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department and law enforcement terminology is utilized throughout the Report. For definitions, refer to page 400.
In 2015, the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) began compiling one of the most comprehensive and detailed publications on use of force (UOF) statistics that has ever been released to the public by a local law enforcement agency in the United States of America (United States). The Use of Force Year-End Review (Report), an annual five-year comparison study, now released in its fourth edition, has come to serve as a vital platform of measurability and analysis of the Department’s UOF occurrences. The Department reaffirms its commitment to transparency by the continuing publication of the Year-End Review.

Technological advancements are changing the way police conduct operations. These advancements include the tracking and monitoring of various forms of information, and identifies concerning statistical trends and isolated outliers. The application of technology within law enforcement agencies, specifically as it relates to data driven measures, enhances accountability, provides greater transparency and allows management to utilize resources more efficiently. As part of our ongoing effort to improve the Department and the service we provide, we will continue to implement systems that will measure results, improve efficiency, and provide overall accountability.

In review of the statistics published herein, the Department seeks to identify areas where potentially ineffective or outdated UOF-related policies and training can be improved, and new innovative practices can be implemented. Our Core Value: Quality Through Continuous Improvement, mandates that we strive to achieve the highest level of quality in all aspects of our work, aim for continuous improvement, and dedicate ourselves to proactively seek new and better ways to serve the community.

The Report serves as a vital instrument in the self-assessment process and is an important medium in the sharing of information with the public. The Department is also committed to learning from the greater law enforcement community through the sharing of knowledge and experiences that have become best practices. Honest self-examination is necessary to shift organizational methods into alignment with current conditions.

The Los Angeles Police Department continues to be a leader and model for innovation in crime reduction and prevention programs, as well as data-driven performance management approach. Through innovative prevention programs and community outreach, our Department will remain a national leader in our mission to become the safest big city in America.

As with past efforts and accomplished solutions, the Department continually strives to maintain its role as a global leader in transparency, innovation, and service. The Use of Force Year-End Review stands as a symbol of those principles.
2018 was a year of transition for the Los Angeles Police Department. With my appointment as the 57th Chief of Police, I pledged the Department would continue policing with purpose and compassion while strengthening the partnerships established by former Chief Charlie Beck. As part of our continued effort to create a police department that is both effective and efficient, we implemented a reorganization plan that realigned key functions under strong leaders, flattened organizational components, and reinforced support for complex and emerging police tasks. While the reduction of crime remains a top priority for the City of Los Angeles, our vision for the Department goes beyond the traditional notions of policing. In 2018, our Department focused on community empowerment, increased responsiveness of our uniformed patrol assets, reduction in the Use of Force, safer roads, and planning for the future of the City of Los Angeles.

COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT
Throughout 2018, we remained committed to reducing senseless violence in our communities by engaging with the community members we serve and providing them with resources designed to reduce the destructive influence drugs, crime, and street gangs have historically held over many of the City’s neighborhoods. The success of our strategic approach to tackling this problem was demonstrated by the observed reductions in the total number of gang homicides, aggravated assaults, shots fired, and victims shot Citywide. Under the leadership of Mayor Eric Garcetti, we strengthened the Department’s coordination with the Gang Reduction and Youth Development Office (GRYD) to expand gang intervention programming in our most vulnerable neighborhoods. GRYD was designed to create safe spaces and provide vital resources for community members through initiatives such as; Summer Night Lights, Fall Friday Nights, and the annual Gun Buy Back program. GRYD was a key component to our expansion of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) program into Harvard Park. In turn, the Harvard Park CSP program harnessed collaborations between community groups, City resources, and police officers dedicated to relationship-based policing to successfully transform what was once a dangerous hub for gang activity into a healthy environment for people to live, work, and play. Each of the Department’s CSP sites have proven the power of placing communities and their specific needs squarely at the center of our policing efforts. CSP collectively stands apart as the model for the next generation of policing.

MORE RESPONSIVENESS
We made a pledge in 2018 to put more officers back on the street and to dedicate resources to the LAPD’s core function — uniformed patrol. Uniformed patrol is vital because it works within and with our diverse communities to answer calls
for service and to respond to critical incidents within our City. In 2018, we reorganized and streamlined the Department, by reallocating approximately 600 personnel from administrative positions and specialized functions to assignments in neighborhood patrol divisions. This reorganization, coupled with the first full-year providing police services to the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, resulted in logging more than 6.4 million regularly scheduled work hours, which marked a four percent increase from 2017. It also effectively increased the number of officers patrolling the City’s streets by more than eight percent, which amounts to an increase of 1 million additional patrol coverage hours. In conjunction with returning resources to neighborhood patrol divisions, the Department also trained and deployed an additional 100 Police Service Representatives, who answer emergency calls from the community. This allows us to answer more emergency calls in a more efficient manner, reducing the wait-times to the more than 3.4-million 911 calls this year.

FEWER USES OF FORCE
One of the greatest challenges our officers face is the responsibility of safely resolving complex and dynamic incidents with various resources, including justified force, while also attempting to de-escalate the incident, which may afford the suspect the opportunity to create further risk to the officer or the public. I feel confident that the men and women of our organization are successfully meeting this challenge under extremely demanding circumstances every day. You will see as you read this report that we had decreases in the number of Officer Involved Shootings (OIS), suspect fatalities, suspect injuries, and applications of less-lethal force, all while contacting approximately 86,000 more people in 2018 as compared to 2017. Despite our officers responding to more than 1-million calls for service in 2018, the Department experienced 11 fewer Officer Involved Shootings, which was a 25 percent reduction from 2017. We are encouraged by the progress we have made as it tends to show that our emphasis on the preservation of life, access to less lethal force options, command and control, and continued de-escalation training is having positive effects. In a continued commitment to use the least amount of force necessary to resolve crisis situations, the Department tested and deployed nearly 300 new 40mm less lethal launchers, which utilize foam rounds designed to impact suspects, but not penetrate the skin. The Department anticipates providing this tool to all patrol resources by the end of 2019.

LOOKING AHEAD TO 2019
As the Department moves into 2019, it will continue its relentless pursuit of building trust, engaging the public, and enhancing the safety and quality of life for all Angelenos. We will accomplish this by reducing crime, increasing responsiveness, and strengthening partnerships through the following initiatives:

• Expanding the Community Safety Partnership Program into the San Fernando Valley, an additional site in Operations-Central Bureau, and are looking to identify the feasibility of two additional sites
• Implement and expand Youth Diversion Programs Citywide
• Conduct additional community surveys to: gauge performance and gain insight into community concerns, evaluate the effects of specific programs, and allow the Department to be more proactive in developing community-based solutions to localized problems
• Continued expansion of community partnerships to emphasize the critical importance of emergency preparedness in our neighborhoods
• Work alongside our community partners to address the needs of persons experiencing homelessness to reduce the victimization of our most vulnerable residents
• Increasing the operational capabilities and service hours of the City’s Unified Homelessness Response Center
• Modernization of technology with an emphasis on improving efficiencies and working conditions to reduce time spent by police officers on administrative tasks
• Exploring new methods to prevent and solve crime through precision and evidence-based policing, while leveraging data to promote transparency and accountability
• Revitalizing, energizing, and expanding our volunteer cadres, reserves and Community Police Advisory Boards
• Utilizing emerging technologies and systems to increase the ease with which the public can report traffic accidents and crime to improve the efficiency with which they are investigated

In 2018, we reorganized and streamlined the Department, [which] resulted in logging more than 6.4 million regularly scheduled work hours... and increased the number of officers patrolling the City’s streets by more than eight percent, which amounts to 1 million additional patrol coverage hours.

Our City and its stakeholders deserve and expect that we continue our mission while holding ourselves to the highest ethical standards to maintain public confidence. Through innovative prevention programs and community outreach, our Department will remain a national leader in our goal to become the safest big city in America. To accomplish this goal, we will maintain a singular focus on improving this organization so it can continue to set an unparalleled standard of excellence in the daily pursuit of the Department’s mission to safeguard the lives and property of the people we serve, to reduce the fear and incidence of crime, and to enhance public safety while working with our diverse communities to improve their quality of life.
Commissioner Decker was appointed to the BOPC in 2018. Commissioner Decker was elected to serve as the Vice President by her fellow Commissioners in October 2018. Commissioner Decker is currently a lecturer in law at University of Southern California Gould School of Law. Commissioner Decker is a Fulbright Specialist with the Department of State, Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs, a program that allows her to travel overseas to lecture and consult on issues of importance to foreign institutions and governments. Commissioner Decker previously served as the United States Attorney for the Central District of California and as an Assistant United States Attorney for nearly 15 years. Commissioner Decker received her law degree from New York University School of Law and her Master’s Degree in Homeland Security Studies from the Naval Postgraduate School. Commissioner Decker was a Wasserstein Fellow at Harvard Law School.

Commissioner Soboroff was appointed to the BOPC in 2013. Commissioner Soboroff served as President from the time of his appointment until 2015, when he assumed the role of Vice President. In September 2017, Commissioner Soboroff was unanimously voted to his second term as President by his fellow Commissioners. Commissioner Soboroff is a prominent business leader and public servant throughout the Los Angeles area. Commissioner Soboroff is a senior fellow at the University of California Los Angeles School of Public Policy, a member of the Board of Councilors at the University of Southern California’s Price School of Public Policy, and is the Chairman of the Center for the Study of Los Angeles at Loyola Marymount University.

Commissioner Goldsmith was appointed to the BOPC in 2016. Commissioner Goldsmith is the President and CEO of the Liberty Hill Foundation, an institution dedicated to providing funding and leadership training for community-based organizations within Los Angeles County. Commissioner Goldsmith received her Master’s Degree in Public Administration from California State University, Long Beach, and is a graduate of Kenyon College.

Commissioner Figueroa-Villa was appointed to the BOPC in 2013. Commissioner Figueroa-Villa has over 40 years of experience working in the social justice and non-profit sectors in Los Angeles. Commissioner Figueroa-Villa has been appointed to various commissions and boards in the Los Angeles area and is a graduate of the California State University at Los Angeles.

Commissioner Bonner was appointed to the BOPC in August of 2018. Commissioner Bonner is the Executive Chairman of Plenary Concessions, a leading investor and developer of public infrastructure with its U.S. operations headquartered in Los Angeles. Commissioner Bonner is a graduate of Georgetown University Law Center and the University of Southern California, where he majored in political science.
DEVELOPMENTS AND INITIATIVES

The Board of Police Commissioners, originally created in the 1920’s, is comprised of five civilians who donate their time to the City while maintaining their professional careers. They are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. The BOPC continually strives to improve the Department’s best practices relative to the UOF.

At the recommendation and direction of the BOPC, the Department initiated the following UOF-related developments and initiatives to provide greater transparency in UOF-related incidents and to aid in the reduction of UOF occurrences.

BODY WORN VIDEO (BWV)

The BOPC continued its oversight role with respect to the continued rollout of BWV among the remaining Areas/Divisions projected for BWV implementation. By the end of 2018, all twenty-one Geographic Areas, all four Traffic Divisions and Metropolitan Division had operational BWV programs.

DIGITAL IN-CAR VIDEO SYSTEM (DICVS)

The BOPC continued its oversight role with respect to the continued rollout of DICVS among the remaining Areas/Divisions projected for DICVS implementation. By the end of 2018, all twenty-one Geographic Areas and the four Traffic Divisions had operational DICVS programs.

TRAINING BULLETIN UPDATES

As new laws and court case decisions are created, law enforcement must update its policies and procedures to reflect these changes. In July 2018, the Department, at the direction of the BOPC, updated its Use of Force Tactics Directives pertaining to the Electronic Control Device - TASER, Oleoresin Capsicum, Bean Bag Shotguns, and Batons. Additionally, the Department approved the 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher in July 2018 and published a related Use of Force-Tactics Directive.

The updates to the Use of Force-Tactics Directives included that whenever practical, officers shall exercise de-escalation techniques to resolve potential use of force incidents and seek voluntary compliance from suspects/subjects. The directives also include the requirement to give a verbal use of force warning, when feasible, prior to utilizing the less-lethal device.

PROCEDURES FOLLOWING AN OIS OR A CATEGORICAL UOF RESULTING IN DEATH OR THE SUBSTANTIAL POSSIBILITY OF DEATH

During critical incidents, officers are faced with the need to make split second decisions, which could have an everlasting effect on all involved parties. The BOPC and COP identified the need to change procedures to give officers time to reflect and process the incident they were involved in. To that end, officers involved in an OIS or a CUOF resulting in death or the substantial possibility of death are required to be removed from field duty for a minimum of 14 days, along with attending a General Training Update (GTU) hosted by Training Division, with participation and input from the employee’s Area and respective Bureau. The GTU shall be completed within two weeks of the incident and prior to returning the employee to field duty, unless otherwise directed by the COP. The GTU shall include the following mandatory topics:

- Use of Force Policy;
- Reverence for Human Life;
- Tactical De-Escalation Techniques;
- Command and Control;
- Equipment Required/Maintained; and,
- Reality-Based Training/Force Options Simulator (only if the employee discharged his/her firearm during an OIS other than an Unintentional Discharge).

Additionally, the employee is required to attend three mandatory sessions with Behavioral Science Services (BSS). The first session shall generally be scheduled within 72 hours of the incident and must be completed prior to returning to full duty. The second session is typically scheduled four to eight weeks after the incident. The last session is scheduled just before or after the Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB) has concluded.

The goal is to provide the involved personnel an opportunity to speak with a mental health professional who is there to support the officer as they process the incident and its aftermath.

ADDRESSING HOMELESSNESS

Homelessness is one of the ongoing challenges facing the City of Los Angeles. The BOPC and COP recognized that more was needed to be done to address this issue. The Department is committed to not only assisting persons experiencing homelessness, but to address the ongoing crime and quality of life issues affecting those neighborhoods impacted by homelessness. As a result of this commitment, the Department restructured its Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) program and added additional officers to the unit. The officers assigned to the HOPE program receive enhanced training that equips them to better address homelessness issues. For example, HOPE officers must attend a 40-hour Mental Health Intervention Training (MHIT) program, which provides them with the skills and knowledge to better understand and assist those in our communities that are experiencing some form of mental illness.

The Homeless Outreach Coordinator’s office began to report on the performance of units, who are interacting with the homeless population, in May of 2017. These reports are submitted quarterly and are summarized on a yearly basis to the BOPC. The Coordinator’s office continues to find innovative methods of addressing homelessness, providing resources to assist those experiencing homelessness, and in identifying personnel who could best help a community that is in need of these resources.

CRITICAL INCIDENT VIDEO RELEASE

The BOPC and COP established Administrative Order No. 6 in April 2018. The stated purpose of the Critical Incident Video Release policy is to increase transparency with respect to operations of the LAPD, which will foster greater public trust. The policy sets the standard and criteria for the public release of video recordings that capture critical incidents involving LAPD officers within 45 days of the incident. The policy is meant to balance the public’s interest in transparency and police accountability, and the privacy interests of the individuals depicted in the videos. The BOPC and COP understood that the release of videos without providing context could lead to the misinterpretation of what was depicted in the videos. The videos have been widely viewed due to not only the quality of the videos, but the narration that provides much needed context to understand what is occurring.
DEPARTMENT CORE VALUES

- COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP
  We believe the Los Angeles Police Department should be a leader in law enforcement. We also believe that each individual needs to be a leader in his or her area of responsibility. Making sure that our values become part of our day-to-day work life is our mandate. We must each work to ensure that our co-workers, our professional colleagues and our communities have the highest respect for the Los Angeles Police Department.

- RESPECT FOR PEOPLE
  Working with the Los Angeles Police Department should be challenging and rewarding. Our people are our most important resource. We can best serve the many and varied needs of our communities by empowering our employees to fulfill their responsibilities with knowledge, authority, and appropriate discretion. We encourage our people to submit ideas, we listen to their suggestions, and we help them develop to their maximum potential. We believe in treating all people with respect and dignity. We show concern and empathy for the victims of crime and treat violators of the law with fairness and dignity. By demonstrating respect for others, we will earn respect for the Los Angeles Police Department.

- QUALITY THROUGH CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
  We will strive to achieve the highest level of quality in all aspects of our work. We can never be satisfied with the “status quo.” We must aim for continuous improvement in serving the people in our communities. We value innovation and support creativity. We realize that constant change is a way of life in a dynamic city like Los Angeles, and we dedicate ourselves to proactively seeking new and better ways to serve.

- SERVICE TO OUR COMMUNITIES
  We are dedicated to enhancing public safety and reducing the fear and the incidence of crime. People in our communities are our most important customers. Our motto “To Protect and to Serve” is not just a slogan - it is our way of life. We will work in partnership with the people in our communities and do our best, within the law, to solve community problems that effect public safety. We value the great diversity of people in both our residential and business communities and serve all with equal dedication.

- REVERENCE FOR THE LAW
  We have been given the honor and privilege of enforcing the law. We must always exercise integrity in the use of the power and authority that have been given to us by the people. Our personal and professional behavior should be a model for all to follow. We will obey and support the letter and spirit of the law.

- INTEGRITY IN ALL WE SAY AND DO
  Integrity is our standard. We are proud of our profession and will conduct ourselves in a manner that merits the respect of all people. Our personal and professional behavior should be a model for all to follow. We will obey and support the letter and spirit of the law.
The Department’s general policing activities are managed through the Office of Operations (OO), which is responsible for a majority of the Department’s sworn personnel. In addition to South Bureau Homicide Division, LAX Field Services Division and the Department Homeless Coordinator, there are four Bureaus within OO, which are further divided into 21 geographic Areas. The Office of Operations is overseen by Assistant Chief Robert Arcos.
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The Office of the Chief of Police, Chief of Staff, is responsible for the coordination and dissemination of information from the Department to command and staff officers. Additionally, the Chief of Staff coordinates projects, investigations, and boards of inquiry on behalf of the Chief of Police. They also serve as the Department’s liaison with the Board of Police Commissioners. The Office of the Chief of Police, Chief of staff is overseen by Deputy Chief Bob Green.
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  - Foothill Area
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  - West Valley Area
  - Topanga Area
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  - 77th Street Area
  - Southwest Area
  - Harbor Area
  - Southeast Area
  - South Bureau Homicide Division
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The Office of Support Services (OSS), is overseen by Assistant Chief Jon Peters and is responsible for various administrative, training and support functions of the Department. Assistant Chief Peters also serves as the Chair of the Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB).
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The Office of Special Operations (OSO), is overseen by Assistant Chief Beatrice Girmala and is responsible for various specialized uniform resources, community engagement and outreach, along with transit and traffic resources within the Department. The Office of Special Operations is allocated the second most sworn personnel between the four Offices.
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Professional Standards Bureau (PSB) oversees all internal administrative and criminal investigations as well as external criminal investigations that are related to CUOF’s.

When a personnel complaint is generated as a result of an Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy finding for a UOF, or for any misconduct discovered during the UOF investigation, PSB assumes investigative responsibility of the complaint. Once the investigative process is complete, the findings are forwarded through the respective chain of command to the COP for final disposition. Additionally, PSB oversees both the administrative and criminal aspects of OIS and other CUOF investigations, and ensures all OIS occurrences are presented to the Los Angeles County District Attorney (LACDA) for evaluation of any criminal allegations pertaining to the involved officer(s). Professional Standards Bureau is overseen by Deputy Chief Debra McCarthy.
Detective Bureau is overseen by Deputy Chief Sean Malinowski, and is responsible for various investigative functions, information technology, and the innovation and strategic planning of the Department.

In 2018, the Department formed the Innovation and Strategic Planning Division to support the Department’s efforts to increase efficiencies and enhance investigative capabilities by incubating new technology-based initiatives, formed by working with private sector firms to bring state of the art technology to the Department.
The Office of Constitutional Policing & Policy

After the Department successfully implemented the Department of Justice’s Federal Consent Decree, the COP established the Office of Constitutional Policing and Policy (OCPP) to further institutionalize the reforms that were prescribed during the time of federal oversight.

The purpose and function of the OCPP is to analyze, develop and implement organizational reform measures that promote constitutional policing policies for the community and the Department. OCPP consists of two groups, four divisions, and two sections that perform essential Department functions meant to advance the Department’s shared vision for the future of the City.

The following groups, divisions, and sections of the OCPP are responsible for ensuring that the Department continues to advance the reforms instituted by a prior federal consent decree through coordinated and collaborative problem solving.

Audit Division
Audit Division was established in April 2001, pursuant to a requirement in a prior federal consent decree. Initially staffed by only a handful of sworn and civilian employees, Audit Division has grown over the years into a professional audit team staffed by over 30 sworn and civilian auditing professionals. The staffing of Audit Division includes Certified Public Accountants, Certified Fraud Examiners, Certified Government Auditing Professionals, and Certified Internal Auditors. Audit Division is responsible for developing the Department’s Annual Audit Plan (AAP), the coordinating and scheduling of audits contemplated by the AAP, ensuring the timely completion of audits and the conducting of audits as directed by the Chief of Police.

In 2004, Audit Division established the nation’s first Police Performance Auditing School, which teaches law enforcement professionals and auditors the fundamentals of auditing police functions.

Government Liaison Section
In August 2018, Audit Division became the first law enforcement auditing entity to successfully pass peer review conducted by the association of local government auditors. A peer review provides assurance that an audit organization is following its established policies and procedures and applicable auditing standards. Government Liaison Section works closely with local, state and federal legislature, and government leaders to ensure that new legislation that
The RMEC Support Unit assists RMEC in their review of an employee’s work performance to assess risk management concerns. In cases that involve UOF, the Department may examine an employee’s conduct to determine if potential ongoing liability issues are present, especially once the BOPC has adjudicated a UOF incident. When deemed necessary and appropriate, RMEC may impose work restrictions and/or other mitigation efforts to rehabilitate the employee, and take necessary corrective actions to address any performance, behavioral, or managerial concerns.

Special Projects Group/Ombuds Section
The Ombuds Section, under the supervision of Special Projects Group, helps foster healthy, productive work environments, and provides an alternative for resolving matters addressed via grievance, personnel complaint, or lawsuit. The assistance they provide covers sworn and civilian employees coping with workplace issues such as personality conflicts, interpersonal conflicts, discrimination, general concerns of “harassment”, and difficult working conditions. The section conducts mediations and conciliations; provides individualized advice on how to manage and cope with workplace conflicts; and, provides training ranging from informal roll call briefings to structured multi-hour training sessions.

Risk Management Legal Affairs Group
Risk Management Legal Affairs Group is responsible for developing and implementing programs to reduce harms and mitigate the risks to the community and to Department personnel, primarily in the areas of UOF, work injuries, employee-involved traffic collisions, and workplace conflict. The Risk Management Legal Affairs Group is comprised of Legal Affairs Division, Risk Management Division, and Policy and Procedures Division. The commanding officer is the Department Risk Manager, who also serves as the Chair of the Risk Management Executive Committee (RMEC).

Legal Affairs Division
Legal Affairs Division coordinates with the City Attorney regarding legal matters affecting the Department, including UOF incidents. It provides investigative services to the City Attorney during litigation and is responsible for Discovery and Public Records requests.

Risk Management Division
Risk Management Division includes the Problem Solving Unit (PSU), Analysis and Evaluation Section, and Risk Management Executive Committee (RMEC) Support Unit.

To help advance the Department-wide efforts to mitigate financial risks resulting from UOF incidents, work injuries, employee-involved traffic collisions, and workplace conflict, is dedicated to researching innovative solutions that foster programs to keep the Department’s workforce and community safe. This is a deliberate effort to improve how the organization serves the community and affirms its commitment to the Reverence for Human Life.
THE DEPARTMENT’S ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITH HOMELESSNESS

In 2018, the City of Los Angeles’ population grew to 3.9 million. Amongst the City’s population, there were approximately 31,285 persons experiencing homelessness and of these, 23,114 were unsheltered. Homelessness has been described by Mayor Eric Garcetti as the “moral and humanitarian crisis of our time.” Every City Department and community partner understands that homelessness requires working more closely together than ever before to assist our community members that are experiencing homelessness, especially those that are unsheltered. The Department along with other City Departments and community partners took significant steps in 2018 to efficiently coordinate and operationalize the City’s Homeless Strategy. While keeping the City safe, clean, and accessible to all, the Department, in partnership with City partners, remains steadfast in its commitment to improving the outcomes of persons experiencing homelessness. Ultimately, it is the Department’s objective to lead with services when contacting a person experiencing homelessness.

Persons experiencing homelessness are amongst the most vulnerable persons in society. In 2018, 2,965 persons experiencing homelessness were reported to be victims of a violent or property crime. In the same year, 4,849 persons experiencing homelessness were either arrestees or reported as suspects of a violent or property crime. To protect some of the most vulnerable persons in society, the Department has committed resources, trained personnel, and is dedicated to the roles and responsibilities articulated in the City’s Homeless Strategy.

CENTCOM

Along with our City partners, the Department confers at a weekly policy group meeting to discuss the City’s Homeless Strategy. These policy group meetings involve everyone’s coordinated response and commitment to work towards all the objectives outlined in the City’s Homeless Strategy. They serve as a platform to share information, highlight best practices and opportunities, and to address imminent concerns such as extreme weather. Most recently, CENTCOM served to coordinate the City’s first A Bridge Home (ABH), mobile pit stops and showers, storage bins for the homeless, and a mutual data sharing platform. These policy group meetings also oversee the utilization of the City’s Unified Homelessness Response Center (UHRC).

THE UNIFIED HOMELESSNESS RESPONSE CENTER (UHRC) - POLICY GROUP

The UHRC is the operational hub of coordination for the City’s efforts to provide a timely, effective, and coordinated street-level response to unsheltered homelessness across the City. A key role of the UHRC is to institute the ABH model including outreach, engagement, safety, and cleanup protocols. The Department supports law enforcement’s role and responsibilities at the UHRC with dedicated personnel and operational street level support. The Department retains a dedicated staff at the UHRC, which includes one lieutenant and three officers. During 2018, the Department extended its support of the UHRC to provide five-day coverage. This included overseeing the safety of ABH zones with the dedicated deployment of personnel. Currently, the Department has one dedicated basic patrol unit in the El Pueblo area, and a secondary dedicated basic patrol unit will commence to serve Hollywood’s Schrader Area by April of 2019. These dedicated basic patrol units are comprised of two officer units, working two 12-hour shifts to provide 24-hour patrol coverage, seven days a week. The units’ primary mission is to remain in the designated areas, with the expectation that officers conduct high visibility patrol as either foot beats or bicycle units. Officers are expected to not only assist in crime control and crime reduction of the area, but to contact community members, including persons experiencing homelessness in order to build trust and partnerships while ensuring the safety of all.

HOMELESS OUTREACH AND PROACTIVE ENGAGEMENT (HOPE)

The Homeless Outreach and Proactive Engagement (HOPE) teams are created in order to collaborate with internal and external organizations to address the needs of the homeless by providing resources, while also addressing the needs of communities and neighborhoods impacted by the increase in homelessness. The HOPE teams are a direct response to the City and County’s joint plan to end homelessness. The Department has four Bureau HOPE teams assigned to each geographic bureau and their corresponding divisions. There are a total of 42 HOPE officers and four sergeants. All personnel assigned to HOPE teams receive Mental Health Intervention Training (MHIT) during their tenure in the unit. An important aspect of HOPE teams is that they also include personnel from Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation (LASAN), and the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) to help connect persons experiencing homelessness to services. The Homeless Outreach Coordinator reports on the performance of units who are interacting with the homeless population. These reports are submitted quarterly and are summarized on a yearly basis to the BOPC. The Coordinator continues to find innovative methods of addressing homelessness, providing resources to assist those experiencing homelessness, and in identifying personnel who could best help a community that is in need of these resources.

RESOURCES ENHANCEMENT SERVICES ENFORCEMENT TEAM (RESET)

Due to the large population of persons experiencing homelessness within Central area, the Resources Enhancement Services Enforcement Team (RESET) was created. Its primary mission is to respond to service calls within a 54-square block (3.4 sq miles) area known as Skid Row, provide uniform foot beats, conduct homeless outreach, code enforcement, and force protection for LASAN’s Operation Healthy Street Clean Up. RESET is a key component to reducing the incidences and fear of crime in the Skid Row area.

TRANSIT SERVICES DIVISION (TSD) HOPE TEAM

In 2017, the Los Angeles Police Department began providing security services on Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) buses and trains within the City limits. One of the biggest challenges in providing services was addressing the homeless population sheltering within the bus and rail systems. In order to focus on this population, a dedicated HOPE Team was assigned to Transit Services Division. TSD HOPE contacts those who are experiencing homelessness and use the MTA systems as a means of shelter and works to connect them to services. The goal is to provide the ridership of the MTA system with a safe, clean, and accessible environment while also providing those experiencing homelessness with resources to help them.
Mental Evaluation Unit

The Mental Evaluation Unit (MEU) is a component of the Department that works with people who are experiencing mental illness or a mental health crisis. The mission of MEU is to reduce the potential for violence during police contacts involving people experiencing mental illness while simultaneously assessing the mental health services available to assist them. MEU works in collaboration with police contacts involving mental illness crisis calls-for-service in support of field operations.

In police contacts with persons suspected to be experiencing mental illness or a mental health crisis, the goal of the Department is to provide a humane, cooperative, compassionate, and effective law enforcement response. The Department seeks to reduce the potential for violence during police contacts involving those experiencing a mental health crisis while simultaneously assessing the mental health services available to assist the individual. This requires a commitment to problem solving, partnerships, and supporting a coordinated effort from law enforcement, mental health services, and the greater community of Los Angeles.

To achieve these goals, MEU evaluates if individuals suspected of experiencing a mental health crisis are a danger to themselves, to others, or are gravely disabled due to mental illness, as per Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) §5150. If so, MEU can assist with:

- Providing intervention, referral, or placement, allowing patrol personnel to return to other field duties.
- Providing resources and references to field personnel.
- Preventing unnecessary incarceration and/or hospitalization of persons.
- Preventing the duplication of mental health service requests.
- Providing alternate care in the least restrictive environment through a coordinated and comprehensive system wide approach; and,

To accomplish this, MEU utilizes the System wide Mental Assessment Response Team (SMART). A SMART team is comprised of a specially trained police officer and a clinician from the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health (LADMH). This team’s goal is to work with individuals experiencing a mental health crisis and to divert them to a mental health facility instead of booking them into jail.

In an effort to provide a measurable outcome, the Case Assessment Management Program (CAMP) was added to the MEU and the Mental Illness Project as a mental illness investigative follow-up team. Staffed by sworn investigators and Department of Mental Health (DMH) clinicians, CAMP’s primary function is to identify those persons experiencing a mental illness who make frequent use of police and fire emergency services and/or who are at risk for violent encounters with police officers, e.g. Targeted School Violence, Suicide Jumpers, and Suicide by Cop (SBC). The CAMP mission is to find and use innovative ways to help people in crisis by decreasing the possibility of a violent episode with emergency first responders.

To accomplish this, CAMP developed the following factors to consider for entry into the program:

- The subject has been the focus of a barricaded suspect scenario or critical incident and suffers from mental illness.
- The subject has been placed on a minimum of six mental health holds within one year and been the focus of repeated contacts with emergency services. The catalyst of these contacts shall be the subject's mental health history. Each case shall be evaluated independently, and six contacts shall only be used as a threshold for accepting cases.
- The subject has engaged in behaviors indicative of Targeted School Violence.
- Contacts with emergency services and members of the community where the subject’s behavior is becoming increasingly violent due to their mental illness, including being involved in a UOF.
- The subject has attempted suicide at the hands of law enforcement (Police Assisted Suicide or Suicide by Cop).
- Firearms and/or other deadly weapons are in the possession of and/or seized from the person with mental illness; or,
- The subject is a Military Veteran.

As a resource to Department personnel, MEU has a 24-hour/7-day-a-week Triage Desk whose primary function is to triage all Department contacts with persons who are experiencing a mental health crisis. The MEU Triage Desk provides advice and guidance to responding personnel in the field and memorizes all Department contacts with persons experiencing a mental health crisis by completing a Mental Evaluation Incident Report. These reports and database are separate from the Crime Analysis Databases and are protected from outside access, which protects the privacy of the individuals who are contacted.

Mental Health personnel sit alongside police officers during the triage process and query the DMH database for an individual’s prior assisted treatment, contact history, treatment history, or any past possession of and/or seized from the person with mental illnesses or those experiencing mental health crisis.

Contacted individuals are assessed and referred to field operations; and, the Department has made a commitment for all patrol officers to be more effective in serving individuals affected by mental illness or suffering from a mental health crisis. In doing so, the hope is that crime in the City and Uses of Force can eventually be reduced.

By increasing mental health training and working with our partners, including those with the DMH, the Department has enhanced the ability of field personnel to recognize symptoms of mental illness and more accurately triage the growing number of calls for service involving individuals suffering from a mental health crisis by connecting those individuals and their families with support services for long-term solutions.

Mental Health

In furtherance of the BOP’s efforts to address mental health, specifically as it relates to UOIF incidents, the Department continued its efforts to provide available resources to individuals with mental illness, or those experiencing a mental health crisis, in 2018. The following are examples of ongoing efforts:

1. The Department continues to provide new officers, and those working in assignments interacting primarily with persons experiencing homelessness, with a 40-hour Mental Health Intervention Training course.
2. Department personnel work alongside professionals from the Department of Mental Health (DMH) and the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI) for improved results; and,
3. The Mental Evaluation Unit (MEU), which has been instrumental in improving its responsiveness to societal changes considered a best practice for ten percent of patrol officers to have specialized training such as MHIT. Currently, the Department has more than doubled that number, and by providing this as a mandatory curriculum during the probationary year for new sworn personnel, the Department has made a commitment for all patrol officers to eventually be more effective in serving individuals affected by mental illness or suffering from a mental health crisis.

Additionally, the Department has organized that when a person is taken into custody for a criminal offense and the person is suspected of experiencing mental illness or a mental health crisis, he/she shall be contacted prior to the person being booked into the custodial facility. Officers shall also contact MEU if the person indicates that he/she has ever sought or obtained mental health treatment.

In 2014, the Department reviewed its current mental health training and a re-design was initiated. At the end of 2014, the Department presented its newly developed Mental Health Intervention Training (MHIT), which is a 40-hour course that is delivered 25 times a year to first responders (field personnel) who have the greatest likelihood of interaction with persons who are experiencing mental illness or a mental health crisis.
LEGAL STANDARDS
Federal and State law defines general UOF policy standards and practices for all law enforcement agencies. The City’s civilian police oversight body, the BOPC, however, further refines the Department’s UOF policy by establishing administrative standards. As a result, the Department’s prescribed policies and procedures are more restrictive when compared to the broader legal guidelines. Therefore, OIS incidents and other applications of force utilized by Department personnel can be adjudicated as Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy by the BOPC, irrespective of the lawfulness of an officer’s decisions or actions.

FEDERAL LEGAL STANDARDS
The United States Constitution and extensive case law dictates how all law enforcement organizations across the nation establish and maintain their UOF policies. The federal legal standard used to determine the lawfulness of a UOF is the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. In Graham v. Connor, the United States Supreme Court determined that an objective reasonableness standard should apply to a civilian’s claim that law enforcement officials used excessive force in the course of making an arrest, investigatory stop, or other “seizure” of his/her person. Graham states in part:

In essence, the Supreme Court’s ruling established that the force used must be reasonable under the circumstances known to the officer at the time. Therefore, the Department examines all UOF incidents from an objective, rather than a subjective, standard.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA LEGAL STANDARDS
In accordance with California Penal Code Section 835(a), law enforcement personnel may only use the amount of force that is “objectively reasonable” to:

• Effect an arrest or detention;
• Prevent escape; or,
• Overcome resistance.

A peace officer who makes or attempts to make an arrest need not retreat or desist from his efforts by reason of the resistance or threatened resistance of the person being arrested; nor shall such officer be deemed an aggressor or lose his right to self-defense by the use of reasonable force to effect the arrest or to prevent escape or to overcome resistance.

THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT USE OF FORCE POLICY
Preamble to the Use of Force Policy
The UOF by members of law enforcement is a matter of critical concern both to the public and the law enforcement community. It is recognized that some individuals will not comply with the law or submit to control unless compelled to do so by the UOF. Therefore, Department personnel are sometimes called upon to use force in the performance of their duties. It is also recognized that members of law enforcement derive their authority from the public and must be ever mindful that they are not only the guardians, but also the servants of the public.

The Department’s guiding value when using force shall be Reverence for Human Life. Officers shall attempt to control an incident by using time, distance, communications, and available resources in an effort to de-escalate the situation, whenever it is safe and reasonable to do so. When warranted, Department personnel may use objectively reasonable force to carry out their duties.
The Department’s guiding value when using force shall be Reverence for Human Life. Officers shall attempt to control an incident by using time, distance, communications, and available resources in an effort to de-escalate the situation, whenever it is safe and reasonable to do so. When warranted, Department personnel may use objectively reasonable force to carry out their duties. Officers who use unreasonable force degrade the confidence of the community they serve, expose the Department and fellow officers to legal and physical hazards, and violate the rights of individuals upon whom unreasonable force is used. Conversely, officers who fail to use force when warranted may endanger themselves, the community, and fellow officers.

THE USE OF FORCE POLICY
It is the policy of the Department that personnel may only use the amount of force that is “objectively reasonable” to:

- Defend themselves;
- Defend others;
- Effect an arrest or detention;
- Prevent escape; or,
- Overcome resistance.

The Department’s UOF policies are more restrictive than State and Federal law. For example, State and Federal law allows officers to shoot at moving vehicles where the suspect is using the vehicle itself as a weapon, while Department policy generally prohibits officers from using deadly force in such circumstances. The Department examines reasonableness using Graham v. Connor, the State of California legal standards set forth in California Penal Code Section 835(a), and from the articulable facts from the perspective of a Los Angeles police officer with similar training and experience placed in generally the same set of circumstances as those of the evaluated incident. In determining the appropriate level of force, officers shall evaluate each situation in light of the facts and circumstances of each particular case. Those factors may include, but are not limited to:

- The seriousness of the crime or suspected offense;
- The level of threat or resistance presented by the subject;
- Whether the subject was posing an immediate threat to officers or a danger to the community;
- The potential for injury to citizens, officers or subjects;
- The risk or apparent attempt by the subject to escape;
- The conduct of the subject being confronted (as reasonably perceived by the officer at the time);
- The time available to an officer to make a decision;
- The availability of other resources;
- The training and experience of the officer;
- The proximity or access of weapons to the subject;
- Officer versus subject factors such as age, size, relative strength, skill level, injury/exhaustion and number of officers versus subjects; and,
- The environmental factors and/or other exigent circumstances.

Utilizing the objectively reasonable standard in Graham, a suspect’s actions and behavior, among other factors, determine whether the officer’s reactions are in policy.

SERIOUS BODILY INJURY:
As defined in California Penal Code Section 243(f)(4), serious bodily injury includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Loss of consciousness;
- Concussion;
- Bone fracture;
- Protracted loss or impairment of function of any bodily member or organ;
- A wound requiring extensive suturing; and,
- Serious disfigurement.

DRAWING AND/OR EXHIBITING FIREARMS
Police officers frequently face dangerous and volatile conditions that carry inherent danger and the potential to result in deadly force situations. During an incident, officers must continually re-assess the various conditions and circumstances of the incident itself, including the suspect’s actions, in determining whether the use of deadly force could be warranted. Although officers must be prepared to protect themselves and the public from life threatening acts by others, it is equally important that officers refrain from drawing their weapon when such conditions do not exist. Therefore, the Department created a specific policy governing when personnel may draw and/or exhibit duty firearms. Officers shall not draw or exhibit a firearm unless the circumstances surrounding the incident create a reasonable belief that the situation could escalate to the point where deadly force would be justified.

DEADLY FORCE
During the rare and unfortunate circumstances when deadly force is justified to stop a threat to the public or police officers, the Department authorizes such force to be utilized by personnel in any of the following situations:

1. Protect themselves or others from what is reasonably believed to be an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury; or,
2. Prevent a crime where the suspect’s actions place person(s) in imminent jeopardy of death or serious bodily injury; or,
3. Prevent the escape of a violent fleeing felon when there is probable cause to believe the escape will pose a significant threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or others if apprehension is delayed.

In these circumstances, officers shall, to the extent practical, avoid using deadly force that might subject innocent bystanders or hostages to possible death or injury.

WARNING SHOTS
Warning shots shall only be used in exceptional circumstances where it might reasonably be expected to avoid the need to
In response to the decision rendered by the Supreme Court of California in the case of Hayes v. County of San Diego, the Department revised its UOF policy in 2014 to include consideration of officers’ tactical conduct and decisions leading up to the use of deadly force when evaluating the objective reasonableness of an incident.

Not Reportable as NCUOF

The following incidents are not reportable as a NCUOF incident:

- The use of a C-grip, firm grip, or joint lock to compel a person to comply with an employee’s direction which does not result in an injury or complaint of injury;
- The UOF reasonable to overcome passive resistance due to physical disability, mental illness, intoxication, or muscle rigidity of a person (e.g., use of a C-grip or firm grip, joint lock, joint lock walk down, or body weight) which does not result in an injury or complaint of injury;
- Under any circumstances, the discharge of a less-lethal projectile weapon (e.g., beanbag shotgun, TASER, 37mm or 40mm projectile launcher, any chemical control dispenser or Compressed Air Projectile System) that does not contact a person;
- Force used by an organized squad in a crowd control situation, or a riotous situation when the crowd exhibits hostile behavior and does not respond to verbal directions from Department employees; and,

Note: Isolated incidents resulting from a crowd control situation may require a UOF investigation as determined by a supervisor at the scene.

- Any incident investigated by FID and determined not to rise to the level of a CUOF.
It is the goal of the Department to be a leader in law enforcement training and development. There are five key training topics that continue to serve as a platform for how the Department designs and implements training:

1. Teaching UOF de-escalation techniques;
2. Building public trust and Reverence for Human Life;
3. Serving the people and systems impacted by mental illness;
4. Mastering laws of arrest (such as consensual encounters, reasonable suspicion, and probable cause);

Teaching UOF De-Escalation Techniques
Guided by the Reverence for Human Life, the Department has consistently upheld the expectation that officers may only use force that is objectively reasonable to effect arrests, prevent the escape of suspects, or overcome their resistance, provided de-escalation attempts were ineffective or unwarranted. For conformity among rank and file and congruity with training efforts, the Department recognized that elements of de-escalation had to be embodied in a comprehensive framework. In April 2017, the Department formally incorporated the concept of de-escalation in the preamble to the UOF policy. Since then, training curriculum and other Department reference material have been amended to include de-escalation principles. To date, de-escalation principles have been integrated into the lesson plans of 57 courses taught to in-service personnel.

As part of the Department’s continuing commitment to training, a new UOF course titled Integrating Communication, De-Escalation, and Crowd Control (ICDC) was introduced in the fall of 2017. The ICDC course contained a review of de-escalation techniques and communication strategies. It also employed scenario-based training for the management of crowds.

In-Service Training
As of November 30, 2018, a total of 6,585 sworn personnel have attended the 10-hour ICDC Course.

Building Public Trust and Officer Safety & Wellness
Between June 2017 and June 2018, the Los Angeles Police Department partnered with the University of Southern California (USC) Price School of Public Policy, and the USC Suzanne Dworak-Peck School of Social Work, to train officers on how to address and manage problems facing 21st century society. The new Law Enforcement Advanced Development (LEAD) Certificate program was created and graduated its first class of 28 officers in June of 2018. Candidates representing the rank of Lieutenants and below were selected from every division and represented diverse years of service, assignment, professional, and educational experience.

The program consisted of monthly online sessions and several on-site classroom sessions at USC, which explored topics such as civil rights, human trafficking, extremism, and conflict resolution. The year-long course of study focused on a solutions-oriented curriculum and culminated with candidates completing capstone presentation projects. Each project was designed to address and resolve important crime and/or quality of life issues facing the Los Angeles community. The capstone presentations were made before USC instructors, Department Command Staff, business and community leaders, and representatives from the Board of Police Commissioners. Each presentation was then evaluated for potential implementation by the Department.

A Healthy and Functional Organization
A vital component in cultivating healthy work environments and strong relationships with the community we serve is a well-trained and educated body of supervision. To accomplish this, the Department has developed a comprehensive framework of de-escalation in the preamble to the UOF policy. Since then, training curriculum and other Department reference material have been amended to include de-escalation principles. To date, de-escalation principles have been integrated into the lesson plans of 57 courses taught to in-service personnel.

As part of the Department’s continuing commitment to training, a new UOF course titled Integrating Communication, De-Escalation, and Crowd Control (ICDC) was introduced in the fall of 2017. The ICDC course contained a review of de-escalation techniques and communication strategies. It also employed scenario-based training for the management of crowds.

In-Service Training
As of November 30, 2018, a total of 6,585 sworn personnel have attended the 10-hour ICDC Course.

Building Public Trust and Officer Safety & Wellness
Between June 2017 and June 2018, the Los Angeles Police Department partnered with the University of Southern California (USC) Price School of Public Policy, and the USC Suzanne Dworak-Peck School of Social Work, to train officers on how
Academy Testing

Almost two years ago, POST implemented a new integrated testing system that emphasizes the importance of critical thinking and problem solving over memorization. This style of integrated testing is consistent with the changes the Department made to the Academy in 2008, emphasizing Problem Based Learning (PBL), critical thinking, and confidence building. Under this system of testing, recruit officers must pass two mid-term examinations and one final examination. The examinations cover material from 43 Learning Domains (LDs) introduced throughout the six months of the Academy program. Questions contained in the written examinations are also integrated into the 14 scenario-based tests, which become increasingly complex as the Academy program progresses. The events depicted in each scenario require recruit officers to utilize the techniques, strategies, and course material from previous instruction to successfully resolve each situation. In addition to the written and scenario-based examinations, recruit officers must pass two mid-term examinations and one final examination.

Academy Hours

The Department’s basic police Academy is currently 912 hours in duration, exceeding the POST requirement of 664 hours of mandated training. Class sizes generally range from 30 to 50 recruits. A new recruit class typically starts every four weeks, and each class is in training for six months. There can be as many as six academy classes operating at any one time. The Department’s goal is to exceed all POST minimum training requirements.

Academy Testing

Almost two years ago, POST implemented a new integrated testing system that emphasizes the importance of critical thinking and problem solving over memorization. This style of integrated testing is consistent with the changes the Department made to the Academy in 2008, emphasizing Problem Based Learning (PBL), critical thinking, and confidence building. Under this system of testing, recruit officers must pass two mid-term examinations and one final examination. The examinations cover material from 43 Learning Domains (LDs) introduced throughout the six months of the Academy program. Questions contained in the written examinations are also integrated into the 14 scenario-based tests, which become increasingly complex as the Academy program progresses. The events depicted in each scenario require recruit officers to utilize the techniques, strategies, and course material from previous instruction to successfully resolve each situation. In addition to the written and scenario-based examinations, recruit officers must pass two mid-term examinations and one final examination.

Academy Hours

The Department’s basic police Academy is currently 912 hours in duration, exceeding the POST requirement of 664 hours of mandated training. Class sizes generally range from 30 to 50 recruits. A new recruit class typically starts every four weeks, and each class is in training for six months. There can be as many as six academy classes operating at any one time. The Department’s goal is to exceed all POST minimum training requirements.

2018 TRAINING OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING</th>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>SERVING</th>
<th>MASTERING</th>
<th>INCORPORATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching UOF de-escalation techniques.</td>
<td>Building Public Trust and Reverence for Human Life.</td>
<td>Serving the people and systems impacted by mental illness.</td>
<td>Mastering laws of arrest (such as consensual encounters, reasonable suspicion, and probable cause)</td>
<td>Incorporating Procedural Justice best practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The class also attends the 40-hour Mental Health Intervention training which addresses topics such as crisis communications, suicide by cop, substance abuse, autism, and psychopharmacology. In 2018, the Department developed PSL II to ensure new officers comprehended the Academy training material. PSL II underwent a two pilot test-phase to determine feasibility and received positive reviews from attending officers. The course is scheduled to be hosted throughout the 2019 year. The target audience for PSL II are officers who have between two and three years of service. PSL II focuses on instructing officers through reality-based training. Scenarios are created from real-life incidents experienced by officers. Attending personnel apply the concepts and topics instructed in the previous course in order to learn how to utilize de-escalation and procedural justice. During scenarios, they also apply the concepts learned from MHIT to address individuals who may be experiencing mental illness. Lastly, officers complete a comprehensive First Aid/CPR course hosted by the Los Angeles Fire Department. As the program progresses, additional coursework will be developed to help officers continue their development as law enforcement professionals. In 2018, a total of 45 officers completed the pilot test-phase.

Field Training Officers (FTO) Program
In October 2015, State Senate Bill 29 was enacted, requiring FTOs to complete a minimum of eight hours of Crisis Intervention Behavioral Health Training. The Mental Evaluation Unit created a 40-hour MHIT course and an eight-hour Crisis Intervention Mental Health Intervention Training Update course. Since its inception, 99 percent (468 of 470) of the Department’s FTOs have completed one of the two MEU Crisis Intervention Courses.

In June 2016, the Department expanded its FTO Update course from 24 to 32 hours. The course now includes MHIT components, de-escalation, and command and control concepts. Also included are public trust concepts such as constitutional policing, fair and impartial policing, and lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transgender, and/or questioning cultural competency.

Procedural Justice
In an effort to support awareness of national topics in law enforcement, Procedural Justice has been integrated into Department training spanning from academy recruits throughout all ranks, including Command Staff officers. This Department-wide initiative was designed to have an impact and hopeful reduction on the number of biased policing complaints. In collaboration with the Board of Police Commissioners, several training strategies are being implemented, including a training course for Command Staff on public engagement. In the fall of 2018, The Davenport Institute, Pepperdine School of Public Safety, presented the topic of “Public Engagement: A Vital Leadership Skill in Difficult Times” as training to Department Command Staff. The emphasis of the discussion during the training was the need for effective public engagement, engagement models, successful strategies, and the role of community policing.

POST Perishable Skills
The California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training requires a minimum of 24-hours of Professional Continuing Education courses, facilitated at the geographical Areas.

The training cycle for these subjects continues through 2018 based on Department and Bureau totals (information below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest &amp; Control</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Museum of Tolerance (MOT)
The Department continues to harness the power of experiential environment by offering MOT to assist officers in understanding complex societal issues. All recruit officers spend a full day at the MOT during their academy training. The MOT developed an interactive 10-hour course for in-service officers on Building Public Trust, which incorporates training on diversity as well as State mandated training on racial profiling. While the MOT allocates the number of classes based on availability, during 2015-2017, Department personnel attended 96 classes. In 2018, Department personnel attended 20 classes.

Field Operations Tactics and Concepts
In order to address current trends in law enforcement, the Field Operations Tactics and Concepts (FOTAC) Unit was created in 2018. Guided by our core value of Quality Through Continuous Improvement, FOTAC created the Advanced Strategies for Command and Control (ASC) Course which will begin in 2019. The unit is also responsible for instructing the Law Enforcement Tactical Application Course (LETAC), a 32-hour class that incorporates a high concentration of scenario-based training. Various scenarios reflecting current trends reinforce the concept of Procedural Justice and enhance officers’ basic tactical knowledge and skills. The course includes in-depth discussion on the Department’s UOF policy, its guiding principle of the Relevance for Human Life, various force options, command and control concepts, UOF Tactics Directives, tactical planning, tactical communication, and firearm safety. In 2018, two LETAC classes were held and one occurred in January 2019. All classes currently scheduled involve the extensive retraining of Department personnel identified during UOF incidents or personnel integrating back into field deployment. By the end of 2018, a total of 1,293 officers completed the course: 295 in 2014, 363 in 2015, 223 in 2016, 348 in 2017, and 64 in 2018.

In addition to providing training during ASCC and LETAC classes, FOTAC instructors provide tactical training for Area Training Coordinators, Reserves, specialized units, and at the request of their commanding officers, tactical enhancement training for field personnel. Personnel from FOTAC also provide instruction to members of the Mayor’s Office, City/ District Attorney’s Office, and the Office of Inspector General. Lastly, FOTAC instructors work with the community by providing demonstrations at community events throughout the City.

De-escalation Tactics
In October 2016, the Department approved UOF – Tactics Directive No. 16, Tactical De-escalation Techniques. This document reiterates the Department’s guiding principle of Relevance for Human Life, defines de-escalation, and introduces the acronym PATROL for a clearer articulation of the techniques included in the de-escalation framework. In November 2016, command staff received a full day of training on de-escalation. Sworn personnel began receiving training on this topic in early 2017. In September of 2017, the Field Operations Training Unit (FOTU) was tasked with training officers in ICCD, which is still on-going. This course includes a comprehensive block of instruction on de-escalation techniques and active shooting training skills. Additionally, a course in the tactical de-escalation framework and PATROL acronyms are woven into the ICCD course, which also includes crowd control, baton, 40mm less-lethal launcher, and a reality-based training program. As of November 30, 2018, 6,585 sworn personnel have attended the ICCD course and the course will conclude in February of 2019. The new Advanced Strategies of Command and Control (ASC) course will become the new...
focus upon the conclusion of ICDC.

The ASCC course imparts officers with a formal definition of Command and Control. It also provides officers with the tools needed to control tactical situations and reinforces Use of Force policy. De-escalation, the Incident Command System, and supervisory responsibilities are also incorporated into the training. The course is ten hours and combines classroom instruction followed by practical application.

Other Training
The Department relies on additional training platforms to uphold proficiency standards for sworn personnel. Force Options Simulators present situations in a virtual reality/scenario-based environment, which requires officers to rely on their skills, knowledge, and experience in addressing challenging situations that may or may not require the UOF.

