The Los Angeles Police Department’s guiding principle when using force shall be reverence for human life. Officers shall attempt to control an incident by using time, distance, communication, and available resources in an effort to de-escalate the situation, whenever it is safe, feasible and reasonable to do so. When warranted, Department personnel may use objectively reasonable force to carry out their duties.
It is the mission of the Los Angeles Police Department to safeguard the lives and property of the people we serve, to reduce the incidence and fear of crime, and to enhance public safety while working with the diverse communities to improve their quality of life. Our mandate is to do so with honor and integrity, while at all times conducting ourselves with the highest ethical standards to maintain public confidence.
REPORTING A NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE IN CROWD CONTROL SITUATIONS

In a crowd control situation, a Use of Force Report is not required when an officer becomes involved in an incident where force is used to push or move individuals who exhibit unlawful or hostile behavior and who do not respond to verbal directions by the police. This applies only to officers working in organized squad and platoon sized units directly involved in a crowd control mission. Additionally, should force be utilized under these circumstances, officers shall notify their immediate supervisor of the use of force once the tactical situation has been resolved. The supervisor shall report the actions on an Incident Command System (ICS) Form 214.

A Use of Force Report is required when an officer(s) becomes involved in an isolated incident with an individual during a crowd control situation, which goes beyond the mission of the skirmish line.

This Report does not capture Use of Force incidents related to crowd control operations that have been reported on an ICS Form 214.

PHOTOGRAPH DEPICTION DISCLAIMER

Photographs in this Report were created prior to the COVID-19 pandemic and do not depict personal safety procedures, including social distancing and the wearing of a facial covering.
Nearly three years ago, I made a promise to you to serve all members of the public with purpose, compassion, and partnership. This has never been more important given the unprecedented challenges for law enforcement professionals due to the tumultuous events of 2020.

My commitment to serve all of you with integrity and honesty is still present, and the lessons learned over the past year have served to strengthen the Los Angeles Police Department’s resolve “to protect and to serve” our communities and all Angelenos. The national movement to re-shape and reshape police agencies to increase transparency, lessen lethal encounters, and focus on relationship-building was heard loud and clear in Los Angeles. As a leader in law enforcement, the Los Angeles Police Department demonstrated a continued commitment to working with the Honorable Board of Police Commissioners, City officials, and community leaders to institute constitutional policies and procedures which promote trust, respect, and neutrality in all encounters with the public.

During 2020, the Los Angeles Police Department completed a comprehensive revision of its use of force policy. The changes highlight my resolution to be transparent and accountable to the public we serve and reinforce our belief that we are not only the guardians but also the servants of the public. The policy now incorporates the requirement by every officer to report potential excessive force to a supervisor, and the requirement to intercede when an officer observes another officer using force that is clearly beyond that which is necessary. Carotid restraint control holds, referred to as “choke holds” are now banned. Additionally, the policy has incorporated the requirement to give verbal warnings prior to using force when feasible and the mandate that peace officers use deadly force only when necessary in defense of human life. There is now the requirement for officers to promptly provide basic and emergency medical assistance to all members of the community to the extent of the officer’s training and experience in first aid and to the level of equipment available. Every member of this Department will be held to the high standards of this policy, and I am confident that the men and women of this Department will rise to this mandate.

The Department continued to train on de-escalation techniques, crowd management and control, and mental health intervention during 2020. Over 7,000 personnel have now attended the Command and Control course which provides officers and supervisors with de-escalation techniques, and over 3,727 personnel were provided training to engage with persons suffering from a mental illness through the 40-hour Mental Health Intervention Training (MHIT). As we move forward with implementing these use of force changes, I am reminded that oftentimes our least tenured employees are entrusted to make the most critical use of force decisions—I am committed to ensuring all our employees have the adequate equipment, knowledge, and confidence through on-going training and a constant reminder of our guiding principle of reverence for human life.

