

**Biased Policing and Mediation Update – 3rd Quarter 2017**  
**November 27, 2017**

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

This report summarizes the types of contact resulting in Biased Policing complaints as well as the alleged discriminatory conduct and biases, and provides demographic data on the accused employees. It covers Biased Policing complaints initiated in the first three quarters of 2017 and provides comparison data for 2015 and 2016. To provide timely, meaningful information, most of this data is based on information obtained during complaint intake rather than on information from complaint investigations closed a year or more after initiation.

This report also provides information on the adjudication of Biased Policing complaints that have closed, including those referred to the Office of Operations (OO) or the Office of Special Operations (OSO) to determine the final disposition when Internal Affairs Group (IAG) disagreed with the adjudication made by the employee’s chain-of-command.

An update on the Department’s complaint mediation program is also included.

**Data**

**Biased Policing Complaints Initiated**

Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2012 through the first three quarters of 2017 are shown in the table below. The number of Biased Policing complaints for 2012 is based on complaints identified at closing as having Biased Policing allegations; the number for 2013 is based on complaints identified at intake or at closing; and the numbers for 2014 through 2017 are based primarily on complaints identified at intake using information obtained from the preliminary investigations.<sup>2</sup> During the third quarter of 2017, data for 2015 and 2016 was updated to include 18 recently closed complaints in which Biased Policing was not alleged at intake but alleged or identified during investigation.<sup>3</sup>

<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017 (YTD)</b>
225	281	284	283	256	160

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Generally, complaints are not classified by specific allegation types until the investigations are completed. During 2013, for Biased Policing cases, IAG began trying to identify Biased Policing allegations at intake rather than at closing. As a result, the number of Biased Policing complaints in 2012 is based on allegations identified at closing, while the number of Biased Policing complaints for 2013 is based on allegations identified intake and at closing. From 2014 onward, Biased Policing complaints were generally identified at intake rather than at closing.

<sup>3</sup> A review of recently closed complaints resulted in the addition of one complaint for 2015 and 17 complaints for 2016. Tables 1-8 were also updated to reflect the additional complaints, but the additional complaints did not have a significant impact on the data.

Tables 1 through 8 discussed below are attached as separate pages. They provide information about Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2015 through 2017 year-to-date. For tables in which a three-year average column is shown, data from 2014 has been included in order to calculate the average. Some complaints involved multiple complainants and/or accused employees, and some complainants alleged multiple discriminatory actions and/or types of bias. Consequently, many of the total counts discussed below exceed the number of complainants and complaints initiated.<sup>4</sup>

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

Bureau (% of City pop. <sup>5</sup> )	2017 YTD (%)	2016 (%)	2015 (%)	2014 (%)	3-Year Avg. (%)
Central (20.5)	35 (21.9)	55 (21.5)	68 (24.0)	65 (22.9)	62.7 (22.8)
South (18.2)	44 (27.5)	63 (24.6)	80 (28.4)	65 (22.9)	69.3 (25.3)
Valley (37.6)	30 (18.8)	59 (23.0)	67 (23.7)	75 (26.4)	67.0 (24.4)
West (23.7)	44 (27.5)	72 (28.1)	63 (22.3)	76 (26.8)	70.3 (25.6)
Outside City/Unknown	7 (4.4)	7 (2.7)	5 (1.8)	3 (1.1)	5.0 (1.8)
<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>274.3</b>

- During the first three quarters of 2017, 160 complaints were identified as containing allegations of Biased Policing, with a projected annual total of 213.
- In comparing the distribution of Biased Policing complaints initiated among the bureaus in the first three quarters of 2017 against the three-year average, Valley Bureau had a lower proportion of Biased Policing complaints in the first nine months of 2017 (18.8%) than the three-year average (24.4%). The distribution of Biased Policing complaints for the remaining three bureaus was roughly similar to the three-year averages.
- When compared to the population data, Valley Bureau had a lower proportion of Biased Policing complaints (18.8%) when compared to the percentage of people residing in Valley Bureau (37.6%). South Bureau had a higher proportion of Biased Policing Complaints (27.5%) compared to the percentage of people residing in South Bureau (18.2%). The proportion of Biased Policing complaints received in remaining bureaus was slightly higher than the percentage of residents in their respective bureaus.
- With respect to the distribution of Biased Policing complaints among the geographic Areas in the first three quarters of 2017, some Areas had a higher proportion of the City's Biased Policing complaints when compared to the percentage of people residing in the Area. For example, Central Area had 8.1 percent of the Biased Policing complaints while

<sup>4</sup> Because of rounding, percentages do not always equal 100.

<sup>5</sup> Based on data from the 2010 United States Census, the City has a population of 3.8 million distributed among the four geographic bureaus as follows: Central 20.5%; South 18.2%; Valley 37.6%; and West 23.7%.

Central Area residents accounted for 1.6 percent of the City population. Similarly, Southeast Area had 11.3 percent of the Biased Policing complaints while Southeast Area residents accounted for 3.7 percent of the City, and Hollywood Area had 10.0 percent of the Biased Policing complaints while its residents made up 3.4 percent of the City.

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

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

- **Gender representation:** In the first three quarters of 2017, of the 247 accused employees for whom gender was known, female employees accounted for 12.6 percent of those accused in Biased Policing complaints, lower than their representation among sworn employees in the Department Deployment Roster (18.5%).<sup>6</sup> This is a slight decrease from the prior quarterly report (when female officers were 14.6% of the accused) and is more in line with prior years. In 2016, female employees were 11.9 percent of the accused but made up 18.4 percent of all sworn employees, and in 2015, female employees were 10.0 percent of the accused but made up 18.8 percent of all sworn employees.
- **Ethnic representation:** Data from the first three quarters of 2017 show the ethnic composition of accused employees was generally consistent with that of all sworn personnel.
- **Age and length of service:** Since summarized information on employee age and length of service is not available in the Department rosters, 3,480 police officers in positions likely to have public contact were chosen as a comparison group (See Table 2, Part 2). The distribution of accused employees among the age and tenure categories reported remains similar to the comparison group. Data from the first three quarters of 2017 show that accused employees were most frequently in their thirties with less than ten years of service, as was the case in prior years.

---

<sup>6</sup> Sworn Department employee makeup as of October 1, 2017: Gender: Male 81.5% and Female 18.5%; Ethnicity: American Indian 0.3%; Asian 7.6%; Black 10.1%; Filipino 2.4%; Hispanic 47.2%; White 32.2%; and Other 0.3% (Source: Sworn and Civilian Personnel by Sex and Descent, October 1, 2017).

Table 3 shows accused employee assignment types at the time Biased Policing complaints were initiated, compared to data on the number of Department employees in each assignment type.<sup>7</sup> Part 1 of Table 3 focuses on the assignment types in which Biased Policing complaints were initiated while Part 2 focuses on the gender of accused employees within those assignment types.

Part 1 – Accused Employee and Assignment Types:

- During the first three quarters of 2017, of the 265 employees accused of Biased Policing, officers assigned to the general Patrol function were the subject of the most Biased Policing complaints, making up 46.8 percent of the accused while in comparison, 21.8 percent of sworn Department employees are assigned to the general Patrol function. Employees assigned to Gang Enforcement were the second most numerous, making up 13.2 percent of the accused in the first three quarters of 2017 while 3.4 percent of officers are assigned to Gang Enforcement. This was followed by employees assigned to Patrol - Specialized Enforcement<sup>8</sup> (11.7 percent of the accused compared to 2.8 percent of the Department), Traffic Enforcement (7.2 percent of the accused compared to 1.9 percent of the Department), and Metropolitan Division (4.5 percent of the accused compared to 3.1 percent of the Department).

The current representation of accused employees in the various assignment types is generally similar to prior years, though their ranking order changes slightly. The table below summarizes the five assignment types with the most Biased Policing complaints, based on number of accused employees, from 2015 to the present.

<b>Five assignment types with the most BP complaints, based on number of accused employees</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>2017 (YTD)</b>		<b>2016</b>		<b>2015</b>	
1	Patrol	46.8%	Patrol	47.2%	Patrol	50.1%
2	Gang Enforcement	13.2%	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	9.6%	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	10.6%
3	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	11.7%	Metropolitan Div.	9.4%	Gang Enforcement	8.0%
4	Traffic Enforcement	7.2%	Gang Enforcement	8.5%	Metropolitan Div. <sup>9</sup>	5.5%
5	Metropolitan Div.	4.5%	Traffic Enforcement	5.9%	Traffic Enforcement	4.7%

- A comparison of the number of Biased Policing complaints initiated for each assignment type against the number of employees in each assignment type in the comparison group shows that officers assigned to Traffic Enforcement were the subject of the most Biased Policing complaints during the first three quarters of 2017. Based on the number of complaints per 100 officers in each assignment type, officers assigned to Traffic

<sup>7</sup> The comparison data for the number of employees in each assignment type is based on data from April, 2016.

<sup>8</sup> Officers assigned to Patrol - Specialized Enforcement are assigned to patrol duties with a special enforcement purpose, such as those assigned to the Hollywood Entertainment District or the Safer Cities Initiative.

<sup>9</sup> In mid-2015, because of an increase in violent crime, Metropolitan Division was expanded to flexibly deploy specially trained officers in high crime areas. At the end of 2014, the Department had 255 officers deployed at Metropolitan Division. By the end of 2015, 471 officers had been assigned to Metropolitan Division. As of April 2016, there were 471 officers deployed to Metropolitan Division, with 388 of them assigned to field operations.

