4.5%)	8 (3.0%)	16 (5.7%)

Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program

During the third quarter of 2016, the Department was still in the third year of the 36-month Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program (Program). In conjunction with the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office (LACA), selected complaints of Biased Policing are mediated as an alternative to the traditional complaint investigation procedure. Beginning September 9, 2015, Discourtesy complaints also became eligible for mediation.

Generally, Biased Policing and Discourtesy complaints with no additional allegations of misconduct, or additional minor allegations of misconduct, may be considered for mediation. The Program's implementation plan provides that complaints involving the following situations should not be mediated, though the Commanding Officer, IAG, makes the final determination of case eligibility:

- Force was used;
- Ethnic remark or other specific discourtesy directed at a class of persons;
- A complainant was arrested;
- An employee was assaulted;
- A lawsuit was filed;
- A person was injured;
- Property was damaged;
- Excessive delay in reporting allegations; and,
- Allegations of criminal misconduct.

During the first three quarters of 2016, 244 complaints were referred to the Program for mediation, and 148 complaints were determined to be eligible, a 60.7 percent eligibility rate. In addition to the 23 complaints that closed as Mediated during the first half of 2016, eight more complaints (involving eleven employees and eight complainants), closed as Mediated during the third quarter of 2016, bringing the total number of complaints closed as Mediated to 31 complaints. At the end of the third quarter, the Mediation Coordinator was attempting to contact the parties to 14 additional eligible complaints in an effort to obtain their agreement to participate in the Program.

The table below summarizes the complaints referred to the Program during the first three quarters of 2016 compared to the total number of complaints referred in 2014 and 2015.

Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program²⁷	2016 (YTD)	2015	2014
Total Complaints Referred	244	195	224
Not Eligible	96 (39.3%)	108 (55.4%)	119 (53.1%)
Eligible	148 (60.7%)	87 (44.6%)	105 (46.9%)
Closed after Mediation conducted ²⁸	25	30	15
Closed as Mediated after two No Shows	6	4	8

Though employees and complainants do not always provide a reason for declining to participate in mediation, beginning in 2016, the reason for reassignment of eligible complaints has been collected. Of the 148 complaints determined eligible for mediation, 105 (70.9%) were reassigned without mediation, either for full investigation (100 complaints), or because the parties agreed to resolve the complaint through the Alternative Complaint Resolution process (five complaints).²⁹ The table below provides a breakdown of the reasons for reassignment for during the first three quarters of 2016.

Eligible for Mediation but Reassigned	2016 (YTD)	2015	2014
Eligible	148	87	105
Reassigned	105 (70.9%)	61 (70.1%)	72 (68.6%)
Reason for Reassignment	105	61	72
Complainant could not be located/contacted	17 (16.2%)	20 (32.8%)	19 (26.4%)
Complainant declined	55 (52.4%)	23 (37.7%)	30 (41.7%)
Wants full investigation	12 (21.8%)		
Too much bother	9 (16.4%)		
Changed mind/does not wish to pursue	6 (10.9%)		
Avoid other party	4 (7.3%)		
Lack of trust in LAPD	2 (3.6%)		
No reason given	22 (40.0%)		
Officer declined	23 (21.9%)	16 (26.2%)	19 (26.4%)
Wants full investigation	10 (43.5%)		
Avoid other party	5 (21.7%)		
Too much bother	1 (4.3%)		
No reason given	7 (30.4%)		
Inappropriate for mediation	5 (4.8%)	2 (3.3%)	4 (5.6%)
Alternative Complaint Resolution	5 (4.8%)		

²⁷ The data in this table include Discourtesy complaints, which became eligible for mediation September 9, 2015. The year-to-date totals for 2016 are significantly higher than in prior years, in part, because Discourtesy complaints are now eligible for mediation through the Program. Currently, Discourtesy complaints make up 35.4 percent the eligible cases referred to the Program for mediation.

²⁸ These complaints could be from the current quarter or a prior quarter.

²⁹ Under the Alternative Complaint Resolution (ACR) process, complaints from the public may be resolved outside the traditional complaint investigation procedure if the conduct alleged is non-disciplinary, or disciplinary but very minor in nature, and both the accused officer and the complainant agree to meet and discuss the issues. The meeting is confidential and a Department supervisor facilitates the discussion to help the parties resolve the issues by coming to an understanding of each other. Complaints are closed with the ACR disposition after completion of the process.

Of the eight complaints that closed as Mediated in the third quarter of 2016, two complaints closed as Mediated because the complainants did not attend the scheduled mediation sessions.³⁰ The remaining six complaints underwent mediation in the third quarter of 2016. Satisfaction surveys from those six mediation sessions, representing six complainants and eight employees, were received from the participants. Based on the surveys received, the table below details the participants' responses to four of the survey questions relating to participant satisfaction with the mediation process, whether the process was fair, whether mediation increased understanding of the other party, and whether the participant would recommend mediation to others.

