

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

June 9, 2015

13.5

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: BIASED POLICING UPDATE - 1st QUARTER 2015 REPORT TO THE BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS

RECOMMENDED ACTION

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

DISCUSSION

On August 19, 2008, the Board of Police Commissioners directed Internal Affairs Group, Professional Standards Bureau, to report quarterly on biased policing investigations. Attached for your review is Internal Affairs Group's Biased Policing report for the first quarter 2015 and an update on the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program.

If you have any questions, please contact Commander Stuart A. Maislin, Commanding Officer, Internal Affairs Group, at (213) 485-1486.

Respectfully,



CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Attachment

Biased Policing Update - 1st Quarter 2015

June 5, 2015

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

This report summarizes the types of contact resulting in Biased Policing complaints as well as the alleged discriminatory conduct and biases, and provides demographic data on the accused employees. It covers Biased Policing complaints initiated in the first quarter of 2015 and provides comparison data for 2013 and 2014.

This report includes information on Biased Policing complaints that have been referred to the Office of Operations (OO) to determine the final disposition because of a conflict between the adjudication recommended by the employee's chain-of-command and that of Internal Affairs Group (IAG).

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

In order to provide timely, meaningful information, this report is based mainly on preliminary complaint information rather than complaints completed a year or more after initiation. As a result, the tables from the Complaint Management System based on closed complaints are no longer attached, though selected information is included herein.

On March 24, 2015, during the presentation of the 2014 Biased Policing and Mediation Annual Report, the BOPC requested additional analyses related to Biased Policing investigations: (1) a comparison of the Black male populations in the City, those arrested and those who file Biased Policing complaints; (2) an analysis of how those populations intersect with Hispanic police officers; (3) whether Black males are stopped more than warranted by the numbers in the population; and (4) why there are more Biased Policing complaints against Hispanic officers. It was ultimately determined that the Office of the Inspector General would provide this information in a separate report.

Data

Biased Policing Complaints Initiated

Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2010 through the first quarter of 2015 are shown below. Biased Policing complaints made in 2013 and 2014 were identified based on the preliminary investigation at intake.² The numbers for 2010 through 2012 are closed cases with Biased Policing allegations.³

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

² Complaints are not classified by specific allegation types until the investigations are completed. Consequently, these Biased Policing complaints were manually identified based solely on information received at the time of intake.

³ Biased Policing cases identified at intake were not tracked prior to 2013.

2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	1 st Q 2015
281	263	218	192	219	46

Through the first quarter of 2015, 46 complaints were identified at intake as containing allegations of Biased Policing, with a projected annual total of 184.

The number of Biased Policing complaints reported by geographic bureau of occurrence for 2012 through 2015 year-to-date is shown below.

Bureau	2012 (%)	2013 (%)	2014 (%)	1 st Q 2015 (%)
Central	52 (23.9)	45 (23.4)	50 (22.8)	13 (28.3)
South	31 (14.2)	39 (20.3)	52 (23.7)	10 (21.7)
Valley	67 (30.7)	64 (33.3)	61 (27.9)	15 (32.6)
West	66 (30.3)	42 (21.9)	55 (25.1)	8 (17.4)
Outside City/Unknown	2 (0.9)	2 (1.0)	1 (0.5)	---
Total	218	192	219	46

Some complaints involved multiple complainants and/or accused employees, and some complainants alleged multiple discriminatory actions and/or types of bias. As a result, many total counts discussed below exceed the number of complaints initiated.⁴

Tables 1 through 6 discussed below are attached as separate pages. They each provide information about Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2013 through 2015 year-to-date.

Table 1 shows a breakdown of the accused employees by gender/ethnicity, age, and length of service to the Department. For this reporting period, female employees form a smaller proportion of those accused in Biased Policing complaints (9.7%) compared to their representation among sworn employees in the Department Deployment Roster (18.8%).⁵ The ethnic composition of accused employees was roughly similar to that of all sworn personnel, except that Black employees form 11.0 percent of the sworn workforce but only 4.2 percent of the accused. This underrepresentation of female and Black employees among the accused was also present, to a lesser extent, in complaints initiated in 2013 and 2014.