Enforcement had 6.4 Biased Policing complaints per 100 officers. This was followed by officers assigned to Patrol - Specialized Enforcement (5.7), Gang Enforcement (4.7), Patrol (2.5), and Metropolitan Division (1.8).

In prior years, Traffic Enforcement and Patrol - Specialized Enforcement were consistently the two assignment types with more Biased Policing complaints than other assignment types. The table below lists, for 2015 to the present, the five assignment types with the most Biased Policing complaints per 100 officers.

<b>Five assignment types with most BP complaints, based on complaints per 100 officers</b>						
<b>#</b>	<b>2017 (YTD)</b>		<b>2016</b>		<b>2015</b>	
1	Traffic Enforcement	6.4	Traffic Enforcement	8.9	Traffic Enforcement	9.3
2	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	5.7	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	7.5	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	8.9
3	Gang Enforcement	4.7	Metropolitan Div.	5.4	Patrol	5.0
4	Patrol	2.5	Patrol	4.1	Gang Enforcement	5.0
5	Metropolitan Div.	1.8	Gang Enforcement	3.8	Metropolitan Div.	4.1

Part 2 – Gender of Accused Employee and Assignment Type:

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

- Consistent with the discussion relating to Table 2 and gender representation, Table 3, Part 2 shows the current overall representation of female officers among the accused (12.6%) has decreased since the prior quarter (14.6%) and now is similar to prior years, when females were 11.9 percent of the accused in 2016, and 10.0 percent in 2015.

In the prior quarterly report, the data in Part 2 indicated that many of the female officers who made up the 14.6 percent of the accused in the first half of 2017 were assigned to Gang Enforcement and Patrol-Specialized Enforcement. Currently, for Gang Enforcement, the percentage of female officers accused of Biased Policing is 8.6 percent, down from 15.0 percent in the prior quarterly report, and essentially the same as the percentage of female officers assigned to Gang Enforcement (8.8%). For Patrol-Specialized Enforcement, the percentage of female officers accused of Biased Policing is now 19.4 percent, down from 27.3 percent in the prior quarterly report, and slightly higher than the percentage of female officers assigned to that function (15.8%).

- Aside from the Patrol - Specialized Enforcement and Gang Enforcement assignments discussed previously, two other assignment types had a slightly higher representation of female officers among the accused than their representation in the comparison group: the general Patrol function (15.3 percent of the accused compared to 12.9 percent of female

officers assigned to Patrol), and Narcotic Enforcement (33.3 percent of the accused compared to 11.4 percent of the Department). It should be noted that for Narcotic Enforcement, there were only a total of three officers accused of Biased Policing, one of whom was female.

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

- Based on the number of public contacts during the first three quarters of 2017, Biased Policing complaints were initiated 0.013 percent of the time. This is similar to 2016 (0.016%) and 2015 (0.017%).
- Consistent with prior years, the type of contact that most frequently resulted in Biased Policing complaints during the first three quarters of 2017 continues to be the traffic stop, accounting for 55 of the 160 complaints (34.4%) initiated. In 2016, traffic stops accounted for 34.8 percent of Biased Policing complaints, and in 2015, they accounted for 39.6 percent of the Biased Policing complaints.
- After traffic stops, radio calls (41) were the next most common, accounting for 25.6 percent of the 160 complaints initiated during the first three quarters of 2017. This was followed by pedestrian stops (31), accounting for 19.4 percent of the complaints.
- The remaining Biased Policing complaints fall into the generic “Other” category, used for all other types of contacts. During the first three quarters of 2017, “Other” contacts accounted for 33 of the 160 complaints (20.6%).<sup>10</sup>

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

- In the first three quarters of 2017, the most commonly complained of discriminatory actions or types of conduct were detentions and arrests. With the exception of the generic “Other” category,<sup>11</sup> this is consistent with the past two years. The remaining types of allegedly biased conduct appeared less frequently.

---

<sup>10</sup> “Other” types of initial contact in the first nine months of 2017 included the following situations: officers accompanying other officials on a housing unit check, an officer investigating a crime in which the complainant was a victim, complainants approaching or flagging down officers, complainants being stopped by officers at security checkpoints, complainants calling or walking into a police station, a complainant who believed an officer engaged in Biased Policing after finding a parking ticket on her car, complaints initiated by a third party after witnessing an incident or hearing an officer testify in court, and situations in which complainants would not specify how they came into contact with officers.

<sup>11</sup> “Other” alleged discriminatory conduct reported in the first nine months of 2017 included: conducting a housing check, improper investigations, questioning only one person in a group, refusing to release property without proof of ownership; driving behind the complainant, asking questions about gang membership, not returning a call, issuing

- **Stop/Detention:** The most commonly complained of conduct continues to be the stop or detention itself. During the first three quarters of 2017, it appeared in 82 of the 160 Biased Policing complaints (51.3%) initiated and accounted for 42.5 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. In 2016, it appeared in 122 of the 256 Biased Policing complaints (47.7%) and in 2015, it appeared in 164 of the 283 complaints (58.0%).
- **Arrest:** Arrest was the second most complained of conduct during the first three quarters of 2017. It appeared in 26 of 160 complaints (16.3%) and accounted for 13.5 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. In 2016, arrest appeared in 35 of 256 complaints (13.7%), and 48 of the 283 complaints (17.0%) in 2015.
- **Handcuffed/Discourtesy:** Complaints about being handcuffed were the third most common during the first three quarters of 2017, appearing in 12 of 160 complaints (7.5%), and accounting for 6.2 percent of discriminatory conduct alleged. This is a change from prior years, when complaints about handcuffing usually ranked fourth or fifth in terms of the type of discriminatory conduct alleged.

Discourtesy based on bias, which was usually ranked third in prior years, dropped to being the fourth most complained of conduct in the first three quarters of 2017, with 11 of the 160 complaints (6.9%) and accounting for 5.7 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. In prior years, when discourtesy was ranked third, it appeared in 30 of 256 complaints (11.7%) in 2016, and in 33 of 283 complaints (11.7%) in 2015.

Table 6 shows the types of bias alleged along with a breakdown of complainants by gender and ethnicity. Effective January 1, 2016, California Penal Code Section 13012 was amended to require that complaints against peace officers be tracked by specific bias categories. While the Department already tracked Biased Policing complaints by bias categories, new categories were added to be consistent with the new law, including: age, gender identity, religion (previously tracked as part of ethnic bias), physical disability, and mental disability (physical and mental disabilities were previously tracked under the general category of disability).<sup>12</sup>

- **Racial/Ethnic bias:** Complaints of discriminatory conduct based on race/ethnicity are overwhelmingly the most frequent. During the first three quarters of 2017, 146 of the 160 Biased Policing complaints (91.3%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on race or ethnicity, accounting for 89.6 percent of all

---

citations, impounding property, favoring the other party in a dispute, asking the purpose for wanting to see the Mayor in person, being denied entry into City Hall, being asked about loitering, being told to stop spray painting at a protest, walking into the complainant's yard during an investigation, not allowing a lawyer to speak to a suspect taking a sobriety test, telling the complainant to stay back while conducting a traffic stop with another party, and complaints in which the behavior was not specified.

<sup>12</sup> A category for "Other" bias is included. "Other" biases are included in Biased Policing complaints only if alleged in combination with ethnic or another categorized bias. During the first three quarters of 2017, one complainant alleged officers were biased because of the complainant's age and appearing to be a gang member. This was classified as "Other." In the past, "Other" biases included such categories as homelessness, political affiliation, prior arrests, size, stature, or location of residence.

biases alleged. In 2016, 230 of the 256 complaints involved an allegation of ethnic bias (89.8%), accounting for 86.8 percent of all biases alleged. In 2015, when ethnic bias included religious bias, 260 of the 283 complaints (91.9%) involved at least one allegation of ethnic or religious bias, accounting for 90.3 percent of all biases alleged.

- **Gender bias:** In the first three quarters of 2017, three of the 160 Biased Policing complaints (1.9%) involved an allegation of gender bias, accounting for 1.8 percent of all biases alleged. This has fluctuated in prior years: in 2016, 12 of 256 complaints (4.7%) alleged gender bias, while in 2015, three of the 283 complaints (1.1%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on gender.
- **Other biases:** Of the 160 Biased Policing complaints received in the first three quarters of 2017, three complaints (1.9%) contained allegations of bias based on physical disability while mental disability was alleged in one complaint (0.6%). Biases based on sexual orientation (1.3%), age (0.6%), gender identity/expression (0.6%), and national origin (0.6%) were also alleged in the first three quarters of 2017.

Ethnic Representation of Complainants: Tables 4, 5 and 6 all show that Black males were the most numerous demographic group among the complainants, making up 80 of the 164 complainants (48.8%) in the first three quarters of 2017; 109 of the 273 complainants (39.9%) in 2016; and 151 of the 307 (49.2%) in 2015. Their complaints usually resulted from traffic and pedestrian stops and usually involved allegations that the stop was based on ethnic bias. Also of note is that while discriminatory searches are not as frequently reported as other conduct, allegations relating to discriminatory search were often reported by Black male complainants. Of the complainants who alleged discriminatory searches in the first three quarters of 2017, six of the ten complainants (60.0%) were Black males. This is similar to 2016 (62.5%) and 2015 (66.7%).