Force Options Simulators
In-Service Training Division and Police Training and Education are currently working together to research new technology specific to virtual reality simulators. The goal is to harness technological advancements that will improve training in the areas of tactics, de-escalation, decision making, and articulation of Use of Force policy.

The Department has continued to use the FOS system for Department-wide qualification during which instructors conducted debriefs after each scenario. All officers are required to utilize sound tactics and techniques in an attempt to de-escalate each incident when feasible. The goal is to use techniques involved in tactical de-escalation to reduce the intensity of an encounter with a suspect and enable an officer to have additional options.

General Training Updates
Following a CUOF incident, General Training Updates (GTUs) address training needs in a collaborative setting between officers and instructors.

General Training Updates are mandatory training sessions for all substantially involved personnel following a CUOF incident. Personnel are not allowed to return to field duties until the GTUs have been successfully completed. There are six mandatory topics, in addition to any other topics identified by either the COP, the concerned Area Commanding Officer (CO), CIRD, and/or PTB:

- Command and Control;
- Equipment Required/Maintained;
- Tactical Communication;
- Tactical De-Escalation;
- Tactical Planning;
- Use of Force Policy; and,
- Force Option Simulator (for OIS incidents).

Training Division was tasked with the responsibility of conducting GTUs for all CUOF incidents. General Training Update sessions are administered by instructors from TD, with the assistance of training unit personnel from the concerned Area and Bureau. In addition to facilitating the actual training, TD is responsible for documentation and tracking of employees who did not attend the training due to valid temporary exemptions (e.g. on-leave due to injury, scheduled vacation, etc.).

Tactical Debriefs
All substantially involved officers in a CUOF incident are required to participate in a Tactical Debrief upon adjudication of the concerned case. The Tactical Debrief affords all involved personnel an opportunity to participate in collaborative training to enhance their performance, identify lessons learned, and recognize the outcomes of a CUOF incident. The Tactical Debrief serves as the final training after the adjudication of a CUOF incident. It is administered by a TD supervisor familiar with the incident and who served as a resource in the IJOFRB process.

Firearms Qualification Requirements
The Department requires its sworn personnel to qualify with their primary duty weapons on a regular basis to ensure shooting proficiencies and the development of sound judgment with the use of lethal force. A qualification schedule has been created, which includes a combination of handgun, shotgun, and FOS qualification.

Employees are required to qualify once within a two-month cycle (not including the one-month shotgun cycle). There are six qualification cycles in a calendar year. Sworn employees (lieutenants and below), reserve officers, and security officers with less than 20 years of service qualify as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Required Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Shotgun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feb/Mar</td>
<td>Handgun – Duty Ammunition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Apr/May</td>
<td>Handgun – Practice Ammunition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jun/Jul</td>
<td>Force Option Simulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sept/Oct</td>
<td>Handgun – Practice Ammunition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nov/Dec</td>
<td>Handgun – Practice Ammunition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sworn employees (lieutenants and below), reserve officers, and security officers with 20 to 29 years of service qualify as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Required Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Shotgun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feb/Mar</td>
<td>Handgun – Duty Ammunition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sept/Oct</td>
<td>Handgun – Practice Ammunition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Captains and above with less than 30 years of service qualify as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Required Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feb/Mar</td>
<td>Handgun – Duty Ammunition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sept/Oct</td>
<td>Handgun – Practice Ammunition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To qualify on the handgun combat course, sworn employees, reserve officers, and security officers shall meet the minimum qualification requirements. Personnel who fail to achieve a qualifying score shall repeat the course until the minimum score for each target is attained in one relay. The maximum score is 300 points. When sufficient daylight exists, the minimum passing score is 210 points, with a minimum of 105 points on each target. During the hours of darkness, the minimum passing score is 190 points, with a minimum of 90 points on each target.

The handgun qualification course is not scored; however, personnel must demonstrate proficiency with the shotgun to satisfy the qualification requirement.

Multiple Attempts to Qualify
Officers who fail to receive a minimum passing score after a third attempt in a qualification cycle are required to attend firearms remediation. The Department does not currently track first or second attempt failures since weapon malfunctions and/or defective ammunition contribute to unsuccessful qualification attempts. A failure to qualify (FTQ) in three or more attempts results in the employee appearing on a report generated by ITB, which is sent to the Administrative Unit, Firearms Training Section for each qualification cycle. When the Firearms Training Section receives the report from ITB, a mandatory remediation class is scheduled for each concerned employee.

Even if the employee received a passing score after a third (or more) attempt, the employee is required to attend firearms remediation. The on-the-one remediation is completed by TD’s firearms instructors at the Elysian Park Academy or the Davis Training Facility.

The instructor observes, diagnoses, and remediates the employee. Once the firearms instructor believed the officer is prepared to qualify, the employee shoots the Department’s qualification course again to demonstrate proficiency. The remediation is documented on a TD Record of Remediation/Supplemental Training form and entered into the Learning Management System (LMS) and the Shooting Qualification and Bonus (SQUAB) computer system.

Failure to Qualify
A Department FTO report is generated for officers who FTQ and is sent to IAG. The IAG’s Annual Complaint Report contains information on actions taken for FTQs.

When a CO is notified that an officer, reserve officer, or security officer under his or her command fails to meet qualification requirements set forth by the Department and lacks a valid exemption, the concerned CO may initiate a personnel complaint. Commanding officers shall be responsible for administering disciplinary action for personnel who FTQ.

The SQUAB system computer application was developed to document shooting and FOS qualification, firearms training and bonuses scores for sworn and armed civilian personnel. The application is used at the four range locations (Davis Training

The Department requires its sworn personnel to qualify with their primary duty weapons on a regular basis to ensure shooting proficiencies and the development of sound judgment with the use of lethal force.
Facility, Elysian Park Academy, Harbor Range, and Oaktree Range) by the Firearms Training Section, Tactics Training Section, and Harbor Range personnel.

The information entered into SQUAS appears on an employee’s Training Evaluation and Management System (TEAMS) II Report, showing a record of the employee’s qualification history for the last five years. The system generates the Department’s FTQ report after each qualification cycle. That report is forwarded by ITB to IAG for dissemination. A report can also be generated by ITB upon request.

Medical Exemptions

Sworn personnel who are unable to qualify due to an injury shall be examined by a physician. A statement shall be obtained from the physician imposing the medical restriction with an estimated time for which the officer should be exempt from qualification requirements.

Note: Temporary medical restrictions are valid for 30 days only. If a medical condition persists past 30 days and continues to inhibit an officer from meeting Department qualification standards, the officer must obtain a subsequent doctor’s statement every 30 days until the restriction is rescinded or is classified permanent and stationary.

An officer with a medical exemption who has not qualified with his or her duty firearm for one calendar year shall be served with a “Notice to Meet Firearms Qualification Requirements within 30 Calendar Days” (30-Day Notice). Once served, the officer has 30 days to determine if he or she is medically fit to qualify and successfully pass the minimum firearm qualification standards. If the officer is unable to qualify with his or her duty firearm by the expiration of the 30-Day Notice, the officer shall be served with an “Order to Relinquish City-Issued Duty Firearm and Police Identification Card, and Restriction of Peace Officer Powers” (Order to Relinquish). The 2018 total of 52 was the lowest of the last five years and a 11 less people as compared to the 63 total personnel that failed to successfully qualify three or more times in one of the four firearm qualification cycles in 2017.

In 2018, 52 Department personnel failed to successfully qualify three or more times within one of the four firearm qualification cycles throughout the year. This was a 17 percent decrease, or 11 less people as compared to the 63 total personnel that failed to successfully qualify three or more times in one of the four firearm qualification cycles in 2017.

The 2018 total of 52 was the lowest of the last five years and 39% lower than the four-year average of 86.
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The guiding value when an officer uses force is reverence for human life. The Department worked toward creating a framework that clearly and thoroughly conveyed the practices and training associated with reverence for human life. As noted by former Chief of Police Charlie Beck, “Although the term ‘tactical de-escalation’ was not specifically used by the Department in the past, many of the fundamental techniques and concepts that fall under the tactical de-escalation umbrella have long been incorporated in training curriculum and successfully utilized by personnel in the field.”

The Department’s official definition and inclusion of tactical de-escalation in the UOF policy, in addition to correlative training curriculum, provides officers a uniform and well-articulated framework of the strategies and techniques available to reduce the intensity of an encounter. While officers exercise tactical de-escalation techniques during intense encounters, there still exists the possibility of the need to use some level of force; whether by non-lethal, less-lethal, or lethal means. As a situation unfolds, it is important for officers and supervisors to exercise effective leadership and decision-making at the scene in order to control the incident. To further this expectation, the Department established the concept of “Command and Control” to assist personnel with efforts to contain, de-escalate, and minimize the negative impact of an incident.

Command and Control is the use of active leadership to direct others while using available resources to coordinate a response, accomplish tasks and minimize risk. **Command** uses active leadership to establish order, provide stability and structure, set objectives and create conditions under which the function of Control can be achieved with minimal risk. **Control** implements the plan of action while continuously assessing the situation, making necessary adjustments, managing resources, managing the scope of the incident (containment), and evaluating whether existing Department protocols apply to the incident.

There are **four key components** to command and control:

* **Active Leadership** – using clear, concise, and unambiguous communication to develop and implement a plan, direct personnel, and manage resources.
* **Using Available Resources** – identifying and managing those resources that are needed to plan and implement the desired course of action.
* **Accomplishing Tasks** – Breaking down a plan of action into smaller objectives and using personnel and other resources to meet those objectives.
* **Minimize Risk** – Taking appropriate actions to mitigate risk exposure to those impacted by the incident, including the community and first responders.
INITIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The senior officer, or any officer on-scene who has gained sufficient situational awareness, shall establish Command and Control and begin the process to develop a plan of action. Although awareness can begin while responding to an incident (e.g. radio calls and broadcasts), situational awareness best occurs after arrival on scene where observations and conditions are witnessed firsthand. Generally, the person responsible for establishing Command and Control will declare themselves the Incident Commander (IC) and initiate the Incident Command System (ICS).

One of the primary responsibilities for the officer initiating Command and Control is the direction and guidance of personnel, which includes but is not limited to:

- Ensuring reasonable numbers of Designated Cover Officers (DCO) for both lethal and less-lethal cover;

Note: Reverence for human life is the primary consideration in developing tactics and strategies to resolve critical incidents. Regarding lethal force, an essential goal of Command and Control includes managing the number of officers who are assigned lethal cover responsibilities. In the event of an officer-involved shooting, the reasonable management of lethal cover will help lessen both the number of officers who discharge their firearms and the number of rounds fired during the incident. Consequently, danger to the community may also be reduced by minimizing the number of rounds fired. Although guided by the person who has assumed Command and Control, etc the individual officer is ultimately responsible for articulating the reasonableness of their decision to draw, exhibit, or discharge their firearm.

- Reducing over-response or over-deployment to specific duties and responsibilities; and,
- Maintaining officer safety through personnel location and assignment.

INDIVIDUAL OFFICER RESPONSIBILITY

All officers at the scene of any incident, at some level, are responsible for Command and Control. In addition to their initial assessment, individual officers must identify the IC - or whomever is responsible for Command and Control at that time. While taking appropriate action based on their assessments, officers must be ready for, and receptive to, direction and orders from the IC. Every officer plays a crucial role in the management and handling of critical incidents and must understand their role within the Command and Control scheme. Officers should be ready to deploy or re-deploy as necessary.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

Concurrent with the goal of containment, officers must assess any immediate danger to the community and to initial responders. Following the assessment, the IC must direct available personnel and coordinate appropriate measures to mitigate the threat.

After appropriate measures have been taken to mitigate risks and preserve human life, the officer who established Command and Control should continue to develop a plan. The plan should include the assignment of tasks to available personnel and the organized use of available resources.

ESTABLISHING COMMAND AND CONTROL

Implementing Command and Control involves utilizing active leadership to use available resources, accomplish tasks, and minimize risk. Major events or incidents that require Command and Control include both natural disasters and tactical situations. Existing Department concepts can be used as tools to aid in establishing Command and Control, based on the type and complexity of the incident. Examples include the PATROL acronym and the Tactical Four C’s.

The PATROL acronym stands for planning, assessment, time, redeployment and/or containment, other resources, and lines of communication as illustrated above.
SUPERVISOR’S RESPONSIBILITY
Responsibility for Command and Control lies with the senior officer or any officer on scene who has gained sufficient situational awareness. Supervisors shall take responsibility for exercising Command and Control when they arrive to the scene of an incident. Supervisors shall also declare themselves the IC until relieved by a higher authority. It is the expectation of this Department that the highest-ranking supervisor at scene assume the role of IC and communicate the transfer of command to all personnel involved.

In July 2018, the Department published the Command and Control Training Bulletin. As we move forward into 2019, the Department will remain focused on further refining the concept of Command and Control. In the future, the Department will also begin training officers on the Advanced Strategies of Command and Control (ASCC). Critical concepts, such as the Designated Cover Officer, Tactical De-Escalation, and Active Leadership, will continue to be reinforced throughout the Department in an effort to prevent or minimize the UOF.

THE TACTICAL FOUR C’S

The Tactical Four C’s stand for control, communicate, coordinate, and contain as illustrated above.
Additional Officers/Units/ Specialized Unit Request(s): If needed, officers working patrol can request additional resources to an incident. These resources can vary from incident to incident and are dependent on the circumstances of a specific event. Resources can include: airship, K-9/Bloodhound, SWAT, Bomb Squad, Hazmat, Fire Department, MEU, Dive Team, Traffic, Mutual Aid (i.e. neighboring police departments), etc.

Command Post (CP): A CP is sometimes created when there is a critical incident and coordination of resources is needed. The CP is established in a nearby, safe location as a meeting location for responding personnel. The CP is usually led by a supervisor or an involved senior officer.

Debrief: After certain incidents (i.e. foot pursuits, vehicle pursuits, building searches, etc.) a debrief is held to discuss and evaluate the incident among involved personnel. The debrief is usually led by a supervisor or an involved senior officer.

All officers at the scene of any incident, at some level, are responsible for Command and Control. In addition to their initial assessment, individual officers must identify the Incident Commander (IC) - or whomever is responsible for Command and Control at that time. While taking appropriate action based on their assessments, officers must be ready for, and receptive to, direction and orders from the IC. Every officer plays a crucial role in the management and handling of critical incidents and must understand their role within the Command and Control scheme. Officers should be ready to deploy or re-deploy as necessary.
Under rapidly evolving circumstances, especially when a suspect poses an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury, officers may not have sufficient time or reasonable options to resolve the situation without the need to use objectively reasonable force.
Tactical de-escalation involves the use of techniques to reduce the intensity of an encounter with a suspect and enable an officer to have additional options to gain voluntary compliance or mitigate the need to use a higher level of force while maintaining control of the situation.
The Department’s guiding value when using force shall always be the reverence for human life. When a situation warrants the use of intermediate force, personnel when practicable, can utilize a variety of less-lethal force options to attempt to safely defuse a situation.

Less-lethal, or intermediate force options, as defined by recent court decisions, shall not be used on a suspect or subject who is passively resisting or merely failing to comply with commands. Verbal threats of violence or mere non-compliance alone do not justify the use of less-lethal force. Personnel may use less-lethal force options when they have a reasonable belief that a suspect or subject is violently resisting arrest or poses an immediate threat of violence or physical harm.

Less-lethal devices can afford officers the opportunity to seek cover and maintain distance between themselves and suspects. The use of cover and distance are fundamental concepts that create time to allow for tactical decision-making. When officers are able to safely and effectively deploy less-lethal devices, the risk of injury to themselves, the suspect(s), and the public can be reduced. Less-lethal devices can also be effective tools to prevent the escalation of an incident to a higher, more serious level of force. The Department currently has a variety of less-lethal devices available to personnel for daily field operations and other tactical situations.

40-MILLIMETER (MM) LESS-LETHAL LAUNCHER
The Defence Technology Tactical Single Launcher Model 1425LA 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher is a tactical single-shot, 40mm launcher, configured with a green stock and pistol grip, a rifled barrel, picatinny rail mounting system, and Department approved optics, which allows for increased accuracy over longer distances compared to any other Department approved less-lethal device. The color green is consistent with the Department’s color code for less-lethal devices and signifies that the 40mm launcher is for the Less-Lethal 40mm eXact Impact round only. The 40mm eXact Impact round is a point-of-aim, point-of-impact, direct fire round consisting of a plastic body and a sponge nose. It can be identified by its silver metal case and blue sponge material nose. These sponge rounds are designed to be non-penetrating and upon striking a target distribute energy over a broad surface area. Due to the smokeless powder propellant, it has velocities that are extremely consistent.

Originally authorized for use only by Metropolitan Division, Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT), the 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher was later approved in a pilot program for deployment by patrol personnel in 2016 and 2017. The purpose of the pilot program was to evaluate the effectiveness and functionality of the device in a patrol setting. In 2018, the Department authorized Department-wide use of the 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher for all sworn personnel who have been trained in its use. At the conclusion of 2018, 7,256 sworn personnel have been trained to use the 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher.

BEANBAG SHOTGUN
The Department’s beanbag shotgun is a Remington 870 shotgun that has been reconfigured with a green slide handle and stock, rifled barrel, and side saddle ammunition holder. The color green is consistent with the Department’s color code for less-lethal devices and signifies that the beanbag shotgun is for use with the Less-Lethal LAPD Super-Sock Round only. The LAPD Super-Sock Round is a 12-gauge, clear-hulled cartridge, containing a shot-filled fabric bag. It can be identified by its clear plastic hull containing a yellow fabric bag. These rounds are designed to be non-penetrating and distribute energy over a broad surface area upon striking a target.

OLEORESIN CAPSICUM SPRAY
Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) spray is a chemical agent that is either extracted from cayenne pepper plants or produced by synthetic means. Oleoresin Capsicum spray primarily affects the eyes, the respiratory system, and the skin by generating an intense burning sensation. The mucous membranes may swell, causing uncontrollable coughing, gagging, and/or gasping. Oleoresin Capsicum spray can...
be an effective tool for law enforcement. However, it has proven to have varying degrees of effectiveness on individuals, with some even being unaffected or immune. Additionally, OC spray may contaminate enclosed areas, is susceptible to wind and other weather factors, and can have unintended effects on officers and the public in close proximity.

TASER
The Thomas A. Swift Electric Rifle (TASER) or Electronic Control Device (ECD), is a conducted electrical device that has the ability to cause neuromuscular incapacitation (NMI) of a subject. Neuro-muscular incapacitation is the involuntary stimulation of both the sensory and motor nerves, causing uncontrollable muscle contractions that inhibit a subject’s ability to perform coordinated movement, thereby reducing the subject’s ability to harm themselves or others. The Department issued TASER features a green body and removable black cartridge, which houses the probes and wires. The color green is consistent with the Department’s color code for less-lethal devices and signifies that the TASER is a less-lethal device. The current model of ECD deployed by the Department is the model X26P manufactured by Axon, previously known as Taser International. The X26P ECD has been in use since February 2015, and was an upgrade from previous ECD models with the following improvements from the previous generation:

- Consistent performance and complete data capture due to a new all-digital architecture;
- Improved ergonomics; and,
- Green color coding for easy identification by officers and the community.

The TASER has three activation techniques, listed below.

Probe Mode: This is the most effective way to deploy the TASER and provides officers the ability to maintain distance from the intended target. This method utilizes the TASER cartridge to deploy two metal probes attached to wires, at the subject. Once both probes make contact with the subject, NMI is possible.

Drive-Stun/Direct-Stun: This method is used in close quarter situations and requires the device to be brought into direct contact with the subject’s body or clothing. As soon as the TASER is moved away from the subject’s body, the energy being delivered to the subject stops. This feature may be used with or without a cartridge in place. If a cartridge is in place, the probes will deploy into the subject when the TASER is activated. The drive-stun mode generally will not cause NMI and is primarily a pain compliance option.

Three-Point Drive-Stun: This is a technique where a drive-stun is applied with a cartridge in place. After deploying the probes from the cartridge into the body of the subject at a minimum of two inches, the officer applies a drive-stun to an area of the body away from the probe impact site. The spread between the deployed probes and the area of the applied drive-stun is used to create NMI.

As of September 2015, all uniformed officers assigned to O0 are required to carry a TASER on their person while working any field assignment (O0 Order No. 4, dated September 21, 2015).

In 2016, the Department approved the use of a new redesigned TASER cartridge. This redesigned cartridge features 25-foot probe wires which offer an additional 4-feet of deployment distance, a redesigned longer probe point to better penetrate clothing, and green exterior cartridge doors (blast door).

FN-303 LESS-LETHAL LAUNCHER
The FN-303 Less-Lethal Launcher is a semi-automatic, shoulder fired device that fires non-lethal munitions and liquids. The device is powered by compressed air to fire the projectiles, which are loaded into an attached 15-round drum magazine. The Department, with the approval of the BOPC, initiated a limited-time pilot program for the device in 2016. At the conclusion of the pilot program, the Department determined that additional testing and data gathering was necessary for a more comprehensive analysis. In July 2017, the Department re-initiated the pilot program for two Divisions: Metropolitan Division and Custody Services Division. At the conclusion of 2018, the FN-303 Less-Lethal Launcher was recommended for deployment by both Metropolitan Division, K9 and SWAT and is currently awaiting Department approval.

PEPPERBALL VKS LAUNCHER
The PepperBall Variable Kinetic System (VKS) Launcher is a less-lethal, semi-automatic shoulder device with a nomenclature comparable to that of a standard AR-15/M4 carbine rifle. Powered by an internal air source, the VKS Launcher is able to deploy a variety of less-lethal projectiles at an accurate distance up to 120-150 feet. As of year-end 2018, the device is still in the testing phase.

37-MILLIMETER PROJECTILE LAUNCHER
The 37mm Projectile Launcher is a less-lethal shoulder device that can fire various types of munitions. A rifled barrel, coupled with a calibrated sighting system such as a mounted optical sight or iron sighting system, makes the device highly accurate when delivering rounds to its intended target. When deployed by specially trained personnel from Metropolitan Division, typical munitions include blunt force and chemical agent ordnance.

The 37mm device can also be deployed during incidents where the circumstances require a crowd to be dispersed when immediate action is necessary to stop violence and/or property damage and/or sufficient resources are not present to ensure public safety. Less-lethal munitions can be deployed by Metropolitan Division or specially trained personnel. Both groups may deploy 37mm non-target specific dispersal rounds.

BATON
A baton is an impact and/or control device used to push, move, or strike individuals who exhibit unlawful or hostile behavior. Currently, the Department authorizes three versions of the baton for Department-wide use: a collapsible baton, a side handle baton and a collapsible side handle baton. In 2017, the Department began to issue the Peacekeeper Rapid Containment Baton (RCB) collapsible baton as a standard-issue model along with the side handled baton to all recruit officers. When compared to previous models, the Peacekeeper RCB has a more durable and functional design. Additionally, the Department authorizes a straight baton for Metropolitan Division personnel only.

LAPD BALLISTIC SHIELD
Ballistic shields had historically been deployed by specialized entities, such as Metropolitan Division. To provide additional resources for officers, the Department tested and evaluated several different ballistic shields. In 2016, the ASPIS X Level III Ballistic Shield, manufactured by Point Blank, was also approved for use by certified officers assigned to patrol operations.
The 40-millimeter (40mm) Impact Launcher is a direct impact device that delivers a foam or sponge type round at the desired target. Originally authorized for use by Metropolitan Division, Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT), the 40mm Impact Launcher was later approved for deployment by normal patrol functions in 2016. That year, the Department initiated a pilot program to evaluate the effectiveness and functionality of the device in a patrol setting. At the conclusion of the pilot program, the Department adopted the 40mm impact launcher and issued them to all patrol and traffic divisions. The 40mm Impact Launcher’s maximum effective range is 110 feet.

The Thomas A. Swift Electric Rifle (TASER) or Electronic Control Device (ECD) is an Axon model X26P, which features a green body with removeable black cartridge that contains both wires and probes. The TASER induces neuro-muscular incapacitation (NMI) or involuntary stimulation of the sensory and motor nerves to inhibit the subject’s movements. The TASER has three activation techniques with the Probe Mode being the most effective technique, which when applied correctly will create NMI and maintains distance for officers. The TASER’s maximum effective range is 25 feet.
The Department’s Beanbag shotgun is a Remington 870 shotgun that has been reconfigured with a green slide handle and stock, rifled barrel and side saddle ammunition holder. The beanbag shotgun ammunition is an LAPD Super-Sock 12-gauge round that can be identified by its clear-hulled plastic cartridge, containing a shot-filled fabric bag. The beanbag shotgun’s maximum effective range is 45 feet.

The 37-Millimeter Projectile Launcher is a less-lethal device that can fire various types of munitions (blunt force and chemical agents). The 37-Millimeter Projectile Launcher is normally deployed by Metropolitan Division or specially trained personnel and can be utilized for crowd dispersal. The 37-Millimeter Projectile Launcher’s maximum effective range is 50 feet.
Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) spray is a chemical agent that is extracted from cayenne pepper plants or produced synthetically. OC primarily affects the eyes, respiratory system and skin by causing an intense burning sensation. OC has been proven to have varying degrees of effectiveness and can cause unintended effects to officers/public if deployed in enclosed areas. The OC’s maximum effective range is 12 feet.

The baton is an impact/control device used to push, move or strike individuals who exhibit unlawful or hostile behavior. Currently, the Department authorizes three versions of the baton for Department-wide use: a collapsible baton, a side handle baton and a collapsible side handle baton.
BALLISTIC SHIELD

An added element of cover for officers during tactical incidents.

Ballistic shields had historically been deployed by specialized entities, such as Metropolitan Division. To provide additional resources for officers, the Department tested and evaluated several different ballistic shields. In 2016, the ASPIS X Level III Ballistic Shield, manufactured by Point Blank, was also approved for use by certified officers assigned to patrol operations.
In November of 1979, two police officers recognized that the City and Department needed assistance with conducting searches for dangerous suspects. These searches often ended with suspects eluding police agencies utilize a “find and bite” method, the PSDs are trained to take a bite hold on a suspect in response to movement that may constitute an aggressive, threatening or evasive action that poses a threat of harm to the suspect, the K-9 handler, other personnel or community members in the area (The bite hold is considered a K-9 contact, which occurs when a person is bitten or injured by a deployed K-9). Training in this method is more labor intensive, however it has resulted in higher instances of finds and lower instances of K-9 contacts or bibles as compared to other departments.

Prior to initiating a K-9 search, K-9 officers ensure that K-9 announcements and warnings are given. The announcements and warnings are intended to notify persons within the search area of the intent to use a PSD. This is to afford suspects an opportunity to surrender and to give community members an opportunity to enter their homes, businesses and/or leave the area.

In April of 1980, the Department approved the training of two dogs to be utilized in a one-year pilot program within Operations-West Bureau. Within two short months, the achievements of these two dogs were astounding that the one-year pilot program was declared a success. Over the last 38 years, the program has been formalized and expanded into the current Metropolitan Division, K-9 Platoon. The K-9 Platoon now provides the Department with rapid access to search K-9s on a City-wide basis, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

The mission of Metropolitan Division’s K-9 Platoon is to support the Department’s field and detective operations in the search for outstanding felony suspects, misdemeanor suspects who are reasonably believed to be armed with a firearm or other deadly weapon, and in the search for firearms, and firearm-related evidence (i.e. ammunition, magazines, etc.).

There are currently 17 police officers assigned as K-9 handlers in the Metropolitan Division K-9 Platoon. Each of these 17 officers are assigned one Police Service Dog (PSD). Five of these officers are also assigned a second dog that is trained to detect firearms and firearm related evidence.

The Department’s K-9 programs is one of the few that trains and certifies its PSDs in the “find and bark” method. While the majority of police agencies utilize a “find and bite” method, the LAPD does not. In this method, the PSD will search an identified area and upon locating a suspect, the PSD will alert the K-9 handler by barking or other positive alert method. The PSDs are trained to take a bite hold on a suspect in response to movement that may constitute an aggressive, threatening or evasive action that poses a threat of harm to the PSD, the K-9 handler, other personnel or community members in the area (The bite hold is considered a K-9 contact, which occurs when a person is bitten or injured by a deployed K-9). Training in this method is more labor intensive, however it has resulted in higher instances of finds and lower instances of K-9 contacts or bibles as compared to other departments.

Prior to initiating a K-9 search, K-9 officers ensure that K-9 announcements and warnings are given. The announcements and warnings are intended to notify persons within the search area of the intent to use a PSD. This is to afford suspects an opportunity to surrender and to give community members an opportunity to enter their homes, businesses and/or leave the area. In situations where noise or perimeter size is a factor, officers will use amplified sound systems such as bullhorns or the public-address systems on Department vehicles or helicopters to make the announcement. The search announcement and warning is an additional attempt to de-escalate the situation, and encourage the suspect(s) to voluntarily surrender before the PSD is used.

The search announcement and warning is as follows:

“This is the Los Angeles Police Department; we are searching for a suspect and are preparing to use a police dog. For your safety, please go inside your home or business and stay inside until we have completed our search.

To the person or persons who are hiding from the police. Make your location known to us immediately. Put down all weapons, come out with your hands raised, and follow directions. If you do not, a police dog will be used to find you. When the dog finds you, do not move or you may be bitten. Surrender now and the dog will not be used.”

As multiple announcements are made at various locations throughout the perimeter, the time, location, and who confirmed each announcement is documented. If there is no response from the suspect, and there is no indication that the suspect(s) are surrendering, the K-9 search will commence. The K-9 search team is comprised of the K-9 handler and his PSD, along with two to four additional officers, depending on the nature and number of personnel being utilized and expanded into the current Metropolitan Division K-9 personnel. Upon arrival, K-9 personnel are briefed on the circumstances of the perimeter, the crime the suspect is wanted for and whether the suspect is armed. Once it is determined that the circumstances meet the established K-9 Deployment criteria a tactical plan is developed by the K-9 handler, with concurrence from the K-9 supervisor, and approval of the Incident Commander.

The search announcement and warning is as follows:

“This is the Los Angeles Police Department; we are searching for a suspect and are preparing to use a police dog. For your safety, please go inside your home or business and stay inside until we have completed our search.

To the person or persons who are hiding from the police. Make your location known to us immediately. Put down all weapons, come out with your hands raised, and follow directions. If you do not, a police dog will be used to find you. When the dog finds you, do not move or you may be bitten. Surrender now and the dog will not be used.”

As multiple announcements are made at various locations throughout the perimeter, the time, location, and who confirmed each announcement is documented. If there is no response from the suspect, and there is no indication that the suspect(s) are surrendering, the K-9 search will commence. The K-9 search team is comprised of the K-9 handler and his PSD, along with two to four additional officers, depending on the nature and number of personnel being utilized and expanded into the current Metropolitan Division K-9 personnel. Upon arrival, K-9 personnel are briefed on the circumstances of the perimeter, the crime the suspect is wanted for and whether the suspect is armed. Once it is determined that the circumstances meet the established K-9 Deployment criteria a tactical plan is developed by the K-9 handler, with concurrence from the K-9 supervisor, and approval of the Incident Commander.

The announcements and warnings are intended to notify persons within the search area of the intent to use a PSD. This is to afford suspects an opportunity to surrender and to give community members an opportunity to enter their homes, businesses and/or leave the area. In situations where noise or perimeter size is a factor, officers will use amplified sound systems such as bullhorns or the public-address systems on Department vehicles or helicopters to make the announcement. The search announcement and warning is an additional attempt to de-escalate the situation, and encourage the suspect(s) to voluntarily surrender before the PSD is used.

The search announcement and warning is as follows:

“This is the Los Angeles Police Department; we are searching for a suspect and are preparing to use a police dog. For your safety, please go inside your home or business and stay inside until we have completed our search.

To the person or persons who are hiding from the police. Make your location known to us immediately. Put down all weapons, come out with your hands raised, and follow directions. If you do not, a police dog will be used to find you. When the dog finds you, do not move or you may be bitten. Surrender now and the dog will not be used.”

As multiple announcements are made at various locations throughout the perimeter, the time, location, and who confirmed each announcement is documented. If there is no response from the suspect, and there is no indication that the suspect(s) are surrendering, the K-9 search will commence. The K-9 search team is comprised of the K-9 handler and his PSD, along with two to four additional officers, depending on the nature and number of personnel being utilized and expanded into the current Metropolitan Division K-9 personnel. Upon arrival, K-9 personnel are briefed on the circumstances of the perimeter, the crime the suspect is wanted for and whether the suspect is armed. Once it is determined that the circumstances meet the established K-9 Deployment criteria a tactical plan is developed by the K-9 handler, with concurrence from the K-9 supervisor, and approval of the Incident Commander.
circumstances presented by the search. All search team personnel are briefed on the tactical search plan and their specific roles during the search. The K-9 handler will also ensure that at least one team member is equipped with a less-lethal force option before the search begins. Multiple K-9 search teams may be utilized depending on the size, geography or other factors presented by the perimeter. As the K-9 utilizes its capabilities, the search team will continually look for evidence that could prove vital in pinpointing the suspect’s location or direction of travel. During the search, officers will also interview witnesses and attempt to locate surveillance cameras near the suspect’s direction of travel.

When a PSD is deployed, the K-9 handler is expected to exercise control in a manner that enhances the safety of the search team and community while efficiently utilizing the detection capabilities of the PSD. Additionally, the K-9 handler maintains the sole responsibility for the control and direction of their PSD.

When the PSD locates a suspect, the handler will recall the dog to their side and control. Verbal orders will then be given to the suspect to surrender and submit to arrest. If it is determined that the PSD has bitten or injured the suspect (K-9 contact), an ambulance is requested and the suspect is transported to a hospital for further evaluation and treatment. If the suspect is admitted to a hospital due to the injury from the K-9 contact, the incident is investigated as a Categorical Use of Force, and proper protocols are initiated.

**2014-2018 K-9 Deployments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Deployments</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Find Pct</th>
<th>Contacts</th>
<th>Contacts Pct</th>
<th>CUOF</th>
<th>CUOF Pct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2018 experienced the least number of K-9 Contacts and CUOFs in the last five years.
Upon the detention and transportation of an arrestee to a geographic Area, a watch commander will visually inspect and inquire whether the arrestee has any medical conditions. Medical conditions declared by the arrestee are documented on the detention log and are addressed prior to booking into the care and custody of either Custody Services Division (CSD) or the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department. Any medical conditions which are life-threatening or require immediate emergency medical care are addressed by requesting the Los Angeles Fire Department who assess, treat, and/or transport the arrestee to the appropriate hospital. Medical conditions which are pre-existing or non-life threatening are addressed at a detention facility by medical staff.

Once booking approval has been obtained by the arresting officer at the geographic Area, the arrestee is transported by officers to a detention facility where the arrestee is provided the necessary medical treatment prior to being booked. While at the facility, arresting officers complete a standardized medical questionnaire. The questionnaire is utilized to identify and assess the arrestee’s medical concerns, mental health status, use of prescribed medication, and substance abuse. All arrestees who exhibit objective symptoms of being under the influence of Phencyclidine (PCP) or who register a Gas Chromatography Intoximeter (GCI) of .30% or higher must be examined by medical staff. Additionally, the questionnaire is used to document observations made by the arresting officers that describe the arrestee’s level of impairment and any medical condition, along with documenting any injuries or medical history that may require the arrestee to receive an increased level of care.

Onsite Medical Services Division (MSD) staff examine any arrestee who reports or displays the need for medical treatment. The staff utilize the medical questionnaire along with an in-person assessment to conduct an evaluation of the arrestee. An arrestee who has medications for a pre-existing condition may have their medications stored with MSD. Any medications brought into the detention facility must be inspected by staff prior to booking. If the arrestee’s medication is unable to be dispensed by medical staff, the medicine is itemized and stored with the arrestee’s personal property package. If the arrestee requires medication which is not available at the dispensary or if the level of care the arrestee needs is greater than what the onsite facility can provide, the arrestee is transferred to a contract hospital or county jail for further treatment. If the treating physician at a contract hospital clears the arrestee for booking, a secondary evaluation at the detention facility is conducted. Medical Services Division will then continue to monitor the level of care the arrestee is provided until transferred to another facility.

After the MSD staff has cleared the arrestee for booking, arresting officers will present the arrestee and the booking paperwork to staff from CSD. All documents are reviewed and an additional evaluation by CSD staff is completed to determine if any special housing arrangements are required for the arrestee. Once the arrestee is accepted by the detention facility, CSD personnel conduct in-person welfare checks on the arrestee at a minimum of once every 30 minutes.

While in custody, arrestees with medical conditions are seen by MSD staff during Sick-Call twice per day. Personnel assigned to CSD document the date and time Sick-Call was conducted each day. Medical Service Division staff also use this time to address any new medical concerns that appear while the arrestee is in custody at the facility. Those arrestees requesting medical attention during Sick-Call are evaluated by a physician.
Developments

The DICVS platform was the first of two camera systems deployed by the Department and was initially introduced in Southeast Area in 2010. Efforts to expand the Department’s video capability resulted in the implementation of Body Worn Video (BWV) cameras to all uniformed personnel working field assignments in patrol functions. These camera platforms have proven to be powerful policing tools that enhance community relations through transparency, improve both operational and administrative oversight, and assist in more effectively resolving criminal matters.

The release of DICVS and BWV footage along with other video sources following critical incidents was approved and implemented on April 13, 2018 by the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC) and COP. The policy on Critical Incident Video Release authorizes the public release of video recordings that capture critical incidents involving LAPD officers. The videos are mandated to be released within 45 days of the date of incident unless the BOPC or the Chief of Police (COP) determines that either an earlier or later release is warranted.

The public release of video is contingent on certain privacy and legal considerations. When such factors are a cause for concern, a three-member panel, comprised of the COP and the two BOPC Commissioners that are designated liaisons for video release, must unanimously determine to delay the release for a 14-day period, after which that decision must be re-assessed. If the delayed release continues for more than 28 days, the matter shall be placed on the agenda for the next regularly scheduled BOPC meeting for consideration of the continued justification for delay, as well as an anticipated time frame for release. The BOPC shall make the decision to release or continue the delay, and the video imagery in question shall be released as soon as the purpose for the delay has been resolved.

Although the Department has incorporated video and audio evidence in the investigative, review, and adjudication processes of internal investigations for many years, it should be noted that the legal basis used to determine the lawfulness of an officer’s actions during a UOF incident still remains the standard of objective reasonableness, as detailed in Graham v. Connor 490 U.S. 386 (1989). As such, events captured on DICVS and/or BWV are only one source of evidence and should not be used as the sole factor in determining the lawfulness of an officer’s actions.

To date, both video-based platforms have continued to be instrumental in daily police activities and serve the interest of all stakeholders. The technology platform continues to be updated and enhanced with the goal of achieving integration of both DICVS and BWV video systems into one interface.
The Los Angeles Police Department currently deploys two types of video recording devices in field operations, the Digital In-Car Video System (DICVS) and the Body Worn Video (BWV) camera. Both devices and their related software serve a crucial role in streamlining data collection and evidence sharing. With the sheer number of DICVS and BWV cameras in use, the capabilities of the Department’s digital evidence-management systems have become increasingly important. The effective management of the ever-growing repository of digital evidence is critical given that the overriding goal of these systems is to increase transparency while simultaneously assisting the Department and its personnel in the performance of their duties. In addition, these platforms have facilitated the Department’s initiative to release video recordings as part of the Critical Incident Video Release, which is used to enhance transparency and build public trust.

It is also the goal of the Department to utilize these platforms to enhance accountability, deter criminal activity and uncooperative behavior, assist in resolving personnel complaints and to provide information for officer training and improvement.

DIGITAL IN-CAR VIDEO SYSTEM (DICVS):
BACKGROUND, POLICY, AND CAPABILITIES

The DICVS program provides digital video and audio monitoring between officers and citizens. In effect, the DICVS assists officers in providing accurate depictions of events for courtroom testimony by capturing recordings of crimes in progress, the aftermath of crimes, and/or statements from suspects, victims, and witnesses.

Audio recordings are obtained through wireless microphones (linked to the video system) that are worn on the officer’s person. The activation of the wireless microphone simultaneously activates the camera system with the push of a button. Two fixed video cameras are positioned on the interior of patrol vehicles: one forward facing inside the windshield and a second mounted to the ceiling in the rear passenger compartment. When the emergency light bar on a patrol vehicle is activated for more than eight seconds, the DICVS automatically begins recording. Officers can also manually activate the camera system utilizing the touch screen monitor inside the cabin of the vehicle.

The DICVS video and audio recordings are stored digitally and cannot be manipulated, altered, or deleted. Video footage from DICVS can be immediately viewed on a monitor within the patrol vehicle or once uploaded, may be viewed later on any computer that is connected to the Department’s Local Area Network.

Prior to use and deployment, field personnel must complete the Department’s DICVS training on the proper use, maintenance, and activation of the system. Supervisors are required to ensure that subordinates adhere to Department DICVS policy and procedures by providing the necessary guidance, training, and direction commensurate with both mandatory and proactive implementation standards. Each geographic Bureau is staffed with personnel whose sole job function is to conduct regular audits of both the DICV and BWV to ensure proper adherence to Department policy. The DICVS program policy requires that officers activate DICVS during the initiation of the following activities (Special Order No. 45 - dated October 20, 2009):

• All vehicle stops;
• All Code 3 responses and pursuits;
• All suspect transports
• All pedestrian stops (when practicable); and,
• Any other occasion when, in the officer’s judgment, it would be beneficial to do so. This may include, but is not limited to, stops and detentions, crimes in progress when recording is reasonably feasible, Mobile Field Force situations, or any situation, condition, or event presenting the potential for injury, loss of life, damage to property, or any potential risk-management issue.

Exception: Exigent circumstances that preclude officers from the immediate activation of DICVS. Each exception will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Activation of the front DICVS cameral shall remain in effect until the entire incident has stabilized or field contact has ended. The rear camera shall remain activated until the suspect (rear passenger) has exited the vehicle.
BODY WORN VIDEO (BWV): EXPECTATIONS AND SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION

Consistent with the objectives of DICVS, the Department’s Body Worn Video (BWV) program was instituted to enhance:

- Police operations and safety;
- Police reporting;
- Officer accountability;
- Investigation and resolution of personnel complaints; and,
- Documentation of evidence for criminal prosecution.

BWV equipment generally consists of a body-mounted camera with a built-in microphone and a separate handheld viewing device. The BWV camera is worn facing forward, on the outside of the uniform. The BWV recordings are stored digitally on the camera’s internal memory and can be viewed on the separate handheld viewing device or any computer connected to the Department’s Local Area Network. The recordings cannot be manipulated, altered, or deleted.

Prior to usage and deployment in the field, Department personnel assigned BWV must complete the Department’s training on the proper use, maintenance, and activation criteria. Supervisors are required to ensure that subordinates adhere to Department BWV policy and procedures by providing the necessary guidance, training, and direction commensurate with both mandatory and proactive implementation standards. Each geographic Bureau is staffed with personnel whose sole job function is to conduct regular audits of both the DICV and BWV to ensure proper adherence to Department policy.

Absent exigent circumstances that preclude the immediate activation of BWV (in which case activation is required when safe and practicable), officers are required to record any investigative or enforcement activity involving a member of the public, including all:

- Vehicle stops;
- Pedestrian stops (including officer-initiated consensual encounters);
- Calls for service;
- Code 3 responses (including vehicle pursuits);
- Foot pursuits;
- Searches;
- Arrests;
- Uses of force;
- In-custody transports;
- Witness and victim interviews;
- Crowd management and control involving enforcement or investigative contacts; and,
- Other investigative or enforcement activities where, in an officer’s judgment, a video recording would assist in the investigation or prosecution of a crime or when a recording of an encounter would assist in documenting the incident for a later investigation or review.

The BWV shall continue recording until the investigative or enforcement activity has concluded. If enforcement or investigative activity resumes, officers are required to reactivate the BWV device and resume recording.

Officers are encouraged to inform individuals that they are being recorded when feasible, however, consent is not required when the officer is lawfully in an area where the recording takes place. In addition, officers are not required to play back BWV recordings for review by members of the public.

If an officer is involved in a Categorical Use of Force (CUOF), they shall not review any BWV footage until authorized by the assigned FID investigator. Prior to being interviewed by FID and upon the approval of the assigned FID supervisor, the involved officer shall review the footage, and any other relevant recording (including DICVS footage). Once approved, the officer may review the videos with an employee representative or attorney without FID being present. The separating and monitoring of officers involved in a CUOF shall be maintained during the review of BWV recordings, consequently video review shall not occur jointly among other involved employees.

Supervisors assigned to monitor any officer(s) involved in a CUOF must take possession of the concerned employee’s BWV equipment, ensure the device is and remains powered off, and maintains custody of the equipment until transferred to FID personnel.

Supervisors investigating NCUOF incidents shall, allow involved officers to review their BWV recordings and if deemed necessary, other BWV recordings to ensure complete and accurate reports and documentation of the incident.

By the end of 2018, all LAPD geographical Areas, traffic divisions and Metropolitan Division were equipped with and deploying BWV.

Note: Department policy requires both the DICVS and Body Worn Video systems to be deployed while in the field and activated based on their individual criteria.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

The Department’s BWV program is fully funded by an annual allocation from the City’s General Fund and is currently contracted with Axon. The BWV program continues to enhance crime-fighting capabilities, police accountability, and police-community relationships. Future plans to integrate both DICVS and BWV video sources into one interface will further facilitate data gathering, accessibility, and mission effectiveness for the Department as a whole.
The BWV video and audio recordings are stored digitally on the BWV camera and can be viewed on a hand held viewing device or an authorized computer. In 2018, the Department began to release video recording of critical incidents between officers and the public. These Critical Incident Briefings provide the community with any relevant video pertaining to the issue at hand.

Administrative Order No. 6 (2018), adopted by the BOPC, set forth the standards and criteria for the public release of video recordings that capture critical incidents involving LAPD officers. The order took into consideration the public’s interest in transparency and police accountability as well as the privacy interests of the individuals depicted in the videos. At the same time, there is consideration for the preservation of the integrity of the related investigations.

The first video was released on June 20, 2018. Since then, 21 additional videos were released by the end of 2018. These 22 videos have generated approximately 1.8 million views with a combined watch time of 6.7 million minutes. These analytics reinforce part of the purpose of this policy, which states, “The people of Los Angeles have an undeniable interest in being informed, in a timely fashion and based on the most accurate information available, about how their police department conducts its business, especially where officers use lethal force or where the use of force by the police result in the death or serious injury of a civilian.”

Moving toward the future, the release of these videos will aid in transparency. The videos will also provide a training forum for how to improve upon our tactics in dealing with incidents that have an impact upon the lives of the people that we have sworn to protect and to serve.
The Department understands the impact of every UOF and has implemented thorough investigative, review, and adjudicative processes to ensure that Department policies are being adhered to and most importantly, to safeguard the constitutional rights of the public.
NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE

POLICY AND PROCEDURE

NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE
The adjudication process for NCUOF incidents differs with respect to the chain of investigation, review, analysis, and adoption of findings compared to CUOF incidents. Nonetheless, the implementation of highly precise, systematic, and proficient levels of review ensures that all NCUOF cases receive a high degree of evaluation and proper adjudication by the Department.

Investigation of a NCUOF Level I Incident
Supervisors are required to record non-Department witness statements, document/photograph injuries, and obtain medical treatment (when applicable) of involved suspect(s) or employee(s), and acquire photographs of the NCUOF incident scene.

Investigation of a NCUOF Level II Incident
The process for documenting/reporting Level II incidents shall mirror that of a Level I incident, with the following exceptions:
- The requirement to record non-department witnesses is eliminated;
- The requirement for an “Incident Overview” is eliminated; and,
- The requirement to document any suspect and witness statements in the narrative of the NCUOF report is eliminated.

The related crime and/or arrest report or Employee’s Report will serve as documentation of statements for the subject of the UOF, witnesses, and involved Department employees. Any discrepancies between statements shall still be addressed in “Investigating Supervisor’s Notes.”

Note: Discrepancies that constitute a substantial conflict between witness or suspect accounts and the involved employee(s) account shall be reported as a Level I incident.

Watch Commander Responsibility
As part of the Watch Commander’s evaluation of the NCUOF incident, they shall:
- Evaluate whether or not the applications of force used were objectively reasonable and consistent with actions reported by the involved Department employee(s), ensuring that all relevant tactical actions, UOF application(s) and policy issues are addressed.
- Ensure that all supervisors are interviewed regarding their conduct at the scene during the incident; and,
- Evaluate the actions of each of these supervisors

Note: The Watch Commander/OIC shall evaluate the force that was used, not the force options that could have been considered.

Commanding Officer Responsibility
Upon receipt of a NCUOF investigation, the CO of the concerned Bureau/Area/Division shall:
- Utilize the Area/Division Training Coordinator to evaluate the incident;
- Contact subject matter experts (e.g. Training Division) to obtain additional information, as needed;
- Review all reports and make a recommendation on the disposition; and,
- Notify the employee of CIRD’s final disposition as soon as practicable.

Commanding Officer, CIRD Responsibility
The Director of OSS is the Department’s review authority for the administrative review of all UOF incidents. For NCUOF incidents, that authority is generally exercised through the CO of CIRD, who shall:
- Review the NCUOF investigation and all related reports to ensure compliance with Department policy and procedure; and,
- Approve or disapprove the recommended disposition and provide a written rationale for any finding that differs from that of the Bureau CO.
- Retain the original Non-Categorical Use of Force Internal Process Report and copies of all related reports; and,
- Forward a copy of the completed Internal Process Report to the bureau commanding officer.

If the Commanding Officer, Critical Incident Review Division, requires further information prior to adjudication, such a request shall be submitted to the employee’s bureau commanding officer.

Post-Adjudication Procedures
Following adjudication of a NCUOF incident, the following shall occur:
- Recordation of training into the concerned employee’s TEAMS II Report; and,
- If applicable, directed training for issues or deficiencies identified from the incident, and/or initiation of a personnel complaint.
A supervisor responds and conducts the NCUOF investigation.

Watch Commander and Training / Teams II Coordinator reviews the supervisor’s completed investigation and makes adjudication recommendations.

Area/Division CO reviews the NCUOF investigation and makes a recommendation regarding Tactics and the UOF.

Bureau CO reviews the NCUOF investigation and may approve or make an alternate recommendation.

CIRD reviews the NCUOF investigation
- CIRD CO may approve the recommendations of either the Area/Division CO or Bureau CO or determine that an alternate Adjudication is more appropriate.

Possible Dispositions:
- No Action
- Incident Debrief
- Informal meeting/counseling
- Divisional training
- Formal training
- Comment Card
- Notice to correct deficiencies
- Personnel complaint
- Modified field duties
- Assigned to non-field duties
- Tactical Debrief
CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE

POLICY AND PROCEDURE

CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE
The Department, like all other law enforcement agencies, is mandated by law to oversee and investigate all UOF incidents by its officers. The adjudication process for CUOF incidents involves a precise and systematic process with specific procedures. Officer involved shootings (OIS), for example, take on a different level of investigation and review compared to NCUOF incidents. Unlike NCUOF incidents, all CUOF incidents are followed by a formal adjudication process consisting of a comprehensive investigation, a thorough analysis of the force used by a UOFRB (does not apply to Animal Shootings and UD’s), recommended findings presented by the UOFRB to the COP, recommended findings by the COP to the BOPC, and the final adopted findings imposed by the BOPC.

PUBLIC SAFETY STATEMENT
Immediately after a CUOF incident occurs, specifically an OIS, a Department supervisor will take a Public Safety Statement (PSS) from substantially involved personnel (SIP). The PSS is a cursory statement of what occurred in order to address public safety concerns.

SEPARATION AND TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONNEL
After the PSS has been obtained and all public safety concerns have been addressed (e.g., establishing a perimeter, protecting the crime scene, locating witnesses/victims/suspects/injured bystanders/evidence, managing the response of additional resources, etc.), the Incident Commander shall ensure that all SIP’s and witness employees are transported individually by supervisors to the location of the FID interview as soon as practicable. Separation shall remain in effect until FID interviews all concerned employees.
FORCE INVESTIGATION DIVISION

Upon arrival at the scene of a CUOF incident, FID personnel assume responsibility of the overall investigation. As part of the investigation, FID personnel conduct interviews of all involved parties, locate and collect evidence, manage crime scenes, coordinate the acquisition of photographs, and liaise with other relevant Department and non-Department entities.

As soon as possible after being notified of a CUOF incident, but not required within 20 minutes, the DOC is responsible for making notifications to the following entities:

- Force Investigation Division;
- Family Liaison Unit;
- Office of the COP or his designee;
- Office of Operations;
- Office of Support Services;
- Chief of Staff; and,
- Office of the Inspector General (acting on behalf of the BOPC).

Additionally, the following Department and/or outside entities may respond:

- Media Relations Division;
- Commanding Officer, Emergency Services Division;
- Commanding Officer, Professional Standards Bureau;
- Involved employee(s) CO;
- Office of Constitutional Policy and Policing;
- Community Engagement Group;
- Risk Management Legal Affairs Group;
- Legal Affairs Division; and,
- Los Angeles County District Attorney’s Office (for those cases identified in the roll out protocol governing such notifications).

INITIAL NOTIFICATION AND CALL-OUT PROCEDURES

Currently, the DOC notifies the on-call FID Officer-in-Charge (OIC) that a CUOF incident has occurred. The FID OIC then coordinates for FID personnel to respond to the scene within one hour of notification. The first arriving FID investigator ensures that on-scene personnel have secured the crimes scene(s), generated crime scene logs and have established a perimeter.

As soon as possible after being notified of a CUOF incident, the FID OIC then coordinates for FID personnel to respond to the scene within one hour of notification. The first arriving FID investigator ensures that on-scene personnel have secured the crimes scene(s), generated crime scene logs and have established a perimeter.