Since summarized information on employee age and length of service is not available in the Department rosters, 3,480 police officers in positions likely to have public contact were chosen as a comparison group (See Table 1, Part 2)⁶. In the first quarter of 2015, the distribution of the accused employees among the age and tenure categories reported remains quite similar to that of the comparison group. Most frequently, accused employees were in their thirties and had less than ten years of service.

⁴ Because of rounding, percentages do not always equal 100.

⁵ Sworn Department employee makeup - Gender: Male 81.2% and Female 18.8%; Ethnicity: American Indian 0.3%; Asian 7.3%; Black 11.0%; Filipino 2.3%; Hispanic 44.9%; White 34.0%; and Other 0.2% (Source: Sworn and Civilian Personnel by Sex and Descent, May 17, 2015).

⁶ Data obtained in March 2015 from the Deployment Planning System (DPS).

The types of contact or police encounter that resulted in Biased Policing complaints are shown in Table 2 along with a breakdown of the complainants by gender and ethnicity. For the first quarter of 2015, traffic stops led to 17 of the 46 Biased Policing complaints (37.0%), while the remainder resulted from 15 pedestrian stops (32.6%), nine radio calls (19.6%) and five “Other” types of contact (10.9%).⁷ The percentage of traffic stops decreased slightly in comparison to the previous two years while pedestrian stops increased.

Table 3 shows the distribution of discriminatory conduct reported. This refers to the law enforcement actions or conduct alleged to have been based on bias. Also included is a breakdown of complainants by gender and ethnicity.

The most commonly complained of conduct was the stop or detention itself. It appeared in 26 of the 46 Biased Policing complaints (56.5%) initiated during the first quarter of 2015 (and accounted for 33.3 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged).⁸ In 2014, it appeared in 117 of the 219 complaints (53.4%); and 109 of the 192 (56.8%) in 2013.

The allegation that an employee was discourteous or rude because of bias continues to be the second most frequently reported discriminatory conduct. Fourteen of the 46 complaints (30.4%) from the first quarter of 2015 included at least one allegation that the employee “Was Discourteous.”

Prior to 2015, ethnic or otherwise objectionable remarks were included in the “Was Discourteous” category. In 2015, “Objectionable Remark” was distinguished as a separate category of discriminatory conduct to isolate ethnic, racial and otherwise derogatory or discriminatory remarks. Five of the 46 complaints (10.9%) contained at least one allegation that an employee made an objectionable remark because of bias.

Over the last three years, the three most commonly complained of discriminatory actions or types of conduct were detentions, arrests and discourtesy. With the exception of the generic “Other” category, the remaining types of allegedly biased conduct appeared less frequently.⁹

The types of bias alleged are shown in Table 4 along with a breakdown of complainants by gender and ethnicity. Complaints of discriminatory conduct based on ethnic bias are overwhelmingly the most frequent. In the first quarter of 2015, 40 of the 46 Biased Policing complaints (87.0%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on ethnicity (accounting for 87.0 percent of all biases alleged). In 2014, 196 of the 219 Biased Policing

⁷ “Other” types of contact included crime reporting at police stations, citizen flag-downs, consensual encounters, warrant service, third-party complaints, follow-up investigations, passers-by in public, a ride-along request denial, and unknown circumstances not included in the information received at the time of intake.

⁸ In complaints of Biased Policing, complainants often make allegations of more than one type of discriminatory conduct. For example, in addition to being stopped because of his race, a complainant may also contend the officer searched and handcuffed him because of his race. In these types of cases, the percentage of total complaints would be different from the percentage of all discriminatory conduct alleged.

⁹ “Other” alleged discriminatory conduct reported included harassed, cited, used force, treated unfairly, planted evidence, suppressed First Amendment rights, and inquired about parole/probation status.

complaints (89.5%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on ethnicity. (This accounted for 84.5 percent of all biases alleged.) In 2013, 171 of the 192 complaints (89.1%) involved at least one allegation of ethnic bias. Few complaints fell within the remaining categories.

“Other” biases did not appear this quarter, but previously were included in complaints only in combination with ethnic or another categorized bias.¹⁰ The types of bias have remained fairly consistent since 2013.