Participant Mediation Survey Responses from 3rd Quarter 2016		Complainants (6)		Employees (8)		Total (14)	
Category	Rating	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Satisfaction with Complaint Mediation Process	Very Satisfied	5	83.3%	5	62.5%	10	71.4%
	Somewhat Satisfied			1	12.5%	1	7.1%
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	1	16.7%	1	12.5%	2	14.3%
	Not Satisfied at All			1	12.5%	1	7.1%
Fairness of Outcome of Complaint Mediation Process	Completely Fair	5	83.3%	7	87.5%	12	85.7%
	Somewhat Fair						
	Not Very Fair						
	Not Fair at All	1	16.7%	1	12.5%	2	14.3%
Increased Understanding of Police Work / Community Member	Increased a Great Deal	1	16.7%	2	25.0%	3	21.4%
	Increased Somewhat	2	33.3%	3	37.5%	5	35.7%
	Increased a Little	1	16.7%	2	25.0%	3	21.4%
	Did Not Increase	2	33.3%	1	12.5%	3	21.4%
Likelihood of Recommending Complaint Mediation Process	Very Likely	5	83.3%	7	87.5%	12	85.7%
	Somewhat Likely						
	Not Very Likely	1	16.7%			1	7.1%
	Not Likely at All			1	12.5%	1	7.1%

Data from surveys received from the start of the Program in 2014 through the third quarter of 2016 are provided in Table 10. Though ratings for the various satisfaction categories have fluctuated since 2014, for both complainants and officers, overall satisfaction levels remain high. The data shows the Program has been well-received and is having a positive impact on community members and Department employees. Summarized below are the results for surveys received during the third quarter of 2016.

Satisfaction with the process: In the third quarter, 11 of 14 participants (78.6%) were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the mediation process. Complainants (83.3%) were slightly more likely to be satisfied with the process than officers (75.0%).

³⁰ Under the Program guidelines, when a complainant does not appear for scheduled mediation twice without good cause, the complaint is closed as Mediated.

Fairness of the process: Out of 14 participants in the third quarter, 12 (85.7%) indicated the outcome of the mediation process to be “somewhat fair” or “completely fair.” In this category, officers (87.5%) were slightly more likely to believe the process to be fair than complainants (83.3%).

Understanding of the Other Party: Of the 14 participants in the third quarter, 11 (78.6%) indicated their understanding of the other party increased after the mediation. The percentage of participants who reported an increase in understanding was greater for officers (87.5%) than it was for complainants (66.7%).

Likelihood of Recommending to Others: During the third quarter of 2016, 12 of 14 participants (85.7%) indicated they were either “somewhat likely” or “very likely” to recommend the mediation process to others. The percentage of participants who would recommend the mediation process to others was slightly higher for officers (87.5%) than for complainants (83.3%).

In a Biased Policing complaint mediated recently, the complainant was dissatisfied with the way officers handled a call about a parking dispute the complainant had with her neighbors, who were Hispanic. The complainant felt the officers had not been responsive to her concerns and believed the officers, who were also Hispanic, sided with the neighbors and were biased against the complainant, who was not Hispanic. At mediation, the officers explained that they had in fact admonished the neighbors to comply with the parking rules for the apartment complex, but they had to respond to another urgent call and were unable to advise the complainant afterwards what they had done on her behalf. The mediator described the mediation as “very successful and transformative” because the complainant became much more positive toward the officers after hearing what they had done, and the officers realized the importance of letting the complaining party know what had been done on the complainant’s behalf. In their surveys, all the parties indicated they were very satisfied with the mediation process and would recommend it to other people.

The Department continues its internal outreach effort to boost program awareness and understanding among employees by providing presentations at Department training schools and various forums including supervisor schools and divisional training days. The Mediation Coordinator also continues to try to make the process as easy as possible for complainants by scheduling mediations at local libraries closer to the complainants’ residences and identifying volunteer mediators to conduct mediations on weekends and during evening hours.

Internal Affairs Group is also looking at ways to take lessons learned through mediation and transmit them to the entire Department. Officers have come out of mediation sessions with the realization that they could have handled a situation differently and possibly avoided the personnel complaint altogether. For example, officers have realized they should have taken more time explaining their actions to detainees and “switched gears” or de-escalated during traffic stops. A semiannual newsletter where mediation sessions are summarized and lessons are identified will be developed for posting on the Department’s Infoweb so that all Department employees can benefit from the individual officers’ experience. The information will also be forwarded to Police Sciences and Training Bureau to fine-tune training.

Addenda

1. Table 1 - Complaints by Bureau and Geographic Area
2. Table 2 - Accused Employee Demographics: Ethnicity and Gender; Age at Date of Incident; Length of Service at Date of Incident; and Age and Length of Service Comparisons
3. Table 3 - Accused Employee Assignments
4. Table 4 - Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter
5. Table 5 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged
6. Table 6 - Type of Bias Alleged
7. Table 7 - Complainant Ethnicity by Bureau
8. Table 8 - Accused and Complainant Ethnicities for Ethnic Bias Complaints Only
9. Table 9 - Biased Policing Allegation Dispositions for Closed Complaints
10. Table 10 - Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program Survey Responses