Partnerships and building trust are at the heart of my efforts to increase police legitimacy in all the neighborhoods we serve. Partnerships and building trust are at the heart of my efforts to increase police legitimacy in all the neighborhoods we serve. The Department’s commitment to de-escalation training, “fire discipline,” and techniques to minimize the need to use higher levels of force resulted in notable reductions in officer-involved shootings (OIS). Over the past five years, the Los Angeles Police Department had a 44% reduction in overall OIS incidents and a 66% reduction in fatal OIS incidents. The Department’s holistic approach to lessen fatal encounters resulted in seven fatal OIS incidents in 2020 compared to 37 fatal OIS incidents in 1990, the lowest in the past 30 years. This is truly a testament to the collective efforts of every member of this Department to embody the Department’s Core Values of Respect for People and Quality through Continuous Improvement.

Partnerships and building trust are at the heart of my efforts to increase police legitimacy in all the neighborhoods we serve. Trust and legitimacy are greatly diminished when an officer uses unreasonable force. To this end, building trust is a goal in every encounter between the police and the public, but this is exponentially true when an officer prevents a use of force with the proper use of de-escalation techniques. The men and women of this Department are the best trained and most professional police officers in the nation, and I look forward to another year of transparency and relationship-building with the diverse communities that we serve.
Commissioner Decker was appointed to the BOPC in 2018. Commissioner Decker was elected to serve as the Vice President by her fellow Commissioners in October 2018, and then as President in August 2019. Commissioner Decker lectures at USC, UCLA, and Pepperdine law schools. Commissioner Decker is a Fulbright Specialist with the Department of State, Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs, a program that allows her to travel overseas to lecture. Commissioner Decker previously served as the United States Attorney for the Central District of California, the Los Angeles Deputy Mayor of Homeland Security & Public Safety for nearly six years, and as an Assistant United States Attorney for nearly 15 years. Commissioner Decker received her law degree from New York University School of Law and her Master’s Degree in Homeland Security Studies from the Naval Postgraduate School. Commissioner Decker was a Wasserstein Fellow at Harvard Law School.

Commissioner Goldsmith was appointed to the BOPC in 2016. Commissioner Goldsmith is the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Liberty Hill Foundation, an institution dedicated to providing funding and leadership training for community-based organizations within Los Angeles County. She was also Executive Director of PATH Ventures, a non-profit agency that builds and provides housing for people who are homeless and mentally ill. Commissioner Goldsmith received her Master’s Degree in Public Administration from California State University, Long Beach, and is a graduate of Kenyon College.

Commissioner Soboroff was appointed to the BOPC in 2013 and served as President until 2015. He served a second term as President of the Board of Police Commissioners from 2017 to 2019. Commissioner Soboroff is a prominent business leader and public servant throughout the Los Angeles area. Commissioner Soboroff is a senior fellow at the University of California Los Angeles School of Public Policy, a member of the Board of Councilors at the University of Southern California’s Price School of Public Policy, and is the Chairman Emeritus of Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Los Angeles.

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

Commissioner Calanche was appointed to the BOPC in 2020. Commissioner Calanche is the Founder and Executive Director of Legacy LA, a youth development organization providing at-risk youth living in the Ramona Gardens community of Boyle Heights. Prior to Legacy LA, she was a Political Science professor at East Los Angeles Community College. She served as a Council Deputy for City of Los Angeles Councilmember Richard Alatorre, the Director of Community Outreach for the University of Southern California Health Sciences Campus and has also served on several community nonprofit boards and City of Los Angeles Commissions including El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Park and the City’s Housing Authority. Commissioner Calanche has an undergraduate degree from Loyola Marymount University, Master of Public Administration Degree from University of Southern California where she is also a Doctoral Candidate focusing her research on land-use policy and citizen participation.
Governed by the Los Angeles City Charter, the Board of Police Commissioners functions as the civilian head of the Los Angeles Police Department. The Commissioners are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council.

The Board of Police Commissioners, originally created in the 1920s, is comprised of five civilians who donate their time to the City. The Commissioners serve a maximum of two five-year terms, as well as up to two years of an unexpired term. The Commissioners routinely spend 25-50 hours per week on Commission business and serve as the citizens’ voice in police affairs in order to ensure a more responsive and effective City government.