Table 7 compares the ethnicity of complainants, broken down by geographic bureau of occurrence, against the City's ethnic composition based on census data from 2010. During the first three quarters of 2017, Black complainants were the most numerous demographic group. For complaints in which the Area of occurrence could be determined, 97 (61.8%) of the 157 complainants were Black.<sup>13</sup> This number is similar to prior years, when Black complainants made up 57.1 percent of the complainants in 2016 and 62.6 percent in 2015. In comparison, the 2010 census data shows that only 9.4 percent of the City population is Black.

Table 8 provides a comparison of the ethnicities of accused employees and complainants only for cases involving alleged ethnic bias. As noted in prior reports, in the majority of cases, Black complainants accused Hispanic or White employees. This has remained constant since 2015.

---

<sup>13</sup> There were 99 Black complainants in the first three quarters of 2017, but because two of those complainants were from an Unknown/Outside location, only 97 could be attributed to a specific Area and bureau.



## **Adjudication**

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

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

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

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

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

An allegation is "Sustained" when the investigation discloses that the act complained of occurred and constitutes misconduct. When the investigation indicates the act complained of did not occur, the allegation is "Unfounded." "Demonstrably False" is used when it is clearly proven an allegation did not occur because the complainant demonstrates an irrational thought process

and/or has an established a pattern of making crank complaints; or audio/video evidence captured the entire incident and conclusively shows the alleged misconduct did not occur.

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

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

While the Department’s Training Evaluation and Management System tracks all dispositions, only allegations adjudicated as “Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate,” “Not Resolved,” “Sustained,” and “Guilty” can be considered when evaluating an employee’s history for purposes of disciplinary review.<sup>14</sup>

### **Biased Policing Complaints Closed**

In contrast to the section on Biased Policing complaints initiated, which was based on preliminary complaint information, this section, which includes Tables 9 and 10, presents information on closed complaints drawn from the Complaint Management System.

Table 9, is comprised of two parts. Part 1 provides data on complaints in which officers are accused of taking law enforcement action based on a prohibited bias category and compares the adjudication of those Biased Policing allegations in the first three quarters of 2017 to those of the last three years. Part 2 provides data on sustained complaints that did not allege Biased Policing per se, but some of the misconduct alleged and sustained by the Department relates to bias.

#### **Part 1 - Closed complaints with allegations of Biased Policing**

During the first three quarters of 2017, 206 complaints with 379 Biased Policing allegations were adjudicated.

- Of 379 Biased Policing allegations adjudicated, 328 allegations (86.5%) were adjudicated as Unfounded, similar to the three-year average of 82.1 percent.

---

<sup>14</sup> Under California Penal Code Section 832.5(c), complaints and allegations determined to be unfounded may not be considered for punitive or promotional purposes.

- Twenty-two allegations (5.8%) closed with the Mediated disposition during the first three quarters of 2017. The three-year average is 7.9 percent, though the rate has fluctuated.
- Twenty allegations (5.3%) closed with the disposition Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate. This is lower than the three-year average (7.6%), but again, the rate has fluctuated over the years.
- Six allegations (1.6%) closed as Demonstrably False during the first three quarters of 2017.
- Two allegations (0.5%) from one complaint closed in the second quarter as No Misconduct, but should have been adjudicated as Unfounded instead. Since video of the incident confirmed a legitimate basis for the police action and there was no evidence indicating bias, the more appropriate adjudication would have been Unfounded rather than No Misconduct. However, because of statute deadlines, the dispositions could not be altered. A memorandum was sent to the commanding officer explaining the rationale.
- One Biased Policing allegation (0.3%) was adjudicated as Not Resolved during the first three quarters of 2017. The current rate of Not Resolved dispositions is lower than the three-year average of 2.1 percent.

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

While the complaints in Part 2 do not contain allegations that officers took law enforcement action on the basis of a prohibited bias category, the sustained complaints reported in Part 2 reflect conduct that may be indicative of bias.<sup>15</sup> Through the third quarter of 2017, there have been five complaints in which the Department sustained allegations against officers for conduct that may indicate bias.

Of those five complaints, two closed in the third quarter of 2017. The first complaint included a sustained allegation of Discourtesy - Ethnic and involved an off-duty officer who used an ethnic slur during an argument with a girlfriend. Because of other related allegations, the accused officer was directed to a Board of Rights, which resulted in his termination. The second complaint involved a sustained allegation for an Improper Remark made by an officer while in the Area office relating to another officer's gender. While the subject of the officer's joke said she was not offended by the remark, another officer reported it, resulting in an Official Reprimand for the accused officer.

---

<sup>15</sup> Unlike Part 1, which is a count of allegations, the information in Part 2 is a count of complaints and the discipline imposed as a result of the complaint. Because complaints often contain multiple allegations, the discipline listed in Part 2 reflects the discipline for all sustained allegations, not necessarily the discipline imposed for the allegations indicating possible bias.

## **Video in Adjudication of Biased Policing Complaints**

Table 10 summarizes whether video/audio recordings were used in adjudicating the Biased Policing complaints that closed in the first three quarters of 2017 and breaks down the types of media available to the adjudicator. Of the 206 complaints with Biased Policing allegations that closed in that time period, about half occurred in geographic Areas in which officers were not equipped with Body Worn Video (BWV) and/or Digital In-Car Video (DICV). However, for 107 (51.9%) complaints, the adjudicator had access to some type of video and/or audio recording during adjudication.

Of the 107 Biased Policing complaints with video and/or audio recordings, one complaint did not go through the adjudication process because it was referred to mediation and closed as Mediated. The remaining 106 complaints went through the adjudication process during the first three quarters of 2017. Of those 106 complaints, video and/or audio recordings assisted in the adjudication of 81 (76.4%) complaints and disproved all allegations in three complaints (2.8%).

One of the three Biased Policing complaints disproved by video this quarter was based on DICV. Officers stopped to investigate the complainant, who they knew to be on probation, for loitering in front of a convenience store where the owner had previously complained about loiterers. The complainant alleged the officers detained him because of his race, poked him in the chest, used racial slurs, and threatened to kill him. The DICV, which did not substantiate any of his allegations, showed the complainant yelling racial slurs and threatening to file complaints of misconduct. The investigation also revealed the complainant had previously filed more than 30 complaints against officers using pre-filled complaint forms containing the same or similar allegations. The complainant said he uses the pre-filled forms whenever he encounters officers. None of his prior complaints have been sustained. Because of the video and the complainant's history, the complaint was closed as Demonstrably False.

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

As previously described, when IAG disagrees with a chain-of-command adjudication for a Biased Policing complaint, IAG forwards the complaint to the office director in the employee's chain-of-command. In the third quarter of 2017, IAG disagreed with the chain-of-command adjudication for two Biased Policing complaints. One complaint was referred to the Director, Office of Operations (OO), who agreed with IAG's recommendation that the Biased Policing allegations be adjudicated as Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate. The second complaint was referred to the Director, Office of Special Operations (OSO), who disagreed with IAG's recommendation that the allegations be adjudicated as Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate. The allegations were closed as Unfounded. A summary of the dispositions for the complaints referred to the office directors during the first three quarters of 2017 appears in the table below.

<b>BIASED POLICING COMPLAINTS REFERRED TO OFFICE DIRECTOR FOR FINAL DISPOSITION</b>			
<b>2017 Quarter</b>	<b>Bureau Recommendation</b>	<b>Internal Affairs Group Recommendation</b>	<b>Office Director Adjudication</b>
<b>1</b>	No Referrals	No Referrals	No Referrals
<b>2</b>	Unfounded	Not Resolved	Not Resolved (OO)
	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Unfounded (OSO)
	Unfounded	Not Resolved	Unfounded (OSO)
<b>3</b>	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate (OO)
	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Unfounded (OSO)

As mentioned in the first quarterly report, IAG disagreed with a chain-of-command adjudication of Unfounded for a Biased Policing complaint in the first quarter but did not refer it to the office director because the complaint was too close to the statute date. For training purposes, IAG sent correspondence to the chain-of-command explaining the rationale. There have been no other complaints in 2017 in which IAG disagreed with the chain-of-command adjudication but did not refer the complaint to office director because of the statute date.

In total, IAG disagreed with the chain-of-command recommendation for six Biased Policing complaints during the first three quarters of 2017.<sup>16</sup> The six closed complaints represent 2.9 percent of the 206 Biased Policing complaints closed in the first three quarters 2017. The table below summarizes, from 2015 to present, the number of complaints in which IAG disagreed with the chain-of-command.

<b>Closed Biased Policing (BP) Complaints</b>	<b>2017 (YTD)</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2015</b>
BP complaints closed	206	270	264
Closed BP complaints in which IAG disagreed with adjudication	6 (2.9%)	9 (3.3%)	8 (3.0%)

### **Complaint Mediation Program**

The Department’s complaint mediation program began in 2014, when the Department, in conjunction with the Los Angeles City Attorney’s Office (LACA), launched a 36-month pilot program in which selected complaints of Biased Policing were mediated as an alternative to the traditional complaint investigation procedure. In September of 2015, Discourtesy complaints also became eligible for mediation. After the pilot period concluded in 2016, the BOPC approved the Department’s request to make mediation a permanent part of the Department’s

---

<sup>16</sup> Two complaints are not included in this count because the differences were technical in nature. In one complaint, IAG agreed that evidence, which included video, supported the conclusion that discrimination did not occur, but the two discrimination allegations should have been closed as Unfounded instead of No Misconduct. The dispositions could not be altered because of the statute date. In the second complaint, IAG also agreed that discrimination did not occur, but because of video evidence and the complainant’s history, the allegation was closed as Demonstrably False instead of Unfounded.

complaint resolution process, and the name changed to the Community Police Unification Program (Program) to reflect its expanded scope and goals.