Table 1 – Complaints by Bureau and Geographic Area

			2016 (YTD)		2015		2014		2013		3-Year Avg. (%) (2013-2015)	
BUREAUS/AREAS	Population		Complaints		Complaints		Complaints		Complaints			
CENTRAL BUREAU	780,269	20.5%	27	18.1%	56	23.9%	65	23.0%	70	24.9%	63.7	23.9%
Central	61,668	1.6%	10	6.7%	27	11.5%	20	7.1%	30	10.7%	25.7	9.6%
Hollenbeck	179,536	4.7%	4	2.7%	4	1.7%	8	2.8%	6	2.1%	6.0	2.3%
Newton	146,201	3.9%	9	6.0%	17	7.3%	16	5.7%	16	5.7%	16.3	6.1%
Northeast	227,903	6.0%	2	1.3%	2	0.9%	10	3.5%	7	2.5%	6.3	2.4%
Rampart	164,961	4.3%	2	1.3%	6	2.6%	11	3.9%	11	3.9%	9.3	3.5%
SOUTH BUREAU	689,238	18.2%	32	22.8%	64	27.4%	65	23.0%	60	21.4%	63.0	23.7%
77th Street	178,933	4.7%	20	13.4%	19	8.1%	12	4.2%	17	6.0%	16.0	6.0%
Harbor	178,163	4.7%	2	1.3%	3	1.3%	7	2.5%	7	2.5%	5.7	2.1%
Southeast	141,371	3.7%	6	4.0%	14	6.0%	16	5.7%	8	2.8%	12.7	4.8%
Southwest	190,771	5.0%	6	4.0%	28	12.0%	30	10.6%	28	10.0%	28.7	10.8%
VALLEY BUREAU	1,427,148	37.6%	43	28.9%	60	25.6%	74	26.1%	88	31.3%	74.0	27.8%
Devonshire	216,499	5.7%	7	4.7%	12	5.1%	10	3.5%	9	3.2%	10.3	3.9%
Foothill	196,513	5.2%	1	0.7%	5	2.1%	6	2.1%	12	4.3%	7.7	2.9%
Mission	244,576	6.4%	7	4.7%	4	1.7%	11	3.9%	11	3.9%	8.7	3.3%
North Hollywood	203,856	5.4%	8	5.4%	9	3.8%	12	4.2%	18	6.4%	13.0	4.9%
Topanga	193,901	5.1%	11	7.4%	6	2.6%	13	4.6%	9	3.2%	9.3	3.5%
Van Nuys	177,918	4.7%	6	4.0%	15	6.4%	16	5.7%	17	6.0%	16.0	6.0%
West Valley	193,885	5.1%	3	2.0%	9	3.8%	6	2.1%	12	4.3%	9.0	3.4%
WEST BUREAU	900,515	23.7%	41	27.5%	51	21.8%	76	26.9%	61	21.7%	62.7	23.6%
Hollywood	128,999	3.4%	12	8.1%	15	6.4%	17	6.0%	14	5.0%	15.3	5.8%
Olympic	186,615	4.9%	4	2.7%	3	1.3%	14	4.9%	11	3.9%	9.3	3.5%
Pacific	203,623	5.4%	16	10.7%	18	7.7%	20	7.1%	20	7.1%	19.3	7.3%
West Los Angeles	230,275	6.1%	1	0.7%	4	1.7%	9	3.2%	3	1.1%	5.3	2.0%
Wilshire	151,003	4.0%	8	5.4%	11	4.7%	16	5.7%	13	4.6%	13.3	5.0%
OUTSIDE CITY/ UNKNOWN LOCATION	NA	NA	4	2.7%	3	1.3%	3	1.1%	2	0.7%	2.7	1.0%
TOTAL	3,797,170		149		234		283		281		266.0	

(upd.. 10/18/2016)

Table 2 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 1)

Ethnicity and Gender

Year	Gender	Ethnicity								Gender Total
		American Indian	Asian	Black	Filipino	Hispanic	White	Other	Unknown	
2016 (YTD)	Female		2	2		14	8		1	27
	Male		21	20		83	64	1	1	190
	Unknown								19	19
	Ethnicity Total	0	23	22	0	97	72	1	21	236
2015	Female		2	3		21	8			34
	Male	1	25	23	2	137	98		8	294
	Unknown								37	37
	Ethnicity Total	1	27	26	2	158	106	0	45	365
2014	Female		4	3		22	17	1	1	48
	Male	2	27	28		194	141	1	2	395
	Unknown								33	33
	Ethnicity Total	2	31	31	0	216	158	2	36	476

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

Age at Date of Incident

Year	Age in Years				
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50/+	Unknown
2016 (YTD)	36	89	67	17	27
2015	69	136	83	22	55
2014	97	160	135	40	44

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

Length of Service at Date of Incident

Year	Years of Service					
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20/+	Unknown
2016 (YTD)	46	80	25	31	28	26
2015	57	132	47	47	33	49
2014	74	166	52	90	57	37

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

Table 2 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 2)

Age and Length of Service Comparisons

Age in Years	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2016 (YTD)	2015	2014
20-29	757	21.8%	17.2%	22.3%	22.5%
30-39	1501	43.1%	42.6%	43.9%	37.0%
40-49	954	27.4%	32.1%	26.8%	31.3%
50/+	268	7.7%	8.1%	7.1%	9.3%

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

Years of Service	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2016 (YTD)	2015	2014
0-4	799	23.0%	21.9%	18.0%	16.9%
5-9	1348	38.7%	38.1%	41.8%	37.8%
10-14	454	13.0%	11.9%	14.9%	11.8%
15-19	553	15.9%	14.8%	14.9%	20.5%
20/+	326	9.4%	13.3%	10.4%	13.0%

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

Accused having unknown Age or Years of Service are excluded from the percentage calculations.