Depending upon the type of CUOF incident, the following Department resources may be utilized:

- Command Post Unit;
- Forensic Science Division (FSD), comprised of Field Investigation, Firearms Analysis, Narcotics Analysis, Quality Assurance, Questioned Documents, Serology/ DNA, Toxicology and Trace Analysis Units;
- Technical Investigation Division (TID) comprised of the Electronics, Latent Print, Photography, and Polygraph Units; and,
- Air Support Division (aerial photographs).

Resources Utilized by FID

Depending upon the type of CUOF incident, the following Department resources may be utilized:

- Media Relations Division;
- Commanding Officer, Professional Standards Bureau;
- Involved employee(s) CO;
- Office of Constitutional Policy and Policing;
- Community Engagement Group;
- Risk Management Legal Affairs Group;
- Legal Affairs Division; and,
- Los Angeles County District Attorney’s Office (for those cases identified in the roll out protocol governing such notifications).

INCLUSION OF OTHER INVESTIGATIVE ENTITIES

During the preliminary notification of the CUOF by on-scene supervisors or during their initial on-scene investigation. Factors that would impact the decision to involve other investigative entities include, but are not limited to, the death of, or serious bodily injury sustained by a police officer as a result of the suspect’s actions, the identification of a Department employee as the victim of a crime directly related to the incident being investigated, or allegations of officer involved misconduct. In such events, the Department may involve the following:

- Office of Constitutional Policy and Policing;
- Community Engagement Group;
- Los Angeles County District Attorney’s Office, CAPOS.

INVESTIGATION, REVIEW, & ADJUDICATION PROCESS

The Criminalistics Laboratory is a part of the Hertzberg-Davis Forensic Science Center at the Los Angeles Regional Crime Laboratory. The 180,000 square foot forensic science facility is located on the campus of California State University, Los Angeles. The facility is shared by the Department, the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, California State University, Los Angeles, the California Forensic Science Institute, and the California Criminalistics Institute. The Criminalistics Laboratory is comprised of the Field Investigation Unit, Firearm Analysis Unit, Narcotics Analysis Unit, Quality Assurance Unit, Questioned Documents Unit, Serology/ DNA Unit, and the Toxicology and Trace Analysis Unit. The Technical Laboratory encompasses the Electrons, Latent Print, Photography and Polygraph Units.

BEEHAVORIAL SCIENCE SERVICES

There are four specific situations that Department employees may be involved in that generate a mandated referral to BSS. These situations include OIS incidents, CUOF incidents (other than OIS incidents), blood-borne pathogen exposure, and military deployment. Appointments are arranged by the employee’s CO and are conducted on-duty.

Any officer who is involved in an OIS is required to attend three mandatory, on-duty sessions with BSS. The first session is generally scheduled within 72 hours of the incident, or as soon as practicable. The second session takes place approximately four to eight weeks after the incident. The last session is scheduled just before or after the UOFRB has concluded.

The officer must attend the first BSS session prior to returning to full duty.
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Within 72-Hours of an OIS…an initial briefing is scheduled for the COP and other concerned command staff members. During the briefing, FID provides a preliminary presentation of the incident and answers questions by the COP and attending staff members.

72-HOUR BRIEFING
Within 72-Hours of an OIS (or other significant CUOF incident wherein a briefing is deemed necessary by the COP), an initial briefing is scheduled for the COP and other concerned command staff members. During the briefing, FID provides a preliminary presentation of the incident and answers questions by the COP and attending staff members. Although the briefing is an initial assessment of the incident based on preliminary information, many basic facts are available at this stage. The objective of the briefing is to address issues that require immediate Department attention. The involved employees of the incident do not attend the briefing.

GENERAL TRAINING UPDATE
General Training Updates are mandatory training sessions for all substantially involved personnel following a CUOF incident. The GTU is generally completed within two weeks of an incident and prior to the employee returning to field duty. There are six mandatory topics in addition to any other concerns addressed by the COP, the concerned Area CO, CIRD, and/or PTB:

• Use of Force Policy;
• Reverence for Human Life;
• Tactical De-Escalation Techniques;
• Command and Control;
• Equipment Required/Maintained; and,
• Reality-Based Training/FOS (only if the employee discharged his or her firearm during an OIS other than an Unintentional Discharge).

In 2017, TD was tasked with the responsibility of conducting GTUs for all CUOF incidents. Prior to TD assuming responsibility of the GTU instruction, Area training coordinators completed the required training. General Training Update sessions are administered by instructors from TD, with assistance of training unit personnel from the concerned Area and Bureau. In addition to facilitating the actual training, TD is responsible for documentation and tracking of employees who did not attend the training due to valid temporary exemptions (e.g. on-leave due to injury, scheduled vacation, etc.).

Statute of Limitations for Adjudication
To ensure that CUOF incidents are properly reviewed and adjudicated in a timely manner, time limitations are implemented for various levels of investigation and review. These include:

• The statute date, or completion date for the entire process, which is one year from the CUOF incident date (or the date the incident is reported to a Department supervisor);
• FID’s completion of the entire CUOF incident, which is within
the incident is reported to a Department supervisor); and,
• The COP’s recommended findings, which shall be submitted to the BOPC within 60 calendar days prior to the administrative statute date.

Review & Findings
Upon completion of FID’s investigation of a CUOF incident, CIRD receives and completes a comprehensive review and analysis of the incident. Critical Incident Review Division then schedules a UOFRB.

Factors Considered in Determining Appropriate Findings
In determining the proper adjudication for a CUOF incident, the following sections are extensively evaluated by all levels of review (including the UOFRB, the COP, the OIG, and the BOPC):

• **Tactics:** Was the officer’s tactical decision making appropriate during and prior to the incident? Were his/her actions considered a substantial deviation from Department training and, if so, was that deviation justifiable?
• **Drawing/Exhibiting:** Did the officer have a reasonable belief that the tactical situation could potentially escalate to the point where deadly force may be justified?
• **Use of Force:** Was the officer’s force objectively reasonable and carried out in accordance with the Department’s UOF policy?

### TACTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Debrief</td>
<td>Tactical Debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Disapproval</td>
<td>Tactical Debrief and one or more of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Policy</td>
<td>• Extensive Retraining;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Notice to Correct Deficiencies; and/or,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personnel Complaint.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DRAWING/EXHIBITING OF FIREARM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Policy/No Further Action</td>
<td>Tactical Debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Disapproval/</td>
<td>Tactical Debrief and one or more of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Policy</td>
<td>• Extensive Retraining;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Notice to Correct Deficiencies; and/or,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personnel Complaint.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Per Department Manual 3/792.10, a finding of Administrative Disapproval in any area will result in one or more of the following:

• Extensive Retraining;
• Notice to Correct Deficiencies; and/or,
• Personnel Complaint.

### USE OF FORCE REVIEW BOARD
The UOFRB consists of a representative from each of the following entities:

• Office of Support Services (Chair);
• Representative from the respective Office;
• Personnel and Training Bureau;
• Representative from the concerned geographic or specialized Bureau; and,
• Peer member (similar rank of the substantially involved personnel).

Additionally, a representative from the OIG is present at the UOFRB in an oversight capacity.

Force Investigation Division personnel presents information and analysis regarding the facts of the incident and subsequent investigation to the UOFRB. The CO of the concerned substantially involved employee also attends and offers his/her assessment of the incident and recommendations regarding Tactics, Drawing and Exhibiting and Use of Force. After careful examination, the UOFRB makes its recommendations of the findings and forwards them to the COP for consideration.

### CHIEF OF POLICE
Force Investigation Division personnel presents information and analysis regarding the facts of the incident and subsequent investigation to the COP. The COP analyzes and examines all the facts presented, including the UOFRB’s recommendations, and either adopts in whole or in part their recommendations or comes to a different determination. The COP then submits correspondence to the BOPC detailing his/her recommended findings prior to 60 days to the administrative statute date.

### LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY’S OFFICE
Personnel from LACDA respond to OIS and ICD incidents to assess whether an independent criminal investigation is
necessary. Additionally, the LACDA is available to provide advice to FID regarding criminal law issues.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

All FID investigations and UOFRB proceedings are closely monitored by the OIG. The OIG’s oversight begins immediately following the occurrence of a CUOF. The OIG has a 24-hour on-call response capability, and is promptly notified following a CUOF. The OIG responds to the scene of CUOF incidents and monitors FID’s on-scene investigation, assesses compliance with applicable policy standards, and generally works to ensure the overall quality of the investigative work being performed. In practice, the OIG works closely with FID and is briefed regularly to ensure that, whenever possible, investigative issues identified during the course of the investigation are addressed and resolved.

As it conducts its own independent review of each CUOF, the OIG’s staff also monitors the progression of the Department’s internal review. This monitoring role includes attendance at every UOFRB, where the OIG may ask questions and provide input to the board members.

The OIG reviews the COP’s report to the BOPC and evaluates the COP’s recommendations and rationale. The OIG’s oversight of each investigation culminates in a detailed report to the BOPC. The OIG report reviews every aspect of the case, including an assessment regarding the quality of the FID investigation, analysis of the COP’s recommendations and provides its own recommendations regarding Tactics, Drawing and Exhibiting, and Use of Force. In cases where the OIG concurs with the findings of the COP, it will recommend to the BOPC that it adopt those findings. If the OIG believes additional or different analysis is warranted, the OIG will provide that analysis to the BOPC in its report. In cases where the OIG determines that the available evidence supports findings other than those recommended by the COP, it will make alternate recommendations and provide supporting analysis and rationale for consideration by the BOPC.

BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS

Force Investigation Division personnel presents information and analysis regarding the facts of the incident and subsequent investigation to the BOPC. The BOPC reviews and examines the facts of the case while considering the recommended findings proposed by both the COP and OIG. The BOPC adjudicates the case and delivers the adopted findings for each of the concerned Department personnel.

POST-ADJUDICATION PROCEDURES

Tactical Debrief, Extensive Retraining, & Disciplinary Proceedings

Under current policy, an Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy determination will result in one or more of the following: Extensive Retraining, Notice to Correct Deficiencies, and/or a Personnel Complaint. If such findings are adopted, the COP will render a decision on which of the outcomes are most suitable to address the employee’s actions.

Extensive Retraining is conducted by TD. The facilitator of the Extensive Retraining course tailors the training to be incident specific and verifies that the areas of concern are included in the course curriculum. If a Notice to Correct Deficiencies is served, the COP of the employee will complete and submit the necessary documentation, which is to be recorded on the employee’s TEAMS II Report.

In certain circumstances, it may be appropriate for the Department to initiate a personnel complaint. Those instances include when training alone is insufficient, has already been provided and proven ineffective, and/or the employee substantially deviated from Department policy or procedure(s) without justification. When a personnel complaint is initiated, the employee could face an official reprimand, demotion, suspension, or termination.

Internal Process Report (IPR) Immediately following the adjudication by the BOPC and decision by the COP on outcomes, CIRD forwards an IPR Form, which lists the individual findings for each substantially involved employee, to the involved employee’s CO. The CO personally meets with the employee(s) and discusses the incident, the BOPC findings and COP determination on the outcomes. Additionally, the CO shall discuss any adverse actions related to the incident as a result of a finding of Administrative Disapproval or Out of Policy.

Tactical Debrief

All SIP in a CUOF receive a formal debriefing known as a Tactical Debrief. This Tactical Debrief is a critical part of the process for the employees, the Department, and law enforcement in general. It affords all parties the opportunity to identify what was successful, as well as which areas require improvement. The Tactical Debrief addresses topics that could assist in the modification or enhancement of the Department’s commitment to best practices and overall employee performance. Curriculum and class instruction are formatted to promote dialogue and an open forum between personnel and the instructors, thus allowing a more suitable platform for collaboration and overall enrichment. The Tactical Debrief is facilitated by a member of the Department’s Training Division and occurs within 90 days after the BOPC’s adjudication of the incident.

DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL TRACKING & MONITORING

Following the enactment of the Federal Consent Decree in 2001, the Department was required to implement numerous reform measures to track the trajectory and scope of its performance and consent decree adherence. One such measure was the development of the computerized Training Evaluation and Management Systems II (TEAMS II) database.

TEAMS II is the Department's version of a risk management database, wherein information is collected about each officer's UOF involvement, civilian complaints, training activities, commendations, vehicle accidents, and many other performance measures. Once a threshold is met in any of those fields, the system automatically alerts supervisors about officer-specific patterns of activity seem more at risk than their peers. The TEAMS II system is an effective human resource management tool for the Department and its use promotes transparency and accountability within the organization.
CATEGORICAL

USE OF FORCE

USE OF FORCE REVIEW PROCESS

1. **CUOF INCIDENT OCCURS**
   - SIP immediately restricted from the field.

2. **FID/OIG**
   - Force Investigation Division (FID) personnel respond and conduct the CUOF investigation (completed within 240 days of the incident).
   - Office of Inspector General (OIG) responds to the scene and monitors the investigation.

3. **CRITICAL INCIDENT REVIEW DIVISION**
   - CIRD receives completed FID investigation for review and schedules a UOFRB.

4. **USE OF FORCE REVIEW BOARD**
   - UOFRB is convened, and chaired by the Director of OSS.

5. **CHIEF OF POLICE**
   - The COP receives UOFRB recommendations and evaluates the incident.
   - COP reports his recommendations to the BOPC.

6. **BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS**
   - BOPC receives COP recommendations and evaluates the incident.
   - BOPC adjudicates the incident.

7. **CHIEF OF POLICE**
   - COP determines the outcome for BOPC findings of:
     - Administrative Disapproval - Tactics;
     - Out of Policy - Drawing and Exhibiting; and,
     - Out of Policy - Use of Force.

   The outcomes are:
   - Extensive retraining;
   - Notice to correct deficiencies; or,
   - Personnel complaint.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY’S OFFICE
LACDA call-out team monitors the investigation of incidents that meet the criteria.

JUSTICE SYSTEM INTEGRITY DIVISION
The LACDA Justice System Integrity Division submits a letter of declination or files charges against the officer.

PERSONNEL COMPLAINT
A personnel complaint may be initiated as a result of BOPC’s findings. See page 134 for details on the personnel complaint process.
For almost 70 years, Internal Affairs Group, under the command of PSB, has operated as the investigative arm of the COP to identify and report employee behavior that violates Department policy or otherwise discredits the organization.

**INITIATION & INVESTIGATION PROCESS**

The initiation process for complaints resulting from UOF findings of Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy differs depending on whether the force was classified as a CUOF or NCUOF incident.

**Categorical Use of Force**

The Board of Police Commissioners adjudicates the UOF and determines the findings for each involved employee. If an Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy finding is adopted the COP determines which of the below listed outcomes is most appropriate to address the employee’s actions. Such remedial actions may include:

- Completion of extensive retraining;
- Notice to Correct Deficiencies; and/or
- Personnel complaint.

If the COP determines a personnel complaint is appropriate, CIRD initiates the complaint through the Complaint Management System and transmits it to the Complaint Classifications Unit (CCU), IAG. Complaints resulting from CUOF incidents are investigated by CCU.

Due to the exhaustive FID investigation and subsequent review process, complaints are commonly initiated within two months of the administrative statute date. To complete the complaint investigation within such a short time period, CCU investigators generally use the FID investigation, interviews, and transcripts to complete the complaint. There are occasions when ancillary allegations and discrepancies necessitate additional investigation by CCU staff.

**Non-Categorical Use of Force**

Personnel complaints and/or training resulting from Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy findings for NCUOF Incidents may be initiated by one of the following at any point throughout the UOF review cycle:

- Divisional CO;
- Bureau CO; or
- Commanding Officer, CIRD.

Complaints associated with NCUOF incidents are generally investigated by CCU, and occasionally by other IAG investigators. The investigators review all reports and interviews related to the UOF, probe ancillary allegations, and address discrepancies as they would any other type of allegation.

**COMPLAINT ADJUDICATION PROCESS**

The Department’s adjudication process begins with the accused employee’s CO and goes through multiple levels of review. Upon completion of a disciplinary complaint investigation the employee’s CO is responsible for reviewing the investigation, determining whether misconduct occurred, and recommending the disposition, and penalty, if applicable. Consistent with the Department’s standards, adjudicators must determine by a preponderance of evidence whether misconduct occurred. Preponderance of evidence means the weight of evidence on one side is greater than the evidence presented for the other side. The adjudicator must make a determination for each allegation based on factual, reasonable consideration of the evidence and statements presented in the investigation.

The possible disciplinary dispositions for all complaints of misconduct include:

- Sustained;
- Unfounded (the act did not occur);
- Exonerated (the act occurred but was justified, lawful and proper);
- Not Resolved (when evidence does not clearly prove or disprove the allegation);
- Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate; or,
- Withdrawn by the COP (used only by the COP when an allegation would be better adjudicated by a court; imposing discipline is legally prohibited; the alleged act is minor misconduct and significant time has passed; or evidence has been lost or destroyed).

However, when force known to have occurred is found to be Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy, and the COP has determined it should be addressed with a personnel complaint, the most likely disposition is sustained.
The CO submits the adjudication disposition recommendation up the chain of command to the employee’s bureau CO. The bureau CO can concur with the recommendation, or if the bureau CO disagrees with the recommended adjudication, the bureau CO will prepare correspondence to IAG documenting the rationale for the bureau’s recommended adjudication. This is referred to as a Military Endorsement.

The next level of review is done in a group setting referred to as a “Case Analysis Team.” This group consists of the COs of PSB and IAG, the captains assigned to PSB and IAG, the Department Advocate, and the lieutenants preparing to present sustained cases to the COP. The purpose of the meeting is to provide an opportunity for the presenters to brief the group on each case being presented to the COP. The presenters include a synopsis of the supporting evidence, or lack thereof, discuss errors made by the adjudicator(s) in the findings or recommended penalty, a risk analysis of the employee, which includes disciplinary history, and other unusual circumstance(s) that may affect the final decision by the COP. The group asks questions to ensure that all pertinent areas of the investigation were covered and that the final disposition of findings is sound. The recommended penalty is also evaluated to ensure it is within a range consistent with that which other similarly situated officers have received for similar misconduct. Once the group agrees the findings and penalty are appropriate, the case is ready for presentation to the COP.

All personnel complaints resulting from CUOF incidents found to be Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy by the BOPC are presented to the COP for final adjudication and penalty.

Complaints resulting from Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy findings for NCUOF incidents are subject to the same review process as all other types of complaints. When the recommended adjudication is sustained with a penalty of an official reprimand or greater, IAG submits the completed review process as all other types of complaints. When the Policy findings for NCUOF incidents are subject to the same review process as all other types of complaints. When the Board of Rights finds the officer guilty or not guilty based on the preponderance of evidence [City Charter Section 1070(l)]. If the Board of Rights finds the officer guilty, the complaint concludes and the officer is referred to a Board of Rights.

**BOARDS OF RIGHTS**

A Board of Rights is considered a de novo hearing. The Board is composed of two sworn Department members (at the rank of Captain or above), and one civilian member from the BOPC’s list of approved hearing officers. Members of the Board of Rights must make an independent assessment of the matter based solely on the evidence presented to them at the hearing [City Charter Sections 1070(f), 1070(n), and 1070(x)].

The Board of Rights will determine, by majority vote, if the officer is guilty or not guilty based on the preponderance of evidence [City Charter Section 1070(l)]. If the Board of Rights finds the officer not guilty, the complaint concludes and the COP may not impose a penalty.

If the officer is found guilty, under City Charter Section 1070(n), the Board of Rights recommends a penalty, which is prescribed by written order of:

- Suspension for a definite period not exceeding 65 working days with total loss of pay, and with or without reprimand;
- Demotion in rank, with or without suspension or reprimand or both; or
- Reprimand without further penalty; or
- Removal.

In determining the final penalty, the COP will consider the Board of Rights’ recommendation, but has the authority to impose a lesser penalty than recommended. The COP, however, may not impose a higher penalty [City Charter Section 1070(p)].

**APPEAL PROCESS**

The appeal process for complaints resulting from Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy findings on UOF incidents varies depending on the penalty imposed.

If the officer is guilty, under City Charter Section 1070(n), the Board of Rights recommends a penalty, which is prescribed by written order of:

- Suspension for a definite period not exceeding 65 working days with total loss of pay, and with or without reprimand;
- Demotion in rank, with or without suspension or reprimand or both; or
- Reprimand without further penalty; or
- Removal.

In determining the final penalty, the COP will consider the Board of Rights’ recommendation, but has the authority to impose a lesser penalty than recommended. The COP, however, may not impose a higher penalty [City Charter Section 1070(p)].

The COP shall either uphold the recommendation of the Board of Rights or may, at his discretion, impose a penalty less severe than that ordered by the Board of Rights, but may not impose a greater penalty [City Charter Section 1070(p)].

Officers are also provided an opportunity to appeal the Department’s action when a CUOF results in Administrative Disapproval – Extensive Retraining. As set for in Article 9 of the MOU, CUOF adjudications of Administrative Disapproval – Extensive Retraining are subject to the Administrative Appeal process. The Department shall bear the burden of proof to establish by a preponderance of evidence that the Department’s action should remain.
The Department’s Behavioral Science Services (BSS) is the oldest and most established in-house law enforcement psychological service entity in the United States. Since 1968, BSS has been a leader in the field of law enforcement psychology, having introduced not only the first in-house counseling service, but the first group of field-deployed police psychologists assigned to geographical Areas and Divisions. Behavioral Science Services police psychologists are experienced in debriefing officers exposed to a wide array of potentially traumatizing occurrences, including both CUOF and NCUOF incidents.

Officers involved in an OIS, including those who discharged their weapons and others who were immediately present, are mandated to visit BSS for individual psychological debriefings by a licensed psychologist. The purpose of the debriefing is to evaluate the officer’s emotional, cognitive, behavioral, and physiological reactions to the incident. If an officer was involved in an OIS that resulted in injury, or a CUOF resulting in death or the substantial possibility of death, the officers will attend a total of three mandatory sessions with BSS. A CO can also order his/her personnel to BSS at their discretion if the employee was involved in a CUOF incident other than those listed above.

The first session is generally scheduled three days after the incident. Appointments are arranged by the concerned employee’s CO and the sessions are conducted on an on-duty basis. Following the first session, the psychologist typically makes a recommendation to the concerned CO regarding whether the officer should be allowed to return to their pre-incident work assignment. The psychologist may also direct the officer to return for additional mandated sessions or, if warranted, suggest temporary non-field duties. To be reinstated to full work-duty status, an employee must receive approval from BSS and concurrence from the COP, via the employee’s chain of command. Under no circumstance will an officer who discharged their weapon be returned to field duty until at least 14 days have elapsed from the date of the incident.

The second session is scheduled approximately four to eight weeks after the incident. The third session occurs just before or after the UOFRB has concluded.

Behavioral Science Services also provides individual and couples counseling to all Department personnel and their spouses. Although counseling is the primary service offered by BSS, the psychologists also provide training for Department personnel on topics such as stress management, suicide prevention, and anger management.

Behavioral Science Services also provides organizational and psychological consultation to groups within the Department. In addition, psychologists from BSS respond with SWAT personnel to hostage negotiations and barricaded suspect situations. Furthermore, BSS designs and conducts research regarding various specialized areas related to law enforcement training and operations.

To assist with the Department’s commitment to provide employees with wellness related services, BSS recently identified specific organizational goals, including expansion of wellness and injury reduction efforts, quality enhancements of its pre-existing services and automatization of its procedures for increased efficiency. To effectively achieve these goals, BSS will:

- Examine ways of expanding wellness promotion activities to both sworn and civilian personnel;
- Publish public service announcement-style educational materials regarding various health and injury prevention subjects;
- Expand proactive addiction prevention efforts of the Addiction Prevention Unit;
- Minimize the risk of compassion fatigue among staff;
- Develop, implement, and audit strategies to enhance clinical service delivery;
- Critically examine the various functions and tasks the organization performs for opportunities to automate and improve monitoring, service delivery, and efficiency; and,
- Implement real-time service delivery reporting and analysis.
The analysis and application of data-driven strategies within the Department, specifically as it relates to the monitoring of crime levels and significant law enforcement-related occurrences (including UOF incidents), enhances accountability and transparency, and allows for a more effective utilization of resources.
Consistent with the parameters established by the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program, the Department categorizes the following four criminal offenses as violent crimes: criminal homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>1,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>7,940</td>
<td>9,001</td>
<td>10,307</td>
<td>10,818</td>
<td>10,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agg Assault</td>
<td>10,652</td>
<td>14,396</td>
<td>15,996</td>
<td>16,944</td>
<td>16,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,502</td>
<td>25,596</td>
<td>28,691</td>
<td>30,069</td>
<td>29,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, there were a total of 29,145 violent crimes that occurred throughout the City, which accounted for a decrease of 924 violent crime occurrences, or three percent, compared to 2017. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 24,715 violent crime occurrences, 2018 had 4,430 more violent crimes, or 18 percent, above the four-year annual average.

In review of the four violent crime categories, all four categories (homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) experienced decreases in 2018 as compared to the prior year. Additionally, two of the four violent crime categories (robbery and aggravated assault) exceeded their respective 2014 through 2017 annual averages.

OTHER CITY COMPARISON

According to 2018 UCR violent crime data for the first half of 2018, as published by the FBI, Houston experienced the highest violent crime rate amongst the five most populous cities in the country, with 5.2 violent crime occurrences per 1,000 individuals. Chicago experienced the second highest violent crime rate of 4.8 violent crime occurrences per 1,000 individuals. Philadelphia experienced the third highest violent crime rate of 4.4 violent crime occurrences per 1,000 individuals. Los Angeles experienced the fourth highest violent crime rate of 3.6 violent crime occurrences per 1,000 individuals. New York City experienced the fifth highest violent crime rate of 2.6 violent crime occurrences per 1,000 individuals.

In 2018, Black suspects accounted for 17,685 of the four cumulative violent crime categories, which represented 43 percent of the 41,119 total violent crime suspects in 2018. Hispanic suspects accounted for the second highest group with 16,456 suspects, or 40 percent, of the total. Whites had the third highest with 16,345 suspects, or eight percent, of the total. Unknown ethnic classification accounted for 1,225 suspects, or three percent, of the total.
2018 USE OF FORCE YEAR-END REVIEW

LAPD PERSONNEL FIGURES

As of December 31st, 2018, the Department employed 10,080 sworn personnel, making it the third largest police department in the nation behind the New York Police Department (NYPD) and the Chicago Police Department (CPD).

Sworn Personnel by Ethnicity

Sworn Department personnel of Hispanic descent account for the largest ethnic category of employees in the Department with 4,881 out of the 10,080 total personnel, or 48 percent. The following depicts the remaining Department sworn personnel categories according to ethnicity along with their respective totals and percentage breakdowns:

Sworn Personnel by Rank

The Department has 6,900 employees that are at the rank of police officer, which represents 68 percent of the 10,080 total Department personnel. The following depicts the remaining Department sworn personnel categories according to rank along with their respective totals and percentage breakdowns:

Note: On a per capita basis, the Department has 25.5 officers per 10,000 residents, compared to the CPD and NYPD averages of 46.1 and 41.8 officers per 10,000 residents, respectively. From a geographical perspective, the Department has 21.5 officers per square mile, compared to the CPD with 54 officers per square mile, and NYPD with 119 officers per square mile.

2018 STATISTICAL SNAPSHOT

FIGURES

Department Personnel Figures

In 2018, 81,963 Part II Crime incidents (kidnap, other sex offenses, weapons violations, identity theft, fraud, forgery/counterfeiting, embezzlement, prostitution, disorderly conduct, and vandalism) occurred throughout the City. This number represents a two percent decrease, or 2,432 less incidents, than the 131,525 incidents in 2017. In 2018, there were 11,572, or ten percent, more incidents than the 2017 five-year average annual occurrence of 117,155 incidents.

Part II Crime

In 2018, 81,963 Part II Crime incidents (kidnap, other sex crimes, simple assaults, crimes against family/children, weapons violations, identity theft, fraud, forgery/counterfeiting, embezzlement, prostitution, disorderly conduct, and vandalism) occurred throughout the City. The 2018 total was a decrease of 2,911 incidents, or three percent, less compared to the 84,874 incidents in 2017.
In 2018, Hispanic subjects accounted for 348,388, or 46 percent, of the 754,352 individuals stopped during observation-related field detentions. Black subjects accounted for 219,471, or 29 percent, of the individuals stopped. White subjects accounted for 17 percent with 129,627 of the individuals stopped. American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Other or Unknown ethnicities accounted for 56,866 individuals, or eight percent, cumulatively.

In 2018, 77th Street Division accounted for the most calls for service with 299,139 calls, or 30 percent, of the 1,000,063 total for the year. West Bureau had the second highest count with 251,006 calls, or 25 percent. Central Bureau had the third highest count with 233,677 calls, or 23 percent. Lastly, South Bureau accounted for the lowest radio call count with 55,855 calls, or six percent of the total calls for service.

Based on Bureau totals in 2018, Valley Bureau accounted for the most calls for service with 299,139 calls, or 30 percent, of the 1,000,063 total for the year. West Bureau had the second highest count with 251,006 calls, or 25 percent. Central Bureau had the third highest count with 233,677 calls, or 23 percent. Lastly, South Bureau accounted for the lowest radio call count with 233,677 calls, or 23 percent. The remaining 2,329 calls for service, or two percent, occurred in non-defined City areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. of Suspects</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>219,471</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>348,388</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>129,627</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>56,866</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>754,352</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, 77th Street Division accounted for the most calls for service with 299,139 calls, or 30 percent, of the 1,000,063 total for the year. West Bureau had the second highest count with 251,006 calls, or 25 percent. Central Bureau had the third highest count with 233,677 calls, or 23 percent. Lastly, South Bureau accounted for the lowest radio call count with 55,855 calls, or six percent of the total calls for service.

Based on Bureau totals in 2018, Valley Bureau accounted for the most calls for service with 299,139 calls, or 30 percent, of the 1,000,063 total for the year. West Bureau had the second highest count with 251,006 calls, or 25 percent. Central Bureau had the third highest count with 233,677 calls, or 23 percent. Lastly, South Bureau accounted for the lowest radio call count with 55,855 calls, or six percent of the total calls for service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. of Suspects</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>219,471</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>348,388</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>129,627</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>56,866</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>754,352</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department Citation Information
In 2018, a total of 227,293 citations were issued. This total included 198,500 traffic related citations and 28,793 Release from Custody (RFC) arrest reports, which are written in lieu of confinement for certain misdemeanor-related violations.

In 2018, 77th Street Division accounted for the most calls for service with 299,139 calls, or 30 percent, of the 1,000,063 total for the year. West Bureau had the second highest count with 251,006 calls, or 25 percent. Central Bureau had the third highest count with 233,677 calls, or 23 percent. Lastly, South Bureau accounted for the lowest radio call count with 55,855 calls, or six percent of the total calls for service.

Based on Bureau totals in 2018, Valley Bureau accounted for the most calls for service with 299,139 calls, or 30 percent, of the 1,000,063 total for the year. West Bureau had the second highest count with 251,006 calls, or 25 percent. Central Bureau had the third highest count with 233,677 calls, or 23 percent. Lastly, South Bureau accounted for the lowest radio call count with 55,855 calls, or six percent of the total calls for service.

Based on Bureau totals in 2018, Valley Bureau accounted for the most calls for service with 299,139 calls, or 30 percent, of the 1,000,063 total for the year. West Bureau had the second highest count with 251,006 calls, or 25 percent. Central Bureau had the third highest count with 233,677 calls, or 23 percent. Lastly, South Bureau accounted for the lowest radio call count with 55,855 calls, or six percent of the total calls for service.
**USE OF FORCE REVIEW**

Department personnel were involved in 61 CUOF incidents and 2,126 NCUOF incidents in 2018. The combined total of 2,187 incidents was a decrease of 14 incidents, or one percent less, compared to the 2,201 total UOF incidents in 2017.

### Categorical Use of Force Incidents

The table below depicts the CUOF totals for 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>On-Duty, Non-Tactical</th>
<th>On-Duty, Tactical</th>
<th>Off-Duty</th>
<th>Pre-Planned</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warning Shot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LERI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Custody Death</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Flag Down</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Duty, Non-Tactical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Duty, Tactical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source of Activity for CUOF Incidents**

In 2018, 30 incidents, or 50 percent of the Department’s 61 CUOF incidents, originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. Eighteen incidents, or 30 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (i.e. pedestrian and traffic stops). Four incidents originated as pre-planned activities, which represented seven percent.

The following depicts the remaining category totals and their respective percentages:

- Off-Duty: one incident, or two percent;
- On-Duty, Non-Tactical (Unintentional Discharge [UD] incidents): four incidents, or seven percent;
- Station Call: one incident, or two percent;
- Citizen Flag Down: one incident, or two percent; and,
- Other: one incident, or two percent

**Officer Involved Shooting Incidents**

Of the 61 CUOF incidents in 2018, 33 were OIS occurrences. The 2018 OIS total was a decrease of 11 incidents, or 25 percent, less than the 44 OISs in 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 162 OIS occurrences, resulting in an annual average of 41 incidents. The 2018 count was below the 2014 through 2017 four-year annual average by eight incidents, or 20 percent.

There were 35 suspects involved in the 33 OIS incidents in 2018. Nineteen of the 35 suspects, or 54 percent, were Hispanic. Ten of the suspects, or 29 percent, were Black. Four of the suspects, or 11 percent, were Other or Unknown ethnic designation. Two of the suspects, or six percent, were White.

**Source of Activity for NCUOF Incidents**

In 2018, 1,226, or 58%, of the Department’s 2,126 NCUOF incidents occurred in the City. The remaining 876 incidents occurred in the unincorporated areas of the county.

**Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2018 OIS Suspect</th>
<th>Violent Crime Suspect</th>
<th>City Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(See Other)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Categorical Use of Force Incidents**

In 2018, 2,126 NCUOF incidents occurred in the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>1,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**

- Citizen Flag Down: 169 incidents, or eight percent;
- Other: 132 incidents, or six percent;
- Station Call: 23 incidents, or one percent; and,
- Unknown: six incidents, or less than one percent.

Refer to Page 40, Non-Categorical Use of Force Levels, for definition of Level I and Level II.
It is important to note that a vast majority of police interactions with the public do not result in a use of force. In 2018, the Department had 1,754,415 documented public contacts. During those contacts, 754,352 individuals were stopped during observation-related field detentions (including both vehicle and pedestrian stops), 92,751 arrests were effected, and 2,187 use of force incidents occurred (33 of which were OIS incidents).
The graph below depicts the 2014 through 2018 annual percentages of seven of the most represented weapon/force types utilized by suspects in OIS incidents. As shown, firearms overwhelmingly accounted for the highest volume of weapons utilized by suspects, with a seven-year annual average of 53 percent. During the same period, edged weapons consistently accounted for the second highest volume of weapons with a five-year annual average of 19 percent. OIS incidents involving “other” weapons, perception-based shootings, and replica/pellet guns accounted for a five-year annual average of 16 percent. Impact devices accounted for four percent of weapons; and lastly, two percent involved no weapons.

2018 experienced the highest percentage of suspects armed with firearms compared to the previous four years.
Philadelphia Police Department (PPD) – Qualify once per year with handguns; twice per year with long gun (rifle or shotgun) if certified, and once a year on a Force Option Simulator (FOS) type system. There are no years of service and/or rank exemptions.

New York Police Department (NYPD) – Qualify twice per year with handguns; no shotgun or rifle qualification unless certified and part of a specialized unit. There is no FOS type qualification and there are no years of service and/or rank exemptions.

Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department (LASD) – Qualify four times per year with handguns; no shotgun qualification and no qualification on a FOS type system. Rifle certification for LASD is a two year qualification which requires deputies to qualify twice on the range the first year, then complete an eight hour class and another range qualification the following year.

Houston Police Department (HPD) – Qualify once per year with handguns; once per year with shotgun, and once per year with rifle if rifle certified. There is no FOS type qualification, but monthly training on a FOS type system is required. There are no years of service and/or rank exemptions.

Chicago Police Department (CPD) – Qualify once per year with handguns; once per year with shotgun if deploying shotgun in the field and twice per year with rifle if rifle certified. There is currently no FOS type qualification. There are no years of service and/or rank exemptions.

Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) – Qualify four times per year with handguns; once per year with shotgun, twice per year with rifle if certified, and once per year on a FOS type system. There are years of service and rank exemptions.
OSIS INCIDENTS
In 2018, the Department had a total of 33 OSIS incidents, which was the highest number of incidents in the comparison group. When compared to 2017, the Department had the largest reduction in the number of OSIS incidents with 11 less incidents than the previous year. The Chicago Police Department (CPD) had the second highest number of OSIS incidents in 2018 and saw no reduction in the number of incidents from the previous year. The Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department (LASD) had the third highest number of OSIS incidents in 2018 and like CPD, had no change in the number of incidents from the previous year. The New York Police Department (NYPD), which was the largest police department in the comparison group, reduced their OSIS incidents by six incidents from the previous year and had the fourth highest number of OSIS incidents in the group. Houston Police Department (HPD) had the fifth highest number of OSIS suspect fatalities in 2018 and had a five-year average of 13 OSIS suspect fatalities. The LASD was the only agency in the comparison group to have an increase of OSIS suspect fatalities. The CPD had the third highest number of OSIS suspect fatalities in 2018 and had the second highest number of OSIS incidents. The CPD had six OSIS suspect fatalities in 2018, which was two less than the previous year, and had a five-year average of 10 OSIS suspect fatalities. The NYPD had the highest number of OSIS suspect fatalities with a total of five OSIS fatalities, which was five less than the previous year. The HPD had the highest reduction in OSIS fatalities amongst the five agencies and had a five-year average of eight OSIS fatalities. The HPD had a total of four OSIS suspect fatalities in 2018, which was one less than the previous year.

OSIS SUSPECTS DECEASED
In 2018, the Department had a total of 14 suspect fatalities as a result of OSIS incidents, which was an 18 percent reduction, or three less fatalities than the previous year. This represented the lowest number of deceased OSIS suspects in the last five years. The Department had the second highest reduction in suspect fatalities from the previous year in the comparison group and had a five-year average of 18 OSIS fatalities. The LASD had the second highest number of OSIS suspect fatalities in 2018 and had the third highest number of OSIS incidents in the comparison group. The LASD had a total of nine OSIS suspect fatalities in 2018, which was one more than the previous year and had a five-year average of 13 OSIS suspect fatalities. The CPD was the only agency in the comparison group to have an increase of OSIS suspect fatalities. The CPD had the third highest number of OSIS suspect fatalities in 2018 and had the second highest number of OSIS incidents. The CPD had six OSIS suspect fatalities in 2018, which was two less than the previous year, and had a five-year average of 10 OSIS suspect fatalities. The NYPD had the fourth highest OSIS suspect fatalities with a total of five OSIS fatalities, which was five less than the previous year. The NYPD had the highest reduction in OSIS fatalities amongst the five agencies and had a five-year average of eight OSIS fatalities. The CPD had six OSIS suspect fatalities in 2018, which was two less than the previous year. The HPD had the smallest reduction in OSIS fatalities compared to the other agencies and had a five-year average of 3.4 OSIS suspect fatalities.

PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 2017 TO 2018
Overall, the six largest agencies in the U.S. either saw no change or a reduction in the number of OSIS incidents in 2018 when compared to 2017. The NYPD had a 26 percent decrease in the number of OSIS incidents from 2017 to 2018, which was the highest percentage decrease amongst the other agencies. The Department had the second highest percentage decrease in OSIS incidents at 25 percent and the PP had the third largest decrease of incidents at 15 percent. The CPD, LASD, and HPD saw no change in the number of incidents from 2017 to 2018. When comparing OSIS suspect fatalities, the NYPD and the HPD each had a 50 percent reduction which was the highest percentage decrease from the previous year. The CPD saw a 25 percent reduction from the previous year, and the HPD experienced a 20 percent decrease of OSIS suspect fatalities. The Department experienced the smallest percentage decrease when compared to the other agencies at 18 percent. The LASD was the only agency that saw an increase of one OSIS suspect fatality, or a 13 percent increase, from 2017 to 2018. In 2017, all six agencies combined had a total of 150 incidents, resulting in a total of 52 suspect fatalities as the result of an OSIS incident. In 2018, all six agencies combined had a total of 131 incidents with a total of 40 suspect fatalities as the result of an OSIS incident, resulting in a 13 percent reduction in the number of OSIS incidents and a 23 percent reduction in the number of suspect fatalities.
The Department’s publication of various mapping resources assists management in the planning, deployment, and analysis of various assets. Furthermore, mapping resources provide invaluable visual references for field personnel in their daily efforts to prevent crime and to better serve the City.

**UNDERSTANDING**

**MAPPING RESOURCES**

**AND USE OF FORCE HIGHLIGHTS**

**2018 UOF INCIDENTS**

**(BY REPORTING DISTRICT)**

**Geographic Areas**

1. Central Area
2. Rampart Area
3. Southwest Area
4. Hollenbeck Area
5. Harbor Area
6. Hollywood Area
7. Wilshire Area
8. West Los Angeles Area
9. Van Nuys Area
10. West Valley Area
11. Northeast Area
12. 77th Street Area
13. Newton Area
14. Pacific Area
15. North Hollywood Area
16. Foothill Area
17. Devonshire Area
18. Southeast Area
19. Mission Area
20. Olympic Area
21. Topanga Area

**UOF Occurrence**

- None
- Very Low
- Low
- Moderate
- High
- Very High
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LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
There were a total of 61 categorical use of force incidents in 2018.

- **Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) - Hit**: There were a total of 24 OIS incidents in 2018.
  - 5 of 7 resulted from radio calls (71%)
  - All involved personnel were assigned to patrol
  - 2 of 7 deceased were perceived to be homeless
  - 1 of 7 deceased was perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis
  - All three deceased with completed toxicology examinations had positive results for alcohol and/or controlled substance(s)
  - 2 of 7 deceased were determined to have died by suicide

- **Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) - No Hit**: There were a total of 9 OIS incidents in 2018.
  - 3 of 7 incidents resulted from radio calls
  - 4 of 7 involved personnel assigned to patrol
  - Average 2.3 rounds fired was 18% below four-year annual average (2014-2017)

- **In-Custody Death (ICD)**: There were a total of 7 incidents in 2018.
  - Fewest number of incidents in the last five years
  - 3 of 7 incidents resulted from radio calls
  - 4 of 7 involved personnel assigned to patrol
  - Average 2.3 rounds fired was 18% below four-year annual average (2014-2017)

- **Animal Shooting**: There were a total of 7 incidents in 2018.

- **Unintentional Discharge**: There were a total of 4 incidents in 2018.
  - Full Cube - 10 Incidents
  - Half Cube - 5 Incidents

- **Law Enforcement Related Injury (LERI)**: There were a total of 6 LERI incidents in 2018.
  - Full Cube - 10 Incidents
  - Half Cube - 5 Incidents

- **Head Strike**: There were a total of 2 Head Strike incidents in 2018.

- **Carotid Restraint Control Hold (CRCH)**: There was a total of 1 CRCH incident in 2018.

- **K-9 Contact (Requiring Hospitalization)**: There was a total of 2 K-9 Contact incidents requiring hospitalization in 2018.
54% of OIS incidents involved 1-5 rounds fired by officers.

25% decrease of OIS incidents compared to 2017. 19% below the 2014 through 2017 annual average.

48 officers were involved, an average of 1.5 officers per incident, and a 40% decrease compared to the 2017 average of 2.5.

54% of OIS incidents involved 1-5 rounds fired by officers.

2018 had an average of 1.5 officers per incident (48 Department personnel involved in 33 OIS incidents which was 40% less than the 2017 average of 2.5 officers per incident) 110 Department personnel involved in 44 OIS incidents.

2018 had the 2nd lowest number of OIS incidents in the last 30 years.

58% of completed toxicology examinations for deceased suspects indicated the presence of drugs and/or alcohol.

77% of OIS suspects were armed with either a firearm or an edged weapon.

61% of OIS incidents involved 1 officer firing during the incident in 2018. A decrease of 3%.

36% of OIS incidents involved suspects shooting at officers and/or third-parties.

2018 had an average of 1.5 officers per incident.
Attacks on Officers

- 783 attacks on LAPD officers in 2018, a 5% increase compared to 2017, and a 25% increase compared to the 2013-2017 annual average of 628 incidents.

Firearm Recoveries

- 6,406 firearm recoveries, a 9% increase when compared to the 2013-2017 annual average of 5,851 firearm recoveries.

Public Contacts

- 2018 had 86,258 more public contacts than 2017, but had only 3 more NCUOF incidents than the previous year.

Suspects Drug Impaired

- 2018 had seen a 11% increase compared to 2017.

Suspects Perceived Mentally Ill

- Suspect perceived mentally ill has seen a 3% increase compared to 2017.

Suspect Injuries

- Suspect injuries are down when compared to 2017.

**2018 NCUOF INCIDENTS**

**38%**

**Beanbag use**

- In NCUOF incidents decreased by 38% compared to 2017, and showed a decrease of 1 percentage point compared to the 2014 through 2017 aggregate percentage average of 4%.

**46%**

**TASER use**

- In NCUOF incidents decreased by 46% compared to 2017, and was 40% below the 2014 through 2017 average. 2018 had the lowest number of TASER usages in the past 4 years.

**OC use**

- In NCUOF incidents decreased by 38% compared to 2017, and continued in a five-year downward trend.

**Non-Lethal Force Increase in 2018**

- Non-Lethal Force (Up) **4%**
  - (body weight, firm grips, joint locks, physical force, strikes, and takedowns) in NCUOF increased by 4% in 2018. 2018 had the highest number of non-lethal force applications in the past 4 years.
In review of the statistics published herein, the Department seeks to identify areas where potentially ineffective or outdated UOF-related policies and training can be enhanced, and new innovative practices can be implemented.
In 2018, 12 of the 33 total OIS incidents, or 36 percent, were categorized as Classification I shootings. This accounted for a 13 percentage point increase compared to 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification I shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 22 percent, 2018 experienced a 14 percentage point increase. Historically from 2014 through 2018, Classification I shooting incidents accounted for 48 of the 195 total OIS incidents, or 27 percent.

In 2018, Department personnel were involved in 33 OIS incidents, a decrease of 11 incidents, or 25 percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 162 OIS incidents, resulting in an annual average of 40.5 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 7.5 incidents, or 19 percent.

Officer Involved Shooting incidents are categorized into Hit or No Hit occurrences.

ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, Department personnel were involved in 33 OIS incidents, a decrease of 11 incidents, or 25 percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 162 OIS incidents, resulting in an annual average of 40.5 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 7.5 incidents, or 19 percent.

Continues on page 151
In 2018, ten of the 33 total OIS incidents, or 30 percent, were categorized as Classification II shootings. This accounted for a six percentage point decrease compared to 36 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification II shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 36 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point decrease. Historically from 2014 through 2018, Classification II shooting incidents accounted for 69 of the 195 total OIS incidents, or 35 percent.

In 2018, eight of the 33 total OIS incidents, or 24 percent, were categorized as Classification V shootings. This accounted for a ten percentage point decrease compared to 34 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification V shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 28 percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point decrease. Historically from 2014 through 2018, Classification V shooting incidents accounted for 54 of the 195 total OIS incidents, or 28 percent.

In 2018, 18 of the Department's 33 OIS incidents, or 55 percent, originated from radio calls. This accounted for a 12 percentage point increase compared to 43 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of OIS incidents resulting from radio calls from 2014 through 2017 of 46 percent, 2018 experienced a nine percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, radio calls represented the largest source category of OIS incidents, accounting for 92 of the 195 total incidents, or 47 percent.

In 2018, 14 of the Department's 33 OIS incidents, or 42 percent, originated from field detentions based on officers' observations (i.e., pedestrian and traffic stops). This accounted for a 15 percentage point increase compared to 27 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of OIS incidents resulting from field detentions from 2014 through 2018, field detentions based on officers' observations represented the second largest source category of OIS incidents, accounting for 67 of the 195 total incidents, or 34 percent.

The remaining incident in 2018 occurred during a pre-planned activity, such as a warrant service.
In 2018, seven of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was a decrease of five incidents, or 42 percent, compared to 2017. Twenty-one percent of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department - 33; Central Bureau - seven).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 53 OIS incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 13.3 incidents. The Central Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 6.3 incidents, or 53 percent. For the first time in the past five years, Central Area did not have any OIS incidents.

In 2018, 11 of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was an increase of five incidents, or 83 percent, compared to 2017. Thirty-three percent of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department - 33; South Bureau - 11).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 29 OIS incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 7.3 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 3.7 incidents, or 51 percent.

In 2018, West Bureau experienced the lowest number of OIS incidents of all four Bureaus over the last five years.

In 2018, three of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, a decrease of six incidents, or 67 percent, compared to 2017. Nine percent of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred in West Bureau (Department - 33; West Bureau - three).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 25 OIS incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 6.3 incidents. The West Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 3.3 incidents, or 52 percent.

In 2018, 12 of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was a decrease of one incident, or eight percent, compared to 2017. Thirty-six percent of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department - 33; Valley Bureau - 12).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 37 OIS incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 9.3 incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.7 incidents, or 29 percent.
In 2018, January and July represented the months with the most OIS incidents with five occurrences each, or 15 percent respectively, of the 33 total incidents for the year. June and November each had the second most incidents with four incidents each, or 12 percent respectively. February and May had the third highest counts with three incidents each, or nine percent respectively. The remaining nine incidents, or 27 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

From 2014 through 2018, January represented the month with the most OIS incidents with 23 of the 195 total incidents, or 12 percent. October represented the month with the least, accounting for eight incidents, or four percent. September had the second fewest with nine incidents, or five percent. The remaining 159 incidents, or 86 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

In 2018, January – March: 52 incidents, or 27 percent; April – June: 53 incidents, or 27 percent; July – September: 48 incidents, or 25 percent; and, October through December: 42 incidents, or 22 percent.

The OIS percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2014 through 2018 was as follows:

- January – March: 52 incidents, or 27 percent;
- April – June: 53 incidents, or 27 percent;
- July – September: 48 incidents, or 25 percent; and,
- October through December: 42 incidents, or 22 percent.

No OIS incidents occurred outside the Department's geographical jurisdiction in 2018. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 18 OIS incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 4.5 incidents.

In 2018, Sunday represented the day of the week with the most OIS incidents, accounting for nine occurrences, or 27 percent. Monday represented the second most frequent day of the week with eight incidents, or 24 percent. Saturday represented the third most frequent day of the week with seven incidents, or 21 percent. The remaining nine incidents, or 27 percent, were fairly evenly distributed through the remaining days of the week.

From 2014 through 2018, Sunday and Monday represented the days with the most OIS incidents with 35 of the 195 total, or 18 percent, each. The remaining 125 incidents, or 64 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining days of the week.

The five-year annual average for 2014 through 2018 was 17.4 OIS incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and 21.6 incidents occurring between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The time distribution varied from 2014 through 2017, where 74 OIS incidents, or 46 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m. and 88 incidents, or 54 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.
In 2018, 48 Department personnel were involved in the 33 OIS incidents throughout the year, resulting in an average of 1.5 officers per incident. This accounted for a 40 percent decrease compared to an average of 2.5 officers per incident in 2017. The 2018 officer to incident average fell below the 2014 through 2017 aggregate annual average of 1.6 officers per incident by 17 percent.

In 2018, 44 male officers were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 94 percent of the 48 total employees, or 61 of 48. This accounted for a 40 percent decrease compared to 95 percent in 2017. The percentage of male officers involved in OIS incidents in 2018 was ten percentage points below the Department’s overall male total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 94 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017 aggregate annual average of 1.6 officers per incident by 17 percent.

In 2018, four female officers were involved in OIS incidents, which represented eight percent of the 48 total employees. This accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to five percent in 2017. The percentage of female officers involved in OIS incidents in 2018 was ten percentage points below the Department’s overall female total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female personnel from 2014 through 2017 of six percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, females accounted for 22 of the 346 total involved employees, or six percent.

In 2018, 26 Hispanic officers were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 54 percent of the 48 total employees. This accounted for a six percent point increase compared to 48 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic officers involved in OIS incidents in 2018 was six percentage points above the Department’s overall Hispanic total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 55 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in OIS incidents were Hispanic, accounting for 191 of the 346 total employees, or 55 percent.

In 2018, 14 White officers were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 29 percent of the 48 total employees. This accounted for a nine percentage point decrease compared to 38 percent in 2017. The percentage of White officers involved in OIS incidents in 2018 was two percentage points below the Department’s overall White total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 32 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, White officers represented for the second largest ethnic category of personnel involved in OIS incidents, accounting for 110 of the 346 total employees, or 32 percent.

In 2018, five Asian/Pacific Islander officers were involved in OIS incidents, which represented ten percent of the 48 total employees. This accounted for a five percentage point increase compared to five percent in 2017. The percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander officers involved in OIS incidents in 2018 was two percentage points above the Department’s overall Asian/Pacific Islander total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Asian/Pacific Islander personnel from 2014 through 2017 of six percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Asian/Pacific Islander officers accounted for 22 of the 346 total employees involved in OIS incidents, or six percent.

The remaining three employees, or six percent, involved in 2018 OIS incidents included two Filipino officers and one Black officer.
The following depicts the percentage of personnel involved in OIS incidents in 2018 based on their respective years of service classifications:

- **Less than one year of service** – four percent (two out of 48 total officers).
- **1-5 years of service** – 23 percent (11 out of 48 total officers).
- **6-10 years of service** – 21 percent (11 out of 48 total officers); and
- **11-20 years of service** – 26 percent (12 out of 48 total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in three of the five years of service categories and decreases in three when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in OIS incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- **Less than one year of service** – two percentage point increase (two percent during four-year period, four percent in 2018);
- **1-5 years of service** – five percentage point decrease (22 percent during four-year period, 17 percent in 2018);
- **6-10 years of service** – four percentage point decrease (14 percent during four-year period, ten percent in 2018).