The Commission is responsible for establishing Department policy, implementing necessary reform measures, improving the Department’s service to the community, and enhancing community policing programs. The Commission also reviews and adjudicates Categorical Uses of Force by Department employees, including officer-involved shootings, in-custody deaths, and uses of force resulting in a person’s admission to a hospital due to injury. In adjudicating each of these critical incidents, the Commission considers whether the actions of the involved officers adhered to all relevant Department policies and training. Should the Commission find any of the actions of the involved officers out of policy, the authority for the administration of discipline under the City Charter vests with the Chief of Police. Additionally, the Commission regularly directs the Office of the Inspector General to investigate the conduct and performance of the Department. These investigations, which include recommendations for improvement when warranted, cover a wide variety of areas such as adherence to national best practices, reviews of the Department’s specialized units, assessments of jail and holding tank procedures, etc.
We are dedicated to enhancing public safety and reducing the fear and the incidence of crime. People in our communities are our most important customers. Our motto, “to protect and to serve,” is not just a slogan. It is our way of life. We will work in partnership with the people in our communities and do our best, within the law, to solve community problems that affect public safety. We value the great diversity of people in both our residential and business communities and serve all with equal dedication.

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

Integrity is our standard. We are proud of our profession and will conduct ourselves in a manner that merits the respect of all people. We will demonstrate honest, ethical behavior in all our interactions. Our actions will match our words. We must have the courage to stand up for our beliefs and do what is right. Throughout the ranks, the Los Angeles Police Department has a long history of integrity and freedom from corruption. Upholding this proud tradition is a challenge we must all continue to meet.

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

**DEMOGRAPHIC COMPARISON**

**Los Angeles Police Department**
- 9,850 sworn officers
- 2,949 civilian employees
- 500 sq mi (patrol area)
- 3.9 million (population)

**Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department**
- 9,972 sworn officers
- 7,954 civilian employees
- 4,084 sq mi (patrol area)
- 10 million (population)

**Houston Police Department**
- 5,400 sworn officers
- 892 civilian employees
- 671 sq mi (patrol area)
- 2.3 million (population)

**Chicago Police Department**
- 12,138 sworn officers
- 948 civilian employees
- 237 sq mi (patrol area)
- 2.7 million (population)

**Philadelphia Police Department**
- 6,300 sworn officers
- 800 civilian employees
- 140 sq mi (patrol area)
- 1.8 million (population)

**New York Police Department**
- 34,583 sworn officers
- 18,366 civilian employees
- 302 sq mi (patrol area)
- 8.3 million (population)
In 2020, the Department had a total of seven OIS suspects as a result of an OIS incident, which was a 42 percent reduction, or five less fatalities than the previous year. This represented the lowest number of deceased OIS suspects in the past five years for the Department and when compared in the comparison group. In 2020, NYPD had a total of nine suspect fatalities, which was an 18 percent reduction, or two less fatalities than in 2019. NYPD, along with HPD, had nine suspect fatalities which accounted for the second highest suspect fatality in the comparison group. In 2020, CPD had a total of seven suspect fatalities, which was a 40 percent increase, or an increase of two suspect fatalities compared to 2019. CPD had the third highest number of suspect fatalities for the year 2020 with seven fatalities in the comparison group. The HPD had the second highest number of OIS incidents, which was an increase of 29 percent, or increase of two suspect fatalities compared to 2019. HPD accounted for the second highest fatality in the comparison group. LASD had a total of 13 fatalities, which was an increase of 30 percent, or increase of three suspect fatalities compared to 2019. LASD had the most fatality in the comparison group. The PPD had a total of one fatality, which was an increase of one suspect fatality compared to 2019, or a 100 percent increase. PPD had the least amount of fatality among the comparison group.

When comparing OIS suspect fatalities, the Department and NYPD both experienced a four percent increase in OIS incidents when compared to 2019. When comparing OIS suspect fatalities, the Department and NYPD both experienced a four percent increase in OIS incidents when compared to 2019. When comparing the agencies that saw an increase in the number of OIS incidents, CPD saw the largest increase of OIS incidents with an increase of 112 percent. HPD saw the second largest increase with a 30 percent increase of OIS incidents. LASD saw the third largest increase with a 27 percent increase in OIS incidents. The Department and NYPD both experienced a four percent increase in OIS incidents when compared to 2019.