Comparison Group – 3480 Police Officers

Rank	Officers	Percentage
PO 1	250	7.2%
PO 2	2519	72.4%
PO 3	711	20.4%

Function	Officers	Percentage
Patrol	2829	81.3%
Specialized Enforcement	261	7.5%
Traffic	390	11.2%

Table 3 – Accused Employee Assignments (Part 1)

Assignment Type	Comparison Group ¹ # of Employees	2016			2015			2014		
		# of Accused	# of Complaints	Complaints per 100	# of Accused	# of Complaints	Complaints per 100	# of Accused	# of Complaints	Complaints per 100
Detective/Investigator - Area	726 (5.8%)	8 (3.4%)	7	1.0	7 (1.9%)	5	0.7	12 (2.5%)	9	1.2
Detective/Investigator - Specialized	864 (6.9%)	2 (0.8%)	2	0.2	5 (1.4%)	4	0.5	3 (0.6%)	2	0.2
Uniformed Detective ²	159 (1.3%)	1 (0.4%)	1	0.6	8 (2.2%)	4	2.5	2 (0.4%)	1	0.6
Gang Enforcement	422 (3.4%)	17 (7.2%)	8	1.9	34 (9.3%)	18	4.3	45 (9.5%)	25	5.9
Metropolitan Division ³	388 (3.1%)	22 (9.3%)	11	2.8	20 (5.5%)	13	3.4	6 (1.3%)	3	0.8
Narcotics Enforcement	245 (2.0%)	2 (0.8%)	1	0.4				3 (0.6%)	1	0.4
Patrol	2,730 (21.8%)	120 (50.8%)	70	2.6	173 (47.4%)	107	3.9	273 (57.4%)	156	5.7
Patrol - Specialized Enforcement ⁴	348 (2.8%)	17 (7.2%)	13	3.7	40 (11.0%)	25	7.2	43 (9.0%)	28	8.0
Traffic Collision Investigation	199 (1.6%)	3 (1.3%)	3	1.5	4 (1.1%)	4	2.0	13 (2.7%)	11	5.5
Traffic Enforcement	236 (1.9%)	17 (7.2%)	14	5.9	20 (5.5%)	20	8.5	31 (6.5%)	24	10.2
Other Sworn ⁵	2,975 (23.7%)				5 (1.4%)	4	0.1	5 (1.1%)	3	0.1
Detention Officer	306 (2.4%)				2 (0.5%)	1	0.3			
Police Service Representative	608 (4.8%)									
Other Civilian	1,795 (14.3%)				1 (0.3%)	1	0.1	1 (0.2%)	1	0.1
Unassigned ⁶ /Unknown ⁷	545 (4.3%)	27 (11.4%)	22	4.0	46 (12.6%)	39	7.2	39 (8.2%)	35	6.4
Total	12,546	236	149⁸	1.2	365	234⁸	1.9	476	283⁸	2.3

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

1 - **Comparison Group** reflects employee data as of April, 2016.

2 - **Uniformed Detective** refers to officers assigned to specialized uniformed detective functions such as a Parole Compliance Unit, Juvenile Car or School Car.

3 - **Metropolitan Division**: In mid-2015, because of an increase in violent crime, Metropolitan Division was expanded to flexibly deploy specially trained officers in high crime areas. At the end of 2014, the Department had 255 officers deployed at Metropolitan Division. By the end of 2015, 471 officers had been assigned to Metropolitan Division, an increase of 216 officers from the prior year. Toward the end of the first quarter of 2016, there continued to be 471 officers deployed to Metropolitan Division, with 388 of them assigned to field operations as of April 2016.

4 - **Specialized Enforcement** refers to patrol officers assigned to a specific enforcement functions, such as officers assigned to the Hollywood Entertainment District, Safer Cities Initiative, and the Housing Authority City of Los Angeles details.

5 - **Other Sworn**: In 2015, this included officers assigned to Jail Division, and in 2014, this category included an officer working as a community relations officer and an officer assigned to Training Division as the magnet school coordinator.

6 - **Unassigned** refers to employees in the comparison group who are on leave, such as long term military, sick leave or injured on duty status.

7. **Unknown** refers to those accused in complaints in which there was not enough information to determine the employee's identity.

8. **Total - Number of Complaints** counts the actual number of complaints initiated. Because one complaint can involve multiple employees, each with a different assignment, the same complaint may appear in more than one assignment type. As a result, summing up the number of complaints from all the different assignment types may result in a number that is greater than the number of complaints actually initiated. The number listed as the total number of complaints does not count those duplicates.