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in OIS incidents had 6-10 years of service, accounting for 109 of the 346 total employees, or 32 percent. Officers with 11-20 years of service accounted for the second largest category with a total of 104 employees, or 30 percent. Officers with 1-5 years of service were the third largest group, with 78 employees, or 23 percent. Officers with less than one year of service, which accounted for seven employees, represented only two percent of the total.

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the five years of service categories and decreases in three when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in OIS incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- **Less than one year of service** – two percentage point increase (two percent during four-year period, four percent in 2018);
- **1-5 years of service** – five percentage point decrease (22 percent during four-year period, 17 percent in 2018);
- **6-10 years of service** – four percentage point decrease (14 percent during four-year period, ten percent in 2018).

In 2018, 43 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 90 percent of the 48 total employees. This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 94 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in OIS incidents in 2018 was 22 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 93 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of personnel involved in OIS incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 91 out of the 346 total employees, or 26 percent.

In 2018, three employees at the rank of detective were involved in OIS incidents, which represented six percent of the 48 total employees. This accounted for a one percentage point increase compared to five percent in 2017. The percentage of detectives involved in OIS incidents in 2018 was nine percentage points below the Department’s overall detective total.

When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of detective from 2014 through 2017, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, detectives represented the second largest category of personnel involved in OIS incidents, accounting for 17 of the 346 total employees, or five percent.

The remaining two employees involved in OIS incidents in 2018, representing four percent of the 48 total personnel, were at the rank of sergeant.
In 2018, eight personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 17 percent of the 48 total personnel. This represented a 14 percentage point decrease compared to 31 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division from 2014 through 2017 of 20 percent, 2018 experienced a 13 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Metropolitan Division personnel were in more OIS incidents than any other division, accounting for 68 of the 346 total employees involved in OIS incidents, or 20 percent.

In 2018, seven personnel assigned to Southwest Division were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 15 percent of the 48 total employees. This represented a 13 percentage point increase compared to two percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Southwest Division from 2014 through 2017 of two percent, 2018 experienced a 13 percent point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to Southwest Division accounted for 14 of the 346 total employees involved in OIS incidents, or four percent. In 2017, Metropolitan Division SWAT personnel were involved in four OIS incidents, accounting for 65 percent of the Metropolitan Division personnel involved in OIS incidents.

**Notes:** In 2017, 22 Metropolitan Division SWAT personnel were involved in four OIS incidents, accounting for 65 percent of the Metropolitan Division personnel involved in OIS incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Area/Bureau</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Traffic Divisions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining 26 Department personnel, or 54 percent, were fairly evenly distributed amongst the remaining Areas/Divisions.

The following is the employee Bureau assignment for the 48 total personnel involved in OIS incidents in 2018:

- Central Bureau: four personnel, or eight percent;
- West Bureau: four personnel, or eight percent;
- South Bureau: 13 personnel, or 27 percent;
- Valley Bureau: 17 personnel, or 35 percent;
- CTSOB: eight personnel, or 17 percent; and,
- Other: two personnel, or four percent.

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the six Bureau categories and decreases in four, when compared to 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Central Bureau: seven percentage point decrease (15 percent in 2017, eight percent in 2018);
- West Bureau: ten percentage point decrease (18 percent in 2017, eight percent in 2018);
- South Bureau: 18 percent point decrease (18 percent in 2017, 27 percent in 2018);
- Valley Bureau: 17 percent point increase (18 percent in 2017, 36 percent in 2018);
- CTSOB: 14 percentage point decrease (31 percent in 2017, 17 percent in 2018); and,
- Other: four percentage point decrease (eight percent in 2017, four percent in 2018).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the six Bureau categories and decreases in four, when compared to their respective aggregate percentages during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Central Bureau: 16 personnel point decrease (24 percent during four-year period, eight percent in 2018);
- West Bureau: seven percentage point decrease (15 percent during four-year period, eight percent in 2018);
- South Bureau: 11 percentage point increase (16 percent during four-year period, 27 percent in 2018);
- Valley Bureau: 17 percentage point increase (15 percent during four-year period, 35 percent in 2018);
- CTSOB: three percentage point decrease (20 percent during four-year period, 17 percent in 2018); and,
- Other: three percentage point decrease (seven percent during four-year period, four percent in 2018).

Similarly in 2018, seven personnel assigned to Van Nuys Division were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 15 percent of the 48 total employees. This represented a 11 percentage point increase compared to four percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Van Nuys Division from 2014 through 2017 of three percent, 2018 experienced a 12 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to Van Nuys Division accounted for 17 of the 346 total employees involved in OIS incidents, or five percent.
In 2018, 31 personnel assigned to patrol were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 65 percent of the 48 total personnel. This accounted for a 20 percentage point increase compared to 45 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2014 through 2017 of 54 percent, 2018 experienced an 11 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in OIS incidents were assigned to patrol, accounting for 191 of the 346 total employees, or 55 percent.

In 2018, eight personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 17 percent of the 48 total personnel. This accounted for a 14 percentage point decrease compared to 31 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division from 2014 through 2017 of six percent, 2018 experienced no percentage point change. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division represented the third largest category of personnel involved in OIS incidents, accounting for 68 of the 346 total employees, or 20 percent.

In 2018, six personnel assigned to specialized assignments were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 13 percent of the 48 total personnel. This accounted for a six percentage point decrease compared to 19 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to specialized assignments from 2014 through 2017 of 20 percent, 2018 experienced a seven percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to specialized assignments represented the fourth largest category of personnel involved in OIS incidents, accounting for 69 of the 346 total employees, or 20 percent.

In 2018, there were 20 single shooter OIS incidents, which represented 61 percent of the 33 total incidents. This accounted for a three percentage point decrease compared to 64 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of single shooter OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 65 percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point decrease.

No Department personnel were killed during or resulting from OIS incidents during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018. However, 56 officers sustained injuries during the same five-year period.

In 2018, nine officers sustained injuries during the 33 OIS incidents throughout the year. This accounted for a 25 percent decrease compared to 12 injured officers in 2017. Additionally, when compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 11.75 injured officers, 2018 was 2.75 injured officers, or 23 percent, below the four-year annual average.
In 2018, 44 handguns were utilized during OIS incidents, which represented 38 percent of the 59 total weapon types. This accounted for a 23 percentage point increase compared to 65 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of handguns utilized during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 77 percent, 2018 experienced an 11 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, handguns were the most utilized weapon type during OIS incidents, accounting for 274 of the 350 total weapons, or 79 percent.

In 2018, four rifles were utilized during OIS incidents, which represented eight percent of the 50 total weapon types. This accounted for a 24 percentage point decrease compared to 32 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of rifles utilized during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of four percent, 2018 experienced a 11 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, rifles were the second most utilized weapon type during OIS incidents, accounting for 62 of the 350 total weapons, or 18 percent.

In 2018, two shotguns were utilized during OIS incidents, which represented four percent of the 50 total weapon types. This accounted for a one percentage point increase compared to three percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of shotguns utilized during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of four percent, 2018 experienced no percentage point change. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, shotguns represented four percent of the 50 total weapon types. This accounted for 14 of the 350 total weapons utilized in OIS incidents, representing four percent.

In 2018, 44 handguns were utilized during OIS incidents, which represented 38 percent of the 59 total weapon types. This accounted for a 23 percentage point increase compared to 65 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of handguns utilized during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 77 percent, 2018 experienced an 11 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, handguns were the most utilized weapon type during OIS incidents, accounting for 274 of the 350 total weapons, or 79 percent.

In 2018, four rifles were utilized during OIS incidents, which represented eight percent of the 50 total weapon types. This accounted for a 24 percentage point decrease compared to 32 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of rifles utilized during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of four percent, 2018 experienced a 11 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, rifles were the second most utilized weapon type during OIS incidents, accounting for 62 of the 350 total weapons, or 18 percent.

In 2018, two shotguns were utilized during OIS incidents, which represented four percent of the 50 total weapon types. This accounted for a one percentage point increase compared to three percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of shotguns utilized during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of four percent, 2018 experienced no percentage point change. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, shotguns represented four percent of the 50 total weapon types. This accounted for 14 of the 350 total weapons utilized in OIS incidents, representing four percent.

In 2018, an average of 7.6 rounds were fired during OIS incidents. When compared to the 2017 average of 11.2 rounds fired, 2018 experienced a decrease of 3.6 rounds, or 32 percent. Additionally, when compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 7.8 rounds fired per incident, 2018 was 0.2 rounds, or three percent, below the four-year annual average.
In 2018, there were 18 OIS incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired, which represented 55 percent of the 33 total incidents. This accounted for a six percentage point decrease compared to 61 percent in 2017. In addition, when compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 69 percent, 2018 experienced a 14 percentage point decrease.

In 2018, there were five OIS incidents in which 6-10 rounds were fired, which represented 15 percent of the 33 total incidents. This accounted for an eight percentage point increase compared to seven percent in 2017. In addition, when compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 6-10 rounds were fired during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 12 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point increase.

In 2018, there were six OIS incidents in which 11-15 rounds were fired, which represented 18 percent of the 33 total incidents. This accounted for a four percentage point increase compared to 14 percent in 2017. In addition, when compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 11-15 rounds were fired during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of seven percent, 2018 experienced an 11 percentage point increase.

In 2018, there were two OIS incidents in which 16-20 rounds were fired, which represented six percent of the 33 total incidents. This accounted for a one percentage point decrease compared to seven percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 16-20 rounds were fired during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of five percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase.

The remaining two occurrences, or six percent, were shootings in which 21-25 and 26-30 rounds were fired per incident. Both of these categories increased by one occurrence when compared to zero occurrences in 2017.

In 2018, there were no OIS incidents in which 31 or more rounds were fired. This accounted for a 100 percent decrease compared to 11 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 31 or more rounds were fired during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of four percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point decrease.

The 2018 total number of rounds fired compared to the total number of rounds which struck their intended targets resulted in a hit ratio of 33 percent. This accounted for a nine percentage point increase compared to 24 percent in 2017. In addition, when compared to the 2014 through 2017 aggregate hit ratio of 32 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the hit ratio of all OIS incidents, accounting for 491 of the 1,517 total rounds fired, was 32 percent.
In 2018, there were 35 suspects involved in the 33 OIS incidents. Two incidents involved two suspects, while the remaining incidents involved one suspect each. In 2018, 19 Hispanic suspects were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 54 percent of the 35 total suspects. This accounted for a three percentage point decrease compared to 57 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in OIS incidents in 2018 was five percentage points above the City’s overall Hispanic population total. Additionally, the percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in OIS incidents in 2018 was 14 percentage points above the City’s overall Hispanic violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 30 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Hispanic category was the most represented ethnic group involved in OIS incidents with 194 of the 200 total suspects, or 97 percent.

In 2018, 26 Black suspects were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 74 percent of the 35 total suspects. This accounted for a six percentage point decrease compared to 80 percent in 2017. The percentage of Black suspects involved in OIS incidents in 2018 was 14 percentage points above the City’s overall Black violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Black suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 22 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of suspects involved in OIS incidents were male, representing 194 of the 200 total suspects, or 97 percent.

In 2018, 10 Asian/Pacific Islander suspects were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 28 percent of the 35 total suspects. This accounted for a three percentage point decrease compared to 31 percent in 2017. The percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander suspects involved in OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 54 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Asian/Pacific Islander violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Asian/Pacific Islander suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 12 percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of suspects involved in OIS incidents were male, representing 194 of the 200 total suspects, or 97 percent.

In 2018, 12 White suspects were involved in OIS incidents, which represented six percent of the 35 total suspects. This accounted for a 16 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of suspects involved in OIS incidents were male, representing 194 of the 200 total suspects, or 97 percent.

In 2018, one suspect, representing three percent, had an “Unknown” ethnicity classification, pending completion of the investigation by FID.

In 2018, 19 female suspects were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 54 percent of the 35 total suspects. This accounted for a four percentage point increase compared to 50 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 22 percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of suspects involved in OIS incidents were male, representing 194 of the 200 total suspects, or 97 percent.

No female suspects were involved in OIS incidents in 2018.

In 2018, most suspects involved in OIS incidents were in the 30-39 age group. Specifically, 14 of the 35 total suspects, or 40 percent, were included in this age group. The 30-39 age category accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to 37 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 30-39 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 22 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 18-23 age group represented the second largest age category of suspects involved in OIS incidents with 45 of the 200 total suspects, or 23 percent.壮

In 2018, the 18-23 age group represented the second largest age category (along with the 24-29 age group), with eight of the 35 total suspects, or 23 percent. The 18-23 age category accounted for a six percentage point increase compared to 17 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 18-23 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 22 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 18-23 age group represented the second largest age category of suspects involved in OIS incidents with 45 of the 200 total suspects, or 23 percent.

Continues on page 170.
Of the 14 decedents involved in 2018 OIS incidents, nine of whom have completed toxicology examinations by the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner, eight individuals, representing 89 percent of those completed cases, had positive results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s). Toxicology reports for five decedents, or 36 percent of the 14 total decedents, are pending from the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner’s Office.

In 2018, the 24-29 age group represented the second largest age category (along with the 18-23 age group), with eight of the 35 total suspects, or 23 percent. The 24-29 age category accounted for an eight percentage point increase compared to 15 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 24-29 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 22 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 24-29 age group represented the third largest age category of suspects involved in OIS incidents with 44 of the 200 total suspects, or 22 percent.

The five remaining suspects, or 14 percent, in 2018 were in the age ranges of 0-17, 40-49, 50-59, 60 and above, and one with an “unknown” age designation, each accounting for one suspect each.

In 2018, four of the 35 total suspects, or 11 percent, involved in OIS incidents were homeless. This accounted for a four percentage point increase compared to seven percent in 2017. From 2016 through 2018, homeless suspects involved in OIS incidents accounted for nine of the 122 total suspects, or seven percent.

Of the 14 decedents involved in 2018 OIS incidents, nine of whom have completed toxicology examinations by the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner, eight individuals, representing 89 percent of those completed cases, had positive results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s). Toxicology reports for five decedents, or 36 percent of the 14 total decedents, are pending from the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner’s Office.

The partial 2018 percentage of completed cases with positive alcohol and/or a controlled substance results, representing 89 percent, accounted for a seven percentage point increase compared to 82 percent of positive cases in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of decedents with positive toxicology results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s) in OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 at 79 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point increase.

The Department was directed by the BOPC to track homeless data for suspects involved in CUOF incidents starting in 2016. Force Investigation Division has since implemented new procedures to capture this statistic.

Historically from 2014 through 2018, suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for 54 of the 200 total suspects, or 27 percent.
As of year-end 2018, toxicology results for four decedents involved in OIS incidents for the year were unavailable due to pending toxicology reports from the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner.

In 2018, six of the nine OIS decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 67 percent, had positive results for methamphetamine. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 32 percent point increase compared to 36 percent of decedents with positive methamphetamine results in 2017 OIS incidents. Historically, 32 of the 75 decedents involved in 2014 through 2017 OIS incidents, representing 43 percent, had positive toxicology results for methamphetamine.

In 2018, three of the nine OIS decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 33 percent, had positive results for alcohol. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for an eight percent point decrease compared to 41 percent of decedents with positive alcohol results in 2017 OIS incidents. Historically, 29 of the 75 decedents involved in 2014 through 2017 OIS incidents, representing 39 percent, had positive toxicology results for alcohol.

In 2018, three of the nine OIS decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 33 percent, had positive results for marijuana. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a nine percent point decrease compared to 24 percent of decedents with positive marijuana results in 2017 OIS incidents. Historically, 29 of the 75 decedents involved in 2014 through 2017 OIS incidents, representing 39 percent, had positive toxicology results for marijuana.

In 2018, 22 firearms were utilized by suspects during OIS incidents, which represented 63 percent of the 35 total weapon types. This accounted for an 11 percent point increase compared to 52 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of firearms utilized by suspects during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 51 percent, 2018 experienced a 12 percent point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, firearms were the most utilized weapon type by suspects during OIS incidents, representing 108 of the 200 total weapons, or 53 percent.

In 2018, five edged weapons were utilized by suspects during OIS incidents, which represented 14 percent of the 35 total weapon types. This accounted for a six percent point decrease compared to 20 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of edged weapons utilized by suspects during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of nine percent, 2018 experienced a five percent point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, edged weapons were the second most utilized weapon type by suspects during OIS incidents, representing 37 of the 200 total weapons, or 19 percent.

In 2018, two suspects were perceived to be armed with a weapon (perception-basedショッキング), which represented six percent of the 35 total weapon types. This accounted for a one percent point decrease compared to seven percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of perception-based OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of six percent, 2018 experienced a two percent point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, perception-based OIS incidents represented 12 of the 200 total incidents, or six percent.

Two decedents, representing 22 percent of the nine OIS decedents with completed toxicology examinations, had positive results for opiates. Additionally, one decedent, or 11 percent, had positive results for cocaine and another decedent, also representing 11 percent, had positive results for PCP. One decedent, or 11 percent, had negative toxicology results for alcohol and/or controlled substances.
One suspect in 2014, one suspect in 2016, and two suspects in 2018 suffered a fatal self-inflicted gunshot wound during OIS incidents and were not included in the analysis below.

In 2018, 12 suspects died from police gunfire, resulting in a death in 36 percent of the 33 total OIS incidents. When compared to the 2017 total of 17 deaths, the number of deceased suspects decreased by five individuals, or 29 percent, in 2018. Additionally, the 2018 percentage of deaths relative to the number of incidents accounted for a three percentage point decrease compared to 39 percent in 2017. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 19 deceased suspects, 2018 was seven decedents, or 37 percent, below the four-year annual average. Additionally, when compared to the aggregate percentage of suspect deaths from police gunfire during OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 25 percent, 2018 experienced an eight percentage point decrease. Eighty-eight percent of the Department’s 33 OIS incidents in 2018 included a suspect struck by police gunfire (either suffering a fatal or non-fatal injury).

In 2018, 15 suspects sustained non-fatal injuries in 45 percent of the 33 total OIS incidents. When compared to the 2017 total of 20 suspects injured during OIS incidents, the number of injured suspects decreased by five individuals, or 25 percent, in 2018. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 14.25 injured suspects, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, an average of 14.4 suspects sustained non-fatal injuries during OIS incidents each year. Eighty-eight percent of the Department’s 33 OIS incidents in 2018 included a suspect struck by police gunfire (either suffering a fatal or non-fatal injury).

In 2018, five suspects were uninjured during OIS incidents. Additionally, one suspect’s injury status remained unknown as of year-end 2018.

Note: Two of the four black suspects died as a result of self-inflicted gunshot wounds.

One suspect in 2014, one suspect in 2016, and two suspects in 2018 suffered a fatal self-inflicted gunshot wound during OIS incidents and were not included in the analysis below.

Of the 12 decedents involved in OIS incidents in 2018, eight individuals, or 67 percent, were Hispanic. This accounted for an eight percentage point increase compared to 59 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved deceased Hispanic suspects from OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 53 percent, 2018 experienced a fourteen percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of deceased suspects involved in OIS incidents were Hispanic, accounting for 48 of the 87 total decedents, or 55 percent.

Of the 12 decedents involved in OIS incidents in 2018, two individuals, or 17 percent, were Black. This accounted for an eleven percentage point increase compared to six percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved deceased Black suspects from OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 25 percent, 2018 experienced an eight percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Black suspects represented the second highest ethnic decedent count, accounting for 21 of the 87 total decedents, or 24 percent.

Of the 12 decedents involved in OIS incidents in 2018, one individual, or eight percent, were White. This accounted for a 27 percentage point decrease compared to 36 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved deceased White suspects from OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 17 percent, 2018 experienced a nine percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, White suspects represented the third highest ethnic decedent count, accounting for 14 of the 87 total decedents, or 16 percent.
In 2017, the Tactic in one OIS incident resulted in a "No Findings" decision by the BOPC. As such, 98 of the 109 total OIS Tactic findings, representing 90 percent, were adjudicated as "Tactical Debrief." This accounted for a 45 percentage point increase compared to 45 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of "Tactical Debrief" Tactic findings from 2014 through 2016 of 35 percent, 2017 experienced a 25 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Tactical Debrief force findings resulted in an "In Policy (No Further Action)" outcome, accounting for 24 of the 295 total Tactic findings, or 74 percent.

In 2017, 110 of the 110 total OIS Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as "In Policy (No Further Action)." This accounted for no percentage point change compared to 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of "In Policy (No Further Action)" Drawing/Exhibiting findings from 2014 through 2016 of 11 percent, 2017 experienced a 0.5 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Drawing/Exhibiting findings resulted in an "In Policy (No Further Action)" outcome, accounting for 25 of the 296 total Drawing/Exhibiting findings, or 99.7 percent.

In 2017, the Tactic in one OIS incident resulted in a "No Findings" decision by the BOPC. As such, 11 of the 109 total OIS Tactic findings, representing 10 percent, were adjudicated as "Administrative Disapproval." This accounted for a 45 percentage point decrease compared to 55 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of "Administrative Disapproval" Tactic findings from 2014 through 2016 of 11 percent, 2017 experienced an 11 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, 44 of the 295 total Lethal force findings, representing less than one percent, was adjudicated as "Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)." In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, only one of the 296 Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing less than one percent, was adjudicated as "Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)."
CLASSIFICATION OF OIS-HIT INCIDENTS

An incident in which a Department employee intentionally discharges a firearm (excluding Warning Shot, Animal Shooting, and/or Tactical Intentional Discharge incidents). Officer Involved Shooting incidents are categorized into Hit or No Hit occurrences.

ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS

In 2018, Department personnel were involved in 24 OIS-Hit incidents, a decrease of six incidents, or 20 percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 121 OIS-Hit incidents, resulting in an annual average of 30.3 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 6.3 incidents, or 21 percent.

CLASSIFICATION OF OIS-HIT INCIDENTS

In 2018, eight of the 24 total OIS-Hit incidents, or 33 percent, were categorized as Classification I shootings. This accounted for a 13 percentage point increase compared to 20 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification I shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 18 percent, 2018 experienced a 15 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Classification I shooting incidents accounted for 30 of the 145 total OIS-Hit incidents, or 21 percent.

Classification Description

1. Suspect verified with firearm - fired at officer or 3rd party
2. Suspect verified with firearm - firearm in hand or position to fire (but did not fire)
3. Perception shooting - firearm present but not drawn
4. Perception shooting - firearm present but not drawn
5. Suspect armed with weapon other than firearm
6. Suspect not armed, but threat of causing serious bodily injury or death to others
7. Other

Continues on page 180
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Classification of OIS-Hit Incidents continued

In 2018, eight of the 24 total OIS-Hit incidents, or 33 percent, were categorized as Classification V shootings. This accounted for a 55 percent point increase compared to 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification V shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 32 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Classification V shooting incidents accounted for 49 of the 145 total OIS-Hit incidents, or 34 percent.

The remaining two incidents, or eight percent, were categorized as Classification IV and VII shootings respectively.

In 2018, six of the 24 total OIS-Hit incidents, or 25 percent, were categorized as Classification II shootings. This accounted for a 12 percentage point decrease compared to 37 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification II shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 32 percent, 2018 experienced an 11 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Classification II shooting incidents accounted for 47 of the 145 total OIS-Hit incidents, or 32 percent.

In 2018, six of the 24 total OIS-Hit incidents, or 25 percent, were categorized as Classification I shootings. This accounted for an 18 percentage point increase compared to 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of OIS-Hit incidents resulting from field detentions based on officers’ observations (i.e. pedestrian and traffic stops), this accounted for a nine percentage point decrease compared to 13 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of OIS-Hit incidents resulting from field detentions based on officers’ observations from 2014 through 2017 of 32 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, field detentions based on officers’ observations represented the second largest source category of OIS-Hit incidents, accounting for 45 of the 145 total incidents, or 31 percent.

In 2018, 14 of the Department’s 24 OIS-Hit incidents, or 58 percent, originated from radio calls. This accounted for a five percentage point increase compared to 53 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of OIS-Hit incidents resulting from radio calls from 2014 through 2017 of 53 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, radio calls represented the second largest source category of OIS-Hit incidents, accounting for 78 of the 145 total incidents, or 54 percent.

In 2018, nine of the Department’s 24 OIS-Hit incidents, or 38 percent, originated from field detentions based on officers’ observations (i.e. pedestrian and traffic stops). This accounted for an 18 percentage point increase compared to 20 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of OIS-Hit incidents resulting from field detentions based on officers’ observations from 2014 through 2017 of 30 percent, 2018 experienced an eight percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, field detentions based on officers’ observations represented the second largest source category of OIS-Hit incidents, accounting for 45 of the 145 total incidents, or 31 percent.

In 2018, one of the Department’s 24 OIS-Hit incidents, or four percent, originated from pre-planned activities (i.e. warrant searches, parole/probation checks, etc.). This accounted for a nine percentage point decrease compared to 13 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of OIS-Hit incidents resulting from pre-planned activities from 2014 through 2017 of seven percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, pre-planned activities represented the third largest source category of OIS-Hit incidents, accounting for nine of the 145 total incidents, or six percent.

In 2018, five of the Department’s OIS-Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was a decrease of two incidents, or 29 percent, compared to 2017. Twenty-one percent of the Department’s OIS-Hit incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department - 24; Central Bureau - five).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 38 OIS-Hit incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 9.5 incidents. The Central Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 4.5 incidents, or 47 percent.

In 2018, six of the Department’s OIS-Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was an increase of four incidents, or 200 percent, compared to 2017. Twenty-five percent of the Department’s OIS-Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department - 24; South Bureau - six).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 18 OIS-Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 4.5 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 1.5 incidents, or 33 percent.
In 2018, three of the Department’s OIS-Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, a decrease of four incidents, or 57 percent, compared to 2017. Thirteen percent of the Department’s OIS-Hit incidents occurred in West Bureau (Department - 24; West Bureau - 3).

In 2018, ten of the Department’s OIS-Hit incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department - 24; West Bureau - 10).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 21 OIS-Hit incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 5.3 incidents. The West Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.7 incidents, or 38 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 29 OIS-Hit incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 7.3 incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.3 incidents, or 42 percent.

In 2018, June represented the month with the most OIS-Hit incidents with 4 incidents, or 8 percent. The remaining incident, or four percent, occurred in the month of August.

In 2018, June represented the month with the most OIS-Hit incidents with 18 of the 145 total incidents, or 12 percent. September represented the month with the least, representing six incidents, or four percent. February and October had the second fewest with eight incidents, or six percent, respectively. The remaining 105 incidents, or 72 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

The OIS-Hit percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2014 through 2018 was as follows:

- January – March: 34 incidents, or 23 percent;
- April – June: 41 incidents, or 28 percent;
- July – September: 36 incidents; or 26 percent; and,
- October – December: 32 incidents, or 22 percent.

In 2018, no OIS-Hit incidents occurred outside the Department’s jurisdiction, which was a decrease of four incidents, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 15 OIS-Hit incidents occurred in areas outside the Department jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 3.75 incidents. The total incident count for outside areas in 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 3.75 incidents, or 100 percent.
In 2018, Monday and Sunday represented the days of the week with the most OIS-Hit incidents with six occurrences, or 25 percent, each. Saturday represented the second most frequent day of the week with five incidents, or 21 percent.

From 2014 through 2018, Monday represented the day with the most OIS-Hit incidents with 27 of the 145 total, or 19 percent. Tuesday represented the day with the second most OIS-Hit incidents with 26, or 18 percent. The remaining 92 incidents, or 63 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining days of the week.

In 2018, 12 OIS-Hit incidents, or 50 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while the other 12 incidents, also 50 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m. The time distribution was similar from 2014 through 2017, where 60 OIS-Hit incidents, or 49.6 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and 61 incidents, or 50.4 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The five-year annual average for 2014 through 2018 was 14.4 OIS-Hit incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and 14.6 incidents between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

In 2018, 38 Department personnel were involved in the 24 OIS-Hit incidents throughout the year, resulting in an average of 1.6 officers per incident. This accounted for a 41 percent decrease compared to an average of 2.7 officers per incident in 2017. The 2018 officer to incident average fell below the 2014 through 2017 aggregate annual average of 2 by 20 percent.

In 2018, 34 male officers were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 89 percent of the 38 total employees. This accounted for a seven percentage point decrease compared to 96 percent in 2017. The percentage of male officers involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was seven percentage points above the Department’s overall male total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 95 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point decrease compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 96 percent.

The five-year annual average for 2014 through 2018 was 14.4 OIS-Hit incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and 14.6 incidents between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

In 2018, four female officers were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 11 percent of the 38 total employees. This accounted for a seven percentage point increase compared to four percent in 2017. The percentage of female officers involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was seven percentage points below the Department’s overall female total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female personnel from 2014 through 2017 of five percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, female officers accounted for 16 of the 274 total involved employees, or six percent.
In 2018, 21 Hispanic officers were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 55 percent of the 38 total employees. This accounted for a six percentage point increase compared to 49 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic officers involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was seven percentage points above the Department’s overall Hispanic total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 56 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in OIS-Hit incidents were Hispanic, accounting for 152 of the 374 total employees, or 55 percent.

In 2018, ten White officers were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 26 percent of the 38 total employees. This accounted for a ten percentage point decrease compared to 36 percent in 2017. The percentage of White officers involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was five percentage points below the Department’s overall White total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 67 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, most of the officers involved in OIS-Hit incidents were White, representing only two percent of the total.

In 2018, four Asian/Pacific Islander officers were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 11 percent of the 38 total employees. This accounted for a six percentage point increase compared to five percent in 2017. The percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander officers involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was three percentage points above the Department’s overall Asian/Pacific Islander total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Asian/Pacific Islander personnel from 2014 through 2017 of six percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Asian/Pacific Islander officers represented the third largest ethnic category of personnel involved in OIS-Hit incidents, accounting for 19 of the 374 total employees, or seven percent.

The remaining three employees, or eight percent, involved in 2018 OIS-Hit incidents included one Black officer and two Filipino officers.

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in three of the five years of service categories, and a decrease in two when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in OIS-Hit incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – three percentage (one out of 38 total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 34 percent (13 out of 38 total officers);
- 6-10 years of service – 21 percent (eight out of 38 total officers);
- 11-20 years of service – 37 percent (14 out of 38 total officers); and,
- More than 20 years of service – five percent (two out of 38 total officers).

The following depicts the percentage of personnel involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 based on their respective years of service classifications:

- Less than one year of service – three percentage point increase (one percent during four-year period, three percent in 2018);
- 1-5 years of service – ten percentage point increase (24 percent during four-year period, 34 percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – ten percentage point decrease (31 percent during four-year period, 21 percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – eight percentage point increase (29 percent during four-year period, 37 percent in 2018); and,
- More than 20 years of service – nine percentage point decrease (14 percent during four-year period, five percent in 2018).

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, most of the officers involved in OIS-Hit incidents had 6-10 and 11-20 years of service with each category accounting for 82 of the 274 total employees, or 30 percent. Officers with 1-5 years of service accounted for the third largest category with a total of 70 employees, or 26 percent. Officers with more than 20 years of service had 35 officers, or 13 percent, and officers with less than one year of service, which accounted for five officers, represented only two percent of the total.
In 2018, 33 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 87 percent of the 38 total employees. This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 91 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was 19 percentage points below the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 92 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in OIS-Hit incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 251 of the 274 total employees, or 92 percent.

In 2018, three employees at the rank of detective were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented eight percent of the 38 total employees. This accounted for a one percentage point increase compared to seven percent in 2017. The percentage of detectives involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was seven percentage points below the Department’s overall detective total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of detective from 2014 through 2017 of five percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, employees at the rank of detective accounted for the second largest category of personnel involved in OIS-Hit incidents, representing 14 of the 274 total employees, or five percent.

The remaining two employees involved in a OIS-Hit incidents in 2018, representing five percent of the 38 total personnel, were at the rank of sergeant.

In 2018, six personnel assigned to Van Nuys Division were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 16 percent of the 38 total employees. This represented a 12 percentage point increase compared to four percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Van Nuys Division from 2014 through 2017 of four percent, 2018 experienced a 12 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to Van Nuys Division accounted for 15 of the 274 total employees involved in OIS-Hit incidents, or five percent.
In 2018, five personnel assigned to Southwest Division were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 13 percent of the 38 total employees. This represented an increase of five personnel compared to zero in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Southwest Division from 2014 through 2017 of 14 percent, 2018 experienced an 11 percent point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to Southwest Division accounted for nine of the 274 total employees involved in OIS-Hit incidents, or three percent.

In 2018, four personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 11 percent of the 38 total employees. This represented an 11 percent point decrease compared to 22 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division from 2014 through 2017 of 17 percent, 2018 experienced a six percent point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division accounted for 44 of the 274 total employees involved in OIS-Hit incidents, or 16 percent.

In 2018, four personnel assigned to Hollywood Division were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 11 percent of the 38 total employees. This represented a six percent point decrease compared to 17 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Hollywood Division from 2014 through 2017 of 14 percent, 2018 experienced a three percent point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to Hollywood Division accounted for 37 of the 274 total employees involved in OIS-Hit incidents, or 14 percent.

The remaining 19 Department personnel, or 50 percent, were fairly evenly distributed amongst the remaining Areas/Divisions.

The following is the employee Bureau assignment for the 38 total personnel distributed amongst the remaining Areas/Divisions.

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the six Bureau categories and decreases in four when compared to 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Central Bureau: nine percentage point decrease (20 percent in 2017, 11 percent in 2018);
- West Bureau: 11 percentage point decrease (22 percent in 2017, 11 percent in 2018);
- South Bureau: 17 percentage point increase (seven percent in 2017, 24 percent in 2018);
- Valley Bureau: 19 percentage point increase (20 percent in 2017, 39 percent in 2018);
- CTSOB: 11 percentage point decrease (22 percent in 2017, 11 percent in 2018); and,
- Other: four percentage point decrease (nine percent in 2017, five percent in 2018).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the six Bureau categories and decreases in two when compared to their respective aggregate percentages during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Central Bureau: 15 percentage point decrease (26 percent during four-year period, 11 percent in 2018);
- West Bureau: seven percentage point decrease (18 percent during four-year period, 11 percent in 2018);
- South Bureau: ten percentage point increase (14 percent during four-year period, 24 percent in 2018);
- Valley Bureau: 20 percentage point increase (19 percent during four-year period, 39 percent in 2018);
- CTSOB: six percentage point decrease (17 percent during four-year period, 11 percent in 2018); and,
- Other: one percentage point decrease (six percent during four-year period, five percent in 2018).

In 2018, there were 19 Department personnel, or 50 percent, were fairly evenly distributed amongst the remaining Areas/Divisions.
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No Department personnel were killed during or resulting from OIS-Hit incidents during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018. However, 45 officers sustained injuries during the same five-year period.

In 2018, nine officers sustained injuries during the 24 OIS-Hit incidents throughout the year. This accounted for a 29 percent increase compared to seven injured officers in 2017. Additionally, when compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 9.3 injured officers, 2018 was 0.3 injured officers, or three percent, below the four-year annual average.

The nine officers injured during OIS incidents sustained 12 injuries:
- 2 gunshot wounds
- 1 concussion
- 2 sprain/pulled muscle
- 2 contusions
- 2 lacerations
- 2 minor/complained of pain

In 2018, 35 handguns were utilized during OIS-Hit incidents, which represented five percent of the 40 total weapon types. This accounted for a one percentage point increase compared to four percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of handguns utilized during OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 20 percent, 2018 experienced a 12 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, shotguns were the second most utilized weapon type during OIS-Hit incidents, representing four percent.

In 2018, three rifles were utilized during OIS-Hit incidents, which represented eight percent of the 40 total weapon types. This accounted for a 24 percentage point decrease compared to 32 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of rifles utilized during OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 20 percent, 2018 experienced a 12 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, shotguns accounted for 12 of the 276 total weapons utilized in OIS-Hit incidents, representing four percent.

In 2018, a total of 220 rounds were fired during the 24 OIS-Hit incidents. When compared to the 2017 total of 334 rounds fired, 2018 experienced a decrease of 114 rounds, or 34 percent. Additionally, when compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 248 rounds fired, 2018 was 28 rounds, or 11 percent, below the four-year annual average.

The total number of rounds fired in 2018 was the second lowest in the last five years.
In 2018, 193 rounds were fired from handguns during OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 88 percent of the 220 total rounds fired. This accounted for a 37 percentage point decrease compared to 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of rounds fired from shotguns during OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of two percent, 2018 experienced a 20 percentage point decrease.

In 2018, there were 11 OIS-Hit incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired, which represented 46 percent of the 24 total incidents. This accounted for a seven percentage point decrease compared to 53 percent in 2017. In addition, when compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired during OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 66 percent, 2018 experienced a 20 percentage point decrease.

In 2018, there were five OIS-Hit incidents in which 11-15 rounds were fired, which represented 21 percent of the 24 total incidents. This accounted for a four percentage point increase compared to 17 percent in 2017. In addition, when compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 11-15 rounds were fired during OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of seven percent, 2018 experienced a 14 percentage point increase.

In 2018, there were four OIS-Hit incidents in which 6-10 rounds were fired, which represented 17 percent of the 24 total incidents. This accounted for a seven percentage point increase compared to ten percent in 2017. In addition, when compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 6-10 rounds were fired during OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 15 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point increase.

The remaining four occurrences, or 17 percent, were shootings in which 16-20, 21-25, and 26-30 rounds were fired per incident. When compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents with these same categories during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017 of six percent, 2018 was 11 percentage points above the four-year annual average.
The suspect sections below include data for all individuals that Department personnel applied force against during OIS-Hit incidents.

### SUSPECT – ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, 17 Hispanic suspects were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 65 percent of the 26 total suspects. This accounted for a seven percentage point increase compared to 58 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was 16 percentage points above the City's overall Hispanic population total. Additionally, the percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was 25 percentage points above the City's overall Hispanic violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 53 percent, 2018 experienced a 12 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Hispanic category was the most represented ethnic group involved in OIS-Hit incidents with 92 of the 149 total suspects, or 55 percent.

In 2018, five Black suspects were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 19 percent of the 26 total suspects. This accounted for a six percentage point increase compared to 13 percent in 2017. The percentage of Black suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was 24 percentage points below the City’s overall Black population total. However, the percentage of Black suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was 24 percentage points below the City’s overall Black violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Black suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 25 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Black category was the second most represented ethnic group involved in OIS-Hit incidents with 36 of the 149 total suspects, or 24 percent.

In 2018, one White suspect was involved in an OIS-Hit incident, which represented four percent of the 26 total suspects. This accounted for a 25 percentage point increase compared to 29 percent in 2017. The percentage of White suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was 4 percentage points below the City’s overall White population total. Additionally, the percentage of White suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was 24 percentage points below the City’s overall White violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 15 percent, 2018 experienced an 11 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the White category was the third most represented ethnic group involved in OIS-Hit incidents with 20 of the 149 total suspects, or 13 percent.
In 2018, 26 male suspects were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 100 percent of the 26 total suspects. This accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to 97 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 97 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point increase.

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents were male, representing 145 of the 149 total suspects, or 97 percent. In 2018, seven of the 26 total suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents, representing 27 percent, were in the 24-29 age group. The 24-29 age group represented the third largest age category of suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents with 50 of the 149 total suspects, or 34 percent. In 2018, 26 male suspects were involved in OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 100 percent of the 26 total suspects. This accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to 97 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 97 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point increase.

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 30-39 age group represented the largest age category of suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents with 50 of the 149 total suspects, or 34 percent. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 30-39 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 33 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 30-39 age group represented the second largest age category of suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents with 36 of the 149 total suspects, or 24 percent. In 2018, 5 of the 26 total suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents, representing 19 percent, were in the 18-23 age group. The 18-23 age group accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to 16 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 18-23 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 18 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 18-23 age group represented the third largest age category of suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents with 27 of the 149 total suspects, or 18 percent.

The four remaining suspects, or 15 percent, in 2018 OIS-Hit incidents were in the age ranges of 0-17, 40-49, 50-59, and 60 and above, with each category accounting for one suspect each.

Calculations:
- Male suspects: 26 (100%)
- Female suspects: 0 (0%)
- Age distribution:
  - 0-17: 0
  - 18-23: 5 (19%)
  - 24-29: 6 (23%)
  - 30-39: 4 (15%)
  - 40-49: 7 (27%)
  - 50-59: 2 (8%)
  - 60 and Above: 2 (8%)
- Suspect gender:
  - Male: 96
  - Female: 87

**CUOF - Suspect Gender - OIS Hit**

In 2018, most suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents were in the 30-39 age group. Specifically, ten of the 26 total suspects, or 38 percent, were included in this age group. The 30-39 age category accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to 36 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 30-39 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 24 percent, 2018 experienced a 15 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 79 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point increase compared to 82 percent of positive cases in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of decedents with positive toxicology results, representing 88 percent, accounted for six percentage point increase compared to 82 percent of positive cases in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of decedents with positive toxicology results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance, representing 85 percent, accounted for an 11 percentage point increase compared to 74 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of decedents with positive toxicology results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s), had positive results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s). Toxicology reports for four decedents, or 33 percent of the 12 total decedents, are pending from the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner’s Office.

Of the 12 decedents involved in 2018 OIS incidents, eight of whom have completed toxicology examinations by the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner, seven individuals, representing 88 percent of those completed cases, had positive results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s). Toxicology reports for four decedents, or 33 percent of the 12 total decedents, are pending from the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner’s Office.

The partial 2018 percentage of completed cases with positive alcohol and/or a controlled substance results, representing 88 percent, accounted for a six percentage point increase compared to 82 percent of positive cases in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of decedents with positive toxicology results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s) in OIS incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 74 percent, 2018 experienced a nine percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for 44 of the 149 total suspects, or 30 percent.

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, females represented four of the 149 total suspects, or 2.7 percent. In 2018, No female suspects were involved in OIS-Hit incidents. This accounted for a decrease of one individual compared to 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 16 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease.

When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female suspects within the 18-23 age group. The 18-23 age category accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 18-23 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 24 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, females represented four of the 149 total suspects, or 2.7 percent. In 2018, No female suspects were involved in OIS-Hit incidents. This accounted for a decrease of one individual compared to 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 16 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease.

When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female suspects within the 18-23 age group. The 18-23 age category accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 18-23 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 24 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, females represented four of the 149 total suspects, or 2.7 percent. In 2018, No female suspects were involved in OIS-Hit incidents. This accounted for a decrease of one individual compared to 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 16 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease.
In 2018, four of the 26 total suspects, or approximately 15 percent, involved in OIS-Hit incidents were homeless. This accounted for a five percentage point increase compared to ten percent in 2017. From 2016 through 2018, homeless suspects involved in OIS-Hit incidents accounted for eight of the 85 total suspects, or nine percent.

In 2016, two of the eight OIS decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 25 percent, had positive results for marijuana. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 40 percentage point increase compared to 35 percent of decedents with positive marijuana results in 2017 OIS incidents. Historically, 32 of the 75 decedents involved in 2014 through 2017 OIS incidents, representing 43 percent, had positive toxicology results for methamphetamine.

In 2017, six of the eight OIS decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 38 percent, had positive results for alcohol. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 41 percent of decedents with positive alcohol results in 2017 OIS incidents. Historically, 41 percent of decedents with positive alcohol results in 2017 OIS incidents.

In 2018, three of the eight OIS decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 38 percent, had positive results for alcohol. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a five percentage point decrease compared to 43 percent of decedents with positive methamphetamine results in 2017 OIS incidents.

In 2016, one of the eight OIS decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 13 percent, had positive results for PCP. This 2018 partial percentage accounted for a one percentage point increase compared to one percent in 2017.

Two decedents, representing 25 percent of the eight OIS decedents with completed toxicology examinations, had positive results for opiates. Additionally, one decedent, or 13 percent, had positive results for cocaine and another decedent, also representing 13 percent, had positive results for PCP. One decedent, or 13 percent, had negative toxicology results for alcohol and/or controlled substances.

A five percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, edged weapons were the second most utilized weapon type by suspects during OIS-Hit incidents, representing 54 of the 149 total weapons, or 23 percent.

In 2018, five edged weapons were utilized by suspects during OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 58 percent of the 26 total weapon types. This accounted for a ten percentage point increase compared to 48 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of firearms utilized by suspects during OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 45 percent, 2018 experienced a 13 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, firearms were the most utilized weapon type by suspects during OIS-Hit incidents, representing 70 of the 149 total weapons, or 47 percent.

In 2018, five edged weapons were utilized by suspects during OIS-Hit incidents, which represented 19 percent of the 26 total weapon types. This accounted for no percentage point change compared to 17 percent. When compared to the aggregate percentage of edged weapons utilized by suspects during OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 24 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point decrease.
In 2018, two suspects used physical force during OIS-Hit incidents, which represented eight percent of the 26 total weapon types. This accounted for an increase of two suspects who used physical force compared to zero in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of suspects who used physical force during OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of four percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, suspects who used physical force represented seven of the 149 total force types utilized by suspects during OIS-Hit incidents, or five percent.

In 2018, one suspect was perceived to be armed with a weapon (perception-based shooting), which represented four percent of the 26 total weapon types. This accounted for a six percentage point decrease compared to ten percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of perception-based OIS-Hit incidents represented ten of the 149 total weapon classifications, or seven percent.

This accounted for a six percentage point decrease compared to ten percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of perception-based OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of seven percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, perception-based OIS-Hit incidents represented ten of the 149 total weapon classifications, or seven percent.

In 2018, one replica/pellet gun was utilized by a suspect during OIS-Hit incidents, which represented four percent of the 26 total weapon types. This accounted for a six percentage point decrease compared to ten percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of replica/pellet guns utilized by suspects during OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of ten percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, replica/pellet guns represented 13 of the 149 total weapons utilized by suspects during OIS-Hit incidents, or nine percent.

In 2018, 12 suspects died from police gunfire. When compared to the 2017 total of 17, the number of deceased suspects decreased by five individuals, or 29 percent. In 2018. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 18.8 deceased suspects, 2018 was 6.8 decedents, or 36 percent, below the four-year annual average. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, an average of 17.4 suspects died from police gunfire each year.

In 2018, 13 suspects sustained injuries from police gunfire. When compared to the 2017 total of 14, the number of injured suspects decreased by one individual, or seven percent, in 2018. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 12 involved injured suspects, 2018 was one injured suspect, or eight percent, above the four-year annual average. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, an average of 12.2 suspects sustained non-fatal injuries from police gunfire each year.

In 2018, 12 suspects died from police gunfire. When compared to the 2017 total of 17, the number of deceased suspects decreased by five individuals, or 29 percent. In 2018. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 18.8 deceased suspects, 2018 was 6.8 decedents, or 36 percent, below the four-year annual average. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, an average of 17.4 suspects died from police gunfire each year.

In 2018, 13 suspects sustained injuries from police gunfire. When compared to the 2017 total of 14, the number of injured suspects decreased by one individual, or seven percent, in 2018. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 12 involved injured suspects, 2018 was one injured suspect, or eight percent, above the four-year annual average. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, an average of 12.2 suspects sustained non-fatal injuries from police gunfire each year.

In 2018, one replica/pellet gun was utilized by a suspect during OIS-Hit incidents, which represented four percent of the 26 total weapon types. This accounted for a six percentage point decrease compared to ten percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of replica/pellet guns utilized by suspects during OIS-Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of ten percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, replica/pellet guns represented 13 of the 149 total weapons utilized by suspects during OIS-Hit incidents, or nine percent.

The additional decedent involved in OIS-Hit incidents in 2018 was classified as “Other” ethnicity.
In 2017, 72 of the 81 total OIS-Hit Tactics findings, representing 89 percent, were adjudicated as “Tactical Debrief.” This accounted for a 43 percentage point increase compared to 46 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Tactical Debrief” findings from 2014 through 2016 of 69 percent, 2017 experienced a 20 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Tactics findings resulted in a “Tactical Debrief” outcome, representing 178 of the 234 total Tactics findings, or 76 percent.

In 2017, 81 of the 81 total OIS-Hit Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Drawing/Exhibiting findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, representing 233 of the 234 total Drawing/Exhibiting findings, or 99.6 percent.

In 2017, 59 of the 81 total OIS-Hit Lethal force findings, representing 73 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” This accounted for a 16 percentage point decrease compared to 89 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings from 2014 through 2016 of 91 percent, 2017 experienced an 18 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, representing 198 of the 234 total findings, or 85 percent.

In 2017, nine of the 81 total OIS-Hit Tactics findings, representing 11 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for a 43 percentage point decrease compared to 54 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” findings from 2014 through 2016 of 31 percent, 2017 experienced a 20 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, 56 of the 234 total Tactics findings, representing 24 percent, resulted in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome.

In 2017, none of the 81 total OIS-Hit Drawing/Exhibiting findings were adjudicated as “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).” Historically, from 2014 through 2017, only one of the 234 total Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing 0.4 percent, resulted in an “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” outcome.

In 2017, 22 of the 81 total OIS-Hit Lethal force findings, representing 27 percent, were adjudicated as “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).” This accounted for a 16 percentage point increase compared to 11 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” findings from 2014 through 2016 of nine percent, 2017 experienced an 18 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, 36 of the 234 total Lethal force findings, representing 15 percent, resulted in an “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” outcome.
In 2018, four of the nine total OIS-No Hit incidents, or 44 percent, were categorized as Classification I shootings. This accounted for an eight percentage point increase compared to 29 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification I shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 41 OIS-No Hit incidents, resulting in an annual average of 10.3 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 1.3 incidents, or 13 percent.

In 2018, Department personnel were involved in nine OIS-No Hit incidents, a decrease of five incidents, or 36 percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 41 OIS-No Hit incidents, resulting in an annual average of 10.3 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 1.3 incidents, or 13 percent.

In 2018, four of the nine total OIS-No Hit incidents, or 44 percent, were categorized as Classification II shootings. This accounted for a 15 percentage point increase compared to 29 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification II shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point increase compared to 29 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification III shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 34 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point increase compared to 29 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classifications I, II, and III shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 39 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point increase compared to 33 percent in 2017.

In 2018, four of the nine total OIS-No Hit incidents, or 44 percent, were categorized as Classification IV shootings. This accounted for an eight percentage point increase compared to 36 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification IV shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017, 2018 experienced a 15 percentage point increase compared to 29 percent in 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 41 OIS-No Hit incidents, resulting in an annual average of 10.3 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 1.3 incidents, or 13 percent.

In 2018, four of the nine total OIS-No Hit incidents, or 44 percent, were categorized as Classification V shootings. This accounted for an eight percentage point increase compared to 36 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification V shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017, 2018 experienced a 15 percentage point increase compared to 29 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification VI shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 29 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point increase compared to 23 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification VI shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 29 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point increase compared to 23 percent in 2017.

In 2018, four of the nine total OIS-No Hit incidents, or 44 percent, were categorized as Classification VI shootings. This accounted for an eight percentage point increase compared to 36 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification VI shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017, 2018 experienced a 15 percentage point increase compared to 29 percent in 2017.
increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Classification IV shooting incidents accounted for 20 of the 50 total OIS-No Hit incidents, or 40 percent. In 2018, one of the nine total OIS-No Hit incidents, or 11 percent, were categorized as Classification IV shootings. This accounted for an increase of one incident compared to zero in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification IV shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 24 percent, 2018 experienced a 20 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Classification IV shooting incidents accounted for four of the 50 total OIS-No Hit incidents, or eight percent.

### Classification of OIS-No Hit Incidents continued

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Classification IV shooting incidents accounted for 22 of the 50 total incidents, or 44 percent. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Classification IV shooting incidents accounted for four of the 50 total OIS-No Hit incidents, or eight percent.

### SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

In 2018, five of the Department’s nine OIS-No Hit incidents, or 56 percent, originated from field detentions based on officers’ observations (i.e. pedestrian and traffic stops). This accounted for a 13 percentage point increase compared to 43 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of OIS-No Hit incidents resulting from field detentions based on officers’ observations from 2014 through 2017 of 41 percent, 2018 experienced a 15 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, field detentions based on officers’ observations represented the largest source category of OIS-No Hit incidents, accounting for 22 of the 50 total incidents, or 44 percent.

In 2018, four of the Department’s nine OIS-No Hit incidents, or 44 percent, originated from radio calls. This accounted for a 23 percentage point increase compared to 21 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of OIS-No Hit incidents resulting from radio calls from 2014 through 2017 of 24 percent, 2018 experienced a 20 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, radio calls represented the second largest source category of OIS-No Hit incidents, accounting for 14 of the 50 total incidents, or 28 percent.

In 2018, five of the Department’s nine OIS-No Hit incidents, or 56 percent, occurred in South Bureau (Department - nine; South Bureau - five). In 2018, the South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 11 OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.8 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent.

### PRE-PLN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Flag Down</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, five of the Department’s nine OIS-No Hit incidents, or 56 percent, occurred in South Bureau (Department - nine; South Bureau - five). In 2018, the South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 11 OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.8 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent.

### OFF DTY

In 2018, five of the Department’s nine OIS-No Hit incidents, or 56 percent, occurred in South Bureau (Department - nine; South Bureau - five). In 2018, the South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 11 OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.8 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent.

### STATION CALL

In 2018, five of the Department’s nine OIS-No Hit incidents, or 56 percent, occurred in South Bureau (Department - nine; South Bureau - five). In 2018, the South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 11 OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.8 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent.