In 2020, PPD had an 11 percent decrease in the number of OIS incidents from 2019 to 2020. PPD was the sole agency that had a decrease in OIS incidents amongst the comparison group. The Department, LASD, NYPD CPD, and HPD all saw an increase in the number of OIS incidents for the year 2020 when compared to 2019. When comparing the agencies that saw an increase in the number of OIS incidents, CPD saw the largest increase of OIS incidents with an increase of 112 percent. HPD saw the second largest increase with a 30 percent increase of OIS incidents. LASD saw the third largest increase with a 27 percent increase in OIS incidents. The Department and NYPD both experienced a four percent increase in OIS incidents when compared to 2019.
The analysis and application of data-driven strategies within the Department, specifically as it relates to the monitoring of crime levels and significant law enforcement-related occurrences (including UOF incidents), enhances accountability and transparency, and allows for a more effective utilization of resources.
In 2020, there were a total of 28,081 violent crimes that occurred throughout the City, which accounted for a decrease of 1,882 violent crime occurrences, or six percent, compared to 2019. When compared to the 2016 through 2019 annual average of 29,863 violent crime occurrences, 2020 had 1,772 less violent crimes, or six percent below the four-year annual average.

In review of the four violent crime categories, rape experienced a 43 percent decrease while robbery experienced a 19 percent decrease in 2020 when compared to the prior year. Homicides increased by 92 incidents, or 36 percent when compared to the prior year. Aggravated assaults increased by 876 incidents, or five percent in 2020 when compared to the prior year. Additionally, two of the four violent crime categories (Rape and Robbery) fell below their respective 2016 through 2019 annual averages.

<p>| CITY OF LOS ANGELES VIOLENT CRIME STATISTICS |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>2,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>10,307</td>
<td>10,814</td>
<td>10,327</td>
<td>9,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agg Assault</td>
<td>15,874</td>
<td>16,957</td>
<td>17,013</td>
<td>17,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,817</td>
<td>30,507</td>
<td>30,126</td>
<td>29,963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER CITY COMPARISON

According to 2019 Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program violent crime data, as published by the FBI, Houston experienced the highest violent crime rate amongst the five most populous cities in the country, with 10.7 violent crime occurrences per 1,000 individuals. Chicago experienced the second highest violent crime rate of 9.4 violent crime occurrences per 1,000 individuals. Los Angeles experienced the third highest violent crime rate of 7.3 violent crime occurrences per 1,000 individuals. Phoenix experienced the fourth highest violent crime rate of 6.9 violent crime occurrences per 1,000 individuals. New York City experienced the fifth highest violent crime rate of 5.7 violent crime occurrences per 1,000 individuals.
Los Angeles Suspect Violent Crime by Reported Race

Black suspects accounted for 12,318 of the four cumulative violent crime categories, which represented 42 percent of the 29,505 total violent crime suspects in 2020. Hispanic suspects accounted for the second highest group with 11,538 suspects, or 39 percent, of the total. Unknown ethnic classifications had the third highest count with 2,696 suspects, or nine percent of the total. Whites accounted for 2,197 suspects, or seven percent. Other ethnic classifications (includes Asian/Pacific Islander) accounted for 756 suspects, or three percent, of the total.

Los Angeles Victim Violent Crime by Reported Race

Hispanic victims accounted for 13,431 of the four cumulative violent crime categories, which represented 46 percent of the 29,108 total violent crime victims in 2020. Black victims accounted for the second highest group with 7,396 victims, or 25 percent, of the total. White victims had the third highest count with 4,199 victims, or 14 percent, of the total. Victim of Other ethnic victims (includes Asian/Pacific Islander) accounted for 2,173 victims, or seven percent, of the total. Victims of Unknown ethnic victims accounted for 1,909 victims, or seven percent, of the total.
CITY STATISTICS

POPULATION AND AREA
As of year-end 2020, the Los Angeles City Planning estimated the City population to be approximately 3.96 million residents, living within a geographical area encompassing 469 square miles. Based on current estimates of 3.9 million residents, Los Angeles is California’s most populous city and the second most populous city nationally, following New York City.