Table 3 – Accused Employee Assignments and Gender (Part 2)

	Comparison Group		2016 (YTD)		2015		2014	
Detective/Investigator - Area	726	5.8%	8	3.4%	7	1.9%	12	2.5%
Female	197	27.1%	5	62.5%	2	28.6%	6	50.0%
Male	529	72.9%	3	37.5%	5	71.4%	6	50.0%
Detective/Investigator - Specialized	864	6.9%	2	0.8%	5	1.4%	3	0.6%
Female	233	27.0%			1	20.0%		
Male	631	73.0%	2	100.0%	4	80.0%	3	100.0%
Uniformed Detective	159	1.3%	1	0.4%	8	2.2%	2	0.4%
Female	40	25.2%			2	25.0%		
Male	119	74.8%	1	100.0%	6	75.0%	2	100.0%
Gang Enforcement	422	3.4%	17	7.2%	34	9.3%	45	9.5%
Female	37	8.8%	3	17.6%	3	8.8%	3	6.7%
Male	385	91.2%	14	82.4%	31	91.2%	42	93.3%
Metropolitan Division	388	3.1%	22	9.3%	20	5.5%	6	1.3%
Female	19	4.9%						
Male	369	95.1%	22	100.0%	20	100.0%	6	100.0%
Narcotic Enforcement	245	2.0%	2	0.8%	0	0.0%	3	0.6%
Female	28	11.4%	1	50.0%				
Male	217	88.6%	1	50.0%			3	100.0%
Patrol	2,730	21.8%	120	50.8%	173	47.4%	273	57.4%
Female	353	12.9%	12	10.0%	22	12.7%	32	11.7%
Male	2,377	87.1%	108	90.0%	151	87.3%	241	88.3%
Patrol - Specialized Enforcement	348	2.8%	17	7.2%	40	11.0%	43	9.0%
Female	55	15.8%	4	23.5%	4	10.0%	3	7.0%
Male	293	84.2%	13	76.5%	36	90.0%	40	93.0%
Traffic Collision Investigation	199	1.6%	3	1.3%	4	1.1%	13	2.7%
Female	22	11.1%						
Male	177	88.9%	3	100.0%	4	100.0%	13	100.0%
Traffic Enforcement	236	1.9%	17	7.2%	20	5.5%	31	6.5%
Female	6	2.5%					1	3.2%
Male	230	97.5%	17	100.0%	20	100.0%	30	96.8%
Other Sworn	2,975	23.7%	0	0.0%	5	1.4%	5	1.1%
Female	746	25.1%						
Male	2,229	74.9%			5	100.0%	5	100.0%
Detention Officer	306	2.4%	0	0.0%	2	0.5%	0	0.0%
Female	103	33.7%						
Male	203	66.3%			2	100.0%		
Police Service Representative	608	4.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Female	501	82.4%						
Male	107	17.6%						
Other Civilian	1,795	14.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	1	0.2%
Female	1,027	57.2%						
Male	768	42.8%			1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Unassigned (comparison group)	545	4.3%						
Female	122	22.4%						
Male	423	77.6%						
Unknown (accused employee)			27	11.4%	46	12.6%	39	8.2%
Female			2	7.4%			3	7.7%
Male			6	22.2%	9	19.6%	3	7.7%
Unknown Gender			19	70.4%	37	80.4%	33	84.6%
Total	12,546	100.0%	236	100.0%	365	100.0%	476	100.0%
Total with Known Gender	9,837	(sworn)	217	100.0%	328	100.0%	443	10
Female	1,858	18.9%	27	12.4%	34	10.4%	48	10.8%
Male	7979	81.1%	190	87.6%	294	89.6%	395	89.2%

Table 4 - Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter (Part 1)

Year	Total Contacts with Public*	Total Biased Policing Complaints Initiated	Biased Policing Complaints Initiated by Type of Contact			
			Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
2016 (YTD)	1,175,504	149 (0.013%)	23 (15.4%)	42 (28.2%)	55 (36.9%)	29 (19.5%)
2015	1,644,139	234 (0.014%)	56 (23.9%)	43 (18.4%)	96 (41.0%)	39 (16.7%)
2014	1,815,940	283 (0.016%)	57 (20.1%)	55 (19.4%)	120 (42.4%)	51 (18.0%)

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

* **Total Contacts with Public** is the total of all field interviews conducted, calls for service dispatched, arrests made, and citations issued.

2016 (YTD) Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
American Indian	F	0				
	M					
Asian	F	2		1		
	M			1		
Black	F	85	4	9	11	4
	M		12	11	27	7
Filipino	F	0				
	M					
Hispanic	F	35	1	8	3	7
	M		2	1	11	2
White	F	18	1	4	3	1
	M		3	3	2	1
Other	F	3		1		
	M				2	
Unknown	F	17		2	1	2
	M		1	2	4	5

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

Table 4 - Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter (Part 2)

2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
American Indian	F	0				
	M					
Asian	F	0				
	M					
Black	F	152	3	7	13	7
	M		31	14	56	21
Filipino	F	2			1	
	M		1			
Hispanic	F	41	3	3	3	
	M		8	8	13	3
White	F	19		3	3	2
	M		2	4	2	3
Other	F	11	1	2		2
	M		2	2	1	1
Unknown	F	19	2	1		1
	M		5		5	5

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

2014 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
American Indian		2				
	M		1		1	
Asian	F	7		4		
	M			1	2	
Black	F	192	6	10	20	7
	M		38	17	70	24
Hispanic	F	44	2	4	7	4
	M		5	5	15	2
White	F	20	3	4	1	
	M		1	4	3	4
Other	F	10		3	3	1
	M			1		2
Unknown	F	23	2	1	2	4
	M		3	3	1	4
	Unk			1	1	1