Generally, Biased Policing and Discourtesy complaints with no additional allegations of misconduct, or only minor additional allegations, may be mediated. The Program guidelines provide that complaints involving the following situations should not be mediated, though the Commanding Officer, IAG, makes the final determination of case eligibility:

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

During the first three quarters of 2017, 232 complaints were referred to the Program for mediation, and 130 complaints were determined to be eligible, a 56.0 percent eligibility rate. In that period, 15 complaints (involving 15 complainants and 24 employees), closed with a Mediated disposition. The table below summarizes the number of complaints referred to the Program during the first three quarters of 2017 compared to the total number of complaints referred between 2014 and 2016.

<b>Community Police Unification Program<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>2017 (YTD)</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2014</b>
Total Complaints Referred	232	289	195	224
Not Eligible	102 (44.0%)	118 (40.8%)	108 (55.4%)	119 (53.1%)
Eligible	130 (56.0%)	171 (59.2%)	87 (44.6%)	105 (46.9%)
Closed after Mediation Conducted <sup>18</sup>	14	29	30	15
Closed as Mediated after two No Shows	1	6	4	8

Of the 130 complaints eligible for mediation in the first three quarters of 2017, 96 complaints (73.8%) were reassigned without mediation for full investigation. Beginning in 2016, the Department began tracking the specific reasons for complaints being reassigned. The table below provides a breakdown of the reasons for reassignment.

---

<sup>17</sup> The data in this table include Discourtesy complaints, which became eligible for mediation September 9, 2015. Currently, Discourtesy complaints make up 21.6 percent of the eligible cases referred to the Program for mediation.

<sup>18</sup> These complaints could be from the current quarter or a prior quarter.

<b>Eligible for Mediation but Reassigned</b>	<b>2017 (YTD)</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Eligible</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Reassigned</b>	<b>96 (73.8%)</b>	<b>130 (76.0%)</b>	<b>61 (70.1%)</b>	<b>72 (68.6%)</b>
<b>Reason for Reassignment</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Complainant could not be located/contacted</b>	<b>30 (31.3%)</b>	<b>20 (15.4%)</b>	<b>20 (32.8%)</b>	<b>19 (26.4%)</b>
<b>Complainant declined (and reason given)</b>	<b>35 (36.5%)</b>	<b>65 (50.0%)</b>	<b>23 (37.7%)</b>	<b>30 (41.7%)</b>
Avoid other party	2 (5.7%)	6 (9.2%)		
Changed mind/does not wish to pursue	2 (5.7%)	6 (9.2%)		
Lack of trust in LAPD	4 (11.4%)	2 (3.1%)		
Too much bother	9 (25.7%)	3 (20.0%)		
Wants full investigation	12 (34.3%)	16 (24.6%)		
No reason given	6 (17.1%)	22 (33.8%)		
<b>Officer declined (and reason given)</b>	<b>25 (26.0%)</b>	<b>32 (24.6%)</b>	<b>16 (26.2%)</b>	<b>19 (26.4%)</b>
Avoid other party	9 (36.0%)	6 (18.8%)		
Too much bother	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.1%)		
Wants full investigation	10 (40.0%)	15 (46.9%)		
No reason given	6 (24.0%)	10 (31.3%)		
<b>Inappropriate for mediation</b>	<b>3 (3.1%)</b>	<b>6 (4.6%)</b>	<b>2 (3.3%)</b>	<b>4 (5.6%)</b>
<b>Alternative Complaint Resolution</b>	<b>3 (3.1%)</b>	<b>7 (5.4%)</b>		

Table 11 summarizes in two parts data from the satisfaction surveys received from those who participated in mediation. Part 1 provides information on survey responses received in the first three quarters of 2017, while Part 2 compares survey responses received in prior years against those received the first three quarters of 2017. Both tables show the participants' responses to four of the survey questions relating to satisfaction with the mediation process, whether the process was fair, whether mediation increased understanding of the other party, and whether the participant would recommend mediation to others.

#### Part 1 – Survey responses received during the first three quarters of 2017

Summarized below are results from the survey responses received from the 14 complainants and 22 employees who participated in mediations during the first three quarters of 2017.

- **Satisfaction with the process:** Thirty-three of the 36 participants (91.7%) were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the mediation process. Officers (100.0%) were slightly more likely to be satisfied than complainants (78.6%).
- **Fairness of the process:** Thirty-five of the participants (97.2%) indicated the outcome of the mediation process was “somewhat fair” or “completely fair.” The percentage of participants who thought that the outcome was fair was roughly for the same for officers (95.4%) and complainants (100.0%).
- **Understanding of the other party:** Twenty-five of the 36 participants (69.4%) indicated their understanding of the other party increased after the mediation. The percentage of

participants who reported an increase in understanding was slightly higher for officers (72.7%) than for complainants (64.3%).

- Likelihood of recommending to others: Thirty-one of the participants (86.1%) indicated they were either “somewhat likely” or “very likely” to recommend the mediation process to others. The percentage of participants who would recommend mediation to others was higher for officers (95.5%) than it was for complainants (71.4%).

Part 2 – Survey responses received from 2014 through the third quarter of 2017.

Though ratings for the various satisfaction categories have fluctuated since 2014, overall satisfaction levels remain high for both complainants and officers. The data in Part 2 show the Program has been well-received and is helping community members and Department employees develop a better understanding of each other. On average, 86.3 percent of participants since 2014 were satisfied with the process, 93.1 percent believed the outcome to be fair, 69.4 percent reported an increase in understanding of the other party, and 87.1 percent would recommend mediation.

Two recently resolved complaints demonstrate how mediation helped participants gain a better understanding of the other party’s perspective. One complaint involved the victim of a drive-by shooting who was frustrated that the shooter had not been identified a year later. The complainant called the assigned detective’s supervisor and said the detective had not put effort into solving the case because the detective was biased against the complainant, who had changed gender identity since the shooting. The complainant refused to further discuss the issue unless the assigned detective was removed from the case. Through mediation, the complainant learned that gender identity had not been an issue after the detective explained that the crime remained unsolved because very little evidence had been found at the scene, and no witnesses who could assist in the investigation had come forward.

The second mediation involved a complainant who believed he was stopped because of his race. He said he had been stopped three times since he purchased a new car and believed it was because he is a black man with dreadlocks and was in the Watts area. He said he had been through the mediation before and expressed an interest in mediating his recent encounter as well. After mediation, one officer, who was thankful for the opportunity to participate in the Program, said it was eye-opening and informative to learn the community member’s perspective.

In response to the BOPC’s request to consider expanding the Program to more types of public complaints, the Mediation Coordinator is working with IAG’s Complaint Classification Unit to evaluate other types of allegations for mediation. Efforts to make mediation as convenient as possible for complainants continue. In addition to scheduling mediations in the evenings, on weekends, and in local libraries, mediation using internet video-conferencing is another option being considered. Finally, to increase employee awareness, the Mediation Coordinator continues to conduct training for Department employees at roll calls and other training sites, and is developing a newsletter to inform employees.



### **Sworn Employee Training on Implicit Bias**

At the end of March, 2017, the Department began training all sworn employees below the rank of captain on the subject of implicit bias.<sup>19</sup> The mandatory four-hour course, titled “Implicit Bias and Community Policing,” consists of live instruction designed to expose officers to the concept of implicit bias, its causes and impact on community policing, and possible solutions. Training Division reports that as of November 27, 2017, 93.1 percent of officers assigned to the operational bureaus have completed the course, and overall, 91.9 percent of all officers (which includes those in administrative assignments) have completed the training.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Training on the subject of implicit bias is already part of the Police Academy curriculum, and command staff receive training on the subject as part of the Leadership Enhancement and Development Sessions (LEADS).

<sup>20</sup> As noted in Table 3, approximately 4.5 percent of Department employees are on leave (e.g. family leave, medical leave, military leave). Because of this, a 100 percent completion rate is not possible.