The data below reflects the ethnic breakdown of suspects involved in violent crime incidents during 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific</td>
<td>470,867</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>340,688</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,127,314</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>107,899</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,969,657</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the Los Angeles City Planning’s estimated population figures for the City, approximately 1.9 million of the 3.9 million residents, or 48 percent, are Hispanic. White residents account for approximately 1.1 million residents, or 28 percent. Asian/Pacific Islander residents account for approximately 470,000, or 12 percent. Black residents account for approximately 340,000, or nine percent. Los Angeles’s population is diverse and includes approximately 108,000 residents, or three percent, who identify as Other.

CITY CRIME STATISTICS
Violent Crime
In 2020, a total of 28,081 violent crime incidents (consisting of homicides, rapes, robberies, and aggravated assaults) occurred throughout the City. The 2020 total accounted for a decrease of 1,882 incidents, or six percent, compared to 29,963 incidents in 2019. When compared to the 2016 through 2019 annual average of 273 decedents.

In 2020, a total of 12,318 out of the 29,505, or 42 percent, of the suspects involved in violent crime were Black. During the same period, 11,538, or 39 percent, of the suspects involved in violent crime were Hispanic. Suspects involved in violent crime who were White accounted for 2,197, or seven percent. Lastly, 3,452 suspects, or 12 percent, of the suspects involved in violent crime were classified as Other or Unknown ethnic origins.

Part I Crime
In 2020, a total of 113,288 Part I Crime incidents (consisting of homicides, rapes, robberies, aggravated assaults, burglaries, burglaries/thefts from motor vehicles, personal/other thefts, and auto thefts) occurred throughout the City. This number represents an eight percent decrease, or 9,229 less incidents, than the 122,517 incidents in 2019. In 2020, there were 14,298, or 11 percent, less incidents than the 2016 through 2019 four-year annual average of 127,586 incidents.

Part II Crime
In 2020, a total of 80,054 Part II Crime incidents (kidnap, other sex crimes, simple assaults, crimes against family/children, weapons violations, identity theft, fraud, forgery/counterfeiting, embezzlement, prostitution, disorderly conduct, and vandalism) occurred throughout the City. The 2020 total was a decrease of 2,352 incidents, or three percent, less compared to the 77,702 incidents in 2019.

LAPD PERSONNEL FIGURES

Sworn Personnel by Gender
Males accounted for 8,036 of the 9,850 total Department personnel, or 82 percent, and females the remaining 1,813 employees, or 18 percent.

Gender | No. of Sworn Personnel | Percentage |
--------|------------------------|------------|
Female  | 1,813                  | 18%        |
Male    | 8,036                  | 82%        |
Non-binary/Other | 1          | <1%        |
Total   | 9,850                  | 100%       |

Sworn Personnel by Rank
The Department has 6,853 employees that are at the rank of police officer, which represents 70 percent of the 9,850 total Department personnel. The following depicts the remaining Department sworn personnel categories according to rank along with their respective totals and percentage breakdowns:

Rank | No. of Sworn Personnel | Percentage |
-----|------------------------|------------|
Commander & Above | 34 | <1% |
Captain | 80 | 1% |
Lieutenant | 243 | 2% |
Sergeant | 1,197 | 12% |
Detective | 1,443 | 15% |
Police Officer | 6,853 | 70% |
Total | 9,850 | 100% |

Sworn Personnel by Ethnicity
Sworn Department personnel of Hispanic descent account for the largest ethnic category of employees in the Department with 9,410 out of the 9,850 total personnel, or 50 percent. The following depicts the remaining Department sworn personnel categories according to ethnicity along with their respective totals and percentage breakdowns:

Ethnicity | No. of Sworn Personnel | Percentage |
-----------|------------------------|------------|
American Indian | 34 | <1% |
Asian/Pacific Islander | 778 | 8% |
Black | 940 | 10% |
Filipino | 244 | 2% |
Hispanic | 2,909 | 30% |
White | 2,197 | 7% |
Other | 35 | <1% |
Total | 9,850 | 100% |

Note: On a per capita basis, the Department has 24.8 officers per 10,000 residents, compared to the CPD and NYPD averages of 45.1 and 41.5 officers per 10,000 residents, respectively. From a geographical perspective, the Department has 21 officers per square mile, compared to the CPD with 51 officers per square mile, and NYPD with 115 officers per square mile.