(Upd. 6/2/2016)

Table 5 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 1)

Year	Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
2016 (YTD)	24 (12.9%)	73 (39.2%)	12 (6.5%)	4 (2.2%)	8 (4.3%)	7 (3.8%)	12 (6.5%)	22 (11.8%)	24 (12.9%)
2015	43 (13.9%)	142 (45.8%)	11 (3.5%)	3 (1.0%)	10 (3.2%)	3 (1.0%)	9 (3.2%)	31 (10.0%)	57 (18.4%)
2014	42 (11.6%)	148 (40.9%)	17 (4.7%)	10 (2.8%)	n/a	7 (1.9%)	17 (4.7%)	53 (14.6%)	68 (18.8%)

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

2016 (YTD) Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
American Indian	F									
	M									
Asian	F	1								
	M						1			1
Black	F	4	11	2	2	1		1	4	7
	M	13	37	5	2	2	2	6	3	7
Filipino	F									
	M									
Hispanic	F	4	4		1	3	3		6	1
	M	3	13	3				1	1	
White	F	1	1	1		1	1	1	4	2
	M	2	4	1					2	2
Other	F								1	
	M		2							
Unknown	F		1			1			1	2
	M	1	8	1				3		2

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

Table 5 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 2)

2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
American Indian	F									
	M									
Asian	F									
	M									
Black	F	7	22		1	1		3	5	7
	M	26	79	7	1	5	1	9	8	28
Filipino	F		1							
	M		1							
Hispanic	F	1	5	2		1			3	4
	M	5	20	1	1	1		1	5	7
White	F		3						2	3
	M	2	4				1		1	4
Other	F	2	1				1		1	2
	M	2	1						3	
Unknown	F		3	1					1	
	M	1	9	1		2			2	5

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

2014 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
American Indian	F								
	M		2		1			1	
Asian	F	2						1	2
	M		2						1
Black	F	7	21	2	1		4	7	13
	M	22	95	10	6	5	5	20	27
Filipino	F								
	M								
Hispanic	F	3	8					5	4
	M	5	13	4	1		7	6	5
White	F	3	2					2	2
	M	1	3	1			1	5	3
Other	F		2					3	3
	M							1	3
Unknown	F		2		1			2	5
	M		4			2			5
	Unk		2					1	

(Upd. 6/2/2016)

Table 6 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 1)

Year	Age	Gender	Gender Identity/ Expression	Physical Disability ¹	Mental Disability ¹	Race/ Ethnicity ²	Religion ²	Sexual Orientation (LGBQ) ³	National Origin	Other	Not Specified
2016 (YTD)	4 (2.6%)	8 (5.1%)	3 (1.9%)	2 (1.3%)		132 (84.6%)	1 (0.6%)	4 (2.6%)	2 (1.3%)		
2015	n/a	1 (0.4%)	n/a	5 (2.1%)		215 (90.7%)		5 (2.1%)		3 (1.3%)	8 (3.4%)
2014	n/a	10 (3.3%)	n/a	10 (3.3%)		254 (84.4%)		7 (2.3%)		8 (2.7%)	12 (4.0%)

(upd. 10/18/2016)

1 - Physical/Mental Disability: In 2014 and 2015, Disability included both physical and mental disabilities. In 2016, Physical Disability and Mental Disability became separate bias categories.

2 - Ethnicity/Religion: In 2014 and 2015, Race and Religion were included in Ethnicity. In 2016, Race/Ethnicity was separated from Religion and became separate bias categories.

3 - Sexual Orientation includes lesbian, gay, bisexual and questioning. It previously included transgender status, but alleged bias on the basis of transgender status is now counted under Gender Identity/Expression.

2016 (YTD) Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Age	Gender	Gender Identity/ Expression	Physical Disability	Mental Disability	Race/ Ethnicity	Religion	Sexual Orientation (LGBQ)	National Origin	Other	Not Specified
American Indian	F											
	M											
Asian	F						1					
	M	1					1					
Black	F						28					
	M	1	1				55	1	1			
Filipino	F											
	M											
Hispanic	F		1	2	1		14		2	1		
	M						16			1		
White	F	2	2		1		4					
	M		2	2			5		1			
Other	F						1					
	M						2					
Unknown	F		2				3					
	M						12					

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

Table 6 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 2)

2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
American Indian	F							
	M							
Asian	F							
	M							
Black	F		30					
	M		120		1			1
Filipino	F		1					
	M		1					
Hispanic	F		7		2			
	M	1	29				2	2
White	F		7				1	1
	M	3	7		1			
Other	F		4		1			
	M		5	1				
Unknown	F		4					
	M	1	10					4

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

2014 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
American Indian	F		2					
	M							
Asian	F		4	2				
	M		3					
Black	F		40	1				2
	M	4	142	1			5	5
Filipino	F							
	M							
Hispanic	F	1	12		3			1
	M		26		2		1	
White	F	1	4	2	1			1
	M	3	8	1			1	1
Other	F		5					2
	M		4					
Unknown	F		7	2	1			
	M		9	1			1	
	Unk		1					