Tables 2, 3 and 4 all show that Black males were the most numerous demographic group among the complainants, making up 20 of the 46 complainants (43.5%) in the first quarter of 2015; 113 of the 226 complainants (50.0%) in 2014; and 85 of the 196 (43.4%) in 2013. Most of their complaints resulted from traffic and pedestrian stops and predominantly involved allegations that the stop or arrest itself was based on ethnic bias.

Table 5 provides a comparison of the ethnicities of accused employees and complainants only for cases involving alleged ethnic bias. In the majority of cases, Black complainants accused Hispanic or White employees. This has remained fairly constant since 2013.

Adjudication

To adjudicate complaints, Department managers must determine by a preponderance of evidence whether misconduct occurred. The findings must be based on factual, reasonable consideration of the evidence and statements presented in the investigation. The adjudication disposition terms used in the following discussion are defined below.

An allegation is “Sustained” when the investigation discloses that the act complained of did occur and constitutes misconduct. When the investigation indicates the act complained of did not occur, the allegation is “Unfounded.” “Not Resolved” is used when the evidence disclosed by the investigation does not clearly prove or disprove the allegations made. Not Resolved allegations were fully investigated, but without resolution. An allegation is designated “Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate” when it could not be thoroughly or properly investigated. This may be caused by a lack of cooperation by the complainant or witnesses, or the absence of a critical interview that was necessary to proceed with the investigation, or the available physical evidence or witnesses’ statements being insufficient to adjudicate the complaint.

“Guilty” and “Not Guilty” are only used subsequent to a Board of Rights tribunal. The full range of adjudication dispositions is outlined in Department Manual Section 3/820.25.

¹⁰ “Other” biases included age, homelessness, appearing to be a criminal street gang member, political affiliation, prior arrests, prior lawsuits against the Department, size or stature, and location of residence.

Biased Policing Complaints Closed

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

Table 6 shows how the adjudications from the first quarter of 2015 compare to those of the last three years. During the first quarter of 2015, 65 complaints containing 107 allegations of Biased Policing were closed.

During the first quarter of 2015, 78.5 percent of the Biased Policing allegations closed were adjudicated as Unfounded, a decrease in comparison to the prior three-year average of 85.7 percent.

Four allegations of Biased Policing (3.7%) were found to be Not Resolved in the first quarter of 2015. Since 2012, the rate of Not Resolved dispositions has declined and the use of Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate has fluctuated.

Five cases involving nine allegations closed with the Mediated disposition during the first quarter of 2015. This accounted for 8.4 percent of the total dispositions.

Two allegations, both from the same complaint, were closed with the Out of Statute disposition.¹¹

Biased Policing Complaints Referred to the Office of Operations

As detailed in previous quarterly Biased Policing update reports, Internal Affairs Group continues to forward Biased Policing complaints to the Director, OO, when it disagrees with a chain-of-command adjudication recommendation. During the first quarter of 2015, two allegations (1.9% of the 107 adjudicated) were referred to OO for adjudication resolution compared to 16, which were referred in 2014 (3.2% of the 493 adjudicated).

A summary of the two questioned Unfounded adjudication recommendations is shown below. In the first case, OO did not concur with IAG’s Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate recommendation and the complaint was closed as Not Resolved. The second case, which IAG recommended be Not Resolved, was inadvertently overlooked during the recent leadership transition at OO and therefore not reviewed prior to the one-year statute. The Unfounded adjudication was accepted as final.

No.	Chain-of-Command	Internal Affairs Group	Office of Operations
2	Unfounded	(1) Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate (1) Not Resolved	(1) Not Resolved (1) Not reviewed prior to 1-year statute

¹¹ This complaint was initiated in 2010 by the General Services Police Department (GSPD). The investigation was open and already past the one-year statute when the GSPD officers were transferred to the LAPD on January 1, 2013, and LAPD acquired responsibility for their pending personnel complaints.

Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program

January 2015 marked the beginning of the second year of the 36-month Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program. In conjunction with the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office (LACA), selected complaints of Biased Policing are being mediated as an alternative to the traditional complaint investigation procedure. Out of the 46 Biased Policing cases initiated during the first quarter of 2014, 20 were eligible for mediation, a 43.5 percent eligibility rate. During the first quarter, five complaints involving nine employees were closed as Mediated.

Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program	1 st Quarter 2015	2014
Total Complaints	46	219
Not Eligible	26	106
Eligible	20	113
Mediated ¹²	5	25

Fourteen of the 20 eligible complaints (70%) were reassigned for investigation. Department employees continue to be receptive to the program; only one declined participation in the first quarter. Twelve cases were reassigned because the complainant either declined or could not be reached. For one additional case, mediation was determined to be inappropriate. As of the end of the quarter, the parties to ten eligible cases, both from this quarter and a prior quarter, agreed to mediation and were awaiting scheduling.

The satisfaction surveys for the first quarter are quite limited representing only three mediations. Two of the five cases were closed as Mediated after the complainants did not attend two scheduled sessions.¹³ Two of the three complainants surveyed indicated they were "somewhat dissatisfied" overall, while all six of the employees were either "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied."

All of the participants found the outcome of the mediation process to be "somewhat fair" or "completely fair;" and all who responded indicated they were "very likely" or "somewhat likely" to recommend the mediation process, with the exception of one complainant who indicated he or she was "not likely at all." Similarly, all participants indicated the mediators were "very well" or "well acquainted" with the important issues of the complaint.

In mid-August 2014, the Department launched an eLearning course informing Department personnel about the mediation program. The course was designed to give employees a general understanding of the program, which they will need to make a prompt and informed decision if contacted about participation.

¹² These complaints could be from the current quarter or a prior quarter.

¹³ The mediation implementation plan stipulates that if the complainant fails to appear for a second scheduled mediation session without good cause, he or she "...will not be allowed to reschedule mediation for that complaint without the involved employee's consent. Involved employees will be provided a choice of rescheduling the mediation or having the case closed as 'Mediated.'"

Sworn employees, detention officers and police service representatives of all levels were required to complete the course by February 1, 2015, as specified in a Professional Standards Bureau Notice, dated December 12, 2014. After subsequent notifications to the bureaus and offices, overall Department compliance has reached 80.4 percent. Although we have made significant progress since our last update report with 52 percent, more is needed to meet our compliance objective of 100 percent. Internal Affairs Group is going to continue its efforts to increase compliance.

During the first quarter, the Department increased its internal outreach to further boost program awareness and understanding among employees. The Mediation Coordinator (Coordinator) submitted an article to the Los Angeles Police Protective League's (LAPPL) monthly membership publication, the Thin Blue Line. The article, which was published in the May 2015 issue, provided general information about the program and addressed frequently asked questions. In addition, the Coordinator, along with the LACA's program coordinator, mediators and prior participants when available, have given presentations at Department training schools and various forums including Basic Supervisor Schools, Supervisory Update Schools, Watch Commander Schools, Basic Officer Representation School, and LAPPL Board of Directors' meetings.

Using funds secured under a Haynes Foundation Faculty Fellowship, the University of Southern California (USC) has conducted an implementation study of the mediation program. The research team is currently in the final stages of completing its preliminary report.

The Department, in partnership with the LACA and USC, was awarded federal grant funding for its mediation program in November 2014. This grant, which was formally accepted by the Chief of Police and the Mayor in February 2015, provides funding for the LISTEN Program (Leveraging Innovative Solutions to Enhance Neighborhoods), predominantly to fund a program facilitator position at the LACA. The LISTEN program incorporates procedural justice and responsivity principles to address police bias complaints through community mediation. Though this grant includes limited funds for USC's assistance, it does not provide the funds necessary for a comprehensive evaluation study. To date, USC and the Department have been unsuccessful in securing additional funds for a broad evaluation of the mediation program.

Expanding Mediation to Include Discourtesy

In the prior update report to the BOPC, 2014 Biased Policing and Mediation Annual Report, it was recommended that the Department explore an expansion of the mediation program to include complaints of Discourtesy and implement immediately after obtaining the official approval of our partners at the LACA and LAPPL. This recommendation was approved by the BOPC on March 24, 2015, and the meet and confer process with the LAPPL was initiated in mid-April.