2020 STATISTICAL SNAPSHOT
LAPD STATISTICS

Department Call for Service Information
The Department received 921,598 calls for service in 2020, which was a decrease of 57,994 calls, or six percent, compared to the 979,592 calls for service in 2019. In 2020, there were 43,152, or four percent, less calls for service than the 2016 through 2019 four-year annual average of 964,750 calls for service.

In 2020, 77th Street Area accounted for the most calls for service with 66,396 out of the total of 921,598, which represented seven percent of all calls for service generated for the Department’s 21 geographical Areas and other non-defined City areas. Pacific Area accounted for the second highest call for service count with 51,930, or six percent, of the total calls for service. Central Area had the third highest radio call count with 51,542, or six percent, of the total calls for service.

Based on Bureau totals in 2020, Valley Bureau accounted for the most calls for service with 267,063 calls, or 29 percent, of the 921,598 totals for the year. West Bureau had the second highest count with 227,154 calls, or 25 percent. Central Bureau had the third highest count with 223,780, or 24 percent. Lastly, South Bureau accounted for the lowest radio call count with 202,649 calls, or 22 percent. The remaining 852 calls for service, or less than one percent, occurred in non-defined City areas.

Note: Non-defined City areas include calls for service handled by the four Traffic Divisions.

Department Public Contact Information
Department personnel contacted 1,443,077 individuals in 2020, which includes those detained during field detentions and calls for service. This figure, however, is only a small fraction of the total number of individuals officers interact with on an annual basis, as it does not account for interactions with members of the public other than those detailed above. The 2020 total was a decrease of 249,274 individuals, or 15 percent, compared to 1,692,351 individuals contacted in 2019. In 2020, there were 225,092, or 13 percent, less individuals contacted than the 2016 through 2019 four-year annual average of 1,668,169.

Department Calls for Service By Division

Department Field Detention Information
Department personnel stopped 521,479 individuals in 2020 during observation-related field detentions (including both vehicle and pedestrian stops). This accounted for a decrease of 191,280 individuals, or 27 percent, less compared to 712,759 observation-related field detentions in 2019. In 2020, there were 181,940, or 26 percent, less observation-related field detentions than the 2016 through 2019 four-year annual average of 703,419.

In 2020, Hispanic subjects accounted for 253,136, or 48 percent, of the 521,479 individuals stopped during 2020 observation related field detentions. Black subjects accounted for 140,037, or 27 percent, of the individuals stopped. White subjects accounted for 88,155, or 17 percent, of the individuals stopped. American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Other or Unknown ethnicities accounted for 40,151 individuals, or eight percent, cumulatively.

Field Detention Information By Race

Department Citation Information
In 2020, a total of 166,483 citations were issued. This total included 152,218 traffic related citations and 14,265 Release from Custody (RFC) arrest reports, which are written in lieu of confinement for certain misdemeanor-related violations.

Department Arrest Information
The Department had 46,915 total arrests in 2020, which was a decrease of 35,373, or 43 percent, less than the 82,288 individuals arrested in 2019. In 2020, there were 47,890, or 51 percent, less individuals arrested than the 2016 through 2019 four-year annual average of 94,805.

The data below reflects the ethnic breakdown of violent crime arrestees in 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. of Arrestees</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6,044</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,517</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attacks on LAPD Officers
In 2020, there were 1,032 attacks on LAPD officers which was an increase of 274 incidents, or 36 percent, compared to 758 incidents in 2019. Ninety-seven of these attacks occurred during the civil unrest of 2020, accounting for 35 percent of the total increase, or nine percent of the total number of attacks against officers in 2020. In 2020, there were 295, or 40 percent more, incidents than the 2016 through 2019 four-year average of 737.

Note: Data regarding the civil unrest was obtained from the Safe LA Civil Unrest 2020 After Action Report.