(Upd. 6/2/2016)

Table 7 - Complainant Ethnicity by Bureau

	Population		2016 (YTD)		2015		2014	
CENTRAL BUREAU	780,269	20.5%	Complainants: 33		Complainants: 57		Complainants: 70	
American Indian	2,135	0.3%					2	2.9%
Asian	104,891	13.4%					43	61.4%
Black	41,431	5.3%	17	51.5%	36	63.2%		
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	710	0.1%						
Hispanic	525,180	67.3%	10	30.3%	12	21.2%	18	25.7%
Multiple Race	2,907	0.4%						
Other	2,169	0.3%			1	1.8%	2	2.9%
White	100,846	12.9%	5	15.2%	6	10.5%	2	2.9%
Unknown			1	3.0%	2	3.5%	3	4.3%
SOUTH BUREAU	689,238	18.2%	Complainants: 35		Complainants: 69		Complainants: 67	
American Indian	1,769	0.3%						
Asian	29,303	4.3%						
Black	192,009	27.9%	26	74.3%	57	82.6%	55	82.1%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	1,678	0.2%						
Hispanic	395,688	57.4%	4	11.4 %	7	10.1%	6	9.0%
Multiple Race	8,011	1.2%						
Other	2,985	0.4%						
White	57,795	8.4%	1	2.9				
Unknown			4	11.4%	5	7.2%	6	9.0%
VALLEY BUREAU	1,427,148	37.6%	Complainants: 46		Complainants: 63		Complainants: 78	
American Indian	4,778	0.3%						
Asian	157,831	11.1%	1	2.2%			2	2.6%
Black	60,238	4.2%	19	41.3%	26	41.3%	46	59.0%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	2,488	0.2%			1	1.6%		
Hispanic	660,981	46.3%	13	28.3%	17	27.0%	16	20.5%
Multiple Race	6,780	0.5%						
Other	5,203	0.4%	3	6.5%	6	9.5%	5	6.4%
White	528,849	37.1%	7	15.2%	10	15.9%	5	6.4%
Unknown			3	6.5%	3	4.8%	4	5.1%
WEST BUREAU	900,515	23.7%	Complainants: 42		Complainants: 52		Complainants: 79	
American Indian	2,813	0.3%					2	2.5%
Asian	162,413	18.0%	1	2.4%			3	3.8%
Black	64,534	7.2%	22	52.4%	32	61.5%	47	59.5%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	1,632	0.2%			1	1.9%		
Hispanic	258,047	28.7%	8	19.0%	4	7.7%	4	5.1%
Multiple Race	5,923	0.7%						
Other	4,175	0.5%			4	7.7%	3	3.8%
White	400,978	44.5%	4	9.5%	3	5.8%	13	16.5%
Unknown			7	16.7%	8	15.4%	7	8.9%
ALL BUREAUS	3,797,170	100.0%	Complainants: 156		Complainants: 241		Complainants: 294	
American Indian	11,495	0.3%					2	0.7%
Asian	454,438	12.0%	2	1.3%			7	2.4%
Black	358,212	9.4%	84	53.8%	151	62.7%	191	65.0%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	6,508	0.2%			2	0.8%		
Hispanic	1,839,896	48.5%	35	22.4%	40	16.6%	44	15.0%
Multiple Race	23,621	0.6%						
Other	14,532	0.4%	3	1.9%	11	4.6%	10	3.4%
White	1,088,468	28.7%	17	10.9%	19	7.9%	20	6.8%
Unknown			15	9.6%	18	7.5%	20	6.8%
UNKNOWN LOCATION			Complainants: 4		Complainants: 3		Complainants: 4	
Black			1	25.0%	1	33.3%	1	25.0%
Hispanic					1	33.3%		
White			1	25.0%				
Unknown			2	50.0%	1	33.3%	3	75.0%
TOTAL			Complainants: 160		Complainants: 244		Complainants: 298	

Table 8 - Accused & Complainant Ethnicities for Ethnic Bias Complaints Only

Year	Accused Ethnicity	Complainant Ethnicity							
		American Indian	Asian	Black	Filipino	Hispanic	White	Other	Unknown
2016	American Indian								
	Asian			13		9	2		1
	Black		1	9		5	5	1	1
	Filipino								
	Hispanic		2	66		13	4		7
	White			43		17	2	2	6
	Other								
	Unknown			8		3	1		8
2015	American Indian			1					
	Asian			20		3			2
	Black			14		6	4	1	1
	Filipino					2			
	Hispanic			114		21	10	7	7
	White			82	2	16	4	3	3
	Other								
	Unknown			29		6		1	8
2014	American Indian			2					
	Asian	1		22		2	4	1	
	Black			16		5	4		
	Filipino								
	Hispanic	2	7	157		29	8	6	11
	White	2	3	111		19	1	2	7
	Other			2					
	Unknown			22		3	1	1	8

(Upd. 10/18/2016)

Table 9 - Biased Policing Allegation Dispositions for Closed Complaints (Part 1)