## **Addenda - Tables**

Table 1: Complaints by Bureau and Geographic Area

Table 2: Accused Employee Demographics

Table 3: Accused Employee Assignments

Table 4: Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter

Table 5: Discriminatory Conduct Alleged

Table 6: Type of Bias Alleged

Table 7: Complainant Ethnicity by Bureau

Table 8: Accused and Complainant Ethnicities for Race/Ethnic Bias Complaints Only

Table 9: Biased Policing Allegation Dispositions for Closed Complaints

Table 10: Video in the Adjudication of Biased Policing Complaints

Table 11: Mediation Program Survey Responses

**Table 1 – Complaints by Bureau and Geographic Area**

BUREAUS/AREAS	Population		2017 (YTD)		2016		2015		2014		3-Year Avg. (%) (2014-2016)	
			Complaints		Complaints		Complaints		Complaints			
<b>CENTRAL BUREAU</b>	<b>780,269</b>	<b>20.5%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>21.9%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>21.5%</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>62.7</b>	<b>22.8%</b>
Central	61,668	1.6%	13	8.1%	19	7.4%	34	12.0%	20	7.0%	24.3	8.9%
Hollenbeck	179,536	4.7%	3	1.9%	7	2.7%	5	1.8%	8	2.8%	6.7	2.4%
Newton	146,201	3.9%	6	3.8%	16	6.3%	18	6.4%	16	5.6%	16.7	6.1%
Northeast	227,903	6.0%	3	1.9%	7	2.7%	2	0.7%	10	3.5%	6.3	2.3%
Rampart	164,961	4.3%	10	6.3%	6	2.3%	9	3.2%	11	3.9%	8.7	3.2%
<b>SOUTH BUREAU</b>	<b>689,238</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>27.5%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>24.6%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>28.3%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>69.3</b>	<b>25.3%</b>
77th Street	178,933	4.7%	6	3.8%	32	12.5%	24	8.5%	12	4.2%	22.7	8.3%
Harbor	178,163	4.7%	4	2.5%	3	1.2%	5	1.8%	7	2.5%	5.0	1.8%
Southeast	141,371	3.7%	18	11.3%	12	4.7%	19	6.7%	16	5.6%	15.7	5.7%
Southwest	190,771	5.0%	16	10.0%	16	6.3%	32	11.3%	30	10.6%	26.0	9.5%
<b>VALLEY BUREAU</b>	<b>1,427,148</b>	<b>37.6%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>18.8%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>23.0%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>26.4%</b>	<b>67.0</b>	<b>24.4%</b>
Devonshire	216,499	5.7%	4	2.5%	8	3.1%	12	4.2%	10	3.5%	10.0	3.6%
Foothill	196,513	5.2%	3	1.9%	3	1.2%	6	2.1%	6	2.1%	5.0	1.8%
Mission	244,576	6.4%	4	2.5%	11	4.3%	6	2.1%	12	4.2%	9.7	3.5%
North Hollywood	203,856	5.4%	6	3.8%	11	4.3%	10	3.5%	12	4.2%	11.0	4.0%
Topanga	193,901	5.1%	1	0.6%	14	5.5%	7	2.5%	13	4.6%	11.3	4.1%
Van Nuys	177,918	4.7%	7	4.4%	9	3.5%	17	6.0%	16	5.6%	14.0	5.1%
West Valley	193,885	5.1%	5	3.1%	3	1.2%	9	3.2%	6	2.1%	6.0	2.2%
<b>WEST BUREAU</b>	<b>900,515</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>27.5%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>28.1%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>22.3%</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>26.8%</b>	<b>70.3</b>	<b>25.6%</b>
Hollywood	128,999	3.4%	16	10.0%	24	9.4%	19	6.7%	17	6.0%	20.0	7.3%
Olympic	186,615	4.9%	6	3.8%	8	3.1%	4	1.4%	14	4.9%	8.7	3.2%
Pacific	203,623	5.4%	10	6.3%	26	10.2%	20	7.1%	20	7.0%	22.0	8.0%
West Los Angeles	230,275	6.1%	4	2.5%	1	0.4%	6	2.1%	9	3.2%	5.3	1.9%
Wilshire	151,003	4.0%	8	5.0%	13	5.1%	14	4.9%	16	5.6%	14.3	5.2%
OUTSIDE CITY/ UNKNOWN LOCATION	NA	NA	7	4.4%	7	2.7%	5	1.8%	3	1.1%	5.0	1.8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,797,170</b>		<b>160</b>		<b>256</b>		<b>283</b>		<b>284</b>		<b>268.3</b>	

(upd. 10/12/2017)

**Table 2 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 1)**

Ethnicity and Gender

Year	Gender	Ethnicity								Gender Total
		American Indian	Asian	Black	Filipino	Hispanic	White	Other	Unknown	
<b>2017 (YTD)</b>	Female		2	1		22	4	2		<b>31</b>
	Male		17	18		107	70	1	3	<b>216</b>
	Unknown					1	1		16	<b>18</b>
	<b>Ethnicity Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>265</b>
<b>2016</b>	Female		4	4		27	11		1	<b>47</b>
	Male	2	36	37		161	106	3	2	<b>347</b>
	Unknown								32	<b>32</b>
	<b>Ethnicity Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>426</b>
<b>2015</b>	Female		3	3		26	11			<b>43</b>
	Male	3	39	34	2	187	113		8	<b>386</b>
	Unknown								44	<b>44</b>
	<b>Ethnicity Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>473</b>

(Upd. 10/12/2017)

**Note:** Table 2 is a count of accused employees. Because a complaint may have multiple accused employees, the total number of accused employees will often be greater than the total number of complaints.

Age at Date of Incident

Year	Age in Years				
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50/+	Unknown
<b>2017 (YTD)</b>	64	101	56	14	30
<b>2016</b>	77	149	117	34	49
<b>2015</b>	100	176	105	28	64

(Upd. 10/12/2017)

Length of Service at Date of Incident

Year	Years of Service					
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20/+	Unknown
<b>2017 (YTD)</b>	73	77	39	27	22	27
<b>2016</b>	87	128	59	51	53	48
<b>2015</b>	84	164	63	57	46	59

(Upd. 10/12/2017)

**Table 2 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 2)**

Age and Length of Service Comparisons

Age in Years	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2017 (YTD)	2016	2015
20-29	757	21.8%	27.2%	20.4%	24.4%
30-39	1501	43.1%	43.0%	39.5%	43.0%
40-49	954	27.4%	23.8%	31.0%	25.7%
50/+	268	7.7%	6.0%	9.0%	6.8%

(Upd. 10/12/2017)

Years of Service	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2017 (YTD)	2016	2015
0-4	799	23.0%	30.7%	23.0%	20.3%
5-9	1348	38.7%	32.4%	33.9%	39.6%
10-14	454	13.0%	16.4%	15.6%	15.2%
15-19	553	15.9%	11.3%	13.5%	13.8%
20/+	326	9.4%	9.2%	14.0%	11.1%

(Upd. 10/12/2017)

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

Comparison Group – 3480 Police Officers

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

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

**Table 3 – Accused Employee Assignments (Part 1)**

Assignment Type	Comparison Group <sup>1</sup>	2017 (YTD)			2016			2015		
		# of Employees	# of Accused	# of Complaints	Complaints per 100	# of Accused	# of Complaints	Complaints per 100	# of Accused	# of Complaints
Detective/Investigator - Area	726 (5.8%)	6 (2.3%)	4	0.6	11 (2.6%)	8	1.1	15 (3.2%)	10	1.4
Detective/Investigator - Specialized	864 (6.9%)	1 (0.4%)	1	0.1	5 (1.2%)	4	0.5	5 (1.1%)	4	0.5
Uniformed Detective <sup>2</sup>	159 (1.3%)				1 (0.2%)	1	0.6	11 (2.3%)	6	3.8
Gang Enforcement	422 (3.4%)	35 (13.2%)	20	4.7	36 (8.5%)	16	3.8	38 (8.0%)	21	5.0
Metropolitan Division <sup>3</sup>	388 (3.1%)	12 (4.5%)	7	1.8	40 (9.4%)	21	5.4	26 (5.5%)	16	4.1
Narcotics Enforcement	245 (2.0%)	3 (1.1%)	1	0.4	6 (1.4%)	3	1.2	1 (0.2%)	1	0.4
Patrol	2,730 (21.8%)	124 (46.8%)	69	2.5	201 (47.2%)	113	4.1	237 (50.1%)	136	5.0
Patrol - Specialized Enforcement <sup>4</sup>	348 (2.8%)	31 (11.7%)	20	5.7	41 (9.6%)	26	7.5	50 (10.6%)	31	8.9
Traffic Collision Investigation	199 (1.6%)	3 (1.1%)	3	1.5	6 (1.4%)	5	2.5	4 (0.8%)	4	2.0
Traffic Enforcement	236 (1.9%)	19 (7.2%)	15	6.4	25 (5.9%)	21	8.9	22 (4.7%)	22	9.3
Other Sworn <sup>5</sup>	2,975 (23.7%)	2 (0.8%)	2	0.1	2 (0.5%)	2	0.1	9 (1.9%)	5	0.2
Detention Officer	306 (2.4%)	2 (0.8%)	1	0.3	1 (0.2%)	1	0.3	2 (0.4%)	1	0.3
Police Service Representative	608 (4.8%)									
Other Civilian	1,795 (14.3%)	1 (0.4%)	1	0.1	2 (0.5%)	1	0.1	1 (0.2%)	1	0.1
Unassigned <sup>6</sup> /Unknown <sup>7</sup>	545 (4.3%)	26 (9.8%)	23	4.2	49 (11.5%)	42	7.7	52 (11.0%)	45	8.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,546</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>160 <sup>8</sup></b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>256 <sup>8</sup></b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>283 <sup>8</sup></b>	<b>2.3</b>

(Upd. 10/12/2017)

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

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

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

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

5 - **Other Sworn:** In 2017, this included officers assigned to Jail and Security Services Divisions. In 2016, this category included an officer in an administrative assignment, and in 2015, this included officers assigned to Jail Division.