Firearms Recovered by the Department
In 2020, there were 6,538 firearms recovered in Department field operations, which was a decrease of 433, or six percent less, recovered firearms as compared to the 6,969 in 2019. Field operations, which was a decrease of 433, or six percent less, recovered firearms as compared to the 6,969 in 2019. In 2020, there were 6,538 firearms recovered in Department field operations, which was a decrease of 433, or six percent less, recovered firearms as compared to the 6,969 in 2019. In 2020, there were 6,538 firearms recovered in Department field operations, which was a decrease of 433, or six percent less, recovered firearms as compared to the 6,969 in 2019.

Note: These figures exclude firearms acquired through the Department’s Gun Buyback Program.
Department personnel were involved in 52 CUOF incidents and 2,194 NCUOF incidents in 2020. The combined total of 2,246 incidents was a decrease of 127 incidents, or five percent, compared to the 2,373 total UOF incidents in 2019.

Category Use of Force Incidents

The table below depicts the CUOF totals for 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIS - Hit</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIS - No Hit</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIS - Animal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carotid Restraint Control Hold (CRCH)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im/Custody Death (ICD)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-9 Contact</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Related Injury (LERI)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintentional Discharge (UD)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Activity for CUOF Incidents

In 2020, 24 incidents, or 46 percent of the Department’s 52 CUOF incidents, originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. 10 incidents, or 19 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (i.e. pedestrian and traffic stops). Eight incidents originated during pre-planned incidents, which represented 15 percent.

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

- On-Duty, Non-Tactical (Unintentional Discharge [UD] incidents): two incidents, or 4 percent;
- Citizen Flag Down: one incident, or two percent;
- Off-Duty: three incidents, or six percent;
- Amphib: one incident, or two percent;
- On-Duty, Tactical: zero incidents;
- Station Call: three incidents or six percent and;
- Other: zero incidents.

Officer Involved Shooting Incidents

Of the 52 CUOF incidents in 2020, 27 were OIS occurrences. The 2020 total was an increase of one incident, or four percent, compared to 26 OIS incidents in 2019. In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, there were a total of 143 OIS occurrences, resulting in an annual average of 36 incidents. The 2020 count was below the 2016 through 2019 four-year average by 9 incidents, or 25 percent.

There were 31 suspects involved in the 27 OIS incidents in 2020. 13 of the 31 suspects, or 42 percent, were Hispanic. 12 of the suspects, or 39 percent, were Black. Two of the suspects, or 6.5 percent, were White. One of the suspects, or three percent, were Filipino. One of the suspects, or three percent, were Other. Two of the Suspects, or 6.5 percent, were Unknown.

Source of Activity for NCUOF Incidents

In 2020, 1,331, or 61 percent, of the Department’s 2,194 NCUOF incidents originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. During the same period, 552 incidents, or 25 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (i.e. pedestrian and traffic stops).

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

- Citizen Flag Down: 163 incidents, or seven percent;
- Other: 128 incidents, or six percent;
- Station Call: 19 incidents, or one percent; and,
- Unknown: 1 incident, or less than one percent

Officer Involved Shooting Incidents

Of the 2,194 NCUOF incidents in 2020, 50 were OIS occurrences. The 2020 total was an increase of one incident, or four percent, compared to 49 OIS incidents in 2019. In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, there were a total of 153 OIS occurrences, resulting in an annual average of 38 incidents. The 2020 count was below the 2016 through 2019 four-year average by 9 incidents, or 25 percent.

There were 31 suspects involved in the 50 OIS incidents in 2020. 13 of the 31 suspects, or 42 percent, were Hispanic. 12 of the suspects, or 39 percent, were Black. Two of the suspects, or 6.5 percent, were White. One of the suspects, or three percent, were Filipino. One of the suspects, or three percent, were Other. Two of the Suspects, or 6.5 percent, were Unknown.

Source of Activity for NCUOF Incidents

In 2020, 1,331, or 61 percent, of the Department’s 2,194 NCUOF incidents originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. During the same period, 552 incidents, or 25 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (i.e. pedestrian and traffic stops).

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

- Citizen Flag Down: 163 incidents, or seven percent;
- Other: 128 incidents, or six percent;
- Station Call: 19 incidents, or one percent; and,
- Unknown: 1 incident, or less than one percent

Source of Activity for NCUOF Incidents

In 2020, 1,331, or 61 percent, of the Department’s 2,194 NCUOF incidents originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. During the same period, 552 incidents, or 25 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (i.e. pedestrian and traffic stops).