### AMBUSH

In 2018, five of the Department’s nine OIS-No Hit incidents, or 56 percent, occurred in South Bureau (Department - nine; South Bureau - five). In 2018, the South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 11 OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.8 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent.

### OBS

In 2018, five of the Department’s nine OIS-No Hit incidents, or 56 percent, occurred in South Bureau (Department - nine; South Bureau - five). In 2018, the South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 11 OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.8 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent.

### OTHER

In 2018, five of the Department’s nine OIS-No Hit incidents, or 56 percent, occurred in South Bureau (Department - nine; South Bureau - five). In 2018, the South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 11 OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.8 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent.

### OPERATIONS-CENTRAL BUREAU

In 2018, two of the Department’s OIS-No Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was a decrease of three incidents. In 2018, 22 percent of the Department’s OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department - nine; Central Bureau - two).

### OPERATIONS-SOUTH BUREAU

In 2018, five of the Department’s nine OIS-No Hit incidents, or 56 percent, occurred in South Bureau (Department - nine; South Bureau - five). In 2018, the South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 11 OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.8 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.2 incidents, or 79 percent.
In 2018, none of the Department’s OIS-No Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was a decrease of two incidents compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, four OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of one incident.

In 2018, two of the Department’s OIS-No Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was a decrease of one incident, or 33 percent, compared to 2017. Twenty-two percent of the Department’s OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department - nine; Valley Bureau - two).

In 2018, none of the Department’s OIS-No Hit incidents occurred outside the Department’s jurisdiction, which remained the same compared to 2017. In the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, three OIS-No Hit incidents occurred in areas outside the Department’s jurisdiction.

In 2018, January, July, and November represented the months with the most OIS-No Hit incidents with two occurrences each, or 22 percent each, of the nine total incidents for the year. March, May, and August represented the remaining three occurrences, or 11 percent each, respectively.

From 2014 through 2018, January represented the month with the most OIS-No Hit incidents with ten of the 50 total incidents, or 20 percent. October represented the month with the least with no occurrences during the same five-year period. August had the second fewest with one incident, or two percent. The remaining 39 incidents, or 78 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

The OIS-No Hit percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2014 through 2018 was as follows:

- January through March: 18 incidents, or 36 percent;
- April through June: 12 incidents, or 24 percent;
- July through September: 10 incidents; or 20 percent; and,
- October through December: 10 incidents, or 20 percent.
In 2018, Sunday represented the day of the week with the most OIS-No Hit incidents with three occurrences, or 33 percent. Monday, Friday, and Saturday accounted for the remaining six incidents, each representing two, or 22 percent.

From 2014 through 2018, Sunday represented the day with the most OIS-No Hit incidents with 12 of the 50 total incidents, or 24 percent. Monday and Saturday represented the days with the second most, accounting for eight incidents each, or 16 percent. The remaining 22 incidents, or 44 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining days of the week.

The five-year annual average from 2014 through 2018 was three OIS-No Hit incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and seven incidents between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

In 2018, no female officers were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents. This accounted for a decrease of three female officers compared to 2017. The percentage of female officers involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 18 percentage points below the Department’s overall female total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female personnel from 2014 through 2017 of ten percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 to 2018, females accounted for six of the 72 total involved employees, or eight percent.

In 2018, ten Department personnel were involved in the nine OIS-No Hit incidents throughout the year, resulting in an average of 1.1 officers per incident. This accounted for a 48 percent decrease compared to an average of 2.1 officers per incident in 2017. Similarly, the 2018 officer to incident average fell below the 2014 through 2017 aggregate annual average of 1.5 by 27 percent.

The officer sections below include data for all employees who received, or were pending, BOPC “lethal force” adjudicative findings for their involvement in OIS-No Hit incidents.

In 2018, ten Department personnel were involved in the nine OIS-No Hit incidents throughout the year, resulting in an average of 1.1 officers per incident. This accounted for a 48 percent decrease compared to an average of 2.1 officers per incident in 2017. Similarly, the 2018 officer to incident average fell below the 2014 through 2017 aggregate annual average of 1.5 by 27 percent.
In 2018, five Hispanic officers were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 50 percent of the ten total employees. This accounted for a five percentage point increase compared to 45 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic officers involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was two percentage points above the Department’s overall Hispanic total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 55 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in OIS-No Hit incidents were Hispanic, accounting for 39 of the 72 total employees, or 54 percent.

In 2018, four White officers were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 40 percent of the ten total employees. This accounted for a five percentage point decrease compared to 45 percent in 2017. The percentage of White officers involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was nine percentage points above the Department’s overall White total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 35 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, White officers represented the second largest ethnic category of personnel involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, accounting for 28 of the 72 total employees, or 36 percent.

The remaining employee, or ten percent, involved in 2018 OIS-No Hit incidents included one Asian/Pacific Islander officer.

The following depicts the percentage of personnel involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 based on their respective years of service classifications:

- **Less than one year of service** – eight percentage point increase (two percent during four-year period, ten percent in 2018); and,
- **1-5 years of service** – one percentage point decrease (three percent in 2017, ten percent in 2018); and,
- **6-10 years of service** – 13 percentage point decrease (13 percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018); and,
- **11-20 years of service** – three percentage point decrease (36 percent in 2014 through 2017); and,
- **More than 20 years of service** – five percentage point increase (24 percent during four-year period, 30 percent in 2018).

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in OIS-No Hit incidents had 6-10 years of service, accounting for 27 of the 72 total employees, or 38 percent. Officers with 11-20 years of service accounted for the second largest category with a total of 22 employees, or 31 percent. Officers with more than 20 years of service were the third largest group, with 13 personnel, or 18 percent, followed by officers with 1-5 years of service, which had eight officers, or 11 percent. Officers with less than one year of service, which represented two officers, accounted for three percent of the total.
In 2018, ten employees at the rank of police officer were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 100 percent of all involved employees. This accounted for no percentage point change compared to 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 32 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of approximately 94 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in OIS-No Hit incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 68 of the 72 total employees, or 94 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, four personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 40 percent of the ten total employees. This accounted for a 15 percentage point decrease compared to 55 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division from 2014 through 2017 of 32 percent, 2018 experienced an eight percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, most of the officers involved in OIS-No Hit incidents were assigned to Metropolitan Division, accounting for 24 of the 72 total employees, or 33 percent.

In 2018, two personnel assigned to Southwest Division were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 20 percent of the ten total employees. This accounted for a 13 percentage point increase compared to seven percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Southwest Division from 2014 through 2017 of five percent, 2018 experienced a 15 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to Southwest Division accounted for five of the 72 total employees involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, or seven percent.

The remaining four Department personnel involved in 2018 OIS-No Hit incidents, representing 40 percent, were fairly evenly distributed amongst the remaining Areas/Divisions.

In 2018, four personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 40 percent of the ten total employees. This accounted for a 15 percentage point decrease compared to 55 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division from 2014 through 2017 of 32 percent, 2018 experienced an eight percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, most of the officers involved in OIS-No Hit incidents were assigned to Metropolitan Division, accounting for 24 of the 72 total employees, or 33 percent.

In 2018, two personnel assigned to Southwest Division were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 20 percent of the ten total employees. This accounted for a 13 percentage point increase compared to seven percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Southwest Division from 2014 through 2017 of five percent, 2018 experienced a 15 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to Southwest Division accounted for five of the 72 total employees involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, or seven percent.

The remaining four Department personnel involved in 2018 OIS-No Hit incidents, representing 40 percent, were fairly evenly distributed amongst the remaining Areas/Divisions.

Continues on page 218
The following is the employee Bureau assignment for the ten total personnel involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018:

- Central Bureau: no personnel, or zero percent;
- West Bureau: no personnel, or zero percent;
- South Bureau: four personnel, or 40 percent;
- Valley Bureau: two personnel, or 20 percent;
- CTSOB: four personnel, or 40 percent; and,
- Other: no personnel, or zero percent.

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the six Bureau personnel involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018:

- Central Bureau: 16 percentage point increase (16 percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- West Bureau: three percentage point decrease (three percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- South Bureau: 16 percentage point increase (24 percent during four-year period, 40 percent in 2018);
- Valley Bureau: five percentage point increase (15 percent during four-year period, 20 percent in 2018);
- CTSOB: eight percentage point increase (32 percent during four-year period, 40 percent in 2018); and,
- Other: ten percentage point decrease (ten percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in three of the six Bureau categories and, also, decreases in three categories when compared to their respective aggregate percentages during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Central Bureau: 16 percentage point decrease (16 percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- West Bureau: three percentage point decrease (three percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- South Bureau: 16 percentage point increase (24 percent during four-year period, 40 percent in 2018);
- Valley Bureau: five percentage point increase (15 percent during four-year period, 20 percent in 2018);
- CTSOB: eight percentage point increase (32 percent during four-year period, 40 percent in 2018); and,
- Other: ten percentage point decrease (ten percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018).

In 2018, six personnel assigned to patrol were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 60 percent of the ten total personnel. This accounted for a 29 percentage point increase compared to 31 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2014 through 2017 of 32 percent, 2018 experienced a 28 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division accounted for a 29 percentage point increase compared to 31 percent in 2018. This accounted for a 26 of the 72 total employees, or 36 percent.

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in three of the six Bureau categories and, also, decreases in three categories when compared to their respective aggregate percentages during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Central Bureau: 16 percentage point decrease (16 percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- West Bureau: three percentage point decrease (three percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- South Bureau: 16 percentage point increase (24 percent during four-year period, 40 percent in 2018);
- Valley Bureau: five percentage point increase (15 percent during four-year period, 20 percent in 2018);
- CTSOB: eight percentage point increase (32 percent during four-year period, 40 percent in 2018); and,
- Other: ten percentage point decrease (ten percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018).

In 2018, there were eight single shooter OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 89 percent of the nine total incidents. This accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to 86 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of single shooter OIS-No Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 83 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point increase.
In 2018, nine handguns were utilized during OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 90 percent of the ten total weapon types. This accounted for a 21 percentage point increase compared to 69 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of handguns utilized during OIS-No Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 81 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, handguns were the most utilized weapon type during OIS-No Hit incidents, accounting for 61 of the 74 total weapons, or 82 percent.

In 2018, one rifle was utilized during OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented ten percent of the ten total weapon types. This accounted for a 21 percentage point decrease compared to 31 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of rifles utilized during OIS-No Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 16 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, rifles were the second most utilized weapon type during OIS-No Hit incidents, accounting for 11 of the 74 total weapons, or 15 percent.

In 2018, 30 rounds were fired during all nine OIS-No Hit incidents. When compared to the 2017 total of 157 rounds fired, 2018 experienced a decrease of 127 rounds, or 81 percent. Additionally, when compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 6.8 rounds fired per incident, 2018 was 3.5 rounds, or 51 percent, below the four-year annual average. The average number of rounds fired in 2018 was the second lowest in the last five years.

In 2018, an average of 3.3 rounds were fired during OIS-No Hit incidents. When compared to the 2017 average of 11.2 rounds fired, 2018 experienced a decrease of 7.9 rounds, or 71 percent. Additionally, when compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 6.8 rounds fired per incident, 2018 was 3.5 rounds, or 51 percent, below the four-year annual average. The average number of rounds fired in 2018 was the second lowest in the last five years.
In 2018, there were seven OIS-No Hit incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired, which represented 78 percent of the nine total incidents. This accounted for a one percentage point decrease compared to 79 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired during OIS-No Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of seven percent, 2018 experienced no percentage point change.

In 2018, there was one OIS-No Hit incident in which 6-10 rounds were fired during OIS-No Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 11 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point increase.

In 2018, there was one OIS-No Hit incident in which 11-15 rounds were fired, which represented 11 percent of the nine total incidents. This accounted for a four percentage point increase compared to seven percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 11-15 rounds were fired during OIS-No Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of seven percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point increase.

In 2018, five Black suspects were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 56 percent of the nine total suspects. This accounted for a 16 percentage point decrease compared to 40 percent in 2017. The percentage of Black suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 47 percentage points above the City’s overall Black population total. However, the percentage of Black suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 13 percentage points above the City’s overall Black violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Black suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 38 percent, 2018 experienced an 18 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Black category was the second most represented ethnic group involved in OIS-No Hit incidents with 21 of the 51 total suspects, or 41 percent.

In 2018, two Hispanic suspects were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 22 percent of the nine total suspects. This accounted for a 31 percentage point decrease compared to 53 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 27 percentage points below the City’s overall Hispanic population total. Additionally, the percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 18 percentage points below the City’s overall Hispanic violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 48 percent, 2018 experienced a 26 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Hispanic category was the most represented ethnic group involved in OIS-No Hit incidents with 22 of the 51 total suspects, or 43 percent.

In 2018, one White suspect was involved in an OIS-No Hit incident, which represented 11 percent of the nine total suspects. This accounted for a four percentage point increase compared to seven percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White suspects in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 17 percentage points below the City’s overall White population total. Additionally, the percentage of White suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was three percentage points above the City’s overall White violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White suspects from 2014 through 2017 of ten percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the White category was the third most represented ethnic group involved in OIS-No Hit incidents with five of the 51 total suspects, or ten percent.

One suspect, representing 11 percent, had an “Unknown” ethnicity classification, pending completion of the investigation by FID.

The suspect sections below include data for all individuals that Department personnel applied force against during OIS-No Hit incidents.

### SUSPECT INFORMATION

#### ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Is.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>(See Other)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown DNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, five Black suspects were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 56 percent of the nine total suspects. This accounted for a 16 percentage point decrease compared to 40 percent in 2017. The percentage of Black suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 47 percentage points above the City’s overall Black population total. However, the percentage of Black suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 13 percentage points above the City’s overall Black violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Black suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 38 percent, 2018 experienced an 18 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Black category was the second most represented ethnic group involved in OIS-No Hit incidents with 21 of the 51 total suspects, or 41 percent.

In 2018, two Hispanic suspects were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 22 percent of the nine total suspects. This accounted for a 31 percentage point decrease compared to 53 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 27 percentage points below the City’s overall Hispanic population total. Additionally, the percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 18 percentage points below the City’s overall Hispanic violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 48 percent, 2018 experienced a 26 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Hispanic category was the most represented ethnic group involved in OIS-No Hit incidents with 22 of the 51 total suspects, or 43 percent.

In 2018, one White suspect was involved in an OIS-No Hit incident, which represented 11 percent of the nine total suspects. This accounted for a four percentage point increase compared to seven percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White suspects in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was 17 percentage points below the City’s overall White population total. Additionally, the percentage of White suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018 was three percentage points above the City’s overall White violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White suspects from 2014 through 2017 of ten percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the White category was the third most represented ethnic group involved in OIS-No Hit incidents with five of the 51 total suspects, or ten percent.

One suspect, representing 11 percent, had an “Unknown” ethnicity classification, pending completion of the investigation by FID.
In 2018, nine male suspects were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 100 percent of the nine total suspects. This accounted for a seven percentage point increase compared to 93 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 95 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents were male, representing 100 percent of the nine total suspects. This accounted for a decrease of one female suspect compared to 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female suspects from 2014 through 2017 of two percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, only one suspect involved in OIS-No Hit incidents was a female, representing 1 of the 51 total suspects, or two percent.

No female suspects were involved in OIS-No Hit incidents in 2018. This accounted for a decrease of one female suspect compared to 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 27 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, only one suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents was a female, representing 1 of the 51 total suspects, or two percent.

In 2018, OIS-No Hit suspects within the 18-23 age group accounted for four of the nine total suspects, or 44 percent. The 30-39 age category accounted for a four percentage point increase compared to 40 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 30-39 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 19 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 30-39 age group represented the second largest age category of suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents with 13 of the 51 total suspects, or 25 percent.

In 2018, OIS-No Hit suspects within the 24-29 age group accounted for one of the nine total suspects, or 11 percent. The 24-29 age category accounted for a two percentage point decrease compared to 13 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 24-29 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 17 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 24-29 age group represented the third largest age category of suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents with eight of the 51 total suspects, or 16 percent.

The remaining suspect, or 11 percent, in 2018 had an “Unknown” age designation.
None of the suspects involved in 2018 OIS-No Hit incidents were homeless. This was the same compared to 2017.

From 2014 through 2018, no suspects involved in OIS-No Hit incidents died or sustained injuries as a direct result of police gunfire. The data, however, reflects 11 injuries and four deaths (caused by a fatal self-inflicted gunshot wound) sustained by suspects due to causes other than police gunfire during the same five-year period.

In 2018, seven firearms were utilized by suspects during OIS-No Hit incidents, which represented 78 percent of the nine total weapon types. This accounted for an 18 percentage point increase compared to 60 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of firearms utilized by suspects during OIS-No Hit incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 69 percent, 2018 experienced a nine percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, firearms were the most utilized weapon type by suspects during OIS-No Hit incidents, representing 36 of the 51 total weapons, or 71 percent.

The two remaining suspect weapon types, representing 22 percent, involved in 2018 OIS-No Hit incidents were one replica/pellet gun and one incident in which the officer perceived the suspect to be armed with a weapon.

Note: The two suspects that died in 2018 from causes other than police gunfire, died from self-inflicted gunshot wounds.
In 2017, 27 of the 29 total OIS-No Hit Lethal force findings, representing 93 percent, were adjudicated as "In Policy (No Further Action)." This accounted for an eight percentage point increase compared to 85 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of "In Policy (No Further Action)" Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 81 percent, 2017 experienced a 12 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an "In Policy (No Further Action)" outcome; accounting for 53 of the 61 total findings, or 87 percent.

In 2017, 29 of the 29 total OIS-No Hit Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing 96 percent, were adjudicated as "Administrative Disapproval." This accounted for an eight percentage point decrease compared to 15 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of "Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)" Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 19 percent, 2017 experienced a 12 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, eight of the 61 total Lethal force findings, representing 13 percent, resulted in an "Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)" outcome.

In 2017, two of the 29 total Lethal force findings, representing seven percent, were adjudicated as "Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)." This accounted for an eight percentage point decrease compared to 15 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of "Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)" Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 19 percent, 2017 experienced a 12 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, eight of the 61 total Lethal force findings, representing 13 percent, resulted in an "Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)" outcome.
ANIMAL SHOOTING INCIDENTS
An incident in which a Department employee intentionally discharges a firearm at an animal.

ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>OIS - Animal</th>
<th>Department Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, Department personnel were involved in seven Animal Shooting incidents, a decrease of two incidents, or 22 percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 40 Animal Shooting incidents, resulting in an annual average of 10 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by three incidents, or 30 percent.

The number of incidents in 2018 was the lowest in the last five years.

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Flag Down</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Planned</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, three of the Department’s seven Animal Shooting incidents, or 43 percent, originated from radio calls. This accounted for a 13 percentage point decrease compared to 56 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Animal Shooting incidents resulting from radio calls from 2014 through 2017 of 50 percent, 2018 experienced a seven percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, radio calls represented the largest source category of Animal Shooting incidents, accounting for 23 of the 47 total incidents, or 49 percent.

In 2018, one of the Department’s seven Animal Shooting incidents, or 14 percent, originated from off-duty occurrences. This accounted for a 19 percentage point decrease compared to 33 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Animal Shooting incidents resulting from off-duty occurrences from 2014 through 2017 of 18 percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, off-duty occurrences represented the third largest source category of Animal Shooting incidents, accounting for eight of the 47 total incidents, or 17 percent.

In 2018, one of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents, representing 14 percent, originated from a preplanned activity (i.e. warrant services; parole/probation checks; etc.). This accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to 11 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Animal Shooting incidents resulting from pre-planned activities from 2014 through 2017 of 11 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, preplanned activities represented the second largest source category of Animal Shooting incidents, accounting for nine of the 47 total incidents, or 19 percent.

The remaining two incidents, or 28 percent, originated from an officer’s observation and a citizen flag-down, respectively.

ANIMAL SHOOTING INCIDENTS

BUREAU OF OCCURRENCE
OPERATIONS-CENTRAL BUREAU

In 2018, one of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was a decrease of two incidents, or 67 percent, compared to 2017. Fourteen percent of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department - seven; Central Bureau - one).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, eight Animal Shooting incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of two incidents. The Central Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 50 percent.

OPERATIONS-SOUTH BUREAU

In 2018, two of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was a decrease of one incident, or 33 percent, compared to 2017. Twenty-nine percent of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department - seven; South Bureau - two).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 16 Animal Shooting incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of four incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by two incidents, or 50 percent.
In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, five Animal Shooting incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.3 incidents. The West Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 1.7 incidents, or 131 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, eight Animal Shooting incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 2.0 incidents. The total incident count for outside areas in 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 50 percent.

No Animal Shooting incidents occurred in Valley Bureau in 2018. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, three Animal Shooting incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.8 incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 0.8 incidents.

The Animal Shooting percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2014 through 2018 was as follows:

- January – March: ten incidents, or 21 percent;
- April – June: 14 incidents, or 30 percent;
- July – September: 14 incidents; or 30 percent; and,
- October – December: nine incidents, or 19 percent.

In 2018, March represented the month with the most Animal Shooting incidents with two occurrences, or 29 percent, out of seven total incidents for the year. The remaining five incidents were distributed throughout the remaining months of the year without any apparent pattern. From 2014 through 2018, May represented the month with the most Animal Shooting incidents with eight of the 47 total incidents, or 17 percent. August had the second highest count with seven incidents, or 15 percent. February and October had the least with one incident each, or two percent, during the same five-year period.
In 2018, Wednesday represented the day of the week with the most Animal Shooting incidents with three of the seven occurrences, or 43 percent. Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday represented the days with the least with no Animal Shooting incidents. From 2014 through 2018, Friday represented the day with the most Animal Shooting incidents with 12 of the 47 total, or 26 percent. Thursday had the second highest count with nine incidents, or 19 percent. Sunday represented the day with the least occurrences with one incident, or two percent.

In 2018, seven Department personnel were involved in the seven Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 100 percent of the seven total employees. This accounted for a zero percentage point change compared to 2017. The percentage of female officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents in 2018 was 18 percentage points above the Department’s overall male total. This accounted for a zero percent change compared to 2017. The officer sections below include data for all employees who received, or were pending, lethal force BOPC adjudicated findings for their involvement in an Animal Shooting incident.

OFFICER INFORMATION

In 2018, seven Department personnel were involved in the seven Animal Shooting incidents throughout the year, resulting in an average of one officer per incident. This accounted for a zero percent change compared to an average of one officer per incident in 2017. Similarly, the 2018 officer to incident average fell below the 2014 through 2017 aggregate annual average of 1.1 by nine percent.

In 2018, seven male officers were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 100 percent of the seven total employees. This accounted for a zero percentage point change compared to 2017. The percentage of male officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents in 2018 was 18 percentage points above the Department’s overall male total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 51 percent, 2018 experienced a 20 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents were male, accounting for 45 of the 50 total employees, or 90 percent.

In 2018, five Hispanic officers were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 71 percent of the seven total employees. This accounted for a 15 percentage point increase compared to 56 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents in 2018 was 23 percentage points above the Department’s overall Hispanic total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 51 percent, 2018 experienced a 20 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of about 71 percent was involved.

CUOF INCIDENTS · ANIMAL SHOOTING
In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the five years of service categories, decreases in two, and no change in one when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – no percentage point change (zero percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- 1-5 years of service – 22 percentage point increase (21 percent during four-year period, 43 percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 13 percentage point increase (16 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 18 percentage point decrease (47 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018); and,
- More than 20 years of service – 16 percentage point decrease (9 percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018).

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, most of the officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents had 11-20 years of service, accounting for 22 of the 50 total employees, or 44 percent. Officers with 1-5 years of service accounted for the second largest category with 12 employees, or 24 percent. Officers with 6-10 years of service were the third largest group with nine employees, or 18 percent, followed by officers with more than 20 years of service, which accounted for only seven employees, representing 14 percent.

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the five years of service categories, decreases in two, and no change in one when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – no percentage point change (zero percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- 1-5 years of service – 43 percent (three out of seven total officers);
- 6-10 years of service – 29 percent (two out of seven total officers);
- 11-20 years of service – 29 percent (two out of seven total officers); and,
- More than 20 years of service – zero percent (zero out of seven total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the five categories, decreased in two, and no change in one when compared to 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – zero percent (zero out of seven total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 47 percent (47 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 16 percent (16 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 24 percent (24 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018); and,
- More than 20 years of service – zero percent (zero out of seven total officers).

In 2018, two personnel assigned to Hollywood Division were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 29 percent of the seven total employees. This accounted for a 29 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Hollywood Division from 2014 through 2017 of five percent, 2018 experienced a 24 percentage point increase.

The following is the employee Bureau assignment for the seven total personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents in 2018:

- Central Bureau: no personnel, or zero percent;
- West Bureau: three personnel, or 43 percent;
- South Bureau: two personnel, or 29 percent;
- Valley Bureau: one employee, or 14 percent;
- CTSOB: one employee, or 14 percent; and,
- Other: no personnel, or zero percent.

The remaining five Department personnel, or 71 percent, were fairly evenly distributed amongst the remaining Areas/Divisions.

The following depicts the percentage of personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents in 2018 based on their respective years of service classifications:

- Less than one year of service – zero percent (zero out of seven total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 43 percent (three out of seven total officers);
- 6-10 years of service – 29 percent (two out of seven total officers);
- 11-20 years of service – 29 percent (two out of seven total officers); and,
- More than 20 years of service – zero percent (zero out of seven total officers).

In 2018, two personnel assigned to Hollywood Division were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 29 percent of the seven total employees. This accounted for a 29 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents, accounting for 17 of the 50 total employees, or 34 percent.

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the five years of service categories, decreases in two, and no change in one when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – no percentage point change (zero percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- 1-5 years of service – 47 percent (47 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 16 percent (16 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 24 percent (24 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018); and,
- More than 20 years of service – zero percent (zero out of seven total officers).

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, most of the officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents had 11-20 years of service, accounting for 22 of the 50 total employees, or 44 percent. Officers with 1-5 years of service accounted for the second largest category with 12 employees, or 24 percent. Officers with 6-10 years of service were the third largest group with nine employees, or 18 percent, followed by officers with more than 20 years of service, which accounted for only seven employees, representing 14 percent.

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the five years of service categories, decreases in two, and no change in one when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – no percentage point change (zero percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- 1-5 years of service – 47 percent (47 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 16 percent (16 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 24 percent (24 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018); and,
- More than 20 years of service – zero percent (zero out of seven total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the five years of service categories, decreases in two, and no change in one when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – no percentage point change (zero percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- 1-5 years of service – 47 percent (47 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 16 percent (16 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 24 percent (24 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018); and,
- More than 20 years of service – zero percent (zero out of seven total officers).

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, most of the officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents had 11-20 years of service, accounting for 22 of the 50 total employees, or 44 percent. Officers with 1-5 years of service accounted for the second largest category with 12 employees, or 24 percent. Officers with 6-10 years of service were the third largest group with nine employees, or 18 percent, followed by officers with more than 20 years of service, which accounted for only seven employees, representing 14 percent.
In 2018, there were percentage point decreases in three of the six Bureau categories and increases in three when compared to 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Central Bureau: 33 percentage point decrease (33 percent in 2017, zero percent in 2018);
- West Bureau: 43 percentage point increase (zero percent in 2017, 43 percent in 2018);
- South Bureau: four percentage point decrease (33 percent in 2017, 29 percent in 2018);
- Valley Bureau: 14 percentage point increase (zero percent in 2017, 14 percent in 2018);
- CTSOB: 14 percentage point increase (zero percent in 2017, 14 percent in 2018); and,
- Other: 30 percentage point decrease (30 percent in 2017, zero percent in 2018).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in three of the six Bureau categories and decreases in three, when compared to their respective aggregate percentages during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Central Bureau: 26 percentage point decrease (26 percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- West Bureau: 36 percentage point increase (seven percent during four-year period, 43 percent in 2018);
- South Bureau: four percentage point decrease (33 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018);
- Valley Bureau: five percentage point increase (nine percent during four-year period, 14 percent in 2018);
- CTSOB: nine percentage point increase (five percent during four-year period, 14 percent in 2018); and,
- Other: 21 percentage point decrease (21 percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018).

In 2018, four personnel assigned to patrol were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 57 percent of the seven total personnel. This accounted for a 21 percentage point decrease compared to 78 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2014 through 2017 of 70 percent, 2018 experienced a 13 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents were assigned to patrol, accounting for 34 of the 50 total employees, or 68 percent.

In 2018, two employees assigned to a specialized assignment were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 29 percent of the seven total personnel. This accounted for an 18 percentage point increase compared to 11 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to specialized assignments from 2014 through 2017 of 19 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, officers assigned to specialized assignments accounted for the second most represented category of personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents with ten of the 50 total employees, or 20 percent.

The remaining employee involved in a 2018 Animal Shooting incident, representing 14 percent, was assigned to Metropolitan Division. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division from 2014 through 2017 of five percent, 2018 experienced a nine percentage point increase.

In 2018, seven employees at the rank of police officer were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 100 percent of the seven total employees. This accounted for a 22 percentage point increase compared to 78 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents in 2018 was 32 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 96 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 48 of the 50 total employees, or 96 percent.

In 2018, there were percentage point decreases in three of the six Bureau categories and increases in three when compared to 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Central Bureau: 33 percentage point decrease (33 percent in 2017, zero percent in 2018);
- West Bureau: 43 percentage point increase (zero percent in 2017, 43 percent in 2018);
- South Bureau: four percentage point decrease (33 percent in 2017, 29 percent in 2018);
- Valley Bureau: 14 percentage point increase (zero percent in 2017, 14 percent in 2018);
- CTSOB: 14 percentage point increase (zero percent in 2017, 14 percent in 2018); and,
- Other: 30 percentage point decrease (30 percent in 2017, zero percent in 2018).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in three of the six Bureau categories and decreases in three, when compared to their respective aggregate percentages during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Central Bureau: 26 percentage point decrease (26 percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- West Bureau: 36 percentage point increase (seven percent during four-year period, 43 percent in 2018);
- South Bureau: four percentage point decrease (33 percent during four-year period, 29 percent in 2018);
- Valley Bureau: five percentage point increase (nine percent during four-year period, 14 percent in 2018);
- CTSOB: nine percentage point increase (five percent during four-year period, 14 percent in 2018); and,
- Other: 21 percentage point decrease (21 percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018).

In 2018, four personnel assigned to patrol were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 57 percent of the seven total personnel. This accounted for a 21 percentage point decrease compared to 78 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2014 through 2017 of 70 percent, 2018 experienced a 13 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, officers assigned to specialized assignments accounted for the second most represented category of personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents with ten of the 50 total employees, or 20 percent.

The remaining employee involved in a 2018 Animal Shooting incident, representing 14 percent, was assigned to Metropolitan Division. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division from 2014 through 2017 of five percent, 2018 experienced a nine percentage point increase.

In 2018, seven employees at the rank of police officer were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 100 percent of the seven total employees. This accounted for a 22 percentage point increase compared to 78 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents in 2018 was 32 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 96 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 48 of the 50 total employees, or 96 percent.
In 2018, five handguns were utilized during Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 71 percent of the seven total weapon types. This accounted for an 18 percentage point decrease compared to 89 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of handguns utilized during Animal Shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 96 percent, 2018 experienced a 27 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, handguns were the most utilized weapon type during Animal Shooting incidents, accounting for 47 of the 50 total weapons, or 94 percent.

In 2018, one shotgun was utilized during an Animal Shooting incident, which represented 14 percent of the seven total weapon types. When compared to the aggregate percentage of shotguns utilized during Animal Shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 98 percent, 2018 experienced a 27 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, shotguns represented 14 percent of the seven total weapon types. This accounted for two of the 50 total weapons, or four percent.

In 2018, one rifle was utilized during an Animal Shooting incident, which represented 14 percent of the seven total weapon types. This accounted for the only occurrence in which a rifle was utilized during an Animal Shooting incident in the five-year period from 2014 through 2018.

In 2018, five handguns were utilized during Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 71 percent of the seven total weapon types. This accounted for an 18 percentage point decrease compared to 89 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of handguns utilized during Animal Shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 96 percent, 2018 experienced a 27 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, handguns were the most utilized weapon type during Animal Shooting incidents, accounting for 47 of the 50 total weapons, or 94 percent.

In 2018, one shotgun was utilized during an Animal Shooting incident, which represented 14 percent of the seven total weapon types. When compared to the aggregate percentage of shotguns utilized during Animal Shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 98 percent, 2018 experienced a 27 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, shotguns represented 14 percent of the seven total weapon types. This accounted for two of the 50 total weapons, or four percent.

In 2018, one rifle was utilized during an Animal Shooting incident, which represented 14 percent of the seven total weapon types. This accounted for the only occurrence in which a rifle was utilized during an Animal Shooting incident in the five-year period from 2014 through 2018.

In 2018, 16 rounds were fired during all seven Animal Shooting incidents. When compared to the 2017 total of 20 rounds fired, 2018 experienced a decrease of four rounds, or 20 percent. Additionally, when compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 28.3 rounds fired, 2018 was 12.3 rounds, or 43 percent, below the four-year annual average.

The total number of rounds fired in 2018 was the second lowest in the last five years.

In 2018, 14 rounds were fired from handguns during Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 88 percent of the 16 total rounds fired. This accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to 85 percent in 2017. Similarly, when compared to the aggregate percentage of rounds fired from handguns during Animal Shooting incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 97 percent, 2018 experienced a nine percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, rounds fired from handguns were the most frequent round type fired during Animal Shooting incidents, accounting for 124 of the 129 total rounds, or 96 percent.

In 2018, one round was fired from a shotgun during Animal Shooting incidents, which represented six percent of the 16 total rounds fired. This was a decrease of two rounds, or 67 percent, compared to 2017.

In 2018, one round was fired from a rifle during Animal Shooting incidents, which represented six percent of the 16 total rounds fired. The 2018 Animal Shooting incident in which a rifle was utilized was the only such occurrence in the five-year period from 2014 through 2018.

In 2018, an average of 2.3 rounds were fired during Animal Shooting incidents. When compared to the 2017 average of 2.2 rounds fired, 2018 experienced an increase of 0.1 rounds, or five percent. Additionally, when compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 2.7 rounds fired per incident, 2018 was 0.4 rounds, or 15 percent, below the four-year annual average.
In 2017, nine of the nine total Animal Shooting Tactics findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “Out of Policy.” This accounted for a 19 percentage point increase compared to 81 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Tactical Debrief” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of 97 percent, 2017 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Less Lethal force findings resulted in an “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” outcome, accounting for 42 of the 43 total Tactics findings, or 95 percent.

In 2017, none of the Animal Shooting Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, all Animal Shooting Drawing/Exhibiting findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome.

In 2017, none of the Animal Shooting Tactic findings were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for a 19 percentage point decrease compared to 19 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of nine percent, 2017 experienced a nine percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, three of the 43 total Tactics findings, accounting for seven percent, resulted in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome.

In 2017, nine of the nine total Animal Shooting Lethal force findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” This accounted for a six percentage point increase compared to 94 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “In Policy (No Further Action)” Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 97 percent, 2017 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, accounting for 42 of the 43 total findings, or 98 percent.

In 2017, nine of the nine total Animal Shooting Lethal force findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “Tactical Debrief.” This accounted for a 19 percentage point increase compared to 19 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Tactical Debrief” Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 97 percent, 2017 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “Tactical Debrief” outcome, accounting for 42 of the 43 total findings, or 98 percent.

In 2018, all four of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred during on-duty non-tactical situations (e.g. weapon inspections, weapon cleaning, etc.). From 2014 through 2018, on-duty non-tactical situations were the most frequent source of Unintentional Discharge incidents, accounting for 20 of the 35 total incidents, or 57 percent. On-duty tactical situations were the second most common, accounting for ten incidents, or 29 percent, followed by off-duty situations, accounting for five incidents, or 14 percent.

In 2018, Department personnel were involved in four Unintentional Discharge incidents, a decrease of three incidents, or 43 percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 31 Unintentional Discharge incidents, resulting in an annual average of 7.8 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 3.8 incidents, or 48 percent.

The total number of incidents 2018 was the lowest in the last five years.

In 2017, nine of the nine total Animal Shooting Lethal force findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).” This accounted for a 19 percentage point decrease compared to 81 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Tactical Debrief” Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 97 percent, 2017 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” outcome, accounting for 42 of the 43 total findings, or 98 percent.

In 2017, nine of the nine total Animal Shooting Lethal force findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “Tactical Debrief.” This accounted for a 19 percentage point increase compared to 19 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Tactical Debrief” Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 97 percent, 2017 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “Tactical Debrief” outcome, accounting for 42 of the 43 total findings, or 98 percent.

In 2017, none of the Animal Shooting Tactic findings were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for a 19 percentage point decrease compared to 19 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of nine percent, 2017 experienced a nine percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, three of the 43 total Tactics findings, accounting for seven percent, resulted in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome.

In 2017, none of the Animal Shooting Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, all Animal Shooting Drawing/Exhibiting findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome.

In 2017, none of the Animal Shooting Tactic findings were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for a 19 percentage point decrease compared to 19 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of nine percent, 2017 experienced a nine percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, three of the 43 total Tactics findings, accounting for seven percent, resulted in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome.

In 2017, nine of the nine total Animal Shooting Lethal force findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” This accounted for a six percentage point increase compared to 94 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “In Policy (No Further Action)” Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 97 percent, 2017 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, accounting for 42 of the 43 total findings, or 98 percent.

In 2017, nine of the nine total Animal Shooting Lethal force findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “Tactical Debrief.” This accounted for a 19 percentage point increase compared to 19 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Tactical Debrief” Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 97 percent, 2017 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “Tactical Debrief” outcome, accounting for 42 of the 43 total findings, or 98 percent.

In 2017, none of the Animal Shooting Tactic findings were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for a 19 percentage point decrease compared to 19 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of nine percent, 2017 experienced a nine percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, three of the 43 total Tactics findings, accounting for seven percent, resulted in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome.

In 2017, none of the Animal Shooting Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, all Animal Shooting Drawing/Exhibiting findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome.

In 2017, none of the Animal Shooting Tactic findings were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for a 19 percentage point decrease compared to 19 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of nine percent, 2017 experienced a nine percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, three of the 43 total Tactics findings, accounting for seven percent, resulted in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome.

In 2017, nine of the nine total Animal Shooting Lethal force findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” This accounted for a six percentage point increase compared to 94 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “In Policy (No Further Action)” Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 97 percent, 2017 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, accounting for 42 of the 43 total findings, or 98 percent.
In 2018, all four of the Department's Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was an increase of two incidents, or 100 percent, compared to 2017. One hundred percent of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department – four; Central Bureau – four).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, six Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.5 incidents. The Central Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.5 incidents or approximately 167 percent.

In 2018, all four of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was an increase of two incidents, or 100 percent, compared to 2017. One hundred percent of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department – four; Central Bureau – four).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, six Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.5 incidents. The Central Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.5 incidents or approximately 167 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, seven Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.5 incidents. The Central Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.5 incidents, or 100 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, ten Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.5 incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.5 incidents, or 100 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, seven Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.8 incidents. The West Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 1.8 incidents, or 100 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, four Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of one incident. The South Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 100 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, four Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of one incident. The South Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 100 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, seven Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.8 incidents. The West Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 1.8 incidents, or 100 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, ten Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.5 incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.5 incidents, or 100 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, six Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.5 incidents. The Central Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.5 incidents or approximately 167 percent.
In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, four Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred outside the Department’s jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of one incident. The outside jurisdiction count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 100 percent.

In 2018, Wednesday represented the day of the week with the most Unintentional Discharge incidents with three of the four occurrences, or 75 percent. Monday accounted for the second highest count with seven incidents, or 20 percent. Sunday accounted for the third highest count with six incidents, or 17 percent. The remaining 13 incidents were distributed throughout the remaining days of the week without any apparent pattern.

The Unintentional Discharge incident percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2014 through 2018 was as follows:

- January through March: Nine incidents, or 26 percent
- April Through June: Eight incidents, or 23 percent
- July through September: Eight incidents, or 23 percent
- October through December: Ten incidents, or 29 percent

**MONTH OF OCCURRENCE**

**DAY OF OCCURRENCE**

**TIME OF OCCURRENCE**

In 2018, all four Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The five-year annual average for 2014 through 2018 was 3.6 Unintentional Discharge incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and 3.4 incidents between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.
The officer sections below include data for all employees who received, or were pending, BOPC “Unintentional Discharge” adjudicative findings for their involvement in Unintentional Discharge incidents.

In 2018, four Department personnel were involved in the four Unintentional Discharge incidents throughout the year, resulting in an average of one officer per incident. This represented no change when compared to the same officer per incident average in 2017. Similarly, the 2018 officer to incident average represented no change when compared to the same officer to incident aggregate annual average from 2014 through 2017.

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the five years of service categories, decreases in two, and one that remained unchanged, when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – no percentage point change (zero percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- 1-5 years of service – 32 percentage point decrease (32 percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – ten percentage point decrease (35 percent during four-year period, 25 percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 27 percentage point increase (23 percent during four-year period, 50 percent in 2018);
- More than 20 years of service – 15 percentage point increase (ten percent during four-year period, 25 percent in 2018).

In 2018, three male officers were involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents, which represented 75 percent of the four total employees. This accounted for a 25 percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent of male officers in 2017. In 2018, one female officer was involved in an Unintentional Discharge incident, compared to zero in 2017. The percentage of male officers involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents in 2018 was seven percentage points below the Department’s overall male total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male personnel from 2014 through 2018 of 87 percent, 2018 experienced a 12 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents were male, representing 30 of the 35 total employees, or 86 percent.

In 2018, three Hispanic officers were involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents throughout the year, resulting in an average of one Hispanic officer per incident. This represented a 27 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents were Hispanic, representing 18 of the 35 total employees, or 51 percent.

The following depicts the percentage of personnel involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents in 2018 based on their respect years of service classifications:

- Less than one year of service – (no involved officers);
- 1-5 years of service – (no involved officers);
- 6-10 years of service – 25 percent (one out of four total officers);
- 11-20 years of service – 50 percent (two out of four total officers);
- More than 20 years of service – 25 percent (one out of four total officers).

In 2018, there was a percentage point increase in one of the five categories, a decrease in three, and one that remained unchanged, when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – no percentage point change (zero percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- 1-5 years of service – 32 percentage point decrease (32 percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – ten percentage point decrease (35 percent during four-year period, 25 percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 27 percentage point increase (23 percent during four-year period, 50 percent in 2018);
- More than 20 years of service – 15 percentage point increase (ten percent during four-year period, 25 percent in 2018).

The remaining officer involved in a 2018 Unintentional Discharge incident, representing 25 percent, was Black.
In 2018, three employees at the rank of police officer were involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents, which represented 75 percent of the four total employees. This accounted for an 11 percentage point decrease compared to 86 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents in 2018 was seven percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 90 percent, 2018 experienced a 15 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 31 of the 35 total employees, or 89 percent.

In 2018, one employee at the rank of Property Officer was involved in an Unintentional Discharge incident, which represented 25 percent of the four total employees. There were no Property Officers involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents from 2014 through 2017.

In 2018, two personnel assigned to Northeast Division were involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents, which represented 50 percent of the four total employees. There were no Property Officers involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents from 2014 through 2017.

In 2018, two personnel assigned to an Administrative Unit, representing 50 percent, were involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents. In the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, Department Administrative Units accounted for the most Unintentional Discharge incidents (along with Rampart Division) with four of the 35 total, or 11 percent.
In 2018, two personnel assigned to an administrative function were involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents, which represented 50 percent of the four total personnel. This accounted for a 36 percentage point increase compared to 14 percentage in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to an administrative function from 2014 through 2017 of six percent, 2018 experienced a 44 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to an administrative function accounted for four of the 35 total involved employees in Unintentional Discharge incidents, representing 11 percent.

In 2018, one employee assigned to patrol was involved in an Unintentional Discharge incident, which represented 25 percent of the four total personnel. This accounted for a 25 percentage point decrease compared to zero percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to a specialized function from 2014 through 2017 of 13 percent, 2018 experienced a 12 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to a specialized function accounted for five of the 35 total involved employees in Unintentional Discharge incidents, representing 14 percent.

In 2018, no Department personnel sustained an injury as a result of an Unintentional Discharge incident. This accounted for a 14 percentage point decrease compared to 14 percent in 2017. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 13 percent, 2018 experienced a 13 percentage point decrease.

In 2018, two handguns were utilized during Unintentional Discharge incidents, which represented 50 percent of the four total weapons. This accounted for a 36 percentage point increase compared to 14 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of handguns utilized during Unintentional Discharge incidents from 2014 through 2017 of six percent, 2018 experienced a 44 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, handguns represented the highest weapon type count in Unintentional Discharge incidents with 23 of the 35 total firearms, or 66 percent.
In 2018, one of the four incidents, representing 25 percent, involved a Beretta handgun. During the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, Beretta handguns were the least frequent firearms involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents (along with three other handgun makes), accounting for one out of 35 total firearms, or three percent.

In 2018, two of the four incidents, representing 50 percent, involved a rifle. During the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, rifles accounted for four of the 35 total firearms involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents, representing 11 percent.

In 2017, seven of the seven total Unintentional Discharge Tactics findings, representing 100 percent, were adjudicated as “Tactical Debrief.” This accounted for a 14 percentage point increase compared to 86 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Tactical Debrief” findings from 2014 through 2016 of 75 percent, 2017 experienced a 25 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Tactics findings resulted in a “Tactical Debrief” outcome, accounting for 25 of the 31 total Tactics findings, or 81 percent.

In 2017, none of the seven Unintentional Discharge Tactics findings, representing zero percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for a 14 percent decrease compared to 14 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” findings from 2014 through 2016 of 25 percent, 2017 experienced a 25 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, six of the 31 total Tactics findings, or 18 percent, resulted in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome.

During the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, all adjudicated Drawing/Exhibiting findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, accounting for 11 of the 11 total Drawing/Exhibiting findings, or 100 percent.

During the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, all adjudicated Unintentional Discharge findings resulted in an “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” outcome.
In 2018, Department personnel were involved in seven ICD incidents, an increase of five incidents, or 250 percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 17 ICD incidents, resulting in an annual average of 4.25 incidents. The 2018 count exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.75 incidents, or 65 percent. The total number of incidents in 2018 was the second highest in the last five years.

In 2018, five of the Department’s seven ICD incidents, or 71 percent, originated from radio calls. This accounted for a 29 percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of ICD incidents resulting from radio calls from 2014 through 2017 of 53 percent, 2018 experienced an 18 percentage point increase. Historically from 2014 through 2018, ICD incidents resulting from radio calls represented the largest source type of ICD incidents, accounting for 14 of the 24 total incidents, or 58 percent.

In 2018, three of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was an increase of two incidents compared to 2017. Forty-three percent of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department - seven; Central Bureau - three).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, five ICD incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.25 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 0.8 incidents, or 100 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, five ICD incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.25 incidents. The Central Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 1.75 incidents, or 140 percent.

In 2018, five of the Department’s seven ICD incidents, or 71 percent, originated from radio calls. This accounted for a 29 percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of ICD incidents resulting from radio calls from 2014 through 2017 of 53 percent, 2018 experienced an 18 percentage point increase. Historically from 2014 through 2018, ICD incidents resulting from radio calls represented the largest source type of ICD incidents, accounting for 14 of the 24 total incidents, or 58 percent.

Additionally, in 2018 one of the Department’s seven ICD incidents, or 14 percent, resulted from a Station Call and “Other” source of activity, respectively.

Note: Per Special Order No.10 (dated May 10, 2011), the Department is authorized to reclassify CUOF ICD investigations to death investigations when the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner’s Office determines that the concerned subject’s death was caused by natural, accidental, or undetermined means, and when the incident did not involve a UOF or evidence of foul play.

CUOF INCIDENTS · ICD

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, three ICD incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.8 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 0.8 incidents, or 100 percent.
In 2018, one of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was the same number of incidents compared to 2017. Fourteen percent of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department - seven; Valley Bureau - one).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, three ICD incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of .75 incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by .25 incidents, or 33 percent.

In 2018, two of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was an increase of two incidents compared to 2017. Twenty-nine percent of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred in West Bureau (Department - seven; West Bureau - two).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, two ICD incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of .5 incidents. The West Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 1.5 incidents, or 300 percent.

In 2018, one of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred under the command of Custody Services Division, which was an increase of one incident compared to 2017. Fourteen percent of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred within Custody Services Division (Department - seven; Custody Services Division - one).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, four ICD incidents occurred within Custody Services Division, resulting in an annual average of one incident. The Custody Services Division count for 2018 equaled the 2014 through 2017 annual average.

No ICD incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction in 2018.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, zero ICD incidents occurred outside the Department’s jurisdiction.
Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with the month of occurrence for ICD incidents.

**MONTH OF OCCURRENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DAY OF OCCURRENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THUR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with the day of occurrence for ICD incidents.

**TIME OF OCCURRENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000-1759</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-0559</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, five ICD incidents, or 71 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while two incidents, or 29 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The five-year annual average for 2014 through 2018 was 2.6 ICD incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and 2.2 incidents between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

**OFFICER INFORMATION**

The officer sections below include data for all employees who received, or were pending, BOPC “non-lethal,” “less-lethal,” and/or “lethal” force adjudicative findings for their involvement in ICD incidents.

In 2018, 21 Department personnel were involved in the seven ICD incidents throughout the year, resulting in an average of three officers per incident. This accounted for a 50 percent decrease compared to an average of six officers per incident in 2017. The 2018 officer to incident average exceeded the 2014 through 2017 aggregate annual average of 2.4 by 25 percent.

Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, it appears to be no statistical trend associated with the time of occurrence for ICD incidents.

**OFFICER – GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, 19 male officers were involved in ICD incidents, which represented 90 percent of the 21 total employees. This accounted for a two percentage point decrease compared to 92 percent in 2017. The percentage of male officers involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was eight percentage points above the Department’s overall male total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 95 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in ICD incidents were male, accounting for 97 of the 61 total employees, or 93 percent.

In 2018, two female officers were involved in ICD incidents, which represented ten percent of the 21 total employees. This accounted for a two percentage point increase compared to eight percent in 2017. The percentage of female officers involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was eight percentage points below the Department’s overall female total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female personnel from 2014 through 2017 of seven percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, females accounted for five of the 61 total involved employees, or eight percent.
In 2018, 12 Hispanic officers were involved in ICD incidents, which represented 57 percent of the 21 total employees. This accounted for a one percent decrease compared to 58 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic officers involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was nine percentage points above the Department’s overall Hispanic total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 55 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in ICD incidents were Hispanic, accounting for 34 of the 61 total employees, or 56 percent.

In 2018, five White officers were involved in ICD incidents, which represented 24 percent of the 21 total employees. This accounted for a nine percentage point decrease compared to 33 percent in 2017. The percentage of White officers involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was seven percentage points above the Department’s overall White total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 30 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, White officers represented the second largest ethnic category of personnel involved in ICD incidents, accounting for 17 of the 61 total employees, or 28 percent.

In 2018, two Asian/Pacific Islander officers were involved in ICD incidents, which represented ten percent of the 21 total employees. This accounted for a two percentage point increase compared to eight percent in 2017. The percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander officers involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was two percentage points above the Department’s overall Asian/Pacific Islander total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Asian/Pacific Islander personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 14 percent, 2018 experienced no percentage point change. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Asian/Pacific Islander officers were involved in ICD incidents for a total of 18 employees, or 30 percent, during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- In 2018, there were percentage point increases in three of the years of service categories and decreases in two of the years of service categories when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in ICD incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:
  - Less than one year of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
  - 1-5 years of service – 16 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
  - 6-10 years of service – 23 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
  - 11-20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
  - More than 20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the years of service categories and decreases in three of the years of service categories when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in ICD incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 16 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 23 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- More than 20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the years of service categories and decreases in three of the years of service categories when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in ICD incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 16 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 23 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- More than 20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the years of service categories and decreases in three of the years of service categories when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in ICD incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 16 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 23 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- More than 20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the years of service categories and decreases in three of the years of service categories when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in ICD incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 16 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 23 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- More than 20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the years of service categories and decreases in three of the years of service categories when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in ICD incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 16 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 23 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- More than 20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the years of service categories and decreases in three of the years of service categories when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in ICD incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 16 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 23 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- More than 20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the years of service categories and decreases in three of the years of service categories when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in ICD incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 16 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 23 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- More than 20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the years of service categories and decreases in three of the years of service categories when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in ICD incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 16 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 23 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- More than 20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers).

In 2018, there were percentage point increases in two of the years of service categories and decreases in three of the years of service categories when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in ICD incidents during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 16 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 6-10 years of service – 23 percent (zero percent in 2017, five percent in 2018);
- 11-20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers);
- More than 20 years of service – 19 percent (four out of 21 total officers).
In 2018, seven personnel assigned to Newton Division were involved in ICD incidents, which represented 95 percent of the 21 total employees. This accounted for a 12 percentage point increase compared to 83 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was 27 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol, accounting for 56 of the 62 total employees, or 90 percent.

In 2018, 20 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in ICD incidents, which represented 95 percent of the 21 total employees. This accounted for a 12 percentage point increase compared to 83 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was 27 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol, accounting for 56 of the 62 total employees, or 90 percent.

In 2018, one officer assigned to Rampart Division was involved in an ICD incident, which represented five percent of the 21 total employees. This accounted for a 12 percentage point increase compared to 83 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was 27 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol, accounting for 56 of the 62 total employees, or 90 percent.