Addenda

1. Table 1 - Accused Employee Demographics: Ethnicity and Gender; Age at Date of Incident; Length of Service at Date of Incident; and Age and Length of Service Comparisons
2. Table 2 - Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter
3. Table 3 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged
4. Table 4 - Type of Bias Alleged
5. Table 5 - Accused and Complainant Ethnicities for Ethnic Bias Complaints Only
6. Table 6 - Biased Policing Allegation Dispositions for Closed Complaints

Table 1 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 1)

Ethnicity and Gender

Year	Gender	Ethnicity							Gender Total
		American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Other	Unknown	
2015 YTD	Female			1	3	3			7
	Male		5	2	31	18		4	60
	Unknown							5	5
	Ethnicity Total		5	3	34	21		9	72
2014	Female		4		18	10		1	33
	Male	1	19	19	130	99	1		269
	Unknown							27	27
	Ethnicity Total	1	23	19	148	109	1	28	329
2013	Female		4	1	21	14			40
	Male	3	20	18	113	94		1	249
	Unknown							16	16
	Ethnicity Total	3	24	19	134	108	0	17	305

Age at Date of Incident

Year	Age in Years				
	20-30	30-40	40-50	50+	Unknown
2015 YTD	15	26	14	6	11
2014	74	111	84	25	35
2013	84	115	63	26	17

Length of Service at Date of Incident

Year	Years of Service					
	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20+	Unknown
2015 YTD	10	28	9	9	5	11
2014	53	117	37	57	34	31
2013	91	86	43	40	28	17

Table 1 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 2)

Age and Length of Service Comparisons

Age in Years	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2015 YTD	2014	2013
20-30	757	21.8%	24.6%	25.2%	29.2%
30-40	1501	43.1%	42.6%	37.8%	39.9%
40-50	954	27.4%	23.0%	28.6%	21.9%
50+	268	7.7%	9.8%	8.5%	9.0%

Years of Service	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2015 YTD	2014	2013
0-5	799	23.0%	16.4%	17.8%	31.6%
5-10	1348	38.7%	45.9%	39.3%	29.9%
10-15	454	13.0%	14.8%	12.4%	14.9%
15-20	553	15.9%	14.8%	19.1%	13.9%
20+	326	9.4%	8.2%	11.4%	9.7%

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

Comparison Group – 3480 Police Officers

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

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

Biased Policing Update
 1st Quarter Report 2015

Table 2 - Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter (Part 1)

Year	Total Biased Policing Complaints Initiated	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
2015 YTD	46	15 (32.6%)	9 (19.6%)	17 (37.0%)	5 (10.9%)
2014	219	42 (19.2%)	46 (21.0%)	95 (43.4%)	36 (16.4%)
2013	192	40 (20.8%)	25 (13.0%)	96 (50.0%)	31 (16.1%)

2015 YTD		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender						
American Indian	M	1			1	
Black	F	27	3	2	2	
	M		6	1	11	2
Hispanic	F	9	1	2	2	
	M		3	1		
White	M	3	1	2		
Other	F	2	1			
	M			1		
Unknown	F	4				1
	M				1	2

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

2014		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender						
American Indian	M	1	1			
Asian	F	6		3		
	M			1	2	
Black	F	149	4	8	18	6
	M		26	15	55	17
Hispanic	F	30	1	6	3	2
	M		3	3	11	1
White	F	15	3	3	1	
	M		1	4	1	2
Other	F	8		3	3	1
	M					1
Unknown	F	17	2		1	2
	M		3	2	1	5
	Unk			1		

2013		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender						
Asian	F	3	1	1		
	M				1	
Black	F	110	2	5	12	6
	M		24	5	47	9
Filipino	M	1				1
Hispanic	F	37	1	2	2	
	M		4	3	19	4
	Unk		1			1
White	F	15	3	1	1	2
	M		1	2	3	2
Other	F	8		2		2
	M			1	3	
Unknown	F	22	1	1	2	2
	M		2	2	8	1
	Unk			1		2

Table 3 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 1)

Year	Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
2015 YTD	8 (10.3%)	26 (33.3%)	3 (3.8%)	1 (1.3%)	5 (6.4%)		3 (3.8%)	14 (17.9%)	18 (23.1%)
2014	36 (12.2%)	117 (39.5%)	17 (5.7%)	9 (3.0%)	n/a	7 (2.4%)	15 (5.1%)	49 (16.6%)	46 (15.6%)
2013	18 (7.7%)	109 (46.6%)	15 (6.4%)	15 (6.4%)	n/a	8 (3.4%)	8 (3.4%)	25 (10.7%)	36 (15.4%)