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

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

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

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

(upd. 10/15/2017)	Comparison Group		2017 (YTD)		2016		2015	
<b>Detective/Investigator - Area</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3.2%</b>
Female	197	27.1%	1	16.7%	6	54.5%	3	20.0%
Male	529	72.9%	5	83.3%	5	45.5%	12	80.0%
<b>Detective/Investigator - Specialized</b>	<b>864</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
Female	233	27.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%
Male	631	73.0%	1	100.0%	4	80.0%	4	80.0%
<b>Uniformed Detective</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2.3%</b>
Female	40	25.2%			0	0.0%	3	27.3%
Male	119	74.8%			1	100.0%	8	72.7%
<b>Gang Enforcement</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>13.2%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>8.0%</b>
Female	37	8.8%	3	8.6%	3	8.3%	3	7.9%
Male	385	91.2%	32	91.4%	33	91.7%	35	92.1%
<b>Metropolitan Division</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>5.5%</b>
Female	19	4.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Male	369	95.1%	12	100.0%	40	100.0%	26	100.0%
<b>Narcotic Enforcement</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
Female	28	11.4%	1	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%
Male	217	88.6%	2	66.7%	4	66.7%	1	100.0%
<b>Patrol</b>	<b>2,730</b>	<b>21.8%</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>46.8%</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>47.2%</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>50.1%</b>
Female	353	12.9%	19	15.3%	23	11.4%	29	12.2%
Male	2,377	87.1%	105	84.7%	178	88.6%	208	87.8%
<b>Patrol - Specialized Enforcement</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>9.6%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>10.6%</b>
Female	55	15.8%	6	19.4%	5	12.2%	4	8.0%
Male	293	84.2%	25	80.6%	36	87.8%	46	92.0%
<b>Traffic Collision Investigation</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.8%</b>
Female	22	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Male	177	88.9%	3	100.0%	6	100.0%	4	100.0%
<b>Traffic Enforcement</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>4.7%</b>
Female	6	2.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Male	230	97.5%	19	100.0%	25	100.0%	22	100.0%
<b>Other Sworn</b>	<b>2,975</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.9%</b>
Female	746	25.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Male	2,229	74.9%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	9	100.0%
<b>Detention Officer</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
Female	103	33.7%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Male	203	66.3%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
<b>Police Service Representative</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
Female	501	82.4%						
Male	107	17.6%						
<b>Other Civilian</b>	<b>1,795</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
Female	1,027	57.2%	1	100.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
Male	768	42.8%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	100.0%
<b>Unassigned (comparison group)</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>4.3%</b>						
Female	122	22.4%						
Male	423	77.6%						
<b>Unknown (accused employee)</b>			<b>26</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>11.0%</b>
Female			0	0.0%	5	10.2%	0	0.0%
Male			8	30.8%	12	24.5%	9	17.3%
Unknown Gender			18	69.2%	32	65.3%	43	82.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,546</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Total with Known Gender</b>	<b>9,837</b>	<b>(sworn)</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Female	1,858	18.9%	31	12.6%	47	11.9%	43	10.0%
Male	7979	81.1%	216	87.4%	347	88.1%	387	90.0%

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

Year	Total Public Contacts/ Encounters <sup>1</sup>	Biased Policing Complaints Initiated (% of encounters)	Biased Policing Complaints Initiated by Type of Contact			
			Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
2017 (YTD)	1,270,890	160 (0.013%)	31 (19.4%)	41 (25.6%)	55 (34.4%)	33 (20.6%)
2016	1,636,277	256 (0.016%)	41 (16.0%)	65 (25.4%)	89 (34.8%)	61 (23.8%)
2015	1,712,718	283 (0.017%)	65 (23.0%)	54 (19.1%)	112 (39.6%)	52 (18.4%)

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

1 - **Total Contacts with Public** is the total of all pedestrian stops, vehicle stops, calls for service dispatched, and arrests made. Prior to the third quarterly report for 2017, data on public encounters came from the total of field interviews conducted, citations issued, calls for service dispatched, and arrests made. Because data on field interviews and citations is often delayed, and to be consistent with the categories tracked in this report, beginning in the third quarter of 2017, data on vehicle and pedestrian stops were used in place of field interviews and citations to calculate the total number of public encounters. The substitution did not have much impact as the percentage of Biased Policing complaints resulting from public contracts is essentially the same as in prior quarterly reports.

**Note:** Table 4, Part 1 captures the initial type of contact that led to the law enforcement encounter. As there is only one initial contact for each complaint, the number of initial of types of law enforcement contacts should equal total number of complaints.

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

2017 (YTD) Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
American Indian	F	2		1		
	M					1
Asian	F	2				
	M				2	
Black	F	99	1	7	6	5
	M		21	15	28	16
Filipino	F	0				
	M					
Hispanic	F	32	2	2	5	4
	M		4	5	10	
White	F	10	1	2		
	M			4	2	1
Other	F	7		2	1	
	M			1	1	2
Unknown	F	12		2	1	4
	M		3	1	1	
	UNK					

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

**Note:** Table 4, Part 2 captures the gender and ethnicity of the complainants in each law enforcement encounter that led to the complaint. Because there may be multiple complainants in a single complaint, the number of complainants may be greater than the total number of complaints.



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

<b>2016</b> Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		<b>Ethnicity Total</b>	<b>Pedestrian Stop</b>	<b>Radio Call</b>	<b>Traffic Stop</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>American Indian</b>	F	0				
	M					
<b>Asian</b>	F	4		1		
	M			1		2
<b>Black</b>	F	155	6	11	17	12
	M		21	22	48	18
<b>Filipino</b>	F	0				
	M					
<b>Hispanic</b>	F	53	1	10	3	10
	M		5	4	17	3
<b>White</b>	F	26	1	5	3	2
	M		4	5	3	3
<b>Other</b>	F	8		1		3
	M				3	1
<b>Unknown</b>	F	27	1	3	2	2
	M		3	3	5	6
	UNK		1			1

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

<b>2015</b> Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		<b>Ethnicity Total</b>	<b>Pedestrian Stop</b>	<b>Radio Call</b>	<b>Traffic Stop</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>American Indian</b>						
	M					
<b>Asian</b>	F	1				
	M			1		
<b>Black</b>	F	191	3	10	16	11
	M		40	18	68	25
<b>Filipino</b>	M	3			1	
	F		1			1
<b>Hispanic</b>	F	50	4	3	6	
	M		9	10	14	4
<b>White</b>	F	22		3	3	3
	M		2	4	2	5
<b>Other</b>	F	12	1	2		2
	M		2	3	1	1
<b>Unknown</b>	F	28	2	1		9
	M		5		5	6
	UNK					

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

**Table 5 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 1)**

Year	Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
<b>2017 (YTD)</b>	26 (13.5%)	82 (42.5%)	12 (6.2%)	2 (1.0%)	6 (3.1%)	8 (4.1%)	9 (4.7%)	11 (5.7%)	37 (19.2%)
<b>2016</b>	35 (11.1%)	122 (38.6%)	15 (4.7%)	10 (3.2%)	15 (4.7%)	14 (4.4%)	16 (5.1%)	30 (9.5%)	59 (18.7%)
<b>2015</b>	48 (13.4%)	164 (45.7%)	12 (3.3%)	3 (0.8%)	11 (3.1%)	4 (1.1%)	12 (3.3%)	33 (9.2%)	72 (20.1%)

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

**Note:** Table 5, Part 1 counts the behavior alleged to be discriminatory. Because multiple discriminatory conduct may be alleged in the same complaint (e.g. in a single complaint, a complainant may allege that both the initial stop and the subsequent arrest were motivated by racial bias), the total number of discriminatory conduct alleged may be greater than the total number of complaints and complainants.

**Table 5 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 2)**

<b>2017 (YTD) Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender</b>		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
<b>American Indian</b>	F		1							
	M									1
<b>Asian</b>	F									
	M	1	2							
<b>Black</b>	F	2	6		1	1			3	6
	M	15	44	10	1	3	5	6	1	20
<b>Filipino</b>	F									
	M									
<b>Hispanic</b>	F		5	1		1	3	2	1	2
	M	4	15	1		1		1	1	1
<b>White</b>	F									3
	M	3	3						1	
<b>Other</b>	F		1	1						2
	M		1	1				1		2
<b>Unknown</b>	F	1	2		1				3	1
	M		4						1	
	UNK									

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

**Note:** Table 5, Part 2 captures the gender and ethnicity of the complainants in each law enforcement encounter, and captures the discriminatory conduct alleged by each of the complainants within the same complaint. Because there may be multiple complainants in each complaint, and because each complainant may allege more than one discriminatory conduct, the total number of discriminatory conduct alleged may be greater than the total number of complaints and complainants.