In 2018, 21 personnel assigned to patrol were involved in ICD incidents, which represented 100 percent of the 21 total personnel. This accounted for an eight percentage point increase compared to 92 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2014 through 2017 of 88 percent, 2018 experienced a seven percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in ICD incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 56 of the 62 total employees, or 90 percent. The one remaining employee involved in 2018 ICD incidents, representing five percent, was at the rank of sergeant.

Based on data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with the Bureau of assignment for personnel involved in ICD incidents.
No Department personnel were killed as a result of ICD incidents during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018. However, five officers sustained injuries during the same five-year period. No officers were injured during the seven ICD incidents in 2018.

### SUSPECT INFORMATION

The suspect sections below include data for all individuals that Department personnel applied force against during occurrences investigated and/or later classified as ICD incidents.

#### SUSPECT – GENDER

In 2018, six of the seven suspects involved in ICD incidents, or 86 percent, were male. This accounted for a 14 percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 88 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of suspects involved in ICD incidents were male, counting for three of the 24 total suspects, or 33 percent.

In 2018, one of the seven suspects involved in ICD incidents, or 14 percent, was female. This accounted for a 14 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 12 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, only three female suspects were involved in ICD incidents, accounting for one of the 24 total suspects, or 13 percent.

In 2018, three Black suspects were involved in ICD incidents, which represented 43 percent of the seven total suspects. This accounted for a 43 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2017. The percentage of Black suspects involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was 34 percentage points above the City’s overall Black population total. Additionally, the percentage of Black suspects involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was equal to the City’s overall Black violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Black suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 18 percent, 2018 experienced a 25 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Black category represented six of the 24 total suspects involved in ICD incidents, or 25 percent.

In 2018, two Hispanic suspects were involved in ICD incidents, which represented 29 percent of the seven total suspects. This accounted for a 21 percentage point decrease compared to 50 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was 20 percentage points below the City’s overall Hispanic population total. Additionally, the percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was 11 percentage points below the City’s overall Hispanic violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 35 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Hispanic category was the most represented ethnic group involved in ICD incidents with ten of the 24 total suspects, or 42 percent.

In 2018, two White suspects were involved in ICD incidents, which represented 29 percent of the seven total suspects. This accounted for a 21 percentage point decrease compared to 50 percent in 2017. The percentage of White suspects involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was 20 percentage points above the City’s overall White population total. Additionally, the percentage of White suspects involved in ICD incidents in 2018 was one percentage point above the City’s overall White violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 18 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the White category was the second most represented ethnic group involved in ICD incidents with eight of the 24 total suspects, or 33 percent.
In 2018, four of the seven suspects involved in ICD incidents, or 57 percent, were in the 30-39 age range. This particular age category accounted for a 57 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 30-39 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 24 percent, 2018 experienced a 33 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 30-39 age group accounted for eight of the 24 total suspects involved in ICD incidents, representing 33 percent.

### Suspect – Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, the three remaining suspects involved in ICD incidents were in the 24-29, 40-49, and 50-59 age range. Each of these specific age ranges accounted for one of the seven total ICD incidents, or 14 percent respectively. There appears to be no statistical trend associated with these age ranges involved in ICD incidents in 2018.

### Suspect – Perceived Mental Illness

Perceived Mental Illness - ICD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, two of the seven total suspects, representing 29 percent, involved in an ICD incident was perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis. This accounted for a 21 percentage point decrease compared to 50 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis from 2014 through 2017 of 24 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point decrease. Historically from 2014 through 2018, suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for six of the 24 total suspects, or 25 percent.

### Deceased Suspect Toxicology Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance Present</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Pending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the seven decedents involved in 2018 ICD incidents, three have completed toxicology examinations by the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner. All three individuals, representing 100 percent of those completed cases, had positive results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s). Toxicology reports for the remaining four decedents, or 57 percent of the seven total decedents, are pending from the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner’s Office.

The partial 2018 percentage of completed cases with positive alcohol and/or a controlled substance results, representing 100 percent, represented no percentage change when compared to 100 percent of positive cases in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of decedents with positive toxicology results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s) during ICD incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 82 percent, 2018 experienced an 18 percentage point increase.
In 2018, two of the seven total suspects, or 29 percent, involved in ICD incidents were homeless. This accounted for a 21 percentage point decrease compared to 50 percent in 2017. From 2016 through 2018, homeless suspects involved in ICD incidents accounted for three of the 11 total suspects, representing 27 percent.

### Suspect – Toxicology Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methamphetamine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opiates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Medication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of year-end 2018, toxicology results for four decedents involved in ICD incidents for the year were unavailable due to pending toxicology reports from the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner.

In 2018, two of the three ICD decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 67 percent, had positive results for methamphetamine. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 33 percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent of decedents with positive methamphetamine results in 2017 ICD incidents. Historically, eight of the 17 decedents involved in 2014 through 2017 ICD incidents, representing 47 percent, had positive toxicology results for methamphetamine.

In 2018, one of the three ICD decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 33 percent, had positive results for marijuana. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 17 percentage point decrease compared to 50 percent of decedents with positive marijuana results in 2017 ICD incidents. Historically, four of the 17 decedents involved in 2014 through 2017 ICD incidents, representing 24 percent, had positive toxicology results for marijuana.

In 2018, three of the ICD decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 33 percent, had positive results for cocaine. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 33 percentage point increase compared to zero percent of decedents with positive cocaine results in 2017 ICD examinations, or 33 percent, had positive results for cocaine. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 33 percentage point increase compared to 100 percent of decedents with positive methamphetamine results in 2017 ICD incidents. Historically, eight of the 17 decedents involved in 2014 through 2017 ICD incidents, representing 47 percent, had positive toxicology results for methamphetamine.

In 2018, one of the three ICD decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 33 percent, had positive results for cocaine. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 33 percentage point increase compared to zero percent of decedents with positive cocaine results in 2017 ICD examinations, or 33 percent, had positive results for cocaine. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 33 percentage point increase compared to 100 percent of decedents with positive methamphetamine results in 2017 ICD incidents. Historically, eight of the 17 decedents involved in 2014 through 2017 ICD incidents, representing 47 percent, had positive toxicology results for methamphetamine.

In 2018, one of the three ICD decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 33 percent, had positive results for cocaine. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 33 percentage point increase compared to zero percent of decedents with positive cocaine results in 2017 ICD examinations, or 33 percent, had positive results for cocaine. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 33 percentage point increase compared to 100 percent of decedents with positive methamphetamine results in 2017 ICD incidents. Historically, eight of the 17 decedents involved in 2014 through 2017 ICD incidents, representing 47 percent, had positive toxicology results for methamphetamine.

In 2018, one of the three ICD decedents with completed toxicology examinations, or 33 percent, had positive results for cocaine. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 33 percentage point increase compared to zero percent of decedents with positive cocaine results in 2017 ICD examinations, or 33 percent, had positive results for cocaine. This partial 2018 percentage accounted for a 33 percentage point increase compared to 100 percent of decedents with positive methamphetamine results in 2017 ICD incidents. Historically, eight of the 17 decedents involved in 2014 through 2017 ICD incidents, representing 47 percent, had positive toxicology results for methamphetamine.
In 2018, seven individuals died while in the Department’s custody. When compared to the 2017 total of two decedents, 2018 accounted for five more decedents, representing a 250 percent increase. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 4.25 decedents from ICD incidents, 2018 was 2.75 decedents, or 65 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2017, five of the nine total ICD Tactics findings, representing 56 percent, were adjudicated as “Tactical Brief.” This accounted for a 44 percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Tactical Brief” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of 79 percent, 2017 experienced a 23 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated “Tactical Brief” findings resulted in a “Tactical Brief” outcome, accounting for 36 of the 37 total Tactics findings, or 97 percent.

In 2017, one of the two total ICD Less-Lethal force findings, representing 50 percent, was adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” This accounted for a 50 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “In Policy (No Further Action)“ Less-Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 33 percent, 2017 experienced a ten percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Less-Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, accounting for four of the seven total Less-Lethal force findings, or 57 percent.

Historically, during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, ICD deaths attributed to accidental causes accounted for eight of the 17 total ICD deaths, or 47 percent.

In 2017, one of the two decedents, representing 50 percent, died from a manner of death indicative of homicide. This accounted for a 50 percentage point increase of decedent deaths attributed to homicide compared to zero percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of ICD decedents who died from accidental causes during the three-year period from 2014 through 2017, ICD deaths attributed to homicide accounted for six of the 17 total ICD deaths, or 35 percent.

In 2018, two of the seven decedents, representing 29 percent, died from a manner of death indicative of suicide. One of the seven decedents, representing 14 percent, died from a manner of death indicative of homicide. An additional decedent, representing 14 percent, had a manner of death classified as “Undetermined.” The three remaining decedents, or 43 percent, currently have pending Manner of Death classifications, pending completion of their respective investigations by FID.

In 2017, one of the two decedents, representing 50 percent, died from accidental causes. This represented no percentage change of decedent deaths attributed to accidental causes compared to 50 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of ICD decedents who died from accidental causes during the three-year period from 2014 through 2017, 2017 experienced a three percentage point increase.

In 2018, seven individuals died while in the Department’s custody. When compared to the 2017 total of two decedents, 2018 accounted for five more decedents, representing a 250 percent increase. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 4.25 decedents from ICD incidents, 2018 was 2.75 decedents, or 65 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2017, five of the nine total ICD Tactics findings, representing 56 percent, were adjudicated as “Tactical Brief.” This accounted for a 44 percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Tactical Brief” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of 79 percent, 2017 experienced a 23 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated “Tactical Brief” findings resulted in a “Tactical Brief” outcome, accounting for 36 of the 37 total Tactics findings, or 97 percent.

In 2017, one of the two total ICD Less-Lethal force findings, representing 50 percent, was adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” This accounted for a 50 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “In Policy (No Further Action)“ Less-Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 33 percent, 2017 experienced a ten percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Less-Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, accounting for four of the seven total Less-Lethal force findings, or 57 percent.

Historically, during the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, ICD deaths attributed to accidental causes accounted for eight of the 17 total ICD deaths, or 47 percent.

In 2017, one of the two decedents, representing 50 percent, died from a manner of death indicative of homicide. This accounted for a 50 percentage point increase of decedent deaths attributed to homicide compared to zero percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of ICD decedents who died from accidental causes during the three-year period from 2014 through 2017, ICD deaths attributed to homicide accounted for six of the 17 total ICD deaths, or 35 percent.

The Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner determines the manner of death. As of year-end 2017, the Department was awaiting the completion of three autopsy reports from the Coroner’s office, which include manner of death determinations.

Adjudication data for 2018 was omitted from this Report since a vast majority of the CUOF incidents will be adjudicated by the BOPC in 2019.
In 2017, four of the nine total ICD Tactics findings, representing 44 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for a 44 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of 21 percent, 2017 experienced a 23 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, Tactics findings resulting in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome accounted for ten of the 36 total Tactics findings, or 26 percent.

In 2017, one of the 11 total ICD Non-Lethal force findings, representing nine percent, were adjudicated as “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).” This accounted for a nine percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” Non-Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of zero percent, 2017 experienced a nine percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, Non-Lethal force findings resulting in an “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” outcome accounted for one of the 37 total Non-Lethal force findings, or three percent.

In 2017, one of the two total ICD Less-Lethal force findings, representing 50 percent, was adjudicated as “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).” This accounted for a 50 percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” Less-Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 40 percent, 2017 experienced a ten percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, Less-Lethal force findings resulting in an “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” outcome accounted for three of the seven total Less-Lethal force findings, or 43 percent. In 2018, the Department engaged in proactive efforts to identify and implement best practices in an effort to reduce ICD incidents:

- All personnel were reminded on a continuous basis regarding the Department’s expectation to immediately request medical treatment when necessary.
- Physical changes were identified and corrected in detention areas to reduce or mitigate physical injury to detainees.
- New protocols to conduct hourly detainee welfare checks were implemented.
- The Inmate Classification Assessment form was revised to increase the interaction and information shared between arresting officers and jail personnel.
- Additionally, CSD required approximately 390 personnel to attend a one-day MHIT course, conducted on-going tactical training on cell extraction and inmate movement, and continuously reviewed tactical directives and Use of Force Policy with their personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing &amp; Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2018, Department personnel were involved in one CRCH incident, a decrease of one incident, or 50 percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of six CRCH incidents, resulting in an annual average of 1.5 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 0.5 incidents, or 33 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRCH</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS**

In 2018, Department personnel were involved in one CRCH incident, a decrease of one incident, or 50 percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of six CRCH incidents, resulting in an annual average of 1.5 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 0.5 incidents, or 33 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE OF ACTIVITY**

The single 2018 CRCH incident resulted from a field detention based on officer’s observations (i.e. pedestrian and traffic stops). Historically, from 2014 through 2018, three of the seven total CRCH incidents, or 43 percent, resulted from field detentions based on officer’s observations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Flag Down</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUREAU OF OCCURRENCE**

Operations-Central Bureau

No CRCH incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau in 2018.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, four CRCH incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of one incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An upper body control hold by a Department employee, including the modified carotid, full carotid, and locked carotid hold (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).
**OPERATIONS-SOUTH BUREAU**

In 2018, the single CRCH incident occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, one CRCH incident occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.3 incidents.

**OPERATIONS-WEST BUREAU**

No CRCH incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018.

**OPERATIONS-VALLEY BUREAU**

No CRCH incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau in 2018.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, one CRCH incident occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.3 incidents.

**OUTSIDE JURISDICTION**

No CRCH incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018.

**MONTH OF OCCURRENCE**

In 2018, the single CRCH incident occurred in May.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, two CRCH incidents occurred in May, resulting in an annual average of 0.5 incidents.

Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with the month of occurrence for CRCH incidents.

**DAY OF OCCURRENCE**

In 2018, the single CRCH incident occurred on a Sunday.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, two CRCH incidents occurred on Sunday, resulting in an annual average of 0.5 incidents.

Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with the day of occurrence for CRCH incidents.

**TIME OF OCCURRENCE**

In 2018, the single CRCH incident occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with the time of occurrence for CRCH incidents.
The single employee involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was Hispanic. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, three Hispanic officers were involved in CRCH incidents, which accounted for 43 percent of the seven total employees.

In 2018, one Department personnel was involved in the single CRCH incident throughout the year, resulting in an average of one officer per incident. This represented no change when compared to the same officer per incident average in 2017. Similarly, the 2018 officer to incident average represented no change when compared to the same officer to incident aggregate annual average from 2014 through 2017.

The officer sections below include data for all employees who received, or were pending, BOPC "lethal force" adjudicative findings for their involvement in CRCH incidents.

The single employee involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was male. In the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, all seven involved personnel in CRCH incidents were male.

The single employee involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was at the rank of police officer. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, all seven employees involved in CRCH incidents were at the rank of police officer.

The single employee involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was within the 6-10 years of service category. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, five of the seven personnel involved in CRCH incidents, or 71 percent, were within the 6-10 years of service category.

The single officer involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was assigned to Metropolitan Division. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, no Metropolitan Division officers were involved in CRCH incidents.

### OFFICER – GENDER

The single employee involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was male.

In the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, all seven involved personnel in CRCH incidents were male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OFFICER – ETHNICITY

The single employee involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was Hispanic. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, three Hispanic officers were involved in CRCH incidents, which accounted for 43 percent of the seven total employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OFFICER – RANK

The single employee involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was at the rank of police officer. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, all seven employees involved in CRCH incidents were at the rank of police officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OFFICER – UNIT OF ASSIGNMENT

The single officer involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was assigned to Metropolitan Division. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, no Metropolitan Division officers were involved in CRCH incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICER – AREA/DIVISION OF ASSIGNMENT

The single employee involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was assigned to Metropolitan Division.

Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with an employee's Area/Division and/or Bureau of assignment for CRCH incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Area/Bureau</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Traffic Divisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER – INJURIES

No Department personnel were killed during or resulting from CRCH incidents during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018. However, 14 officers sustained injuries during CRCH incidents during the same five-year period.

In 2018, one officer sustained injuries during the single CRCH incident throughout the year. This accounted for a 67 percent decrease compared to the three injured officers in 2017. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 3.3 injured officers, 2018 was 2.3 officers, or 69 percent, below the four-year annual average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT INFORMATION

The suspect sections below include data for all individuals that Department personnel applied “lethal” force against during CRCH incidents.

SUSPECT – ETHNICITY

The single suspect involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was Black. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Black suspects accounted for two of the seven total CRCH suspects, or 29 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT – GENDER

All suspects involved in CRCH incidents during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018 were male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT – AGE

The single suspect involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was within the 50-59 age group. Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with the age of suspects involved in CRCH incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The single suspect involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was determined not to suffer from a perceived mental illness and/or a mental health crisis. Historically from 2014 through 2018, suspects involved in CRCH incidents who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for two of the seven total suspects, or 29 percent.

### SUSPECT – PERCEIVED MENTAL ILLNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per. Mental Illness</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single suspect involved in the 2018 CRCH incident was homeless. Historically from 2014 through 2018, suspects involved in CRCH incidents who were determined to be homeless accounted for three of the five total suspects, or 60 percent.

### SUSPECT – HOMELESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeless</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single suspect involved in the 2018 CRCH incident utilized a firearm. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, no suspects utilized a firearm in CRCH incidents.

### SUSPECT – WEAPON/FORCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon Type</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged Weapon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Device</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replica/Pellet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No suspects were killed during CRCH incidents during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018. However, all seven involved suspects during the same five-year period sustained injuries during the respective incidents.

### SUSPECT – INJURIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2017, one of the two total Non-Lethal force findings in CRCH incidents was adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” When compared to the aggregate percentage of “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings from 2014 through 2016 of 100 percent, 2017 experienced a 50 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Non-Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, representing four of the five total findings, or 80 percent.

### DEPARTMENT ADJUDICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing &amp; Exhibiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TACTICAL DEBRIEF/IN-POLICY (NO FURTHER ACTION)

In 2017, both CRCH Tactics findings were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” This represented no change compared to the same percentage in 2016. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Tactics findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, representing four of the six total findings, or 67 percent.

### ADMINISTRATIVE DISAPPROVAL/OUT OF POLICY

In 2017, one of the two total CRCH Non-Lethal force findings were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for a 100 percentage point increase compared to no “Administrative Disapproval” Non-Lethal force findings during the three-year period from 2014 through 2015.

### TACTICAL DEBRIEF/IN-POLICY (NO FURTHER ACTION)

In 2017, one of the two total CRCH Lethal force findings was adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” findings from 2014 through 2016 of 25 percent, 2017 experienced a 25 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a minority of adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome, representing two of the six total findings, or 33 percent.

18 The Department was directed by the BOPC to track homeless data for suspects involved in CUOF incidents starting in 2016. Force Investigation Division has since implemented new procedures to capture this statistic.

19 Adjudication data for 2018 was omitted from this Report since a vast majority of the CUOF incidents will be adjudicated by the BOPC in 2019.
A use of force incident resulting in an injury requiring hospitalization, commonly referred to as a law enforcement related injury (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

**LAW ENFORCEMENT RELATED INJURY INCIDENTS**

**ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPT TTL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, Department personnel were involved in six LERI incidents, an increase of two incidents, or 50 percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 41 LERI incidents, resulting in an annual average of 10.3 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 4.3 incidents, or 58 percent.

The total number of rounds fired in 2018 was the second lowest in the last five years.

**SOURCE OF ACTIVITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Flag Down</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, three of the six total LERI incidents, representing 50 percent, resulted from radio calls. This accounted for a 50 percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent of LERI incidents resulting from radio calls in 2017. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 aggregate percentage of LERI incidents resulting from radio calls of 63 percent, 2018 experienced a 13 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, 29 of the 47 total LERI incidents, or 62 percent, resulted from radio calls.

In 2018, two of the six total LERI incidents, representing 33 percent, resulted from enforcement activity based on an officer’s observation. This accounted for a 33 percentage point increase compared to zero percent of LERI incidents resulting from an officer’s observation in 2017. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 aggregate percentage of LERI incidents resulting from an officer’s observation of 29 percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point increase.
In 2018, one of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was a decrease of two incidents, or 67 percent, compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department – six; Central Bureau – one).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, one of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department – six; South Bureau – one).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, two of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was an increase of two incidents, or 100 percent, compared to 2017. Thirty-three percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred in West Bureau (Department – six; West Bureau – two).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2018, one of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was the same number of incidents compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department – six; Valley Bureau – one).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, no LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was the same number of incidents compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2017.

In 2018, one of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2017.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, no LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was the same number of incidents compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was the same number of incidents compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was the same number of incidents compared to 2017.

In 2018, one of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was the same number of incidents compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department – six; Valley Bureau – one).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 12 LERI incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of three incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of three incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of three incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2017.

In 2018, one of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was the same number of incidents compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department – six; Valley Bureau – one).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, no LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2017. Seventeen percent of the Department’s LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction (Department – six; Outside Jurisdiction – one).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, no LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of zero incidents. The Outside Jurisdiction count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 100 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, no LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of zero incidents. The Outside Jurisdiction count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 100 percent. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, no LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of zero incidents. The Outside Jurisdiction count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 100 percent.

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, no LERI incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of zero incidents. The Outside Jurisdiction count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by one incident, or 100 percent.
In 2018, 27 Department personnel were involved in the six LERI incidents throughout the year, resulting in an average of 4.3 officers per incident. This accounted for a 31 percent decrease compared to an average of 6.5 officers per incident in 2017. The 2018 officer to incident average exceeded the 2014 through 2017 aggregate annual average of 4.1 by 10 percent.

### Officer Ethnicity: LERI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, 26 male officers were involved in LERI incidents, which represented 96 percent of the 27 total employees. This accounted for a 15 percentage point increase compared to 81 percent in 2017. The percentage of male officers involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 14 percentage points above the Department's overall male total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 92 percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in LERI incidents were male, accounting for 181 of the 195 total employees, or 93 percent.

In 2018, 10 Hispanic officers were involved in LERI incidents, which accounted for 34 percent of the 29 total employees. This accounted for a nine percentage point increase compared to 25 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic officers involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was nine percentage points below the Department's overall Hispanic total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 46 percent, 2018 experienced a nine percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in LERI incidents were Hispanic, accounting for 87 of the 195 total employees, or 87 percent.

In 2018, 51 of the 195 total employees involved in LERI incidents, or 26 percent, were within the 1-5 years of service category. This accounted for a 21 percentage point decrease compared to 37 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel within the 1-5 years of service category from 2014 through 2017 of 42 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in LERI incidents were within the 11-20 years of service category. This accounted for a 16 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, 51 of the 195 total employees involved in LERI incidents, or 26 percent, were within the 1-5 years of service category.

In 2018, five of the 27 involved employees in LERI incidents, or 19 percent, were within the 6-10 years of service category. This accounted for no percentage point change compared to 17 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel within the 6-10 years of service category from 2014 through 2017 of 35 percent, 2018 experienced an 18 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, 44 of the 195 total employees involved in LERI incidents, or 33 percent, were within the 6-10 years of service category.

The remaining six employees involved in 2018 LERI incidents, representing 22 percent of the 27 total involved personnel, had less than one year of service (three employees) and more than 20 years of service (three employees).
In 2018, 26 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in LERI incidents, which represented 96 percent of the 27 total employees. This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 28 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 97 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in LERI incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 189 of the 195 total employees, or 97 percent.

One employee involved in a 2018 LERI incident, representing four percent of the 27 total involved personnel, was at the rank of sergeant.

In 2018, 28 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in LERI incidents, which represented 96 percent of the 27 total employees. This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 28 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 97 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in LERI incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 189 of the 195 total employees, or 97 percent.

One employee involved in a 2018 LERI incident, representing four percent of the 27 total involved personnel, was at the rank of sergeant.

In 2018, 26 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in LERI incidents, which represented 96 percent of the 27 total employees. This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 28 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 97 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in LERI incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 189 of the 195 total employees, or 97 percent.

One employee involved in a 2018 LERI incident, representing four percent of the 27 total involved personnel, was at the rank of sergeant.

In 2018, 26 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in LERI incidents, which represented 96 percent of the 27 total employees. This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 28 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 97 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in LERI incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 189 of the 195 total employees, or 97 percent.

One employee involved in a 2018 LERI incident, representing four percent of the 27 total involved personnel, was at the rank of sergeant.

In 2018, 26 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in LERI incidents, which represented 96 percent of the 27 total employees. This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 28 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 97 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in LERI incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 189 of the 195 total employees, or 97 percent.

One employee involved in a 2018 LERI incident, representing four percent of the 27 total involved personnel, was at the rank of sergeant.

In 2018, 26 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in LERI incidents, which represented 96 percent of the 27 total employees. This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 28 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 97 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in LERI incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 189 of the 195 total employees, or 97 percent.

One employee involved in a 2018 LERI incident, representing four percent of the 27 total involved personnel, was at the rank of sergeant.

In 2018, 26 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in LERI incidents, which represented 96 percent of the 27 total employees. This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 28 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 97 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in LERI incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 189 of the 195 total employees, or 97 percent.

One employee involved in a 2018 LERI incident, representing four percent of the 27 total involved personnel, was at the rank of sergeant.

In 2018, 26 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in LERI incidents, which represented 96 percent of the 27 total employees. This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 28 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 97 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in LERI incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 189 of the 195 total employees, or 97 percent.

One employee involved in a 2018 LERI incident, representing four percent of the 27 total involved personnel, was at the rank of sergeant.
In 2018, 23 personnel involved in LERI incidents were assigned to patrol. This accounted for a four percentage point increase compared to 21 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2014 through 2017 of 67 percent, 2018 experienced an 18 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in LERI incidents were assigned to patrol, accounting for 135 of the 195 total employees, or 69 percent.

In 2018, four personnel involved in LERI incidents were assigned to Metropolitan Division. This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 19 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2014 through 2017 of 12 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point increase.

In 2018, two officers sustained injuries during the six LERI incidents throughout the year. This accounted for a 33 percent decrease compared to 33 percent decrease compared to three injured officers in 2017. Additionally, when compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 7.5 injured officers, 2018 was 5.5 officers, or 73 percent, below the four-year annual average.

In 2018, two Hispanic suspects were involved in LERI incidents, which represented 33 percent of the six total suspects. This accounted for a 17 percentage point decrease compared to 50 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was nine percentage point below the City’s overall Hispanic population total. Additionally, the percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was seven percentage points below the City’s overall Hispanic violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 44 percent, 2018 experienced an 11 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Hispanic category was the most represented ethnic group involved in LERI incidents with 20 of the 47 total suspects, or 43 percent.

In 2018, in total, 14 of the 47 suspects involved in LERI incidents were 43 percent. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Black category accounted for 43 percent. Additionally, the percentage of Black suspects involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 26 percentage points below the City’s overall Black violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Black suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 37 percent, 2018 experienced a 20 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Black category accounted for 16 of the 47 total suspects involved in LERI incidents, or 34 percent.

In 2018, there were two Black suspects involved in LERI incidents, which represented 33 percent of the six total suspects. This accounted for a 17 percentage point decrease compared to 50 percent in 2017. The percentage of Black suspects involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 26 percentage points below the City’s overall Black population total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Black suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 37 percent, 2018 experienced a 20 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Black category accounted for 16 of the 47 total suspects involved in LERI incidents, or 34 percent.

In 2018, three White suspects were involved in LERI incidents, which represented 50 percent of the six total suspects. This accounted for a 25 percentage point increase compared to 25 percent in 2017. The percentage of White suspects involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 22 percentage point above the City’s overall White population total. Additionally, the percentage of White suspects involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 42 percentage points above the City’s overall White violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 15 percent, 2018 experienced a 35 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the White category accounted for nine of the 47 total suspects involved in LERI incidents, or 19 percent.

In 2018, one Black suspect was involved in a LERI incident, which represented 17 percent of the six total suspects. This accounted for an eight percentage point decrease compared to 25 percent in 2017. The percentage of Black suspects involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 8 percentage points above the City’s overall Black population total. However, the percentage of Black suspects involved in LERI incidents in 2018 was 22 percentage points above the City’s overall Black violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Black suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 37 percent, 2018 experienced a 20 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Black category accounted for 16 of the 47 total suspects involved in LERI incidents, or 34 percent.

The suspect sections below include data for all individuals that Department personnel applied force against during LERI incidents.

**Suspect Ethnicity - LERI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suspect Information**

The suspect sections below include data for all individuals that Department personnel applied force against during LERI incidents.

**Suspect Ethnicity - LERI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>City Population</th>
<th>Violent Crime Suspect</th>
<th>LERI Suspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>(See Other)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2018, five of the six total suspects involved in LERI incidents, representing 83 percent, were male. This accounted for a 17 percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2017. During the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, males accounted for 42 of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 89 percent.

In 2018, one of the six total suspects involved in LERI incidents, representing 17 percent, was female. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2017. During the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, females accounted for five of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 11 percent.

In 2018, four of the six total suspects, or 67 percent, involved in LERI incidents were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to 50 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis from 2014 through 2017 of 41 percent, 2018 experienced a 26 percentage point increase. Historically from 2014 through 2018, LERI suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for 21 of the 47 total suspects, or 45 percent.

In 2018, one suspect involved in a LERI incident, which represented 17 percent, was male. This accounted for an eight percentage point decrease compared to 25 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of LERI suspects in the 24-29 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 27 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 24-29 age range accounted for 12 of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 26 percent.

In 2018, one of the six total suspects involved in LERI incidents, representing 17 percent, was female. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2017. During the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, females accounted for five of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 11 percent.

In 2018, four of the six total suspects, or 67 percent, involved in LERI incidents were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to 50 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis from 2014 through 2017 of 41 percent, 2018 experienced a 26 percentage point increase. Historically from 2014 through 2018, LERI suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for 21 of the 47 total suspects, or 45 percent.

In 2018, one suspect involved in a LERI incident, which represented 17 percent, was male. This accounted for an eight percentage point decrease compared to 25 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of LERI suspects in the 24-29 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 27 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 24-29 age range accounted for 12 of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 26 percent.

In 2018, one of the six total suspects involved in LERI incidents, representing 17 percent, was female. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2017. During the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, females accounted for five of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 11 percent.

In 2018, four of the six total suspects, or 67 percent, involved in LERI incidents were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to 50 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis from 2014 through 2017 of 41 percent, 2018 experienced a 26 percentage point increase. Historically from 2014 through 2018, LERI suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for 21 of the 47 total suspects, or 45 percent.

In 2018, one of the six suspects involved in a LERI incident, representing 17 percent, was male. This accounted for an eight percentage point decrease compared to 25 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of LERI suspects in the 24-29 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 27 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 24-29 age range accounted for 12 of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 26 percent.

In 2018, one of the six total suspects involved in LERI incidents, representing 17 percent, was female. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2017. During the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, females accounted for five of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 11 percent.

In 2018, four of the six total suspects, or 67 percent, involved in LERI incidents were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to 50 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis from 2014 through 2017 of 41 percent, 2018 experienced a 26 percentage point increase. Historically from 2014 through 2018, LERI suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for 21 of the 47 total suspects, or 45 percent.

In 2018, one of the six suspects involved in a LERI incident, representing 17 percent, was male. This accounted for an eight percentage point decrease compared to 25 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of LERI suspects in the 24-29 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 27 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 24-29 age range accounted for 12 of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 26 percent.

In 2018, one of the six total suspects involved in LERI incidents, representing 17 percent, was female. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2017. During the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, females accounted for five of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 11 percent.

In 2018, four of the six total suspects, or 67 percent, involved in LERI incidents were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to 50 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis from 2014 through 2017 of 41 percent, 2018 experienced a 26 percentage point increase. Historically from 2014 through 2018, LERI suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for 21 of the 47 total suspects, or 45 percent.

In 2018, one of the six suspects involved in a LERI incident, representing 17 percent, was male. This accounted for an eight percentage point decrease compared to 25 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of LERI suspects in the 24-29 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 27 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 24-29 age range accounted for 12 of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 26 percent.

In 2018, one of the six total suspects involved in LERI incidents, representing 17 percent, was female. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2017. During the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, females accounted for five of the 47 total LERI suspects, or 11 percent.

In 2018, four of the six total suspects, or 67 percent, involved in LERI incidents were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to 50 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis from 2014 through 2017 of 41 percent, 2018 experienced a 26 percentage point increase. Historically from 2014 through 2018, LERI suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for 21 of the 47 total suspects, or 45 percent.
In 2018, two of the six total suspects, or 33 percent, involved in LERI incidents were homeless. This accounted for an eight percentage point increase compared to 25 percent in 2017. From 2016 through 2018, homeless suspects involved in LERI incidents accounted for eight of the 20 total suspects, representing 40 percent.

In 2017, 23 of the 26 total LERI incident Tactics findings, representing 88 percent, were adjudicated as “Tactical Debrief.” This accounted for a five percentage point increase compared to 83 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Tactical Debrief” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of 88 percent, 2017 experienced no percentage point change. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Tactics findings resulted in a “Tactical Debrief” outcome, accounting for 148 of the 168 total Tactics findings, or 88 percent.

In 2017, 24 of the 25 total LERI incident Non-Lethal force findings, representing 96 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” This accounted for a four percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “In Policy (No Further Action)” Non-Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 97 percent, 2017 experienced a 31 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Non-Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, accounting for 136 of the 140 total findings, or 94 percent.

In 2017, four of the six total LERI incident Less-Lethal force findings, representing 67 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” This accounted for a 33 percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “In Policy (No Further Action)” Less-Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 98 percent, 2017 experienced a 31 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Less-Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, accounting for 45 of the 48 total findings, or 94 percent.

As the category indicates, LERI incidents are those wherein suspects sustain injuries as a result of Department action. Thus, suspects who died from injuries sustained by force used by Department personnel are included in the ICD section.

In 2018, six suspects sustained injuries during the six LERI incidents throughout the year. The number of involved suspects in 2018 increased by two individuals, or 50 percent, when compared to 2017. Additionally, the 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 10.3 suspects by 4.3 individuals, or 41 percent.

The Department was directed by the BOPC to track homeless data for suspects involved in CUOF incidents starting in 2016. Force Investigation Division has since implemented new procedures to capture this statistic.

Adjudication data for 2018 was omitted from this Report since a vast majority of the CUOF incidents will be adjudicated by the BOPC in 2019.
In 2017, three of the 26 total LERI incident Tactics findings, representing 12 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for a five percentage point decrease compared to 17 percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of 12 percent, 2017 experienced no percentage point change. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, 20 of the 168 total Tactics findings, accounting for 12 percent, resulted in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome.

In 2017, one of the 25 total LERI incident Non-Lethal force findings, representing four percent, were adjudicated as “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).” This accounted for a four percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” Non-Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of three percent, 2017 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, four of the 140 total Non-Lethal force findings, representing three percent, resulted in an “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” outcome.

In 2017, two of the six total LERI incident Less-Lethal force findings, representing 33 percent, were adjudicated as “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).” This accounted for a 33 percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” Less-Lethal force findings from 2014 through 2016 of two percent, 2017 experienced a 31 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, three of the 48 total Less-Lethal force findings, representing six percent, resulted in an “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing &amp; Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEAD STRIKE INCIDENTS

An intentional head strike with an impact weapon or device (e.g., baton, flashlight) and all unintentional (inadvertent or accidental) head strikes that results in serious bodily injury, hospitalization, or death (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS

In 2018, Department personnel were involved in two Head Strike incidents, an increase of one incident as compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of five Head Strike incidents, resulting in an annual average of 1.3 incidents. The 2018 count exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 0.7 incidents, or 54 percent.

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

In 2018, one of the two total Head Strike incidents, representing 50 percent, resulted from a radio call. This accounted for a 50 percent decrease compared to 100 percent of Head Strike incidents resulting from radio calls in 2017. When compared to the 2014 through 2017 aggregate percentage of Head Strike incidents resulting from radio calls of 60 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, four of the seven total Head Strike incidents, or 57 percent, resulted from radio calls.

In 2018, the other Head Strike incident resulted from an activity that requires an operational plan, also known as a pre-planned activity. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, this was the only Head Strike incident that resulted from pre-planned activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Flag Down</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, one of the two Head Strike incidents, representing 50 percent, occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, three of the seven total Head Strike incidents, or 43 percent, occurred in Central Bureau.

OPERATIONS-SOUTH BUREAU

No Head Strike incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau in 2018. Historically from 2014 through 2018, one of the seven total Head Strike incidents, or 14 percent occurred in South Bureau.

OPERATIONS-WEST BUREAU

No Head Strike incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau in 2018. Historically from 2014 through 2018, one of the seven total Head Strike incidents, or 14 percent occurred in West Bureau.

OPERATIONS-VALLEY BUREAU

No Head Strike incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau in 2018. Historically from 2014 through 2018, one of the seven total Head Strike incidents, or 14 percent occurred in Valley Bureau.
In 2018, one of the two total Head Strike incidents, representing 50 percent, occurred outside of the Department’s geographical jurisdiction. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, this is the only Head Strike incident that occurred outside of the Department’s geographical jurisdiction.

In 2018, one of the two total Head Strike incidents, representing 50 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m. The other Head Strike incident, again representing 50 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The time distribution for the seven Head Strike incidents from 2014 through 2018 was as follows:
- 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m.: two incidents, or 29 percent; and,
- 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.: five incidents, or 71 percent.

In 2018, one male officer was involved in a Head Strike incident, which represented 50 percent of the two total employees. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in Head Strike incidents were male, accounting for five of the seven total employees, or 71 percent.

In 2018, one female officer was involved in a Head Strike incident, which represented 50 percent of the two total employees. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, two of the seven total employees, or 29 percent, involved in Head Strike incidents were female.

The two employees involved in the 2018 Head Strike incidents were White. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, three of the seven total employees, or 43 percent, involved in Head Strike incidents were White.

The two employees involved in the 2018 Head Strike incidents were within the 11-20 years of service category. Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with an employee’s years of service for Head Strike incidents.

In 2018, two Department personnel were involved in two Head Strike incidents throughout the year, resulting in an average of one officer per incident. The 2018 officer to incident average represented no change when compared to the same officer to incident aggregate annual average from 2014 through 2017.

### OFFICER INFORMATION

#### OFFICER – GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OFFICER – ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OFFICER – YEARS OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OFFICER – RANK**

The two employees involved in the 2018 Head Strike incidents were at the rank of police officer. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, all seven employees involved in Head Strike incidents were at the rank of police officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFFICER – AREA/DIVISION OF ASSIGNMENT**

In 2018, the two employees involved in Head Strike incidents were assigned to Northeast Division and a Specialized Unit, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Area/Bureau</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Traffic Divisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFFICER – UNIT OF ASSIGNMENT**

In 2018, one of the two total employees involved in Head Strike incidents, representing 50 percent, was assigned to patrol. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in Head Strike incidents were assigned to patrol, accounting for five of the seven total employees, or 71 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFFICER – INJURIES**

In 2018, both of the employees involved in Head Strike incidents sustained injuries. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, five of the seven total employees, representing 71 percent, sustained injuries during Head Strike incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, one of the two total employees involved in Head Strike incidents, representing 50 percent, was assigned to patrol. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in Head Strike incidents were assigned to patrol, accounting for five of the seven total employees, or 71 percent.

In 2018, the other employee involved in a Head Strike incident was assigned to an investigative unit. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, this was the only employee assigned to an investigative unit involved in a Head Strike incident.

In 2018, both of the employees involved in Head Strike incidents sustained injuries. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, five of the seven total employees, representing 71 percent, sustained injuries during Head Strike incidents.

In 2018, the other employee involved in a Head Strike incident was assigned to an investigative unit. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, this was the only employee assigned to an investigative unit involved in a Head Strike incident.
In 2018, both of the suspects involved in Head Strike incidents were male.

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of suspects involved in Head Strike incidents were male, accounting for six of the seven total suspects, or 86 percent.

In 2018, the other suspect involved in a Head Strike incident was White. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, this was the only White suspect involved in a Head Strike incident.

The suspect sections below include data for all individuals that Department personnel applied force against during Head Strike incidents.

**Suspect – Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suspect – Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suspect – Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suspect – Perceived Mental Illness**

In 2018, one of the two total suspects involved in Head Strike incidents, representing 50 percent, was perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or mental health crisis. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, two of the seven total suspects, or 29 percent, were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or mental health crisis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per. Mental Illness</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suspect – Homeless**

In 2018, both suspects involved in Head Strike incidents were determined not to be homeless.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeless</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suspect – Weapon/Force**

In 2018, one of the two total suspects involved in Head Strike incidents, representing 50 percent, utilized physical force against officers during the incident. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of suspects involved in Head Strike incidents utilized physical force, which accounted for four of the seven total weapon/force types, or 57 percent.

In 2018, the other suspect involved in a Head Strike incident utilized an edge weapon. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, two of the seven total weapon/force types, or 29 percent, were edged weapons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon Type</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged Weapon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Device</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replica/Pellet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suspect – Injuries**

In 2018, both suspects sustained injuries during Head Strike incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2017, the only Head Strike Tactics finding was adjudicated as “Tactical Debrief.” Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of adjudicated Tactics findings resulted in a “Tactical Debrief” outcome, accounting for three of the five total Tactics findings, or 60 percent.

In 2017, the only Head Strike Non-Lethal force finding was adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” Historically, from 2014 through 2017, all five Non-Lethal force findings were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).”

In 2017, the only Head Strike Less-Lethal force finding was adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” Historically, from 2014 through 2017, this was the only adjudicated Less-Lethal force finding.

In 2017, the only Head Strike Lethal force finding was adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a majority of the adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, accounting for three of the five total Lethal force findings, or 60 percent.

None of the 2017 Head Strike incidents were adjudicated as Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy.

---

**K-9 CONTACT INCIDENTS**

An incident in which a member of the public has contact with a Department canine and hospitalization is required. Under Department policy, a canine contact is not a use of force but has been included in this category to satisfy the provisions of the Consent Decree (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

**ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS**

In 2018, Department personnel were involved in one K-9 Contact incident, a decrease of three incidents, or 75 percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 15 K-9 Contact incidents, resulting in an annual average of 3.75 incidents. The 2018 count fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 2.75 incidents, or 73 percent.

In 2017, the single K-9 Contact incident resulted from field detentions based on of officers’ observations. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, 12 of the 16 total K-9 Contact incidents, or 75 percent, resulted from field detentions based on officers’ observations.

**SOURCE OF ACTIVITY**

In 2017, the single K-9 Contact incident resulted from field detentions based on officers’ observations. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, 12 of the 16 total K-9 Contact incidents, or 75 percent, resulted from field detentions based on officers’ observations.
**BUREAU OF OCCURRENCE**

**OPERATIONS-CENTRAL BUREAU**

No K-9 Contact incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau in 2018.

**OPERATIONS-SOUTH BUREAU**

In 2018, the Department’s only K-9 Contact incident occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was the same number of incidents compared to 2017. One hundred percent of the Department’s K-9 Contact incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department - one; South Bureau - one).

In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, three K-9 Contact incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.75 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 0.25 incidents, or 33 percent.

**OPERATIONS-WEST BUREAU**

No K-9 Contact incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau in 2018.

**OUTSIDE JURISDICTION**

No K-9 Contact incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographical jurisdiction in 2018.

**MONTH OF OCCURRENCE**

Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with the month of occurrence for K-9 Contact incidents.
DAY OF OCCURRENCE

Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with the day of occurrence for K-9 Contact incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIME OF OCCURRENCE

In 2018, the single K-9 Contact incident occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

Based on the data for the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, there appears to be no statistical trend associated with the time of occurrence for K-9 Contact incidents as 50 percent occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m. and 50 percent occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600 - 1759</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 - 0559</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER INFORMATION

The officer sections below include data for all employees who received, or were pending, BOPC K-9 Contact deployment and force adjudicative findings for their involvement in K-9 Contact incidents.

In 2018, one Department employee was involved in a K-9 Contact incident throughout the year, resulting in an average of one officer per incident. This represented no change when compared to the same officer per incident average in 2017. Similarly, the 2018 officer to incident average represented no change when compared to the same officer to incident aggregate annual average from 2014 through 2017.

OFFICER – GENDER

The officer involved in the 2018 K-9 Contact incident was male. Similarly, from 2014 through 2018, all personnel involved in K-9 Contact incidents were male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER – ETHNICITY

In 2018, one White officer was involved in a K-9 Contact incident, which represented 100 percent of the total employees. This accounted for a 25 percentage point increase compared to 75 percent in 2017. The percentage of White officers involved in K-9 incidents in 2018 was 69 percentage points above the Department’s overall White total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 60 percent, 2018 experienced a 40 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, White officers involved in K-9 Contact incidents accounted for ten of the 16 total personnel, or 63 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>City Population</th>
<th>Department Personnel</th>
<th>K-9 Contact Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER – YEARS OF SERVICE

The only officer involved in a 2018 K-9 Contact incident had more than 20 years of service.

Historically, from 2014 through 2018, five of the 16 personnel involved in K-9 Contact incidents, or 31 percent, had this same years of service classification. The remaining 11 officers, or 69 percent, were within the 11-20 years of service category.
The only officer involved in a 2018 K-9 Contact incident was at the rank of police officer. Similarly, from 2014 through 2018, all personnel involved in K-9 Contact incidents were of this same rank classification.

In 2018, the only officer involved in a K-9 Contact was assigned to Metropolitan Division. From 2014 through 2018, all of the employees involved in K-9 Contact incidents were assigned to Metropolitan Division.

In 2018, no officers sustained injuries during the one K-9 Contact incident that occurred throughout the year.

No Department personnel were killed during or resulting from K-9 Contact incidents during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018. However, three officers sustained injuries during the same five-year period.

In 2018, no officers sustained injuries during the one K-9 Contact incident that occurred throughout the year.
In 2018, one Black suspect was involved in a K-9 Contact incident, which represented 100 percent of the total suspects. This accounted for a 75 percentage point increase compared to 25 percent in 2017. The percentage of Black suspects involved in K-9 Contact incidents in 2018 was 91 percentage points above the City’s overall Black population total. The percentage of Black suspects involved in K-9 Contact incidents in 2018 was 57 percentage points above the City’s overall Black violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Black suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 13 percent, 2018 experienced an 87 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Black category was the second most represented ethnic group involved in K-9 Contact incidents with three of the 16 total suspects, or 19 percent.

**SUSPECT – ETHNICITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only suspect involved in a 2018 K-9 Contact incident was male. Similarly, from 2014 through 2018, all 16 suspects involved in K-9 Contact incidents were male.

**SUSPECT – GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, the only suspect involved in a K-9 Contact incident was in the 30-39 age group. This specific age category represented a 100 percentage point increase when compared to 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 30-39 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 20 percent, 2018 experienced a 80 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 30-39 age group accounted for four of the 16 total suspects involved in K-9 Contact incidents, or 25 percent.

**SUSPECT – AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only suspect involved in a 2018 K-9 Contact incident was determined not to suffer from perceived mental illnesses and/or mental health crises.

**SUSPECT – PERCEIVED MENTAL ILLNESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per. Mental Illness</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The only suspect involved in a 2018 K-9 Contact incident was determined to be homeless. Historically, from 2016 through 2018, four of the nine total suspects, or 44 percent, involved in K-9 Contact incidents were determined to be homeless.

The only suspect involved in a 2018 K-9 Contact incident did not use any weapons or physical force during the K-9 Contact incident.

The only suspect involved in a 2018 K-9 Contact incident sustained an injury.

The Department was directed by the BOPC to track homeless data for suspects involved in CUOF incidents starting in 2016. Force Investigation Division has since implemented new procedures to capture this statistic.

In 2017, one K-9 Contact incident, or 25 percent, was determined not to be “consistent with established criteria” with regards to the adjudication of the K-9 contact findings. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, this was the only K-9 contact finding determined not to be “consistent with established criteria.”

DEPARTMENT ADJUDICATION

Of the four K-9 Contact incidents in 2017, all received “consistent with established criteria” adjudicative K-9 deployment findings.

Of the four K-9 Contact incidents in 2017, three received “consistent with established criteria” adjudicative K-9 contact findings.

Of the four K-9 Contact incidents in 2017, all received “consistent with established criteria” adjudicative post contact procedure findings.

ADMINISTRATIVE DISAPPROVAL/OUT OF POLICY

In 2017, one K-9 Contact incident, or 25 percent, was determined not to be “consistent with established criteria” with regards to the adjudication of the K-9 contact findings. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, this was the only K-9 contact finding determined not to be “consistent with established criteria.”
WARNING SHOT INCIDENTS

The intentional discharge of a firearm off target not intended to hit a person, to warn others that deadly force is imminent (2018 LAPD Manual 1/556.01).

ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS

In 2018, no Department employees were involved in Warning Shot incidents which was a decrease of two incidents compared to 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Activity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Flag Down</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

No Warning Shot incidents occurred in 2018.

OPERATIONS-CENTRAL BUREAU

No Warning Shot incidents occurred in Central Bureau in 2018, which was a decrease of one incident compared to 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPERATIONS-SOUTH BUREAU

No Warning Shot incidents occurred in South Bureau during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPERATIONS-WEST BUREAU

No Warning Shot incidents occurred in West Bureau during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPERATIONS-VALLEY BUREAU

No Warning Shot incidents occurred in Valley Bureau during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTSIDE JURISDICTION

No Warning Shot incidents occurred outside of the Department’s geographical jurisdiction in 2018, which was a decrease of one incident compared to 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside Jurisdiction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MONTH OF OCCURRENCE

No Warning Shot incidents occurred in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F028-17: Reclassified from OIS-Animal to Warning Shot
### DAY OF OCCURRENCE

No Warning Shot incidents occurred in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIME OF OCCURRENCE

No Warning Shot incidents occurred in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600 - 1759</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 - 0559</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OFFICER INFORMATION

The officer sections below include data for the employee who was pending BOPC “lethal force” adjudicative findings for his involvement in the 2017 Warning Shot incident.

No Department personnel were involved in Warning Shot incidents in 2018.

### OFFICER – ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OFFICER – GENDER

No Department personnel were involved in Warning Shot incidents in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OFFICER – YEARS OF SERVICE

No Department personnel were involved in Warning Shot incidents in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OFFICER – RANK

No Department personnel were involved in Warning Shot incidents in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OFFICER – UNIT OF ASSIGNMENT

No Department personnel were involved in Warning Shot incidents in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No Department personnel were involved in Warning Shot incidents in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Area/Bureau</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Traffic Divisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Department personnel were involved in Warning Shot incidents in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Department personnel fired rounds during Warning Shot incidents in 2018, which was a decrease of one round per officer compared to 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon Type</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handgun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shotgun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historically, from 2014 through 2017, the two 2017 Warning Shot incidents are the only Warning Shot incidents that have been adjudicated.

In 2017, one of the two total Warning Shot Tactics findings, representing 50 percent, was adjudicated as "Tactical Debrief".

In 2017, one of the two total Warning Shot Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing 50 percent, was adjudicated as "In Policy (No Further Action)."

In 2017, one of the two total Warning Shot Lethal force findings, representing 50 percent, was adjudicated as "In Policy (No Further Action)."

Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy

Historically, from 2014 through 2017, the two 2017 Warning Shot accidents are the only Warning Shot incidents that have been adjudicated.

In 2017, one of the two total Warning Shot Tactics findings, representing 50 percent, was adjudicated as "Administrative Disapproval."

In 2017, one of the two total Warning Shot Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing 50 percent, was adjudicated as "Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)."

In 2017, the only Warning Shot Non-Lethal force finding was adjudicated as "Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)."

In 2017, one of the two total Warning Shot Lethal force findings, representing 50 percent, was adjudicated as "Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)."
An incident in which any on-duty Department employee, or off-duty employee whose occupation as a Department employee is a factor, uses a less-lethal control device or physical force to compel a person to comply with the employee's direction; overcome resistance of a person during an arrest or detention; or, defend any individual from an aggressive action by another person (2018 LAPD Manual 4/245.05).

In 2018, Department personnel were involved in 2,126 NCUOF incidents, an increase of three incidents, or less than one percent, compared to 2017. In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, there were a total of 7,736 incidents, resulting in an annual average of 1,934 incidents. The 2018 incident count exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 192 incidents, or ten percent.

In 2018, 146 NCUOF incidents were Level I occurrences, which represented seven percent of 2,126 total incidents. This accounted for a two percentage point decrease when compared to nine percent in 2017. Similarly, when compared to the aggregate percentage of Level I NCUOF incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 91 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the majority of NCUOF incidents were Level II occurrences, accounting for 9,982 of the 9,862 total incidents, or 91 percent.

In 2018, 1,980 NCUOF incidents were Level II occurrences, which represented 93 percent of the 2,126 total incidents. This accounted for a two percentage point increase compared to 91 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Level II NCUOF incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 91 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the majority of NCUOF incidents were Level II occurrences, accounting for 9,982 of the 9,862 total incidents, or 91 percent.
In 2018, TASERs were utilized in 313, or 15 percent, of the 2,126 NCUOF incidents. This accounted for a 12 percentage point decrease compared to 27 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of TASER usage during NCUOF incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 27 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease.

In 2018, beanbag shotguns were utilized in 60, or three percent, of the 2,126 NCUOF incidents. This accounted for a two percentage point decrease compared to the aggregate percentage of beanbag shotguns utilized during NCUOF incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 39 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point decrease.

In 2018, 40mm launchers were utilized in 33, or two percent, of the 2,126 NCUOF incidents. This accounted for an approximate two percentage point increase compared to that same percentage in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of 40mm launcher usage during NCUOF incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 1 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease.

In 2018, Strikes/Kicks/Punches were utilized in 163, or eight percent, of the 2,126 NCUOF incidents. This represented no change when compared to ten percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Strikes/Kicks/Punches utilized during NCUOF incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 6 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease.