2015 YTD		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender										
American Indian	M		1		1					
Black	F	2	5			1		1	3	3
	M	3	14	1		1		2	3	6
Hispanic	F		2	2		1			3	3
	M	1	2			1			2	1
White	M	1							1	2
Other	F	1	1							
	M								1	
Unknown	F								1	
	M		1			1				3

Table 4 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 1)

Year	Disability	Ethnic*	Gender	LGBTQ**	National Origin	Other	Unspecified	
2015 YTD	2 (4.3%)	40 (87.0%)		2 (4.3%)			2 (4.3%)	* Ethnic bias includes race & religion. ** LGBTQ includes lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender & questioning.
2014	5 (2.2%)	196 (84.5%)	6 (2.6%)	5 (2.2%)		8 (3.4%)	12 (5.2%)	
2013	1 (0.5%)	171 (84.7%)	7 (3.5%)	5 (2.5%)	1 (0.5%)	8 (4.0%)	9 (4.5%)	

2015 YTD Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
American Indian	M		1					
Black	F		7					
	M		19		1			
Hispanic	F		4		1			
	M		4					
White	M	1	2					
Other	F		1					
	M		1					
Unknown	F	1						
	M		1					2

Table 4 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 2)

2014 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
American Indian	M		1					
Asian	F		3	1				
	M		3					
Black	F		34					2
	M	3	106	1			5	5
Hispanic	F		10		1			1
	M		17		2		1	
White	F		4	1	1			1
	M	2	5				1	1
Other	F		5					2
	M		1					
Unknown	F		4	2	1			
	M		9	1			1	
	Unk		1					

2013 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
Asian	F		2	1				
	M		1					
Black	F		24					1
	M		81	1	1		4	3
Filipino	M							1
Hispanic	F		3		1	1		
	M		27					2
	Unk		1				1	
White	F		6	1			1	
	M		6	1	2		1	
Other	F		2	1	1			
	M		4					
Unknown	F		5	2				
	M	1	10				1	2
	Unk		3					

Table 5 - Accused & Complainant Ethnicities for Ethnic Bias Complaints Only

Year	Accused Ethnicity	Complainant Ethnicity						
		American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Other	Unknown
2015 YTD	American Indian							
	Asian	1		2				1
	Black			1	1			1
	Hispanic			21	4	2	1	2
	White	2		13	3		1	
	Other							
	Unknown			6	2			
2014	American Indian			1				
	Asian			15	4	4		
	Black			10	3	2	1	
	Hispanic	2	4	105	13	5	3	9
	White		3	72	15	1	2	6
	Other			1				
	Unknown			16	3	1		6
2013	American Indian			2		1		
	Asian		1	12	2	2		5
	Black			8	3	4		3
	Hispanic		2	82	16	4	4	15
	White		2	63	20	7	3	7
	Other							
	Unknown			6	3		1	4

Table 6 - Biased Policing Allegation Dispositions for Closed Complaints

Disposition	2015 YTD				3-Year Average
		2014	2013	2012	
Demonstrably False					
Exonerated					
Guilty					
Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	8 (7.5%)	25 (5.1%)	32 (8.4%)	32 (6.6%)	29.7 (6.6%)
Mediated	9 (8.4%)	27 (5.5%)			9.0 (2.0%)
No Department Employee				2 (0.4%)	0.7 (0.2%)
No Misconduct			1 (0.3%)		0.3 (0.1%)
Not Guilty			2 (0.5%)		0.7 (0.2%)
Not Resolved	4 (3.7%)	14 (2.8%)	15 (3.9%)	39 (8.0%)	22.7 (5.0%)
Out of Statute	2 (1.9%)		5 (1.3%)	1 (0.2%)	2.0 (0.4%)
Sustained					
Sustained - No Penalty					
Unfounded	84 (78.5%)	427 (86.6%)	326 (85.6%)	412 (84.8%)	388.3 (85.7%)
Total Allegations	107	493	381	486	453.3