**Table 5 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 2)**

2016 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
American Indian	F									
	M									
Asian	F	1								
	M						1		2	1
Black	F	5	21	3	3	2	1	1	5	13
	M	19	64	7	6	5	3	10	3	21
Filipino	F									
	M									
Hispanic	F	5	4		1	3	3		6	5
	M	3	21	3		1	1	1	2	4
White	F	1	1	1		1	1	1	5	3
	M	2	6	1	1	1			4	5
Other	F					1	2		2	
	M	1	3			1	1			1
Unknown	F		3			1			2	2
	M	2	10	1	1		1	3		3
	UNK	1								1

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
American Indian	F									
	M									
Asian	F									
	M									1
Black	F	8	25	1	1	2		4	5	10
	M	30	97	7	1	6	1	10	9	33
Filipino	F		1							
	M		1							1
Hispanic	F	2	7	2		1			3	5
	M	5	22	1	1	1	1	1	5	9
White	F		4						2	3
	M	3	4				1		1	5
Other	F	2	1				1		1	2
	M	3	1						3	
Unknown	F		3	1					2	7
	M	1	9	1		2			2	5
	UNK									

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

**Table 6 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 1)**

Year	Age	Gender	Gender Identity/ Expression	Physical Disability <sup>1</sup>	Mental Disability <sup>1</sup>	Race/ Ethnicity <sup>2</sup>	Religion <sup>2</sup>	Sexual Orientation (LGBQ) <sup>3</sup>	National Origin	Other	Not Specified
2017 (YTD)	1 (0.6%)	3 (1.8%)	1 (0.6%)	3 (1.8%)	1 (0.6%)	146 (89.6%)	1 (0.6%)	2 (1.2%)	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.6%)	3 (1.8%)
2016	5 (1.9%)	12 (4.5%)	4 (1.5%)	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.4%)	230 (86.8%)	4 (1.5%)	5 (1.9%)	2 (0.8%)		
2015	n/a	3 (1.0%)	n/a	8 (2.8%)		260 (90.3%)		5 (1.7%)		3 (1.0%)	9 (3.1%)

(upd. 10/16/2017)

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

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

3 – **Sexual Orientation** includes Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Questioning. It previously included transgender status, but alleged bias on the basis of transgender status is now counted under Gender Identity/Expression.

**Note:** Table 6, Part 1 counts the type of bias alleged in each complaint. Because complainants may allege multiple biases within in the same complaint (e.g. a complainant may allege that that she was discriminated against based on race and gender), the total number of biases alleged may be greater than the total number of complaints and complainants.

**Table 6 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 2)**

2017 (YTD) Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender	Age	Gender	Gender Identity/ Expression	Physical Disability	Mental Disability	Race/ Ethnicity	Religion	Sexual Orientation (LGBQ)	National Origin	Other	Not Specified
American Indian	F					1					
	M					1					
Asian	F										
	M					2					
Black	F			1	1	15		1			1
	M	1		1		77				1	1
Filipino	F										
	M										
Hispanic	F		2	1		11					
	M					19		1			
White	F					3					
	M					6	1				
Other	F					3					
	M					4					
Unknown	F		1			5			1		
	M				1	3					1
	UNK										

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

**Note:** Table 6, Part 2 captures the gender and ethnicity of the complainants in each law enforcement encounter, and captures the discriminatory bias alleged by the complainants within the same complaint. Because there may be multiple complainants for each complaint, and because each complainant may allege multiple discriminatory biases, the total number of biases alleged may be greater than the total number of complaints and complainants.

**Table 6 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 2)**

2016 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Age	Gender	Gender Identity/ Expression	Physical Disability	Mental Disability	Race/ Ethnicity	Religion	Sexual Orientation (LGBQ)	National Origin	Other	Not Specified
American Indian	F											
	M											
Asian	F						1					
	M	1					3					
Black	F		1				46					
	M	2	1				106	1	1			
Filipino	F											
	M											
Hispanic	F		1	2	1		19		2	1		
	M						28		1	1		
White	F	2	2		1		6					
	M		2	3			8	2	1			
Other	F		1				4					
	M						3	1				
Unknown	F		4				4					
	M					1	16					
	UNK						2					

(Upd.10/16/2017)

2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
American Indian	F							
	M							
Asian	F							
	M		1					
Black	F	1	38	3				
	M		148		1			2
Filipino	F		1					
	M		2					
Hispanic	F	1	10		2			
	M	1	34				2	2
White	F		8				1	1
	M	3	9		1			
Other	F		4		1			
	M		6	1				
Unknown	F	1	11					
	M	1	11					4
	Unk							

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

**Table 7 - Complainant Ethnicity by Bureau**

(upd 10/16/2017)	Population		2017 (YTD)		2016		2015	
<b>CENTRAL BUREAU</b>	<b>780,269</b>	<b>20.5%</b>	<b>Complainants: 36</b>		<b>Complainants: 61</b>		<b>Complainants: 73</b>	
American Indian	2,135	0.3%						
Asian	104,891	13.4%						
Black	41,431	5.3%	20	55.6%	36	59.0%	47	64.4%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	710	0.1%						
Hispanic	525,180	67.3%	11	30.6%	17	27.9%	16	21.9%
Multiple Race	2,907	0.4%						
Other	2,169	0.3%	1	2.8%	1	1.6%	1	1.4%
White	100,846	12.9%	3	8.3%	6	9.8%	7	9.6%
Unknown			1	2.8%	1	1.6%	2	2.7%
<b>SOUTH BUREAU</b>	<b>689,238</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>Complainants: 45</b>		<b>Complainants: 65</b>		<b>Complainants: 94</b>	
American Indian	1,769	0.3%	1	2.2%				
Asian	29,303	4.3%						
Black	192,009	27.9%	33	73.3%	47	72.3%	72	76.6%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	1,678	0.2%						
Hispanic	395,688	57.4%	8	17.8%	10	15.4%	9	9.6%
Multiple Race	8,011	1.2%						
Other	2,985	0.4%	2	4.4%				
White	57,795	8.4%			2	3.1%		
Unknown			1	2.2%	6	9.2%	13	13.8%
<b>VALLEY BUREAU</b>	<b>1,427,148</b>	<b>37.6%</b>	<b>Complainants: 31</b>		<b>Complainants: 63</b>		<b>Complainants: 70</b>	
American Indian	4,778	0.3%						
Asian	157,831	11.1%	2	6.5%	1	1.6%	1	1.4%
Black	60,238	4.2%	15	48.4%	27	42.9%	28	40.0%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	2,488	0.2%					1	1.4%
Hispanic	660,981	46.3%	5	16.1%	16	25.4%	19	27.1%
Multiple Race	6,780	0.5%						
Other	5,203	0.4%	3	9.7%	5	7.9%	7	10.0%
White	528,849	37.1%	3	9.7%	10	15.9%	11	15.7%
Unknown			3	9.7%	4	6.3%	3	4.3%
<b>WEST BUREAU</b>	<b>900,515</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>Complainants: 45</b>		<b>Complainants: 77</b>		<b>Complainants: 65</b>	
American Indian	2,813	0.3%						
Asian	162,413	18.0%			3	3.9%		
Black	64,534	7.2%	29	64.4%	42	54.5%	42	64.6%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	1,632	0.2%					1	1.5%
Hispanic	258,047	28.7%	7	15.6%	10	13.0%	5	7.7%
Multiple Race	5,923	0.7%						
Other	4,175	0.5%	1	2.2%	2	2.6%	4	6.2%
White	400,978	44.5%	4	8.9%	7	9.1%	4	6.2%
Unknown			4	8.9%	13	16.9%	9	13.8%
<b>ALL BUREAUS</b>	<b>3,797,170</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>Complainants: 157</b>		<b>Complainants: 266</b>		<b>Complainants: 302</b>	
American Indian	11,495	0.3%	1	0.6%				
Asian	454,438	12.0%	2	1.3%	4	1.5%	1	0.3%
Black	358,212	9.4%	97	61.8%	152	57.1%	189	62.6%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	6,508	0.2%					2	0.7%
Hispanic	1,839,896	48.5%	31	19.7%	53	19.9%	49	16.2%
Multiple Race	23,621	0.6%						
Other	14,532	0.4%	7	4.5%	8	3.0%	12	4.0%
White	1,088,468	28.7%	10	6.4%	25	9.4%	22	7.3%
Unknown			9	5.7%	24	9.0%	27	8.9%
<b>UNKNOWN LOCATION</b>			<b>Complainants: 7</b>		<b>Complainants: 7</b>		<b>Complainants: 5</b>	
American Indian			1	14.3%				
Black			2	28.6%	3	42.9%	2	40.0%
Filipino							1	20.0%
Hispanic			1	14.3%			1	20.0%
White					1	14.3%		
Unknown			3	42.9%	3	42.9%	1	20.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>Complainants: 164</b>		<b>Complainants: 273</b>		<b>Complainants: 307</b>	

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

Year	Accused Ethnicity	Complainant Ethnicity							
		American Indian	Asian	Black	Filipino	Hispanic	White	Other	Unknown
<b>2017 (YTD)</b>	<b>American Indian</b>								
	<b>Asian</b>	1		12		5			1
	<b>Black</b>			6		4	2	3	1
	<b>Filipino</b>								
	<b>Hispanic</b>	1	2	84		22	9	5	3
	<b>White</b>		2	47		14	3	2	3
	<b>Other</b>			2				1	
	<b>Unknown</b>			11		1	2		3
<b>2016</b>	<b>American Indian</b>			1		1			
	<b>Asian</b>			24		10	2	2	3
	<b>Black</b>		1	16		8	8	2	2
	<b>Filipino</b>								
	<b>Hispanic</b>		2	129		30	7	2	8
	<b>White</b>		2	70		25	4	7	8
	<b>Other</b>					1			
	<b>Unknown</b>			14		3	1		13
<b>2015</b>	<b>American Indian</b>			3					
	<b>Asian</b>			40		3	2	1	2
	<b>Black</b>			23		8	4	1	1
	<b>Filipino</b>					2			
	<b>Hispanic</b>			159		28	14	7	14
	<b>White</b>		2	98	2	18	7	3	3
	<b>Other</b>								
	<b>Unknown</b>			34	1	6	1	1	9