In 2018, Department personnel activated a TASER 653 times during 313 NCUOF incidents in which TASERs were utilized, resulting in an average of 2.09 activations per incident. When compared to the aggregate annual average of TASER activations per incident from 2014 through 2017 of 2.17, 2018 fell below the four-year average by 0.08 activations per incident, or four percent.

In 2018, TASER activations were effective 636 times during NCUOF incidents, which represented 56 percent of the 653 total activations. This accounted for a two percentage point increase compared to 54 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of effective TASER activations from 2014 through 2017 of 50 percent, 2018 experienced an one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, TASER activations were effective 2,949 times of the 5,212 total activations, or 57 percent.
In 2018, Department personnel discharged a Beanbag Shotgun 128 times during 60 NCUOF incidents in which Beanbag Shotguns were utilized, resulting in an average of 2.13 rounds discharged per incident. This accounted for a two percent decrease compared to the 2.18 average rounds discharged per incident in 2017. When compared to the aggregate annual average of Beanbag Rounds discharged per incident from 2014 through 2017 of 2.43, 2018 experienced a decrease of 0.30 discharges per incident, or 12 percent.

In 2018, Beanbag Rounds were effective 42 times during NCUOF incidents, which represented 33 percent of the 128 total rounds discharged. This accounted for an 11 percentage point decrease compared to 44 percent in 2017.

Note: The Department began tracking the effectiveness of the Beanbag Shotgun in late 2016. As such, an aggregate comparison of the Beanbag Shotgun’s effectiveness could not be completed at the time of this writing.

In 2018, Department personnel discharged a 40mm Launcher 63 times during 33 NCUOF incidents in which 40mm Launchers were utilized, resulting in an average of 1.91 40mm Launcher Rounds discharged per incident. This accounted for a 16 percent increase compared to the 1.64 average rounds discharged per incident in 2017. The 40mm Launcher was deployed Department wide in 2017. As such, an aggregate comparison could not be completed at this time.

Note: The Department began tracking the effectiveness of the 40mm Launcher in late 2016. As such, an aggregate comparison of the 40mm Launcher’s effectiveness could not be completed at the time of this writing.
In 2018, 1,226 of the Department’s 2,126 NCUOF incidents, or 58 percent, originated from radio calls. This represented a two percentage point increase when compared to 56 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of NCUOF incidents resulting from radio calls from 2014 through 2017 of 54 percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point increase. Historically from 2014 through 2018, radio calls represented the largest source category of NCUOF incidents, accounting for 5,435 of the 9,862 total incidents, or 55 percent.

In 2018, 570 of the Department’s 2,126 NCUOF incidents, or 27 percent, originated from field detentions based on officers’ observations (i.e. pedestrian and traffic stops). This represented a one percentage point decrease when compared to 28 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of NCUOF incidents resulting from field detentions based on officers’ observations from 2014 through 2017 of 30 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease. Historically from 2014 through 2018, field detentions based on officers’ observations represented the second largest source category of NCUOF incidents, accounting for 2,869 of the 9,862 total incidents, or 29 percent.

The remaining 330 NCUOF incidents, or 16 percent, in 2018 occurred during citizen flag downs, station calls, occurrences with “other” designations, and those with “unknown” classifications.

In 2018, 475 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred within the geographic Areas of South Bureau, which was a decrease of 48 incidents, or nine percent, compared to 2017. Approximately 22 percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department – 2,126; South Bureau - 475). In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 2,007 NCUOF incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 502 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2018 fell below the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 27 incidents, or approximately five percent.

In 2018, 1,389 NCUOF incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 347 incidents. The West Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 50 incidents, or approximately 14 percent.
In 2018, 32 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred outside of the Department’s jurisdiction, which was a decrease of two incidents, or six percent, compared to 2017. Approximately two percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in areas outside of the Department’s jurisdiction (Department – 2,126; Outside Areas - 32). In the four-year period from 2014 through 2017, 1,515 NCUOF incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 479 incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by 106 incidents, or approximately 22 percent. From 2014 through 2018, March represented the month with the most NCUOF incidents with 1,156 incidents, or 54 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

In 2018, May represented the month with the most NCUOF incidents with 202 occurrences, or approximately ten percent, of the 2,126 total incidents throughout the year. August had the second highest count with 197 incidents or nine percent, respectively. June and July had the third highest counts with 181 incidents, or approximately nine percent. The remaining 1,156 incidents, or 54 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

In 2018, May represented the month with the most NCUOF incidents with 202 occurrences, or approximately ten percent, of the 2,126 total incidents throughout the year. August had the second highest count with 197 incidents or nine percent, respectively. June and July had the third highest counts with 181 incidents, or approximately nine percent. The remaining 1,156 incidents, or 54 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

In 2018, May represented the month with the most NCUOF incidents with 202 occurrences, or approximately ten percent, of the 2,126 total incidents throughout the year. August had the second highest count with 197 incidents or nine percent, respectively. June and July had the third highest counts with 181 incidents, or approximately nine percent. The remaining 1,156 incidents, or 54 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

From 2014 through 2018, March represented the month with the most NCUOF incidents with 1,156 incidents, or 54 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year. Department's jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 27 incidents. The total incident count for outside areas in 2018 exceeded the 2014 through 2017 annual average by five incidents, or approximately 19 percent.

The NCUOF percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2014 through 2018 was as follows:

- January through March: 2,410 incidents, or approximately 24 percent;
- April through June: 2,526 incidents, or approximately 26 percent;
- July through September: 2,529 incidents or approximately 26 percent;
- October through December: 2,397 incidents or approximately 24 percent.

In 2018, May represented the month with the most NCUOF incidents with 202 occurrences, or approximately ten percent, of the 2,126 total incidents throughout the year. August had the second highest count with 197 incidents or nine percent, respectively. June and July had the third highest counts with 181 incidents, or approximately nine percent. The remaining 1,156 incidents, or 54 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

In 2018, May represented the month with the most NCUOF incidents with 202 occurrences, or approximately ten percent, of the 2,126 total incidents throughout the year. August had the second highest count with 197 incidents or nine percent, respectively. June and July had the third highest counts with 181 incidents, or approximately nine percent. The remaining 1,156 incidents, or 54 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

In 2018, May represented the month with the most NCUOF incidents with 202 occurrences, or approximately ten percent, of the 2,126 total incidents throughout the year. August had the second highest count with 197 incidents or nine percent, respectively. June and July had the third highest counts with 181 incidents, or approximately nine percent. The remaining 1,156 incidents, or 54 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.
DAY OF OCCURRENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>2,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIME OF OCCURRENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000-0359</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400-0759</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800-1159</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1559</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1959</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2359</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>2,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Information

The officer sections below include data for all employees who received, or were pending, NCUOF findings for their involvement in NCUOF incidents.

Incidents occurred between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m., which had 702 incidents, or 23 percent. The percentage of male officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was six percentage points below the Department’s overall male total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 90 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in NCUOF incidents were male, accounting for 28,630 of the 32,074 total employees, or 89 percent.

In 2018, 1,005 female officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 13 percent of the 7,963 total employees. This accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to ten percent in 2017. The percentage of female officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was five percentage points below the Department’s overall female total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 10 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2016, females accounted for 3,443 of the 32,074 total involved employees, or 11 percent.

During the five-year period from 2014 through 2018, 2,435 NCUOF incidents occurred between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m., which represented 25 percent of the 9,862 total incidents. The time category with the second highest count was 4:00 p.m. to 7:59 p.m., which accounted for 2,282 incidents, or 23 percent. The time category with the fewest number of NCUOF incidents was 4:00 a.m. to 7:59 a.m., which had 702 incidents, or seven percent.

In 2018, 4,436 Hispanic officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 56 percent of the 7,963 total employees. This accounted for a two percentage point increase compared to 54 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was eight percentage points above the Department’s overall Hispanic total.

OFFICER – GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>5,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4718</td>
<td>5044</td>
<td>5468</td>
<td>6442</td>
<td>6958</td>
<td>32,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Binary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5225</td>
<td>5588</td>
<td>6118</td>
<td>7180</td>
<td>7963</td>
<td>32,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER – ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>2,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td>3,906</td>
<td>4,436</td>
<td>12,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>7,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,225</td>
<td>5,588</td>
<td>6,118</td>
<td>7,180</td>
<td>7,963</td>
<td>32,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, 1,005 female officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 13 percent of the 7,963 total employees. This accounted for a three percentage point increase compared to ten percent in 2017. The percentage of female officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was five percentage points below the Department’s overall female total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 10 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2016, females accounted for 3,443 of the 32,074 total involved employees, or 11 percent.

The 2018 average exceeded the 2014 through 2017 aggregate annual average of 3.1 by 19 percent.

In 2018, 6,958 male officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 88 percent of the 7,963 total employees. This accounted for a two percentage point decrease compared to 90 percent in 2017. The percentage of male officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was six percentage points below the Department’s overall male total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 90 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of officers involved in NCUOF incidents were male, accounting for 28,630 of the 32,074 total employees, or 89 percent.
In 2018, 6,780 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented nine percent of the 7,963 total employees. This represented a one percentage point decrease when compared to four percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of detention officer from 2014 through 2017 of three percent, 2018 experienced no percentage change. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, detention officers accounted for 983 of the 32,074 total personnel involved in NCUOF incidents, representing three percent.

In 2018, 2,233 White officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 28 percent of the 7,963 total employees. This accounted for a one percentage point decrease compared to 29 percent in 2017. The percentage of White officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was three percentage points below the Department’s overall White total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 31 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, White officers represented the second largest ethnic category of personnel involved in NCUOF incidents, accounting for 9,684 of the 32,074 total employees, or 30 percent.

In 2018, 691 Asian/Pacific Islander officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented nine percent of the 7,963 total employees. This represented no change when compared to the same percentage of involved Asian/Pacific Islander officers in 2017. The percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was one percentage above below the Department’s overall Asian/Pacific Islander personnel from 2014 through 2017 of nine percent, 2018 experienced no percentage change. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Asian/Pacific Islander officers accounted for 2,787 of the 32,074 total employees involved in NCUOF incidents, or nine percent.

The remaining 601 employees, or approximately eight percent, involved in 2018 NCUOF incidents included 531 Black officers, 31 American Indian officers, and 39 officers with “other” ethnic designations.

In 2018, 316 personnel assigned to custody assignments were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented four percent of the 7,963 total personnel. This represented a five percentage point decrease compared to five percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2014 through 2017 of 75 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in NCUOF incidents were assigned to patrol, accounting for 24,519 of the 32,074 total employees, or 76 percent.

In 2018, 6,397 personnel assigned to patrol were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 80 percent of the 7,963 total personnel. This represented a five percentage point increase compared to 75 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2014 through 2017 of 75 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in NCUOF incidents were assigned to patrol, accounting for 24,519 of the 32,074 total employees, or 76 percent.

In 2018, 316 personnel assigned to custody assignments were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented four percent of the 7,963 total personnel. This represented a five percentage point decrease compared to five percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to custody from 2014 through 2017 of six percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, personnel assigned to custody accounted for the third largest category of personnel involved in NCUOF incidents, representing 1,688 of the 32,074 total employees, or five percent.

In 2018, 6,780 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 85 percent of the 7,963 total employees. This accounted for a one percentage point increase compared to 84 percent in 2017. The percentage of police officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was 17 percentage points above the Department’s overall police officer total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of police officer from 2014 through 2017 of 86 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in NCUOF incidents were at the rank of police officer, accounting for 27,400 of the 32,074 total employees, or 85 percent.

In 2018, 776 employees at the rank of sergeant were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented ten percent of the 7,963 total employees. This represented no change when compared to the same percentage of involved personnel at the rank of sergeant in 2017. The percentage of sergeants involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was two percentage points above the Department’s overall sergeant total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of sergeant from 2014 through 2017 of nine percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, sergeants accounted for 2,889 of the 32,074 total number of personnel involved in NCUOF incidents, representing nine percent.

In 2018, 2,233 White officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 28 percent of the 7,963 total employees. This accounted for a one percentage point decrease compared to 29 percent in 2017. The percentage of White officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was three percentage points below the Department’s overall White total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White personnel from 2014 through 2017 of 31 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, White officers represented the second largest ethnic category of personnel involved in NCUOF incidents, accounting for 9,684 of the 32,074 total employees, or 30 percent.

In 2018, 691 Asian/Pacific Islander officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented nine percent of the 7,963 total employees. This represented no change when compared to the same percentage of involved Asian/Pacific Islander officers in 2017. The percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was one percentage above below the Department’s overall Asian/Pacific Islander personnel from 2014 through 2017 of nine percent, 2018 experienced no percentage change. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, Asian/Pacific Islander officers accounted for 2,787 of the 32,074 total employees involved in NCUOF incidents, or nine percent.

The remaining 601 employees, or approximately eight percent, involved in 2018 NCUOF incidents included 531 Black officers, 31 American Indian officers, and 39 officers with “other” ethnic designations.

In 2018, 316 personnel assigned to custody assignments were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented four percent of the 7,963 total personnel. This represented a five percentage point decrease compared to five percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2014 through 2017 of 75 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of personnel involved in NCUOF incidents were assigned to patrol, accounting for 24,519 of the 32,074 total employees, or 76 percent.
Officer – Injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>4,595</td>
<td>5,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>4,933</td>
<td>5,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>6,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>6,478</td>
<td>7,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>7,198</td>
<td>7,963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Department personnel were killed during or resulting from NCUOF incidents during the five-year period from 2014 through 2018. However, 3,390 officers sustained injuries during the same five-year period.

In 2018, 765 officers sustained injuries during the 2,126 NCUOF incidents. This accounted for a nine percent increase compared to 702 injured officers in 2017. Additionally, when compared to the 2014 through 2017 annual average of 656 injured officers, 2018 was 108 officers, or 17 percent, above the four-year annual average.

Suspect Information

The suspect sections below include data for all individuals that Department personnel applied NCUOF against.

Suspect Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2018, 1,769 male suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 80 percent of the 2,201 total suspects. This accounted for a three percentage point decrease compared to 83 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved male suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 85 percent, 2018 experienced a five percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, a majority of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents were male, accounting for 8,528 of the 10,200 total suspects, or 84 percent.

In 2018, 428 female suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 19 percent of the 2,201 total suspects. This accounted for a two percentage point increase compared to 37 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 15 percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, females accounted for 1,653 of the 10,200 total suspects involved in NCUOF incidents, or 16 percent.

The remaining four suspects, or less than one percent, involved in 2018 NCUOF incidents have unknown gender classifications.

Suspect Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents from 2014 through 2018 was 10,200. The Black group accounted for 1,504 of the 10,200 total suspects, or 15 percent. This represented no change when compared to the same percentage of suspects who were Black in 2017 NCUOF incidents. The percentage of Black suspects involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was 13 percentage points above the City’s overall Black population total. However, the percentage of Black suspects involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was seven percentage points above the City’s overall White violent crime offender total.

In 2018, 810 Black suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 37 percent of the 2,201 total suspects. This represented a nine percent increase compared to 28 percent in 2017. The percentage of Black suspects involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was one percentage point above the City’s overall Black violent crime offender total.

In 2018, 19 American Indian suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 1 percent of the 2,201 total suspects. This represented no change when compared to the same percentage of suspects who were American Indian in 2017 NCUOF incidents. The percentage of American Indian suspects involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was one percentage point below the City’s overall American Indian population total. However, the percentage of American Indian suspects involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was seven percentage points below the City’s overall White violent crime offender total.

In 2018, 255 Hispanic suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 2 percent of the 2,201 total suspects. This represented a one percentage point increase compared to 1 percent in 2017. The percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was five percentage points below the City’s overall Hispanic violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 40 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the Hispanic category was the most represented ethnic group of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents, accounting for 4,547 of the 10,200 total suspects, or 45 percent.

In 2018, 836 White suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 15 percent of the 2,201 total suspects. This represented a one percentage point increase compared to 14 percent in 2017. The percentage of White suspects involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was 13 percentage points below the City’s overall White population total. However, the percentage of White suspects involved in NCUOF incidents in 2018 was five percentage points above the City’s overall White violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White suspects from 2014 through 2017 of 15 percent, 2018 experienced no change. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the White category was the third most represented ethnic group of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents with 1,504 of the 10,200 total, or 15 percent.

The remaining 88, or four percent, involved in 2018 NCUOF incidents included one American Indian, 28 Asians, 54 with ‘other’ ethnic designations, and five with unknown ethnicities.
In 2018, the 28-32 age group accounted for 1,711 of the 10,200 total NCUOF suspects, or 17 percent. This represented a two percentage point increase compared to 16 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 28-32 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 16 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 28-32 age group represented the third largest age category of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents with 2,259 of 10,200 total suspects, or 22 percent.

In 2018, the 23-27 age group represented the largest age category of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents, or 23 percent. This represented no change for this specific age category when compared to the same percentage in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 23-27 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 22 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 23-27 age group represented the largest age category of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents with 2,201 total suspects, or 22 percent.

In 2018, the 18-22 age group accounted for 1,774 of the 10,200 total suspects, or 17 percent. This represented no change when compared to the same percentage in 2017. Similarly, when compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 18-22 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 18 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 18-22 age group represented the third largest age category, accounting for 509 of the 2,201 total suspects, or 19 percent.

In 2018, the 20-24 age group accounted for 1,661 of the 10,200 total suspects, or 16 percent. This represented a one percentage point decrease compared to 17 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 20-24 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 17 percent, 2018 experienced a one percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 20-24 age group represented the second largest age category with 426 of the 2,201 total suspects, or 19 percent.

In 2018, the 2-17 age group accounted for 993 of the 10,200 total suspects, or 10 percent. This represented a two percentage point decrease compared to 12 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 2-17 age range from 2014 through 2017 of 12 percent, 2018 experienced a three percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, the 2-17 age group represented the fourth largest age category, accounting for 347 of the 2,201 total suspects, or 16 percent.

In 2018, 699 of the 2,201 total suspects, or 32 percent, involved in NCUOF incidents were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis. This represented no change when compared to the same percentage for 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis from 2014 through 2017 of 31 percent, 2018 experienced a six percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for 2,806 of the 10,200 total NCUOF suspects, or 28 percent.

In 2018, 201 of the 2,201 total suspects, or 9 percent, were perceived to be impaired by drugs and/or alcohol. This represented a one percentage point decrease compared to 10 percent in 2017. Similarly, when compared to the aggregate percentage of involved NCUOF suspects who were perceived to be impaired by drugs and/or alcohol from 2014 through 2017 of 11 percent, 2018 experienced a two percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, suspects who were perceived to be impaired by drugs and/or alcohol, representing 43 percent of the 10,200 total NCUOF suspects.
In 2018, 702 of the 2,201 total suspects, or 32 percent, involved in NCUOF incidents were perceived to be homeless. This accounted for a four percentage point increase compared to 28 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved NCUOF suspects who were perceived to be homeless from 2014 through 2017 of 24 percent, 2018 experienced an eight percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017 of 86 percent, 2018 experienced an eight percentage point increase. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Approval” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of 99.1 percent, 2017 experienced a 0.7 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, 7,195 total NCUOF Tactics findings, representing 2.2 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This represented a 1.1 percentage point increase compared to 1.0 percent of “Administrative Disapproval” Tactics findings in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Approval” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2018 of 99.1 percent, 2017 experienced a 0.7 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a vast majority of adjudicated Tactics findings resulted in an “Administrative Approval” outcome, accounting for 23,829 of the 24,145 total tactics findings, or 98.7 percent. In 2017, 7,035 of the 7,195 total NCUOF Tactics findings, representing 97.8 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Approval.” This accounted for a 1.1 percentage point decrease compared to 98.9 percent of “Administrative Approval” Tactics findings in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Approval” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of 99.1 percent, 2017 experienced a 1.3 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a vast majority of adjudicated NCUOF incidents sustained injuries, representing 84 percent of the 10,200 total suspects. This accounted for a 0.6 percentage point decrease compared to 99.7 percent of NCUOF incidents sustained injuries in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of NCUOF incidents sustained injuries from 2014 through 2016 of 99.8 percent, 2017 experienced a 0.7 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, 2,597 suspects involved in NCUOF incidents were perceived to be homeless, representing 25 percent of the 10,200 total suspects. This accounted for a seven percentage point decrease compared to 34 percent of the 10,200 total suspects. In 2018, 7,603 of the 8,560 total Force findings, representing 87.9 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Approval.” This represented a 0.2 percentage point increase compared to 87.7 percent of “Administrative Approval” Force findings in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Approval” Force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 99.8 percent, 2017 experienced a 0.7 percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a vast majority of adjudicated Force findings resulted in an “Administrative Approval” outcome, accounting for 66,629 of the 66,937 total Force findings, or 99.5 percent. In 2017, 21,337 of the 21,539 total NCUOF Force findings, representing 99.1 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Approval.” This represented a 0.6 percentage point decrease compared to 99.7 percent of “Administrative Approval” Force findings in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Approval” Force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 99.8 percent, 2017 experienced a 0.7 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a vast majority of adjudicated Force findings resulted in an “Administrative Approval” outcome, accounting for 66,629 of the 66,937 total Force findings, or 99.5 percent.

In 2018, 1,632 of the 1,933 total suspects, or 84 percent, involved in NCUOF incidents were perceived to be injured. This accounted for a one percentage point increase compared to 83 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved NCUOF suspects who were perceived to be injured from 2014 through 2017 of 84 percent, 2018 experienced an eight percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017 of 96 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point increase. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Approval” Force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 99.6 percent, 2017 experienced a 0.5 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a vast majority of adjudicated Force findings resulted in an “Administrative Approval” outcome, accounting for 66,629 of the 66,937 total Force findings, or 99.5 percent. In 2017, 160 of the 7,195 total NCUOF Tactics findings, representing 2.2 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for a 1.1 percentage point increase compared to 1.0 percent of “Administrative Disapproval” Tactics findings in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” Tactics findings from 2014 through 2016 of 0.9 percent, 2017 experienced a 0.3 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, 316 adjudicated Tactics findings resulted in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome, representing 4.3 percent of the 7,195 total Tactics findings.

In 2018, 2,201 of the 2,201 total suspects, or 100 percent, involved in NCUOF incidents were perceived to be injured. This accounted for a three and a half percentage point increase compared to 96.5 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved NCUOF suspects who were perceived to be injured from 2014 through 2017 of 90.5 percent, 2018 experienced a four percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017 of 93 percent, 2018 experienced a seven percentage point increase. Historically, from 2014 through 2017 of 99.6 percent, 2018 experienced a three and a half percentage point increase. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Approval” Force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 99.6 percent, 2017 experienced a 0.5 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a vast majority of adjudicated Force findings resulted in an “Administrative Approval” outcome, accounting for 66,629 of the 66,937 total Force findings, or 99.5 percent. In 2017, 21,337 of the 21,539 total NCUOF Force findings, representing 99.1 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Approval.” This represented a 0.6 percentage point decrease compared to 99.7 percent of “Administrative Approval” Force findings in 2016. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Approval” Force findings from 2014 through 2016 of 99.8 percent, 2017 experienced a 0.7 percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2017, a vast majority of adjudicated Force findings resulted in an “Administrative Approval” outcome, accounting for 66,629 of the 66,937 total Force findings, or 99.5 percent.

In 2018, 1,667 suspects sustained injuries during the 2,126 NCUOF incidents throughout the year, which represented 78 percent of the 2,201 total suspects. This represented a seven percentage point decrease compared to 83 percent in 2017. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects who sustained injuries during NCUOF incidents from 2014 through 2017 of 84 percent, 2018 experienced a ten percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2014 through 2018, 8,560 suspects involved in NCUOF incidents sustained injuries, representing 84 percent of the 10,200 total suspects.
F003-14: JANUARY 14, 2014
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a robbery investigation at a business. Utilizing the tracking feature on the victim’s cell phone, officers tracked the suspect’s movements and verified his whereabouts. A foot pursuit ensued and the suspect entered a residence at gunpoint, resulting in an extensive standoff with numerous Department resources. At one point, the suspect emerged from the residence and pointed what officers believed to be a handgun at them, resulting in an OIS.

F004-14: JANUARY 15, 2014
Uniformed officers responded to an assault with a deadly weapon/domestic violence radio call at a residence. Upon their arrival, officers heard a single gunshot emanating from the residence. Officers located the suspect and a foot pursuit ensued. During the foot pursuit, an OIS occurred.

F008-14: MARCH 6, 2014
Plainclothes officers contacted a suspicious male and observed a handgun in his front waistband. The suspect failed to comply with officers’ commands and removed the handgun from his waistband, resulting in an OIS.

F009-14: MARCH 24, 2014
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a man armed with a knife and threatening to harm a female victim inside a residence. An LAPD helicopter arrived at scene before patrol officers. Personnel in the airship observed the suspect armed with a shotgun and information was broadcast to the responding units. Patrol officers arrived at scene and began formulating a tactical plan. While on the perimeter, the suspect emerged from the residence and pointed the shotgun at officers, resulting in an OIS.
F019-14: APRIL 24, 2014
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an assault with a deadly weapon suspect armed with a machete in front of a residence. A police helicopter arrived over the scene and observed the suspect running from the location and into a nearby business. Officers deployed into the business and made contact with the suspect, who they verified was armed with a sword. Officers utilized less-lethal force against the suspect, which had no effect. The suspect then charged at the officers with the sword, resulting in an OIS.

F024-14: MAY 12, 2014
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a group fighting at a major entertainment venue. As officers arrived at the location, they observed a large group of individuals fighting and then heard gunfire. Officers deployed along a planter and observed a suspect crouched in a shooting position while holding a handgun. The suspect then charged at the officers with the sword, resulting in an OIS.

F027-14: MAY 17, 2014
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an assault with a deadly weapon suspect at a residence. Officers arrived and made contact with the person reporting. As they continued talking to the PR, large rocks were thrown at their police vehicle. Officers requested back-up and additional resources arrived at the scene. A male suspect then emerged and ran toward the officers holding a kitchen knife while making slashing motions at them with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

A firearm was recovered at the crime scene. However, TID did not provide a photograph of the weapon.
While monitoring a location for narcotics activity, plainclothes officers observed a narcotic transaction. Officers attempted to detain the suspect who sold the item; however, he fled from the location. Officers searched the area and encountered the suspect, who again fled from the officers, provoking a foot pursuit. A physical altercation ensued with the suspect, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a violent male with a mental condition at a residence. Upon arrival, officers observed the suspect in the rear of the location armed with a shotgun. Officers ordered the suspect numerous times to drop the shotgun; however, the suspect failed to comply. The suspect then charged at the officers with the shotgun, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers attempted to conduct a vehicle stop after observing the occupant driving recklessly. The driver failed to yield and a vehicle pursuit was initiated. At one point, the vehicle suddenly stopped and the front passenger exited the vehicle armed with an assault rifle and fired at officers, resulting in an OIS. The suspects continued fleeing, after which the vehicle collided into a building and the suspects fled on foot. As the suspects continued running, the front passenger again fired at officers with the rifle, resulting in a second OIS. Both suspects temporarily evaded capture and a perimeter was established. SWAT arrived at the scene and initiated a search of the area. The driver was subsequently located and taken into custody. While continuing with their search for the passenger, SWAT officers observed him emerge from behind a parked vehicle and begin firing at them with the rifle, resulting in a third OIS.
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a male stabbing himself with a knife. Upon their arrival, officers observed the suspect walking on a nearby sidewalk and saw blood on his T-shirt, hands, and neck area. Officers also observed a black knife in his right hand. The officers ordered the suspect to drop the knife numerous times; however, he ignored their commands and continued cutting and stabbing himself. As officers continued following the suspect on foot, he suddenly turned towards the officers and began to advance toward them with the knife, resulting in an OIS.
Uniformed officers responded to a kidnap radio call. Upon the officers arrival, the victim advised the officers that the suspect had held him overnight at gunpoint in the residence and had refused to let him leave. A perimeter was established and numerous attempts to have the suspect surrender failed. SWAT and K-9 units responded as a result of the barricaded suspect and deployed on the residence. A citizen advised officers that the next door residence was abandoned and that there was a shed behind the house that should be checked. The officers responded to the back and subsequently observed the suspect armed with a handgun. After failed attempts to gain his cooperation, the suspect fired numerous rounds at officers through a window, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a subject attempting suicide at a residence. Los Angeles City Fire Department personnel were the first to arrive at scene and discovered a combative patient who locked himself inside a room. Officers, who responded to a back-up request by the LAFD, formed a contact team and entered the residence. During officers’ attempts to contact the suspect and allow medical personnel to treat him, the suspect stood up with a kitchen knife in his hand and moved toward officers, resulting in an OIS.

While conducting crime suppression, uniformed officers observed a suspect whom they believed was attempting to conceal a weapon under his clothing. When the suspect saw the officers approaching, he began to walk away at a rapid pace. As the officers exited their vehicle, they directed the suspect to stop and show his hands. The suspect reached under his clothing, produced a shotgun, and fired a round, resulting in an OIS.
F007-15: JANUARY 21, 2015
Uniformed officers initiated a vehicle pursuit of a vehicle containing four armed suspects. During the pursuit, the suspect's vehicle struck several parked vehicles and came to rest in the middle of the street. The driver and the front passenger of the vehicle exited and ran, followed by the officers. As the officers chased after the driver, the suspect pointed a handgun at one of the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F008-15: JANUARY 25, 2015
Off-duty detectives responded to the screams of a woman yelling for help at the end of the cul-de-sac outside the city. Following their 911 phone call to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, the detectives approached the area of the screaming woman and observed a male straddling a woman on the ground. The suspect appeared to be strangling the woman with his hands. Both detectives approached, identified themselves as police officers, and ordered the suspect to stop his actions and raise his hands. The suspect did not comply and continued to strangle the woman, resulting in an OIS.

F011-15: FEBRUARY 9, 2015
While being pursued by uniformed patrol officers, the suspect drove erratically, struck several cars, and changed vehicles by carjacking a female victim at gunpoint. The pursuit eventually terminated and the suspect attempted a second carjacking; however, he was unsuccessful. The suspect then fled on foot carrying the firearm in his hand while being pursued by officers. Officers gave the suspect numerous verbal commands to drop his weapon and to get down on the ground; however, he refused. The suspect turned toward the officers with what they believed to be a handgun in his hand, resulting in an OIS.

F012-15: FEBRUARY 10, 2015
While driving back to their police facility, Criminal Gang Homicide Division uniformed officers passed an alley and observed a suspect pointing what they believed to be a handgun at a third party. Officers stopped, approached the suspect on foot, and ordered him to drop the gun. The suspect did not comply, resulting in an OIS.

F016-15: FEBRUARY 23, 2015
Plainclothes detectives were conducting surveillance for a named suspect in an attempted murder investigation. While parked west of the location, plainclothes detectives observed the suspect and a female exit the concerned residence and enter separate vehicles in the driveway. The female slowly drove toward the detective's location while systematically looking inside each of the parked vehicles on the street. As she slowly drove by the detective, she noticed his presence and conducted a three-point turn, slowly driving by him a second time. The female then returned to the residence where she appeared to have a conversation with the suspect. The suspect immediately drove to the detective's parked vehicle and confronted him with a semi-automatic handgun. The suspect then began shooting at the detective, resulting in an OIS.

F017-15: FEBRUARY 26, 2015
While conducting a narcotics investigation, plainclothes officers observed several suspects on the porch of a residence. As the officers drove past the residence, they heard a gunshot behind them. Both officers looked back toward the residence and observed additional muzzle flashes emanating from the corner of the property. Officers stopped their vehicle and an OIS ensued.

F018-15: MARCH 1, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a robbery in progress. Upon their arrival, the officers contacted the suspect and a violent altercation occurred. The suspect attempted to disarm an officer by pulling on his handgun from the holster, resulting in an OIS.

F019-15: MARCH 3, 2015
Uniformed officers initiated a vehicle pursuit of a van that was involved in prior shooting incidents. The pursuit travelled into an alley, where two suspects exited the vehicle and fled on foot while the driver continued evading additional officers in the vehicle. As the passengers exited, officers pursued them on foot. During the foot pursuit, one of the suspects drew a pistol from his waistband and pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F020-15: MARCH 5, 2015
Uniformed officers initiated a vehicle pursuit of a reckless driver. During the pursuit, the suspect's vehicle and the officer's vehicle collided. One officer was unable to exit the vehicle. As the suspect stood next to the door of the police vehicle, the officer was in fear of being ambushed, and an OIS ensued.

F022-15: MARCH 14, 2015  REPLICA/PELLET/BB
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an assault with a deadly weapon suspect at a residence. Upon their arrival, the suspect's father, who had a shoulder injury, stated the suspect was throwing items out of the house and had attacked him with a knife. As officers approached the residence where the suspect lived, the suspect pointed what they believed to be a handgun out of the window at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F023-15: MARCH 15, 2015
As plainclothes officers were driving in an unmarked Department vehicle, their vehicle was struck by gunfire. The officers then observed two suspects shooting at them, resulting in an OIS.

F025-15: MARCH 25, 2015
An off-duty officer was asleep in his residence and was awoken by noises and a flashlight illuminating the interior of the residence. The officer armed himself and exited the residence to further investigate. Upon exiting the front door, the officer observed an unfamiliar vehicle parked in his driveway. A male suspect suddenly appeared from a walkway to the rear yard that was adjacent to the driveway, resulting in an OIS.

F026-15: MARCH 26, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a male with a possible mental illness who was stabbing himself in the throat and had a belt wrapped around his neck. Upon their arrival, the suspect’s mother directed officers to the residence, who was lying on the kitchen floor bleeding profusely. The officers attempted to render aid, while awaiting the arrival of a Fire Department Rescue Ambulance, and verbalized with the suspect to stay calm. When the rescue ambulance arrived, one officer exited the residence to escort LAFD personnel. The suspect leapt to his feet, grabbed two kitchen knives off the counter, and advanced toward the officer. The officer redeployed out of the residence and alerted his partner and the paramedics. As the officers were attempting to gain distance from the residence, the suspect exited the front door, armed with a knife in each hand, and charged at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F027-15: MARCH 29, 2015
While off-duty and driving with a friend, an officer was driving behind a vehicle, driven by an unidentified male suspect. The suspect suddenly conducted a U-turn, causing the officer to brake to avoid a collision. The officer continued driving and was stopped to turn into a side street when he observed the suspect's vehicle rapidly approaching the passenger side of his vehicle. As the suspect drove past the officer's vehicle, the suspect pointed a handgun at them and fired two gunshots. The suspect fled the location in his vehicle, and the officer followed. The officer located the suspect, drew his service weapon, identified himself as a police officer, and gave the suspect commands to surrender. The suspect failed to comply, suddenly backed up, and again pointed a handgun at the officer, resulting in an OIS.

F029-15: APRIL 8, 2015
After hearing gunshots, uniformed officers observed a victim down in the middle of the street. The officers observed a suspect running away from the location and immediately requested additional resources, including an ambulance for the downed victim. An LAPD airship observed the suspect running from the scene and directed uniformed officers to the suspect’s location. As the officers approached on foot, the suspect began to shoot at them, resulting in an OIS.

F031-15: APRIL 21, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a male stabbing himself. Upon their arrival, the officers attempted to make contact with the male. The suspect appeared at the apartment door armed with a hunting knife in his right hand and approached the officers. Officers verbalized with the suspect to drop the knife but he refused to comply and advanced toward officers, resulting in an OIS.
F044-15: MAY 26, 2015
Uniformed officers were flagged down by two victims who advised them that two suspects had threatened them with a gun. The victims directed the officers to the suspects, who were seen walking away from the location. The officers gave the suspects numerous commands to stop and both failed to comply. One suspect continued walking while the other crouched behind a car with his hands in his waistband. The crouched suspect then advanced on one of the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F046-15: JUNE 10, 2015
Uniformed officers and supervisors responded to a radio call of a suicidal man armed with a knife. Two uniformed supervisors arrived and observed the suspect sitting on the sidewalk. The supervisors awaited the arrival of the second unit, requested a beanbag shotgun and a TASER, and coordinated the deployment of the second unit. Two uniformed officers arrived and attempted to verbalize with the suspect from a distance. The suspect charged at one of the supervisors with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

F048-15: JUNE 19, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a domestic violence radio call. Comments of the radio call identified the suspect and advised he had battered his wife, was under the influence, and was possibly driving the victim’s van. Upon their arrival, the officers observed the suspect in the van and attempted to initiate a traffic stop. The suspect failed to yield to the officers and a pursuit ensued. During the pursuit, the suspect called the California Highway Patrol via 911 and advised he had a gun in his lap and was suicidal. After fleeing through Los Angeles and neighboring cities, the suspect stopped his vehicle and exited with what was believed to be a handgun. An officer deployed a beanbag shotgun, firing numerous rounds at the suspect, which had no effect. The suspect pointed the handgun at officers resulting in an OIS. The suspect appeared unaffected by both the beanbag rounds and the gunfire and re-entered the vehicle and continued fleeing from the officers. When the pursuit terminated, the suspect exited the van, pointed the handgun at officers again, resulting in a second OIS.

F032-15: APRIL 23, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to numerous radio calls of a man armed with a gun. Upon arrival, officers located the suspect and observed him armed with what they believed to be a handgun, which he alternately pointed at passing motorists, the officers, and himself. The officers attempted to contain the suspect as he began walking, while repeatedly giving him commands to drop the weapon. The suspect refused to obey the officers’ commands and kept waving the gun and pointing it at himself as he continued walking. Suddenly, the suspect turned and pointed the handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F037-15: MAY 05, 2015
While driving in an unmarked police vehicle, uniformed officers observed a suspect running away from them while holding his waistband area. Believing the suspect was armed, the officers exited their vehicle and pursued the suspect on foot. The suspect jumped over a gate into a driveway and jumped over a fence into the rear yard of another property. Officers contained the area where the suspect was last seen and began establishing a perimeter. Moments later, the suspect emerged from a parked vehicle holding a black handgun. One of the officers issued commands to the suspect to drop the gun; however, the suspect failed to comply and raised the handgun at the officer, resulting in an OIS.

F038-15: MAY 5, 2015
Uniformed officers received a radio call of a man harassing customers and refusing to leave a business. Upon their arrival, the officers encountered the suspect and engaged him in conversation. The suspect agreed to leave the area and began to walk away. Moments later, the suspect became engaged in a fight with a security officer. While attempting to assist the security officer, the officers became involved in a struggle with the suspect and an OIS ensued.

F043-15: MAY 24, 2015
Uniformed officers walked out of an LAPD Service Center and observed a group of three males standing in the parking lot across the street involved in a verbal dispute. Officers then observed the males begin walking away from the location and noted a fourth individual walk to the rear of a nearby parked vehicle, retrieve a handgun and begin walking toward the group of males. When the suspect pointed the handgun at the group of males, an OIS ensued.
F049-15: JUNE 19, 2015
While on patrol, uniformed officers were stopped in traffic when they observed a suspect on a nearby sidewalk advancing toward them with his hands wrapped in a gray cloth in a shooting stance. Believing they were about to be fired upon, the officers exited their vehicle, ordered the suspect to drop what they believed to be a gun, and an OIS ensued.

F054-15: JUNE 29, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a drive-by shooting. During their response, they heard gunfire emanating north of their location. The officers subsequently observed three to four suspects mid-block where additional shots were heard and muzzle flash from a firearm was seen. One of the suspects then turned and pointed a handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F055-15: JULY 6, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an assault with a deadly weapon. The comments of the call indicated a woman was screaming and a man covered in blood was armed with a knife at the location. Upon their arrival with a secondary unit, officers were met in the middle of the street by a male covered in blood while armed with a large kitchen knife. The officers deployed out of their vehicle and directed the suspect to drop the knife. The suspect refused to comply and advanced toward the officers armed with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

F057-15: JULY 9, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a vandalism suspect breaking business windows. Upon their arrival, the officers observed a smashed window and the suspect attempting to smash an additional window with a skateboard. When officers attempted to detain the suspect, the suspect fled on his skateboard and officers followed him in their patrol vehicle. Eventually, the suspect fell off his skateboard and the officers attempted to detain the suspect. A physical altercation ensued and one of the officers utilized the TASER on the suspect. The suspect was able to gain control of the TASER and used it on one officer who became incapacitated, resulting in an OIS by the partner officer.

F058-15: JULY 13, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man armed with a knife. Upon their arrival, the officers observed the suspect was armed with a knife and began giving him commands to drop it. The suspect refused to comply, stood up and began to aggressively approach the officers. One officer utilized a TASER on the suspect, which had no effect. The suspect continued to advance on one of the officers while still armed with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

F062-15: JULY 24, 2015
Citizens observed a suspect firing what was perceived to be shots into the air, causing numerous shots fired and man with a gun radio calls to be generated. A uniformed sergeant and two uniformed officers responded and observed the suspect sitting on a brick wall with what officers believed was a handgun between his legs. The suspect failed to comply with the officers verbal commands to drop the gun, resulting in an OIS.

F065-15: AUGUST 6, 2015
Plainclothes officers were monitoring narcotic sales activity when they observed a suspect standing at the corner holding a handgun. The suspect ran from the location into a nearby alley while holding the handgun and the officers followed in their vehicle. The suspect attempted to scale a chain link fence, but his clothing became entangled and he became stuck on top of the fence. When the officers exited their vehicle, the suspect pointed his handgun at them, resulting in an OIS.

F067-15: AUGUST 12, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a robbery suspect that had just left a business. The comments of the radio call also indicated that the suspect was armed with a large knife. The officers observed the suspect walking away from the location and exited their police vehicles in an attempt to detain her. A foot pursuit ensued and officers chased the suspect into an alley where she armed herself with a large knife. Officers gave the suspect commands to drop it; however, she refused to comply and continued to flee before she suddenly stopped and turned toward the officers with the knife in hand. One officer utilized his TASER on the suspect, which had no effect. She began to advance on one of the officers while still armed with the knife, resulting in an OIS.
F071-15: AUGUST 22, 2015
Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call regarding a violent male with a possible mental illness at a residence. Officers knocked on the apartment door and the subject of the radio call answered the door while in possession of knives. The suspect threw one of the knives at the officers and then fled on foot. Two additional units responded and observed the suspect running from the location. The officers exited their vehicles and observed the suspect running towards them in an aggressive manner while still in possession of a large knife, resulting in an OIS.

F072-15: AUGUST 22, 2015
While working crime suppression, uniformed officers observed a male walking in the street, obstructing vehicle traffic. The officers stopped their police vehicle in order to conduct a pedestrian stop for the observed violation. As the driver officer exited the vehicle, he observed the handle of a handgun protruding from the suspect’s jacket pocket and immediately voiced his observation to his partner. The suspect ran onto the adjacent sidewalk and the officers followed. The suspect turned in the direction of the officers with the handgun in his right hand, resulting in an OIS.

F075-15: AUGUST 27, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a neighbor dispute. Upon arrival, the officers determined that one of the parties involved in the dispute was using utilities from the other’s address without permission. The officers responded to investigate and encountered the suspect. A physical altercation ensued, during which the suspect picked up a metal tool and struck both officers on the head and shoulder area, resulting in an OIS.

F081-15: SEPTEMBER 15, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a man armed with a gun. Upon their arrival, officers observed the suspect and attempted to detain him. As the suspect continued walking away, officers observed that he was armed with a handgun in his right hand. As the officers deployed, the suspect pointed the handgun at one of the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F082-15: SEPTEMBER 16, 2015
Numerous officers responded to a shots fired radio call. In addition to the call, two additional 911 calls were received, one of which was made by the shooting suspect. The responding personnel began to deploy on the residence when the suspect walked out the side door of the residence armed with a rifle. The suspect pointed the rifle at officers, resulting in an OIS.

F083-15: SEPTEMBER 27, 2015
Uniformed officers received a radio call of a woman armed with a knife. Upon their arrival, the officers were confronted by the suspect. The suspect failed to comply with the officers’ commands and continued to approach the officers with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

F084-15: OCTOBER 3, 2015
While conducting a follow-up investigation, detectives observed a wanted shooting suspect driving in the vehicle used in the commission of the crime. The detectives followed him and broadcast their observations and location. The suspect suddenly negotiated a U-turn and drove towards the detectives. The detectives drove into a driveway, exited their vehicle, and were confronted by the suspect, resulting in an OIS.
Uniformed officers assisted in the service of a search and arrest warrant for a murder suspect. The suspect barricaded himself inside the residence and refused to surrender. After some time, the suspect fled the location and began climbing onto the roof of a storage shed in the rear yard of the property. While doing so, the suspect turned towards officers positioned nearby with an object that was believed to be a handgun in his hand, resulting in an OIS.

There is no photograph available as the incident was a perception shooting.

Uniformed officers attempted to detain the driver of a stolen vehicle, resulting in a physical altercation. The officers and suspect fell to the ground and fought over a knife that the suspect had armed himself with. During the physical altercation, the suspect attempted to remove an officer’s gun from the holster, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a male in the middle of the street causing vehicles to swerve around him. Upon the officers’ arrival, the suspect reached into his waistband area, simulated drawing a handgun and ran toward the officers. The officers deployed a beanbag shotgun and TASER on the suspect, which had no effect. A physical altercation ensued and an officer was knocked to the ground. The suspect obtained control of the beanbag shotgun and stood over the officer with the beanbag shotgun, resulting in an OIS.

An off-duty officer was outside his private vehicle which was parked in front of his residence. The officer was confronted by a suspect armed with a handgun, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers were monitoring a suspect receiving medical treatment after he was involved in a prior CUOF incident where he attempted to disarm an officer of his handgun. After medical treatment was provided and the suspect was cleared to be booked by the attending physician, the officers began handcuffing the suspect. In the process, the suspect attacked the officers with bodily force and a metal chair. Officers used TASERs to attempt to control him, which had no effect. The suspect attempted to disarm an officer of his handgun, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers assisted in the service of a search and arrest warrant for a murder suspect. The suspect barricaded himself inside the residence and refused to surrender. After some time, the suspect fled the location and began climbing onto the roof of a storage shed in the rear yard of the property. While doing so, the suspect turned towards officers positioned nearby with an object that was believed to be a handgun in his hand, resulting in an OIS.

There is no photograph available as the incident was a perception shooting.
Having received information regarding a stolen vehicle, uniformed officers observed the vehicle driving on City streets and attempted to conduct a traffic stop. The driver pulled in to a driveway and produced a sawed-off shotgun, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an assault with a deadly weapon suspect who had stabbed one individual inside a residence. As the officers approached the location, they observed the suspect standing on the roof of a motor home-type vehicle. The suspect, who was armed with a knife, then began to cut himself on the neck. The officers attempted to verbalize with the suspect to descend from the roof so they could render medical aid for his injuries, however he refused. The suspect managed to enter the motor home and sat in the driver’s seat. Believing the suspect would attempt to drive away, the officers gained entry into the motor home and deployed the TASER on the suspect, which appeared to have no effect.

While off-duty and asleep in his residence, an officer heard multiple footsteps originating from the interior of his home. The officer armed himself with a handgun and exited his bedroom to investigate. As the officers entered the living room, he was confronted by two suspects. Both suspects immediately fled the residence through a window in the kitchen. As the suspects continued their escape, one turned and reached inside his waistband, resulting in an OIS.

While off-duty and driving in his personal vehicle, an officer observed a drive-by shooting occur, which resulted in a homicide. The officer called 911 and reported his observations while following the suspect’s vehicle. While doing so, the driver of the suspect’s vehicle came to an abrupt stop and began firing numerous rounds at the officer, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a robbery suspect. Officers were directed to the suspect’s location by an LAPD air unit. As officers stopped their patrol vehicle, they were confronted by the suspect, who had armed himself with what they believed to be a handgun. The suspect ran towards their patrol vehicle with the weapon pointed at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

While conducting crime suppression, uniformed officers attempted to stop two pedestrians. As the officers exited their patrol vehicle, one of the individuals, later identified as the suspect, fled on foot. While pursuing the suspect, one officer observed the suspect remove a handgun from his waistband and begin to turn towards the officer, resulting in an OIS.

While off-duty and inside his residence asleep, an officer heard multiple footsteps originating from the interior of his home. The officer armed himself with a handgun and exited his bedroom to investigate. As the officer entered the living room, he was confronted by two suspects. Both suspects immediately fled the residence through a window in the kitchen. As the suspects continued their escape, one turned and reached inside his waistband, resulting in an OIS.
F026-16: APRIL 29, 2016
While on-duty and stopped at a red tri-light, two plainclothes detectives observed two individuals engaged in an altercation with a victim. The detectives observed one of the individuals arm himself with a handgun and begin to shoot at the victim, resulting in an OIS.

F027-16: APRIL 30, 2016
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a domestic violence at an apartment. Comments of the radio call indicated the suspect had locked himself inside a bedroom and was assaulting his girlfriend. Upon their arrival, the officers entered the apartment and located a female who was unconscious and unresponsive. As one officer began providing medical attention to the female, the partner officer covered the hallway and remaining rooms. The covering officer encountered the suspect, who was armed with two knives. The officer ordered the suspect to drop the knives, however, he failed to comply, and an OIS ensued.

F029-16: MAY 13, 2016 PRIOR CRIMES
Uniformed officers observed a group of males congregated by a parked vehicle. While attempting to detain the individuals, one fled from the group and the officers gave chase on foot. During the foot pursuit, the suspect produced a handgun and fired at the officers, striking one, and an OIS ensued.
F043-16: JULY 24, 2016
While conducting patrol, uniformed officers approached a group of individuals on foot and observed one of the individuals armed with a handgun. A foot pursuit and exchange of gunfire with the suspect ultimately ensued, resulting in one officer being struck by gunfire.

F044-16: JULY 26, 2016
While awaiting the arrival of local law enforcement to respond to his residence in regards to a burglary investigation, an off-duty detective observed the suspects from the incident return. One suspect pointed what was believed to be a handgun at the detective and began shooting at him, resulting in an OIS. It was later discovered that the handgun was a paintball gun. Both the suspect and the weapon remain outstanding.

F045-16: JULY 28, 2016
Following a vehicle pursuit, one of the occupants of the suspect vehicle exited and ran from officers. As the officers attempted to take the suspect into custody, the suspect armed himself with a handgun, and an OIS ensued.

F041-16: JULY 7, 2016
While at a restaurant, an off-duty officer was the victim of a robbery. The suspect displayed what was believed to be a handgun at the officer and demanded his property, resulting in an OIS.

F035-16: JUNE 10, 2016
Uniformed officers initiated a traffic stop on a vehicle that had a strong odor of marijuana emanating from inside the cab. As the officers ordered the occupants to exit the vehicle, one suddenly ran from the officers in between two nearby parked vehicles. One officer observed the suspect reach for a handgun located in the suspect’s waistband, and an OIS ensued.

F038-16: JUNE 26, 2016
While working a crime suppression detail, uniformed officers observed a group of male subjects standing on the sidewalk drinking alcoholic beverages. As the officers attempted to detain the individuals in the group, one began walking away from the officers while holding his waistband. One officer followed the suspect and ordered him to stop. The suspect abruptly stopped and turned towards the officer while making a furtive movement, resulting in an OIS.

F037-16: JUNE 26, 2016
While conducting a traffic stop on a vehicle, uniformed officers observed the driver exit the vehicle armed with a handgun. As the suspect ran from the officers, he turned and pointed the handgun at one officer, resulting in an OIS.

F039-16: JUNE 10, 2016
Uniformed officers initiated a traffic stop on a vehicle that had a strong odor of marijuana emanating from inside the cab. As the officers ordered the occupants to exit the vehicle, one suddenly ran from the officers in between two nearby parked vehicles. One officer observed the suspect reach for a handgun located in the suspect’s waistband, and an OIS ensued.

F042-16: JULY 8, 2016
While at a restaurant, an off-duty officer was the victim of a robbery. The suspect displayed what was believed to be a handgun at the officer and demanded his property, resulting in an OIS.

F036-16: JUNE 10, 2016
Uniformed officers initiated a traffic stop on a vehicle that had a strong odor of marijuana emanating from inside the cab. As the officers ordered the occupants to exit the vehicle, one suddenly ran from the officers in between two nearby parked vehicles. One officer observed the suspect reach for a handgun located in the suspect’s waistband, and an OIS ensued.

F040-16: JUNE 17, 2016
While at a restaurant, an off-duty officer was the victim of a robbery. The suspect displayed what was believed to be a handgun at the officer and demanded his property, resulting in an OIS.

F037-16: JUNE 26, 2016
While conducting a traffic stop on a vehicle, uniformed officers observed the driver exit the vehicle armed with a handgun. As the suspect ran from the officers, he turned and pointed the handgun at one officer, resulting in an OIS.
While conducting an undercover narcotics investigation, an LAPD officer was approached by a male, later identified as the suspect, who attempted to rob him. The suspect punched the officer in the face, backed away, lifted his shirt, reached for his waistband, and an OIS ensued.

Uniformed officers escorted an arrestee to a local hospital for a medical examination. During the examination, the suspect escaped custody and fled from the officers. The suspect attempted to carjack an individual near the hospital, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a male armed with a handgun. Officers located an individual who matched the description of the suspect based on the comments of the radio call and attempted to initiate a pedestrian stop. Upon doing so, the suspect turned and pointed what was believed to be a handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F084-16: DECEMBER 17, 2016
While on patrol, uniformed officers recognized a wanted murder suspect. As the officers approached the suspect to detain him, he fled on foot. While being pursued by the officers, the suspect turned and pointed a handgun at them, resulting in an OIS.