Year Closed	2016 (YTD)				3-Year Average (2013-2015)
		2015	2014	2013	
BIASED POLICING COMPLAINTS CLOSED	198	264	283	213	253.3
BIASED POLICING ALLEGATIONS	356	434	493	381	436.0
Disposition of Allegations					
Demonstrably False					
Exonerated					
Guilty					
Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	36 (10.1%)	34 (7.8%)	25 (5.1%)	32 (8.4%)	30.3 (7.0%)
Mediated ¹	31 (8.7%)	51 (11.8%)	27 (5.5%)		26.0 (6.0%)
No Department Employee					
No Misconduct				1 (0.3%)	0.3 (0.1%)
Not Guilty				2 (0.5%)	0.7 (0.2%)
Not Resolved	7 (2.0%)	8 (1.8%)	14 (2.8%)	15 (3.9%)	12.3 (2.8%)
Out of Statute		2 (0.5%)		5 (1.3%)	2.3 (0.5%)
Sustained					
Sustained - No Penalty					
Unfounded	280 (78.7%)	339 (78.1%)	427 (86.6%)	326 (85.6%)	364.0 (83.5%)
Withdrawn by COP	2 (0.6%)				0 (0.0%)

(Upd. 12/15/2016)

1 - **Mediated:** The number of complaints and allegations shown as having been Mediated includes only Biased Policing complaints. Complaints with Discourtesy allegations can also close with the Mediated disposition, but will not be reported here. Also, while a Biased Policing complaint may be closed out of the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program as Mediated, because all complaints must still go through the Department's administrative close-out process, the complaint may not appear in Table 9 until a later quarter. As a result, the number of mediated complaints in the report section on the Mediation Program may not match the numbers shown in Table 9.

Table 9 – Sustained Complaints with Allegations Related to Discriminatory Bias (Part 2)

Year Closed	2016 (YTD)				3-Year Average (2013-2015)
		2015	2014	2013	
Complaints Closed with Sustained Allegation	6	16	6	7	9.7
Penalty Imposed:					
Admonishment	1 (16.7%)	4 (25.0%)	1 (16.7%)		1.7 (17.2%)
Official Reprimand	1 (16.7%)	2 (12.5%)		5 (71.4%)	2.3 (24.1%)
Demotion					
Suspension: 22 days or less	3 (50.0%)	6 (37.5%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (14.3%)	2.7 (27.6%)
Suspension: More than 22 days	1 (16.7%)	1 (6.3%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (14.3%)	1.0 (10.3%)
Termination			1 (16.7%)		0.3 (3.4%)
Resigned/Retired in Lieu of Termination		3 (18.8%)	2 (33.3%)		1.7 (17.2%)

(Upd. 11/21/2016)

Table 10 - Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program Survey Responses

Survey Categories and Ratings		2016 (through 9/30/2016)			2015			2014		
Category	Rating	Total	Complainants	Employees	Total	Complainants	Employees	Total	Complainants	Employees
Satisfaction with Complaint Mediation Process	Very Satisfied	82.0%	80.8%	82.9%	81.7%	70.0%	90.2%	88.6%	77.8%	96.2%
	Somewhat Satisfied									
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	14.8%	11.5%	17.1%	18.3%	30.0%	9.8%	11.4%	22.2%	3.8%
	Not Satisfied at All									
Fairness of Outcome of Complaint Mediation Process	Did Not Answer	3.3%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Completely Fair	88.5%	76.9%	97.1%	91.5%	86.7%	95.1%	93.2%	83.3%	100.0%
	Somewhat Fair									
	Not Very Fair	6.6%	11.5%	2.9%	7.0%	10.0%	4.9%	6.8%	16.7%	0.0%
Increased Understanding of Police Work / Community Member	Not Fair at All									
	Did Not Answer	4.9%	11.5%	0.0%	1.4%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Increased a Great Deal									
	Increased Somewhat	63.9%	69.2%	60.0%	64.8%	63.3%	65.9%	79.5%	77.8%	80.8%
Likelihood of Recommending Complaint Mediation Process	Increased a Little									
	Did Not Increase	32.8%	23.1%	40.0%	32.4%	33.3%	31.7%	18.2%	16.7%	19.2%
	Did Not Answer	3.3%	7.7%	0.0%	2.8%	3.3%	2.4%	2.3%	5.6%	0.0%
	Very Likely	83.6%	76.9%	88.6%	84.5%	86.7%	82.9%	93.2%	83.3%	100.0%
Likelihood of Recommending Complaint Mediation Process	Somewhat Likely									
	Not Very Likely	13.1%	15.4%	11.4%	11.3%	6.7%	14.6%	6.8%	16.7%	0.0%
	Not Likely at All									
	Did Not Answer	3.3%	7.7%	0.0%	4.2%	6.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

(upd. 11/14/2016)

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

February 1, 2017

1.1

TO: All Concerned Personnel

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: ACTING CHIEF OF POLICE

In my absence, First Assistant Chief Michel Moore will serve as Acting Chief of Police on Tuesday, February 7, 2017, 1235 hours, through Friday, February 10, 2017, 2109 hours.

I will be available for notifications through First Assistant Chief Moore's office.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C Beck'.

CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

c: Mayor's Office
Police Commission
Chief of Staff
Office of Operations
Office of Administrative Services
Office of Special Operations
Geographic Bureaus
RACR