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

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

Year Closed	2017 (YTD)				3-Year Average (2014-2016)
		2016	2015	2014	
<b>BIASED POLICING COMPLAINTS CLOSED</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>272.3</b>
<b>BIASED POLICING ALLEGATIONS</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>467</b>
<b>DISPOSITION OF ALLEGATIONS:</b>					
<b>Demonstrably False <sup>1</sup></b>	6 (1.6%)				
<b>Exonerated</b>					
<b>Guilty</b>					
<b>Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate</b>	20 (5.3%)	48 (10.1%)	34 (7.8%)	25 (5.1%)	35.7 (7.6%)
<b>Mediated <sup>2</sup></b>	22 (5.8%)	32 (6.8%)	51 (11.8%)	27 (5.5%)	36.7 (7.9%)
<b>No Department Employee</b>					
<b>No Misconduct</b>	2 (0.5%)				
<b>Not Guilty</b>					
<b>Not Resolved</b>	1 (0.3%)	8 (1.7%)	8 (1.8%)	14 (2.8%)	10.0 (2.1%)
<b>Out of Statute</b>			2 (0.5%)		0.7 (0.1%)
<b>Sustained</b>					
<b>Sustained - No Penalty</b>					
<b>Unfounded</b>	328 (86.5%)	384 (81.0%)	339 (78.1%)	427 (86.6%)	383.3 (82.1%)
<b>Withdrawn by COP</b>		2 (0.4%)			0.7 (0.2%)

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

**1-Demonstrably False:** Previously, discrimination allegations could not be closed as Demonstrably False. Beginning June, 2016, Demonstrably False could be used, but only if video captured the entire incident and conclusively showed the alleged misconduct did not occur, or the complainant demonstrates an irrational thought process or has an established pattern of chronic or crank complaints.

**2-Mediated:** The number of allegations shown as Mediated includes only closed Biased Policing complaints. Complaints with Discourtesy allegations can also be Mediated but will not be reported here. Also, while Biased Policing complaints may close out of the mediation program as Mediated, because they also go through an administrative close-out process, they may not appear in Table 9 until a later quarter. As a result, the number of mediated complaints in Table 9 may differ from the number reported for the mediation program.

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

Year Closed	2017 (YTD)				3-Year Average (2014-2016)
		2016	2015	2014	
<b>Complaints with Sustained Allegation</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9.7</b>
<b>Discipline Imposed:</b>					
<b>Admonishment</b>		1 (14.3%)	4 (25.0%)	1 (16.7%)	2.0 (20.7%)
<b>Official Reprimand</b>	1 (20.0%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (12.5%)		1.0 (10.3%)
<b>Demotion</b>					
<b>Sustained- Training/Counseling</b>	1 (20.0%)				
<b>Suspension: 22 days or less</b>	1 (20.0%)	4 (57.1%)	6 (37.5%)	1 (16.7%)	3.7 (37.9%)
<b>Suspension: More than 22 days</b>			1 (6.3%)	1 (16.7%)	0.7 (6.9%)
<b>Termination</b>	2 (40.0%)			1 (16.7%)	0.3 (3.4%)
<b>Resigned/Retired in Lieu of Termination</b>		1 (14.3%)	3 (18.8%)	2 (33.3%)	2.0 (20.7%)

(Upd. 10/16/2017)

**Note:** Data in Tables 1 - 8 come from Biased Policing complaints initiated during the time period reviewed, while data in Tables 9 and 10 consist of Biased Policing complaints that were most likely initiated in prior years but closed within the time period reviewed. The total number of complaints identified in Tables 1 - 8 will differ from the total number of complaints in Tables 9 and 10.



**Table 10 - Video in the Adjudication of Biased Policing Complaints**

Video in Biased Policing (BP) Complaints	2017 (YTD)						2016	
	Complaints		Complaints by type of recording					
BP complaints closed	206	%	DICV	BWV	DICV+BWV	Other	198	%
No video/audio recording available	99	48.1%					127	64.1%
Video/audio recording was available	107	51.9%	62	14	6	25	71	35.9%
<b>Closed BP complaints that had video</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>%</b>
Not adjudicated (closed as Mediated)	1	0.9%	0	0	0	1	9	12.7%
Went through adjudication process	106	99.1%	62	14	6	24	62	87.3%
<b>Adjudicated BP complaints that had video</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>%</b>
Video did not assist in adjudication/Not stated	22	20.8%	15	3	0	4 <sup>1</sup>	13	21.0%
Video helped in adjudication of some allegations	81	76.4%	46	11	6	18 <sup>2</sup>	44	71.0%
Video proved/disproved entire complaint	3	2.8%	1	0	0	2 <sup>3</sup>	5	8.1%

(Upd. 10/24/2017)

1 – For complaints in which “Other” recording types did not assist in adjudication, the recordings came from a cell phone, an officer’s personal body camera, and security cameras.

2 – For complaints in which “Other” recording types assisted in adjudication, the recordings came from an officer’s handheld video camera, security cameras, personal body cameras, laser speed devices, 9-1-1 recordings, and from video found on social media.

3 – For complaints in which “Other” video disproved the entire complaint, the recordings came from a laser speed device, security cameras, and video found on social media.

**Note:** Data in Tables 1 - 8 come from Biased Policing complaints initiated during the time period reviewed, while data in Tables 9 and 10 consist of Biased Policing complaints that were most likely initiated in prior years but closed within the time period reviewed. The total number of complaints identified in Tables 1 - 8 will differ from the total number of complaints in Tables 9 and 10.

**Table 11 - Mediation Program Survey Responses (Part 1)**

2017 YTD - Participant Mediation Survey Responses		Complainants (14)		Employees (22)		Total (36)	
Category	Rating	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Satisfaction with Complaint Mediation Process	Very Satisfied	7	50.0%	16	72.7%	23	63.9%
	Somewhat Satisfied	4	28.6%	6	27.3%	10	27.8%
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	2	14.3%			2	5.6%
	Not Satisfied at All	1	7.1%			1	2.8%
	Did Not Answer						
Fairness of Outcome of Complaint Mediation Process	Completely Fair	10	71.4%	18	81.8%	28	77.8%
	Somewhat Fair	4	28.6%	3	13.6%	7	19.4%
	Not Very Fair			1	4.5%	1	2.8%
	Not Fair at All						
	Did Not Answer						
Increased Understanding of Police Work / Community Member	Increased a Great Deal	5	35.7%	8	36.4%	13	36.1%
	Increased Somewhat	2	14.3%	6	27.3%	8	22.2%
	Increased a Little	2	14.3%	2	9.1%	4	11.1%
	Did Not Increase	5	35.7%	6	27.3%	11	30.6%
	Did Not Answer						
Likelihood of Recommending Complaint Mediation Process	Very Likely	7	50.0%	15	68.2%	22	61.1%
	Somewhat Likely	3	21.4%	6	27.3%	9	25.0%
	Not Very Likely	3	21.4%	1	4.5%	4	11.1%
	Not Likely at All	1	7.1%			1	2.8%
	Did Not Answer						

(Upd. 10/17/2017)

**Table 11 - Mediation Program Survey Responses (Part 2)**

Survey Categories and Ratings		2017 (YTD)			2016			2015			2014		
Category	Rating	Total	Complainants	Employees	Total	Complainants	Employees	Total	Complainants	Employees	Total	Complainants	Employees
Satisfaction with Complaint Mediation Process	Very Satisfied	91.7%	78.6%	100.0%	83.3%	83.3%	83.3%	81.7%	70.0%	90.2%	88.6%	77.8%	96.2%
	Somewhat Satisfied												
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	8.3%	21.4%	0.0%	13.9%	10.0%	16.7%	18.3%	30.0%	9.8%	11.4%	22.2%	3.8%
	Not Satisfied at All												
	Did Not Answer	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fairness of Outcome of Complaint Mediation Process	Completely Fair	97.2%	100.0%	95.5%	90.3%	80.0%	97.6%	91.5%	86.7%	95.1%	93.2%	83.3%	100.0%
	Somewhat Fair												
	Not Very Fair	2.8%	0.0%	4.5%	5.6%	10.0%	2.4%	7.0%	10.0%	4.9%	6.8%	16.7%	0.0%
	Not Fair at All												
	Did Not Answer	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	10.0%	0.0%	3.3%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Increased Understanding of Police Work / Community Member	Increased a Great Deal	69.4%	64.3%	72.7%	63.9%	73.3%	57.1%	64.8%	63.3%	65.9%	79.5%	77.8%	80.8%
	Increased Somewhat												
	Increased a Little												
	Did Not Increase	30.6%	35.7%	27.3%	31.9%	20.0%	32.4%	32.4%	33.3%	31.7%	18.2%	16.7%	19.2%
	Did Not Answer	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	6.7%	2.4%	2.8%	3.3%	2.4%	2.3%	5.6%	0.0%
Likelihood of Recommending Complaint Mediation Process	Very Likely	86.1%	71.4%	95.5%	84.7%	80.0%	88.1%	84.5%	86.7%	82.9%	93.2%	83.3%	100.0%
	Somewhat Likely												
	Not Very Likely	13.9%	28.6%	4.5%	12.5%	13.3%	11.9%	11.3%	6.7%	14.6%	6.8%	16.7%	0.0%
	Not Likely at All												
	Did Not Answer	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	6.7%	0.0%	4.2%	6.7%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%