F085-16: DECEMBER 18, 2016
Uniformed officers observed an individual, later identified as the suspect, armed with a handgun in his waistband. When officers attempted to detain him, the suspect fled on foot. While being pursued by the officers, the suspect turned and pointed the handgun at them, resulting in an OIS.

F086-16: DECEMBER 20, 2016
A uniformed officer responded to an assault with a deadly weapon/shots fired radio call at a residence. While conducting the subsequent investigation at the location of the radio call, the officer observed one suspect from the incident riding his bike. As the officer approached the suspect to take him into custody, the suspect retrieved a handgun, resulting in an OIS.

F089-16: December 30, 2016
Plainclothes narcotic officers were monitoring an area for narcotics activity when they observed three individuals exit a vehicle and walk toward their location. Officers observed that one of the individuals was pointing a firearm in the officers’ direction, another had a firearm in his hand, and the third was holding his hand in a manner consistent with someone holding a firearm. The suspects appeared to realize the plainclothes officers were police officers and they fled on foot. One of the suspects pointed a firearm at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F001-17: January 31, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man armed with a knife near a major entertainment center. Officers were directed to the suspect’s location and incidentally observed a victim with an apparent stab wound. The officers then observed the suspect standing outside a nearby business holding a knife. As the officers approached the suspect, he immediately turned and entered the business. Once inside, the suspect began stabbing a second individual, which resulted in the deployment of a TASER and an OIS.

F005-17: January 17, 2017
A Federal Bureau of Investigation task force, consisting of various entities and plainclothes LAPD personnel, were directed to a commercial nursery outside City limits where a wanted homicide suspect was located. As the task force members approached the suspect to take him into custody, he armed himself with a sharpened bladed spade and refused to comply with repeated commands to drop the bladed spade and surrender. A task force member deployed a TASER twice, which struck the suspect but was ineffective. The suspect then lunged at an LAPD officer with the bladed spade, and an OIS occurred.

F003-17: January 10, 2017
While on patrol, uniformed officers observed a Department of Transportation officer being chased by an individual armed with a knife. The suspect ran toward the officers’ vehicle with the knife in hand and attempted to open the driver’s door. After requesting help and repositioning their vehicle, the officers exited the police vehicle and utilized their doors as cover. The suspect again advanced toward the officers with the knife in hand and told the officers he was going to kill them, resulting in an OIS.

F004-17: January 15, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a male suffering from a mental illness at a residence. Comments of the call indicated the suspect was armed with a knife and vandalizing the residence. The officers arrived at the scene and were directed to the suspect’s whereabouts. The officers formulated a plan, entered the residence, and located the suspect in one of the bedrooms. The officers attempted to communicate with the suspect as they requested his cooperation and compliance, but were unsuccessful. The suspect opened the bedroom door armed with a knife, and moved toward one of the officers, resulting in the deployment of a beanbag shotgun and an OIS.

F002-17: January 9, 2017
Uniformed officers conducted surveillance on several locations for a wanted attempted murder suspect. Officers observed the suspect enter a vehicle and drive away. Officers initiated a traffic stop with the assistance of additional patrol units. During the stop, the suspect exited the vehicle, was uncooperative, and failed to comply with officers’ commands. Officers deployed the beanbag shotgun on the suspect, which had no effect. The suspect re-entered the vehicle and a vehicle pursuit ensued. During the pursuit, the suspect stopped the vehicle and fired at officers with a handgun, resulting in an OIS. The suspect continued driving, stopped his vehicle a second time, and fired at officers, resulting in a second OIS. Officers utilized the pursuit intervention technique, which disabled the suspect’s vehicle. The suspect did not comply with officers’ commands and a K-9 Contact occurred.

F001-17: January 30, 2017
While off-duty, an LAPD officer confronted two suspects inside his residence. A physical altercation between the officer and the suspects occurred, which resulted in an OIS.

F004-17: January 15, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man armed with a knife near a major entertainment center. Officers were directed to the suspect’s location and incidentally observed a victim with an apparent stab wound. The officers then observed the suspect standing outside a nearby business holding a knife. As the officers approached the suspect, he immediately turned and entered the business. Once inside, the suspect began stabbing a second individual, which resulted in the deployment of a TASER and an OIS.

F002-17: January 9, 2017
Uniformed officers conducted surveillance on several locations for a wanted attempted murder suspect. Officers observed the suspect enter a vehicle and drive away. Officers initiated a traffic stop with the assistance of additional patrol units. During the stop, the suspect exited the vehicle, was uncooperative, and failed to comply with officers’ commands. Officers deployed the beanbag shotgun on the suspect, which had no effect. The suspect re-entered the vehicle and a vehicle pursuit ensued. During the pursuit, the suspect stopped the vehicle and fired at officers with a handgun, resulting in an OIS. The suspect continued driving, stopped his vehicle a second time, and fired at officers, resulting in a second OIS. Officers utilized the pursuit intervention technique, which disabled the suspect’s vehicle. The suspect did not comply with officers’ commands and a K-9 Contact occurred.

F003-17: January 10, 2017
While on patrol, uniformed officers observed a Department of Transportation officer being chased by an individual armed with a knife. The suspect ran toward the officers’ vehicle with the knife in hand and attempted to open the driver’s door. After requesting help and repositioning their vehicle, the officers exited the police vehicle and utilized their doors as cover. The suspect again advanced toward the officers with the knife in hand and told the officers he was going to kill them, resulting in an OIS.

F004-17: January 15, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a male suffering from a mental illness at a residence. Comments of the call indicated the suspect was armed with a knife and vandalizing the residence. The officers arrived at the scene and were directed to the suspect’s whereabouts. The officers formulated a plan, entered the residence, and located the suspect in one of the bedrooms. The officers attempted to communicate with the suspect as they requested his cooperation and compliance, but were unsuccessful. The suspect opened the bedroom door armed with a knife, and moved toward one of the officers, resulting in the deployment of a beanbag shotgun and an OIS.

F002-17: January 9, 2017
Uniformed officers conducted surveillance on several locations for a wanted attempted murder suspect. Officers observed the suspect enter a vehicle and drive away. Officers initiated a traffic stop with the assistance of additional patrol units. During the stop, the suspect exited the vehicle, was uncooperative, and failed to comply with officers’ commands. Officers deployed the beanbag shotgun on the suspect, which had no effect. The suspect re-entered the vehicle and a vehicle pursuit ensued. During the pursuit, the suspect stopped the vehicle and fired at officers with a handgun, resulting in an OIS. The suspect continued driving, stopped his vehicle a second time, and fired at officers, resulting in a second OIS. Officers utilized the pursuit intervention technique, which disabled the suspect’s vehicle. The suspect did not comply with officers’ commands and a K-9 Contact occurred.

F003-17: January 10, 2017
While on patrol, uniformed officers observed a Department of Transportation officer being chased by an individual armed with a knife. The suspect ran toward the officers’ vehicle with the knife in hand and attempted to open the driver’s door. After requesting help and repositioning their vehicle, the officers exited the police vehicle and utilized their doors as cover. The suspect again advanced toward the officers with the knife in hand and told the officers he was going to kill them, resulting in an OIS.

F004-17: January 15, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a male suffering from a mental illness at a residence. Comments of the call indicated the suspect was armed with a knife and vandalizing the residence. The officers arrived at the scene and were directed to the suspect’s whereabouts. The officers formulated a plan, entered the residence, and located the suspect in one of the bedrooms. The officers attempted to communicate with the suspect as they requested his cooperation and compliance, but were unsuccessful. The suspect opened the bedroom door armed with a knife, and moved toward one of the officers, resulting in the deployment of a beanbag shotgun and an OIS.

F002-17: January 9, 2017
Uniformed officers conducted surveillance on several locations for a wanted attempted murder suspect. Officers observed the suspect enter a vehicle and drive away. Officers initiated a traffic stop with the assistance of additional patrol units. During the stop, the suspect exited the vehicle, was uncooperative, and failed to comply with officers’ commands. Officers deployed the beanbag shotgun on the suspect, which had no effect. The suspect re-entered the vehicle and a vehicle pursuit ensued. During the pursuit, the suspect stopped the vehicle and fired at officers with a handgun, resulting in an OIS. The suspect continued driving, stopped his vehicle a second time, and fired at officers, resulting in a second OIS. Officers utilized the pursuit intervention technique, which disabled the suspect’s vehicle. The suspect did not comply with officers’ commands and a K-9 Contact occurred.
F027-17: April 22, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an assault with a deadly weapon incident at a residence. When the officers arrived, they encountered the suspect, who informed them he was armed with a knife. When the officers arrived at the scene, they observed the suspect involved in a verbal dispute with another individual. The suspect then began stabbing the individual, and an OIS ensued.

F018-17: March 8, 2017
Uniformed officers were flagged down by an individual who informed them that he was the victim of a firearm brandishing incident. The victim then directed the officers to the nearby group of suspects. As the officers approached the group, one of the individuals, later identified as the suspect, ran from the officers into a nearby alley. The suspect drew a handgun from his waistband, and an OIS ensued.

F019-17: March 8, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a burglary in progress at a residence. Comments of the call indicated the suspect entered the location while the lone resident was sleeping in one of the bedrooms. The resident observed the suspect in the kitchen area and believed he was armed with a firearm. Officers arrived at the scene, verified the suspect was in fact still inside the residence, and requested SWAT. A tactical plan was formulated and SWAT personnel began to deploy around the residence. After various less-lethal munitions were deployed, the suspect emerged and fired at SWAT personnel with a handgun, resulting in an OIS.

F021-17: March 25, 2017
While on patrol, uniformed officers heard numerous gunshots emanating from a nearby area. Moments later, the officers observed an individual, later identified as the suspect, walking from the area of the shooting. The officers attempted to detain the suspect, who immediately ran from them, resulting in the initiation of a foot pursuit. As officers continued pursuing the suspect, they observed him remove a pistol from his waistband, and an OIS occurred.

F016-17: March 6, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a woman armed with a firearm at a residence. Officers arrived at the location, established a perimeter, and utilized various means to attempt to contact her. The suspect refused to exit the residence and SWAT was requested. While awaiting the arrival of SWAT personnel, uniformed officers observed the suspect exit the residence armed with a rifle. The suspect pointed the rifle at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F025-17: April 7, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a location where several assault with a deadly weapon radio calls were generated. Comments of the calls indicated the suspect was armed with a knife. When the officers arrived at the scene, they observed the suspect involved in a verbal dispute with another individual. The suspect then began stabbing the individual, and an OIS ensued.

F029-17: May 8, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a burglary in progress at a residence. Comments of the call indicated the suspect entered the location while the lone resident was sleeping in one of the bedrooms. The resident observed the suspect in the kitchen area and believed he was armed with a firearm. Officers arrived at the scene, verified the suspect was in fact still inside the residence, and requested SWAT. A tactical plan was formulated and SWAT personnel began to deploy around the residence. After various less-lethal munitions were deployed, the suspect emerged and fired at SWAT personnel with a handgun, resulting in an OIS.

F032-17: May 13, 2017
Uniformed officers attempted to detain a suspicious individual who appeared to be armed with a firearm in a City park. The suspect removed a pistol from his front pocket and began to turn toward the officers with the weapon in hand, resulting in an OIS.
F046-17: June 15, 2017
Uniformed officers conducted a parole/probation compliance check at a residence. As occupants of the residence were exiting the location, an individual who remained inside, later identified as the suspect, fired at officers, and an OIS ensued. The suspect fled the residence through a rear window and again fired at officers who were in the rear of the property, resulting in a second OIS. The suspect fled the location and a perimeter was established. K-9 units responded and assisted in a search of the area. During the search, the suspect shot a Department K-9. SWAT responded and located the suspect in a nearby shed, where the suspect again fired at them, resulting in a third OIS.

F047-17: June 19, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a domestic violence incident at a residence. Upon their arrival, the officers verified that an assault had in fact occurred. The officers later located the suspect in front of a nearby residence armed with a knife. The suspect failed to comply with commands to drop the knife and approached the officers, resulting in the deployment of a TASER and an OIS.

F042-17: June 6, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a male armed with a firearm. Upon their arrival, officers observed an individual matching the description of the suspect and attempted to detain him. As the officers exited their police vehicle, the suspect turned toward them with what officers believed to be a handgun, and an OIS ensued.

F043-17: June 8, 2017
Uniformed officers initiated a consensual encounter with a known gang member. The officers observed a bulge underneath the suspect’s shorts and believed he was armed with a handgun. The suspect failed to comply with verbal commands and a physical altercation ensued. During the altercation, the suspect armed himself with a handgun and began to flee on foot. While doing so, he turned toward the officers with the handgun in hand and an OIS occurred.

F044-17: June 6, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a male armed with a firearm. Upon their arrival, officers observed an individual matching the description of the suspect and attempted to detain him. As the officers exited their police vehicle, the suspect turned toward them with what officers believed to be a handgun, and an OIS ensued.

F034-17: May 16, 2017
Uniformed officers attempted to detain an individual, later identified as the suspect, for drinking alcohol in public. As the officers approached the suspect, he immediately ran from them and removed a handgun from his waistband. The suspect turned and pointed the handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F036-17: May 25, 2017
Uniformed and plainclothes officers executed a search warrant at a residence. Once inside the residence, the suspect advanced on one of the officers with a machete, and an OIS ensued.

F038-17: May 29, 2017
While at a social function, an off-duty officer observed a group of suspects armed with handguns in the middle of an intersection walking toward the area of the event. Individuals within the group began firing at a separate group, resulting in an OIS.

F041-17: June 7, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a male armed with a firearm. Upon their arrival, officers observed an individual matching the description of the suspect and attempted to detain him. As the officers exited their police vehicle, the suspect turned toward them with what officers believed to be a handgun, and an OIS ensued.

F039-17: May 27, 2017
Uniformed officers conducted a parole/probation compliance check at a residence. As occupants of the residence were exiting the location, an individual who remained inside, later identified as the suspect, fired at officers, and an OIS ensued. The suspect fled the residence through a rear window and again fired at officers who were in the rear of the property, resulting in a second OIS. The suspect fled the location and a perimeter was established. K-9 units responded and assisted in a search of the area. During the search, the suspect shot a Department K-9. SWAT responded and located the suspect in a nearby shed, where the suspect again fired at them, resulting in a third OIS.

F040-17: June 8, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a male armed with a firearm. Upon their arrival, officers observed an individual matching the description of the suspect and attempted to detain him. As the officers exited their police vehicle, the suspect turned toward them with what officers believed to be a handgun, and an OIS ensued.

F045-17: June 15, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a male armed with a firearm. Upon their arrival, officers observed an individual matching the description of the suspect and attempted to detain him. As the officers exited their police vehicle, the suspect turned toward them with what officers believed to be a handgun, and an OIS ensued.

F048-17: June 22, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a battery investigation at a residence. The officers arrived at the scene and met with the victim, who directed them to the suspect’s whereabouts. As the officers attempted to contact the suspect, he produced a handgun, and an OIS ensued. The suspect retreated into the residence, affording officers the opportunity to request additional resources. As a separate patrol unit arrived at the scene, they observed the suspect pointing a gun at them from a balcony, and an additional OIS occurred.
F058-17: July 27, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man armed with a gun at the motel. Upon the officers’ arrival, they were directed to the suspect’s location outside City limits and attempted to flee on foot. While running toward the apartment complex, the suspect fired at officers, resulting in a separate OIS incident.

F059-17: August 4, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a request to keep the peace at a residence. Officers arrived at the scene and attempted to make contact with the suspect. The suspect opened the front door armed with a knife, and an OIS ensued.

F060-17: August 9, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a domestic violence incident at a residence. Comments of the call indicated the suspect was threatening to stab additional residents. Officers arrived at the scene and attempted to make contact with the suspect. The suspect ignored verbal commands to drop the rifle, stood, and pointed the rifle at one officer, resulting in an OIS.

F049-17: June 28, 2017
Uniformed officers contacted a known gang member, who abruptly removed a handgun from his backpack and pointed it at his head. Additional units responded to the scene as officers continued verbalizing with the suspect. Officers deployed a beanbag shotgun at the suspect, which was ineffective. The suspect then pointed the handgun at the officers, and an OIS ensued.

F050-17: June 29, 2017
Metropolitan Division SWAT was involved in a vehicle pursuit with an individual, later identified as the suspect. The pursuit terminated when the suspect exited his vehicle outside City limits and attempted to flee on foot. While running toward an apartment complex, the suspect fired at officers, resulting in two separate OIS incidents.

F051-17: July 1, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a domestic violence incident at a residence. The officers encountered the suspect at the location, and a brief vehicle pursuit ensued. At the termination of the foot pursuit, the suspect fired at officers, and an OIS occurred.

F052-17: July 16, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a domestic violence incident at a residence. Comments of the call indicated the suspect, who was armed with a shotgun and two handguns, had shot at the victim. Officers arrived at the scene and determined the suspect was barricaded, thus requesting the assistance of Metropolitan Division SWAT. A perimeter was established. The suspect shot at SWAT personnel manning the perimeter, and an OIS occurred.

F053-17: July 14, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a male armed with a knife at a residence. Comments of the call indicated the suspect was threatening to stab additional residents. Officers arrived at the scene and attempted to make contact with the suspect. The suspect opened the front door armed with a knife, and an OIS ensued.

F054-17: July 15, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a domestic violence incident at a residence. The officers encountered the suspect at the location, and a brief vehicle pursuit ensued. At the termination of the foot pursuit, the suspect fired at officers, and an OIS occurred.
While on patrol, uniformed officers heard gunfire emanating from a nearby parking lot. The officers responded to the area and observed a suspect armed with an assault rifle and a revolver. The suspect pointed the revolver at the officers, and an OIS occurred.

While inside a business, a uniformed officer heard gunfire emanating from outside the location. When the officer exited the business to investigate, he observed a suspect firing at a victim, and an OIS ensued.

A Federal Bureau of Investigation task force, consisting of plainclothes LAPD personnel, conducted surveillance at a residence for a wanted murder/kidnap suspect. Officers located the suspect along with the kidnapped victim and attempted to effect an arrest. In doing so, the suspect removed a handgun from his waist and pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a violent male with a mental illness/assault with a deadly weapon investigation at a residence. Upon their arrival, officers heard screaming from within the location. As the officers walked toward the residence, the suspect emerged and pointed a rifle at them, resulting in the discharge of a beanbag shotgun and an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a male with mental illness at a residence. After determining entry into the residence was not warranted, officers remained outside while another resident, later identified as the victim, entered the location. As the officers approached the location and observed the victim being held by the suspect from behind with a knife to her throat. The suspect, after refusing commands to drop the knife and threatening to kill the victim and the officers, began to approach the officers with the knife in hand, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers observed a stolen vehicle and attempted to detain the driver. The driver of the vehicle failed to yield and a vehicle pursuit occurred. During the pursuit, the suspect crashed her vehicle into two police vehicles, resulting in an OIS.

Plainclothes detectives attempted to conduct a vehicle stop on a wanted robbery suspect, which resulted in the initiation of a vehicle pursuit. SWAT responded and joined the pursuit. At the termination of the pursuit, the detectives observed what they believed to be a firearm and were involved in an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a violent male with a mental illness at a residence. Upon their arrival, officers heard screaming from within the location. As the officers walked toward the residence, the suspect emerged and pointed a rifle at them, resulting in the discharge of a beanbag shotgun and an OIS.

Plainclothes detectives attempted to conduct a vehicle stop on a wanted robbery suspect, which resulted in the initiation of a vehicle pursuit. SWAT responded and joined the pursuit. At the termination of the pursuit, the detectives observed what they believed to be a firearm and were involved in an OIS.

While inside a business, a uniformed officer heard gunfire emanating from outside the location. When the officer exited the business to investigate, he observed a suspect firing at a victim, and an OIS ensued.
F082-17: December 30, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a domestic dispute at a residence. Comments of the call indicated the victim had fled the residence after the incident and the suspect remained at the scene while attempting to arm himself with a firearm. Additionally, the victim's mother was inside the residence with the suspect. When the officers arrived at the scene, they heard gunfire emanating from within the location. The officers then observed the suspect exit the front door while armed with a handgun. The suspect fired the handgun at the officers, and an OIS ensued.

F083-17: December 31, 2017
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a domestic violence incident at an intersection. Officers approached the suspect who produced an object that officers perceived was a handgun, resulting in an OIS.

F007-18: January 26, 2018
Uniformed officers were involved in a vehicle pursuit of a possible unreported stolen vehicle. The suspect exited the vehicle and fled on foot. Officers chased the suspect when they observed the suspect brandish a handgun in their direction, resulting in an OIS.

F004-18: January 14, 2018
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of two suspects sleeping in a driveway with one of the suspects armed with a handgun. When officers arrived, one suspect fled on foot while the other suspect remained on the ground and appeared to be sleeping. As officers illuminated the suspect, the suspect who appeared to be sleeping turned toward the officer armed with a handgun, resulting in an OIS.

F001-18: January 8, 2018
Uniformed officers observed a vehicle driving erratically. The vehicle collided with another vehicle and a street light. As officers approached, the suspect produced a rifle and pointed it at officers, resulting in an OIS.

F003-18: January 11, 2018
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a domestic violence incident at an intersection. Officers approached the suspect who produced an object that officers perceived was a handgun, resulting in an OIS.

F008-17: December 23, 2017
A uniformed officer responded to a radio call regarding a domestic violence incident at a residence. After arriving at the scene, the officer encountered the suspect armed with a machete and requested additional resources. An additional unit responded and located the suspect. The suspect, who was armed with a machete and hammer, ran towards the officers with the weapons in hand, and an OIS ensued.

F009-17: December 20, 2017
While off-duty, an LAPD officer was confronted by a suspect armed with a metal flashlight. The suspect struck the officer on the head with the flashlight, which resulted in an OIS.
Uniformed patrol officers were in pursuit of a stolen vehicle. The suspect stopped, exited the vehicle, and a foot pursuit ensued through an alley. As the suspect ran through the alley, he produced a handgun and fired at officers, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers observed two suspects believed to be involved in gang activity in front of a residence. Officers approached the suspects with the intent of conducting a consensual encounter. One of the suspects immediately ran away from officers while holding a handgun. Officers went in foot pursuit which resulted in an OIS. A loaded firearms magazine was recovered by officers at the scene. The investigation determined that the suspect discarded a firearm; however, it was removed from the scene by an uninvolved individual.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man with a knife at a business. When officers arrived, they observed the suspect holding a knife. Officers began to verbalize with the suspect to drop the weapon at which point he charged towards officers while armed with a pointed metal rod, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a shooting at a business. While enroute, officers observed a vehicle matching the suspect’s vehicle. The suspect’s vehicle came to an abrupt stop, and the suspect exited the vehicle. The suspect walked towards officers holding a handgun, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a juvenile group in a park. While checking the area, they observed a suspect enter the roadway on a bicycle. The suspect dismounted his bicycle, simulated drawing a handgun, and took a shooting stance toward officers, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a burglary at a business. Upon arrival, officers made contact with the suspect and verbalized with him to surrender peacefully. The suspect produced a handgun and pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F041-18: June 20, 2018
Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call of an ambulance cutting. As officers arrived, they observed the suspect standing outside of the residence holding a kitchen type knife. Officers ordered the suspect to drop the knife, however, the suspect walked towards officers while holding the knife. Officers deployed a bean bag shotgun followed by a TASER which were both ineffective. The suspect continued to walk toward officers while holding the knife, which resulted in an OIS.

F040-18: June 16, 2018
Uniformed officers responded to an ambulance cutting radio call at a homeless outreach center. The officers confronted the suspect and ordered him to drop the knife. Officers utilized a beanbag shotgun to stop the suspect’s actions. The suspect grabbed a female bystander and held a knife to her neck, resulting in an OIS.

F039-18: May 30, 2018
Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call of a stabbing. Upon arrival, officers encountered the suspect standing in the carport of the residence preventing them from having access to the stabbing victim. Officers gave commands for the suspect to surrender. The suspect refused to comply with officers’ commands. After numerous attempts to communicate with the suspect, officers deployed less-lethal force options. The suspect armed himself with a large pickaxe and approached officers resulting in an OIS.

F038-18: June 10, 2018
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a stabbing. When officers arrived, they observed the suspect through a locked security screen armed with a knife and in a physical struggle with his father. Officers entered the residence and used less-lethal munitions. The suspect advanced towards his father and attempted to stab him with his knife, resulting in an OIS.

F037-18: June 9, 2018
Officers arrested a suspect who later was transported to a medical facility after the suspect showed signs of having a seizure. At the medical facility, officers removed the suspect’s handcuffs at the request of the medical technician. While officers were in the process of re-handcuffing, the suspect attacked one of the officers and attempted to take an officer’s handgun, resulting in an OIS.

F036-18: June 9, 2018
Officers responded to a radio call of a stabbing. When officers arrived, they observed the suspect through a locked security screen armed with a knife and in a physical struggle with his father. Officers entered the residence and used less-lethal munitions. The suspect advanced towards his father and attempted to stab him with his knife, resulting in an OIS.

F035-18: May 30, 2018
Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call of a stabbing. Upon arrival, officers encountered the suspect standing in the carport of the residence preventing them from having access to the stabbing victim. Officers gave commands for the suspect to surrender. The suspect refused to comply with officers’ commands. After numerous attempts to communicate with the suspect, officers deployed less-lethal force options. The suspect armed himself with a large pickaxe and approached officers resulting in an OIS.

F034-18: May 21, 2018
Uniformed officers were involved in a vehicle pursuit of a stolen vehicle. The suspect in the passenger seat exposed his upper torso out of the vehicle window holding a shotgun. The suspect began to shoot at the officers with the shotgun, resulting in an OIS.

F033-18: May 21, 2018
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a stabbing. When officers arrived, they observed the suspect through a locked security screen armed with a knife and in a physical struggle with his father. Officers entered the residence and used less-lethal munitions. The suspect advanced towards his father and attempted to stab him with his knife, resulting in an OIS.

F032-18: May 19, 2018
Uniformed officers responded to an ambulance cutting radio call at a homeless outreach center. The officers confronted the suspect and ordered him to drop the knife. Officers utilized a beanbag shotgun to stop the suspect’s actions. The suspect grabbed a female bystander and held a knife to her neck, resulting in an OIS.

F031-18: May 18, 2018
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a stabbing. When officers arrived, they observed the suspect through a locked security screen armed with a knife and in a physical struggle with his father. Officers entered the residence and used less-lethal munitions. The suspect advanced towards his father and attempted to stab him with his knife, resulting in an OIS.

F030-18: May 18, 2018
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a stabbing. When officers arrived, they observed the suspect through a locked security screen armed with a knife and in a physical struggle with his father. Officers entered the residence and used less-lethal munitions. The suspect advanced towards his father and attempted to stab him with his knife, resulting in an OIS.

F029-18: May 18, 2018
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a stabbing. When officers arrived, they observed the suspect through a locked security screen armed with a knife and in a physical struggle with his father. Officers entered the residence and used less-lethal munitions. The suspect advanced towards his father and attempted to stab him with his knife, resulting in an OIS.
Plain clothes officers assigned to a Narcotics Enforcement Detail were in an area known for narcotics sales. Officers attempted to initiate an investigative stop of three narcotics suspects. While conducting their investigation, one of the suspects produced a handgun at which point an OIS occurred.

Uniformed Metropolitan officers were conducting patrol near a recreation center when they heard possible gunfire in the area. The officers drove up the apron of a driveway which led to the recreation center parking lot. The officers observed two suspects walking from the recreation center gymnasium building in their direction. One of the suspects fired several rounds at officers who were still seated in their police vehicle. An OIS then ensued.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a trespass suspect. Officers initiated contact with the suspect who was in the shower area. The suspect was naked, uncooperative, and became physically assaultive toward the officers as they attempted to handcuff him. The physical altercation involved physical force and the use of a TASER by officers. During the altercation, the suspect obtained control of the officer’s TASER, punched and broke one officer’s nose, forced a second officer to the ground, and repeatedly struck the officer in the face with his fists. An OIS then ensued.

Uniformed Metropolitan officers working crime suppression observed an individual, later identified as the suspect, straddling a bicycle in the middle of the roadway. The bicycle did not have a source of illumination as required during hours of darkness. Officers initiated contact for enforcement of the violation. As the passenger officer exited the police vehicle, the suspect produced a handgun and fired at the officer. An OIS then ensued.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call and began their investigation on the sidewalk. As officers spoke to the involved parties, an uninvolved vehicle drove by and one of its occupants began discharging rounds immediately. Officers perceived they were being fired upon and an OIS occurred.

Plain clothes officers assigned to a Narcotics Enforcement Detail were in an area known for narcotics sales. Officers attempted to initiate an investigative stop of three narcotics suspects. While conducting their investigation, one of the suspects produced a handgun at which point an OIS occurred.

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a trespass suspect. Officers initiated contact with the suspect who was in the shower area. The suspect was naked, uncooperative, and became physically assaultive toward the officers as they attempted to handcuff him. The physical altercation involved physical force and the use of a TASER by officers. During the altercation, the suspect obtained control of the officer’s TASER, punched and broke one officer’s nose, forced a second officer to the ground, and repeatedly struck the officer in the face with his fists. An OIS then occurred.

Uniformed Metropolitan officers working crime suppression observed an individual, later identified as the suspect, straddling a bicycle in the middle of the roadway. The bicycle did not have a source of illumination as required during hours of darkness. Officers initiated contact for enforcement of the violation. As the passenger officer exited the police vehicle, the suspect produced a handgun and fired at the officer. An OIS then ensued.

Plain clothes officers assigned to a Narcotics Enforcement Detail were in an area known for narcotics sales. Officers attempted to initiate an investigative stop of three narcotics suspects. While conducting their investigation, one of the suspects produced a handgun at which point an OIS occurred.

Uniformed Metropolitan officers working crime suppression observed an individual, later identified as the suspect, straddling a bicycle in the middle of the roadway. The bicycle did not have a source of illumination as required during hours of darkness. Officers initiated contact for enforcement of the violation. As the passenger officer exited the police vehicle, the suspect produced a handgun and fired at the officer. An OIS then ensued.

Plain clothes officers assigned to a Narcotics Enforcement Detail were in an area known for narcotics sales. Officers attempted to initiate an investigative stop of three narcotics suspects. While conducting their investigation, one of the suspects produced a handgun at which point an OIS occurred.

Uniformed Metropolitan officers working crime suppression observed an individual, later identified as the suspect, straddling a bicycle in the middle of the roadway. The bicycle did not have a source of illumination as required during hours of darkness. Officers initiated contact for enforcement of the violation. As the passenger officer exited the police vehicle, the suspect produced a handgun and fired at the officer. An OIS then ensued.

Plain clothes officers assigned to a Narcotics Enforcement Detail were in an area known for narcotics sales. Officers attempted to initiate an investigative stop of three narcotics suspects. While conducting their investigation, one of the suspects produced a handgun at which point an OIS occurred.

Uniformed Metropolitan officers working crime suppression observed an individual, later identified as the suspect, straddling a bicycle in the middle of the roadway. The bicycle did not have a source of illumination as required during hours of darkness. Officers initiated contact for enforcement of the violation. As the passenger officer exited the police vehicle, the suspect produced a handgun and fired at the officer. An OIS then ensued.
F063-18: November 18, 2018
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of shots fired. The comments of the call indicated someone was reportedly shot inside of the location. Upon arriving at the location, officers observed a pedestrian on the sidewalk in front of the location. Officers heard gun shots; however, they did not see where the pedestrian went or where the shots came from. An officer needed help request was broadcast. As additional personnel responded, an officer observed muzzle flash and believed he was being shot at. An OIS then occurred.

F064-18: November 18, 2018
Uniformed officers were conducting patrol when they observed a vehicle with paper plates. A traffic stop was initiated and the driver (suspect) began to pull over. However, the suspect fled at a high rate of speed and officers went in pursuit. The vehicle pursued entered the freeway, which had heavy traffic. The suspect exited the vehicle and was observed to be in possession of a handgun as he fled on foot through traffic, resulting in an OIS.

F065-18: November 25, 2018
Uniformed Metropolitan officers were working a crime suppression detail when they observed two pedestrians, one of whom was holding a handgun. Officers stopped their vehicle, exited, and gave commands for the suspect to drop the handgun. The suspect failed to comply resulting in an OIS. The second suspect complied and was taken into custody without incident. It was determined the second suspect also discharged a handgun.

F068-18: December 22, 2018
Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call of a man disturbing the peace. Upon arrival, officers observed the suspect unsheathing a large knife and confronting a citizen. Officers stopped their vehicle, exited, and attempted to take enforcement action. The suspect fled causing officers to initiate a foot pursuit. During the foot pursuit, the suspect produced and pointed a handgun at officers resulting in an OIS.

F069-18: December 31, 2018
Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call of a screaming woman. Upon arrival, officers knocked on the door of the residence. Officers heard noises coming from within the residence and requested additional resources. Before additional officers arrived, the suspect opened the door and was observed armed with a knife. The suspect moved quickly toward officers, resulting in an OIS.
ADJUDICATION: Tactics, drawing/exhibiting a firearm, and UOF shall be evaluated during the adjudication process. The adjudication process for CUOF incidents differs from NCUOF with respect to the chain of investigation, review, and analysis (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792 and 3/793).

ADMINISTRATIVE DISAPPROVAL/OUT OF POLICY – DRAWING AND EXHIBITING AND/OR UOF: A finding, supported by a preponderance of the evidence that the actions of the employee relative to drawing/exhibiting a firearm or UOF were not within the Department’s policies (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

ADMINISTRATIVE DISAPPROVAL – NEGLIGENT DISCHARGE: A finding, where it was determined that the unintentional discharge of a firearm resulted from operator error, such as the violation of a firearm safety rule (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

ADMINISTRATIVE DISAPPROVAL – TACTICS: A finding, supported by a preponderance of the evidence that the tactics employed during a CUOF incident unjustifiably and substantially deviated from approved Department tactical training (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

ANIMAL SHOOTING: An incident in which a Department employee intentionally discharges a firearm at an animal.

CATEGORICAL CANINE (K-9) CONTACT: An incident in which a member of the public has contact with a Department K-9 and hospitalization is required. If hospitalization is not required, the incident does not rise to the level of a UOF (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

CAROTID RESTRAINT CONTROL HOLD: An upper body control hold by a Department employee, including the modified carotid, full carotid, and locked carotid hold (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

CATEGORICAL UOF INCIDENT A CUOF is defined as:
- The use of deadly force (e.g., discharge of a firearm) by a Department employee;
- All uses of an upper body control hold by a Department employee, including the use of a modified carotid, full carotid or locked carotid hold;
- All deaths while the arrestee or detainee is in the custodial care of the Department (also known as an In-Custody Death or ICD);
- A UOF incident resulting in death;
- A UOF incident resulting in an injury requiring hospitalization (commonly referred to as a LERI incident);
- All intentional head strikes with an impact weapon or device (e.g., baton, flashlight, etc.) and all unintentional (inadvertent or accidental) head strikes that results in serious bodily injury, hospitalization or death;
- Officer involved animal shootings;
- Non-tactical unintentional discharges; and,
- An incident in which a member of the public has contact with a Department canine and hospitalization is required (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

CRIME
- Part I Crime: The FBI’s UCR program classifies the following offenses as Part I crimes: criminal homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft (except motor vehicle theft), motor vehicle theft, and arson.
- Part II Crime: The FBI’s UCR program classifies all violations of state or local laws not specifically identified as Part I offenses (except traffic violations) as Part II crimes.
- Violent Crime: The FBI defines violent crime in its UCR program as those offenses which involve force or threat of force. As such, violent crime is comprised of four offenses (criminal homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.)

FIELD DETENTION: Refer to Public Contact.

FORCE OPTIONS: All Department-approved physical force techniques (e.g. firm grip, strike, takedown) or devices (e.g. OC spray, baton, TASER, beanbag shotgun) available to an officer. Force Options fall into the following three categories: Deadly Force, Less-Lethal force (e.g. TASER, bean bag), and Non-Lethal force (e.g. firm grip, takedown).

GENERAL TRAINING UPDATE: Standardized training provided by the employee’s command or In-Service Training Division personnel to personnel involved in a CUOF incident. The Training Update is not an inquiry into the specific details of the CUOF. The intent of the update is to provide involved personnel with standardized training material in tactical issues and actions readily identified in the CUOF incident as well as an update on the UOF policy. Training should be provided as soon as practicable, and before the involved officer(s) return to field duties, but within 90 days following the incident (2018 LAPD Manual 3/796.35).
DEFINITIONS

HEAD STRIKES: An intentional head strike with an impact weapon or device (e.g., baton, flashlight) and all unintentional (inadvertent or accidental) head strikes that results in serious bodily injury, hospitalization, or death (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

HOMELESSNESS: Per the Department’s Special Order No. 13, Policy Regarding Police Contacts with Persons Experiencing Homelessness, dated June 22, 2016, the terms “homelessness,” “homeless individual,” and “homeless person” shall refer to the following:

- An individual or family who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence;
- An individual or family with a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a sleeping accommodation for human beings (including a car, park, abandoned building, bus or train station, airport, or camping ground);
- An individual or family living in a supervised publicly or privately operated center designated to provide temporary living arrangements (including hotels and motels paid for by federal, state, or local government programs for low-income individuals or by charitable organizations, congregate shelters, and transitional housing); or,
- An individual who resided in a shelter or place not meant for human habitation and who is exiting an institution where he or she temporarily resided.

IN-CUSTODY DEATH: The death of an arrestee or detainee who is in the custodial care of the Department (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

LAW ENFORCEMENT RELATED INJURY INVESTIGATION: A UOF incident resulting in an injury requiring hospitalization, commonly referred to as a LERI incident (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

MANNEF DEATH: The Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner defines the different manners of death based on the following criteria:

- Natural: Due entirely (or nearly so) to natural disease processes;
- Homicide: Due to a volitional act of another person;
- Suicide: Due to injury that occurred with the intent to induce self-harm or cause one’s own death;
- Accidental: Due to injury when there is no evidence of intent to harm (for purposes of this Report, accidental deaths are further categorized into causes of death attributed to narcotic/alcohol overdose); and,
- Undetermined: Inadequate information regarding the circumstances of death to determine manner.

Example: An individual is found unconscious with massive subdural hemorrhage. In the absence of information on the events leading up to death, it is impossible to determine if the hemorrhage was due to accidental fall, homicidal violence, etc.

NON-CATEGORICAL UOF: An incident in which any on-duty Department employee, or off-duty employee whose occupation as a Department employee is a factor, uses a lethal control device or physical force to compel a person to comply with the employee’s direction; overcome resistance of a person during an arrest or a detention; or, defend any individual from an aggressive action by another person (2018 LAPD Manual 4/245.05).


OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING: An incident in which a Department employee intentionally discharges a firearm (excluding Warning Shot, Animal Shooting, and/or Tactical Intentional Discharge incidents). Officer Involved Shooting incidents are categorized into Hit or No Hit occurrences.

PART I CRIME: Refer to Crime.

PART II CRIME: Refer to Crime.

PUBLIC CONTACT: For this report, public contacts are comprised of calls for service and field detentions:

- Calls for Service: Any radio call generated by communications in response to a call from the public.
- Field Detentions: A temporary detention where a person is not free to leave and is initiated by officer’s own observations. Such detentions are categorized as:
  - Pedestrian Stop: Those incidents where officers use the lights, or lights and siren, or make a command, or even a request, for a person to stop or converse. The officers should have reasonable suspicion to believe the suspect to be stopped is involved in criminal activity.
  - Vehicle Stop: Those incidents where officers use the emergency lights, or emergency lights and siren to stop a suspected traffic violator or the officers have reasonable suspicion to believe the suspect(s) to be stopped is involved in criminal activity and is either driving and/or a passenger in a motor vehicle.

SERIOUS BODILY INJURY: Serious bodily injury, as defined in California Penal Code Section 243(f)(4), includes, but is not limited to, the following: loss of consciousness, concussion, bone fracture, protracted loss or impairment of function of any bodily member organ, a wound requiring extensive suturing, and serious disfigurement (2018 LAPD Manual 1/556.10).

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

Radiocall: Call for service directed by Communications Division;
- Observation: Contact initiated by officers based on reasonable suspicion, probable cause, or as a consensus encounter;
- Citizen Flag Down: Contact initiated by a private person alerting officers to a subject, an activity, or a location not otherwise observed by officers or reported to Communications Division;
- Pre-Planned: Any type of activity that requires an operational plan (e.g. search/arrest warrant services, task forces);
- Station Call: Non-coded or low priority incidents where officers are directed to a location by Department personnel, other than Communications Division;
- Ambush: An act or an instance to attack by surprise or lure officers resulting in an officer involved shooting; and,
- Off-Duty: Incident where officers are off-duty and not conducting official Department business.

SUBSTANTIALLY INVOLVED PERSONNEL: Employee(s) applying force or who had a significant tactical or decision making role in the incident (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

SUICIDE BY COP: Those incidents where the suspect appeared to intentionally provoke officers into believing that he posed a deadly threat that resulted in an IOS.

TACTICAL DEBRIEF: The collective review of an incident to identify those areas where actions and decisions were effective and those areas where actions and decisions could have been improved. The intent of a Tactical Debrief is to enhance future performance. The Tactical Debrief is conducted by the In-Service Training Division personnel (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

UNINTENTIONAL DISCHARGE: The unintentional discharge of a firearm by a Department employee regardless of cause. Unintentional discharges are evaluated and categorized as “Tactical Discharges” or “Non-Tactical Discharges” (2018 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

USE OF FORCE: In a complex urban society, officers are confronted daily with situations where control must be exercised to effect arrests and to protect the public safety. Control may be exercised through advice, warnings, persuasion, or by use of physical force. Officers are permitted to use force that is objectively reasonable to defend themselves or others, to effect an arrest or detention, and/or to prevent escape or overcome resistance, consistent with the Department’s Policy on the UOF (2018 LAPD Manual 1/240.10).

USE OF FORCE - TACTICS DIRECTIVE: A written directive that contains procedure and/or insight into UOF and tactics issues. Use of Force policy will continue to be expressed in the Department Manual but may be reiterated in UOF-Tactics Directives. Use of Force-Tactics Directives supersedes any Training Bulletins that have been published regarding the subject matter of the directives (2018 LAPD Manual 1/240.12).

USE OF FORCE REVIEW BOARD: The UOF Review Board shall convene at the direction of the Chair of the Board and shall: Avail itself of any facilities of the Department necessary to conduct a complete examination of the circumstances involved in the incident under investigation, report its findings and recommendations to the Chief of Police and upon adjournment, forward the UOF Internal Process Report, and other related reports to the Chief of Police (2018 LAPD Manual 2/092.50).

USE OF LETHAL FORCE (OTHER): An incident involving the use of deadly force by Department personnel. This type of force will encompass those forces that are not included in other CUF/D classifications.

VIOLENT CRIME: Refer to Crime.

WARNING SHOTS: The intentional discharge of a firearm off target not intended to hit a person, to warn others that deadly force is imminent (2018 LAPD Manual 1/556.01).
### ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOPC</td>
<td>BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSS</td>
<td>BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWV</td>
<td>BODY-WORN VIDEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPOS</td>
<td>CRIMES AGAINST POLICE OFFICERS SECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCU</td>
<td>COMPLAINT CLASSIFICATIONS UNIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEG</td>
<td>COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRD</td>
<td>CRITICAL INCIDENT REVIEW DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>COMMANDING OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODD</td>
<td>COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>CHIEF OF POLICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL TRAINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRCH</td>
<td>CAROTID RESTRAINT CONTROL HOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>CUSTODY SERVICES DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUOF</td>
<td>CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT (OR LAPD)</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICVS</td>
<td>DIGITAL IN-CAR VIDEO SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMH</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID</td>
<td>FORCE INVESTIGATION DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIP</td>
<td>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOS</td>
<td>FORCE OPTION SIMULATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSD</td>
<td>FORENSIC SCIENCE DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTO</td>
<td>FIELD TRAINING OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTQ</td>
<td>FAILURE TO QUALIFY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTU</td>
<td>GENERAL TRAINING UPDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPE</td>
<td>HOMELESS OUTREACH AND PROACTIVE ENGAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAG</td>
<td>INTERNAL AFFAIRS GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD</td>
<td>IN-CUSTODY DEATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICDC</td>
<td>INTEGRATING COMMUNICATION, DE-ESCALATION, AND CROWD CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>INTERNAL PROCESS REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITG</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-9</td>
<td>CANINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACDA</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHAFA</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICE AUTHORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPD</td>
<td>(SEE DEPARTMENT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASSD</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LERI</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT-RELATED INJURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETAC</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT TACTICAL APPLICATION COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>MAJOR CAPSAICINOID CONTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEU</td>
<td>MENTAL EVALUATION UNIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHIT</td>
<td>MENTAL HEALTH INTERVENTION TRAINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>MUSEUM OF TOLERANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMI</td>
<td>NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR THE MENTALLY ILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCUOF</td>
<td>NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPD</td>
<td>NEW YORK POLICE DEPARTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>OLEORESIN CAPSICUM (SPRAY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCPP</td>
<td>OFFICE OF CONSTITUTIONAL POLICING AND POLICY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIC</td>
<td>OFFICER-IN-CHARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIS</td>
<td>OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO</td>
<td>OFFICE OF OPERATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSO</td>
<td>OFFICE OF SPECIAL OPERATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>OFFICE OF SUPPORT SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATROL</td>
<td>PLANNING, ASSESSMENT, TIME, REDEPLOYMENT (AND/OR CONTAINMENT), OTHER RESOURCES, AND LINES OF COMMUNICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCG</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPB</td>
<td>PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BUREAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>POLICE SERVICE DOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSL</td>
<td>POLICE SCIENCES LEADERSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY STATEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTB</td>
<td>PERSONNEL AND TRAINING BUREAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTE</td>
<td>POLICE TRAINING AND EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBC</td>
<td>RECRUIT BASIC COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORT</td>
<td>USE OF FORCE YEAR-END REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESET</td>
<td>RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT AND SERVICES ENFORCEMENT TEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC</td>
<td>RELEASE FROM CUSTODY (ARREST REPORT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMEC</td>
<td>RISK MANAGEMENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIALLY INVOLVED PERSONNEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>SYSTEM-WIDE MENTAL ASSESSMENT RESPONSE TEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUAB</td>
<td>SHOOTING QUALIFICATION AND BONUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAT</td>
<td>SPECIAL WEAPONS AND TACTICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASER</td>
<td>THOMAS A. SWIFT ELECTRIC RIFLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TRAINING DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAMS</td>
<td>TRAINING EVALUATION AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TID</td>
<td>TECHNICAL INVESTIGATION DIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>TACTICS AND TRAINING REVIEW COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>UNIFORM CRIME REPORTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>UNINTENTIONAL DISCHARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOF</td>
<td>USE OF FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOFRB</td>
<td>USE OF FORCE REVIEW BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VKS</td>
<td>VARIABLE KINETIC SYSTEM, PEPPER BALL LAUNCHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS
The Department classifies incidents as CUOF's when a suspect dies in our custody, a suspect is hospitalized as a result of a UOF and when various types of force are used, i.e.: firearms, intentional head strikes, upper body control holds, etc. The FID investigation may reveal that multiple force options were used during an incident. Each one of the force options could potentially be classified as different CUOF categories if captured separately. For tracking purposes, and to avoid duplicate records of an incident, the Department classifies an incident based on the highest level of force used by Department personnel. All aspects of CUOF's are fully investigated and adjudicated, including additional force options not captured under the primary classification.

Critical Incident Review Division queried the CUOF data for the 2018 Use of Force Year-End Review from the Department’s internal databases. Although FID was instrumental in providing outstanding information on cases from their records, they were unable to provide information on every open case as some cases were still being investigated at the time of this report.

ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS
The query period included all CUOF incidents from January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2018.

BUREAU AND AREA/DIVISION OF OCCURRENCE
The Bureau and Area/Division of occurrence is the location where the CUOF incident occurred, regardless of where the incident originated or where the involved personnel were assigned. The exception is ICD incidents, where CSD is the Area/Division of occurrence, not the geographic Area where the jail facility is located.

INVOLVED DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL
For purposes of this Report, only Department personnel who received an adjudication finding, or have a pending finding, in the concerned force type for each respective CUOF incident are counted as involved employees. Department personnel are often at scene as part of the tactical situation, but do not apply force or have a part in the tactical decision-making. The personnel who did not utilize the relevant force or who were not involved in a tactical decision-making were not counted as “involved” in this Report.

All employee statistics were based on their current status as of the date of the UOF incident.

DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL BY CUOF INCIDENT TYPE
This Report included all employees who received, or were pending, BOPC adjudicated findings for their involvement in the following types of incidents:
- Officer Involved Shootings (OIS)
- Animal Shootings
- Unintentional Discharges (UD)
- Warning Shots
- Carotid Restraint Control Hold (CRCH)
- Head Strike Incidents
- K-9 Contact Incidents Resulting in Hospitalization
- Law Enforcement Related Injuries (LERI)
- In Custody Deaths (ICD)

Note: The County of Los Angeles Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner, determines the cause and manner of death of a suspect. ICD's are classified as CUOF's when the Coroner rules that a UOF was a primary or contributing factor to a suspect’s cause of death, where the death is ruled a suicide or is undetermined.

OFFICER - INJURIES
Officer injuries were recorded based on the number of those who sustained injuries during CUOF incidents, regardless if the injuries were caused by the suspect’s actions or other factors.

INVOLVED SUSPECTS
Suspects included in this Report were those subject to categorical force used by Department personnel. The exception is ICD incidents, which also included individuals whose death occurred while in the custodial care of a Department employee, or the Department, regardless if force was used.
SUSPECT – INJURIES
Suspect injuries include self-inflicted injuries, pre-existing medical conditions aggravated during the incident, accidental injuries, and those caused by Department personnel. The manner of death of decedents are determined by the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner - Coroner.

DECEASED SUSPECT TOXICOLOGY RESULTS
Toxicology results for deceased suspects were obtained by FID from the County of Los Angeles Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner. It is uncommon for suspects to release their medical records to the Department. Therefore, toxicology results could only be obtained for deceased suspects involved in OIS-Hit and ICD incidents.

Suspect – Perceived Mental Illness
A suspect was identified as having a perceived mental illness based on the following:
1. Officer(s) and/or investigator(s) perception of the suspect;
2. Suspect having self-reported mental illness;
3. Third-party statement; and/or,
4. Prior MEU contact resulting in a 5150 WIC hold or referral.

Suspect – Homelessness
Per Department Special Order No. 13 - Policy Regarding Police Contacts with Persons Experiencing Homelessness, dated June 22, 2016, the terms “homelessness,” “homeless individual,” and “homeless person” shall refer to the following:
- An individual or family who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence;
- An individual or family with a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings (including a car, park, abandoned building, bus or train station, airport, or camping ground);
- An individual or family living in a supervised publicly or privately-operated shelter designated to provide temporary living arrangements (including hotels and motels paid for by federal, state, or local government programs for low-income individuals or by charitable organizations, congregate shelters, and transitional housing); or,
- An individual who resided in a shelter or place not meant for human habitation and who is exiting an institution where he or she temporarily resided.

Prior to 2016, the Department did not capture the homelessness status of suspects involved in CUOF incidents. At the request of the BOPC, FID captured this information starting in 2016.

Suspect – Perceived Suicide by Cop
Those incidents where the suspect appeared to intentionally provoke officers into believing the suspect posed a deadly threat, resulting in an OIS.

ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS
The query period included all NCUOF incidents from January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2018.

BUREAU AND AREA/DIVISION OF OCCURRENCE
Incident by Bureau and Area detailed where the NCUOF incident occurred, rather than where the involved officers were assigned.

FORCE OPTION USED
Regardless of the number of times the force option was applied by one or more Department personnel, each force option was counted only once per incident. The force options were not mutually exclusive, as multiple force options could have been utilized in a single incident. In such cases, all force options used were counted once per incident.

TASER Activations
TASER activations were measured by the total number of times a TASER device was activated on a suspect during an NCUOF incident. All TASER activations were included in the total count when multiple activations occurred in an incident. Therefore, the total number of TASER activations exceeds the number of incidents in which a TASER was used.

TASER Effectiveness
Effectiveness captured whether a TASER activation caused the suspect to submit to arrest. Multiple TASER activations may have been required for the force option to prove effective.

INVOLVED DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL
For purposes of this Report, only Department personnel who received or are pending an adjudication finding, in the concerned force type for each respective NCUOF incident are counted as involved employees. Department personnel are often at scene as part of the tactical situation, but do not apply force. The officers who did not utilize the relevant force were not counted as “involved” in this Report. All employee statistics were based on their current status as of the date of the UOF incident.

INVOLVED SUSPECTS
Suspects included in this Report are those subject to Non-Categorical force used by Department personnel.

Suspect – Perceived Mental Illness
A suspect’s perceived mental illness for NCUOF incidents was determined based on officers’ observations and statements made by suspects.

Suspect – Perceived Impairment
Officers’ observations were used to determine if a suspect was under the influence of alcohol and/or narcotics for NCUOF incidents. Suspects’ impairment status was not verified through field sobriety tests.

Suspect – Perceived Homelessness
Perceived homelessness for NCUOF incidents was determined based on officers’ observations and statements made by suspects.

Suspect - Injuries
Suspect injuries included injuries sustained by a suspect during a NCUOF incident that were caused by Department personnel.

OTHER
ATTACKS ON POLICE OFFICERS
Attacks on Police Officers include all battery and assault with a deadly weapon incidents against Department personnel.
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The Los Angeles Police Department’s guiding value when using force shall be Reverence for Human Life. Officers shall attempt to control an incident by using time, distance, communications, and available resources in an effort to de-escalate the situation, whenever it is safe and reasonable to do so. When warranted, Department personnel may use objectively reasonable force to carry out their duties.