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

- Citizen Flag Down: 163 incidents, or seven percent;
- Other: 128 incidents, or six percent;
- Station Call: 19 incidents, or one percent; and,
- Unknown: 1 incident, or less than one percent
It is important to note that a vast majority of police interactions with the public do not result in a use of force. In 2020, the Department had 1,443,077 documented public contacts. During those contacts, 521,479 individuals were stopped during observation-related field detentions (including both vehicle and pedestrian stops), 46,915 arrests were effected, and 2,246 use of force incidents occurred (27 of which were OIS incidents).

**1,443,077** Total documented public contacts.

**521,479** Total observation-related field detentions occurred in 36% of the total public contacts.

**46,915** Arrests occurred in 3% of the total public contacts.

**2,246** Uses of Force occurred in 0.14% of the total public contacts.

**27** OISs occurred in 0.001% of the total public contacts.

The graph below depicts the 2016 through 2020 annual percentages of seven of the most represented weapon/force types utilized by suspects in OIS incidents. As shown, firearms overwhelmingly accounted for the highest volume of weapons utilized by suspects, with a five-year annual average of 59 percent. During the same period, edged weapons consistently accounted for the second highest volume of weapons with a five-year annual average of 18 percent. OIS incidents involving "other" weapons, perception-based shootings, and replica/pellet guns accounted for a five-year annual average of 18 percent. Impact devices accounted for three percent of weapons utilized by suspects in OIS incidents within the five-year annual average; and lastly, two percent involved no weapons in the same five-year annual average.
The Department's publication of various mapping resources assists management in the planning, deployment, and analysis of various assets. Furthermore, mapping resources provide invaluable visual references for field personnel in their daily efforts to prevent crime and to better serve the City.
2020 VIOLENT CRIME OCCURRENCE
and OIS incidents

Geographical Areas
- Central Area
- Rampart Area
- Southwest Area
- Hollenbeck Area
- Harbor Area
- Hollywood Area
- Wilshire Area
- West Los Angeles Area
- Van Nuys Area
- West Valley Area
- Northeast Area

Violent Crime Occurrence
by Reporting District
- Very Low
- Low
- Moderate
- High
- Very High

OIS Incidents
- Hit Incidents
- No-Hit Incidents

OIS-HIT Incidents
- 2016 = 40
- 2017 = 40
- 2018 = 33
- 2019 = 25
- 2020 = 25

* Map excludes UOF and OIS incidents that occurred outside the Los Angeles city limits.
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* Map excludes UOF incidents that occurred outside the Los Angeles city limits.
OIS-HIT INCIDENTS (2016 - 2020)

Geographical Areas
- Central Area
- Rampart Area
- Southwest Area
- Hollenbeck Area
- Harbor Area
- Hollywood Area
- Wilshire Area
- West Los Angeles Area
- Van Nuys Area
- West Valley Area
- Northeast Area
- 77th Street Area
- Newton Area
- Pacific Area
- North Hollywood Area
- Foothill Area
- Devonshire Area
- Southeast Area
- Mission Area
- Olympic Area
- Topanga Area
- Police Stations

OIS-HIT Incidents
- 2016 = 27
- 2017 = 26
- 2018 = 24
- 2019 = 20
- 2020 = 19

OIS-NO HIT INCIDENTS (2016 - 2020)

Geographical Areas
- Central Area
- Rampart Area
- Southwest Area
- Hollenbeck Area
- Harbor Area
- Hollywood Area
- Wilshire Area
- West Los Angeles Area
- Van Nuys Area
- West Valley Area
- Northeast Area
- 77th Street Area
- Newton Area
- Pacific Area
- North Hollywood Area
- Foothill Area
- Devonshire Area
- Southeast Area
- Mission Area
- Olympic Area
- Topanga Area
- Police Stations

OIS-NO HIT Incidents
- 2016 = 13
- 2017 = 14
- 2018 = 9
- 2019 = 5
- 2020 = 15

* Map excludes UOF incidents that occurred outside the Los Angeles city limits.
**2020 UNSHeltered People**

by Census Tract

Geographical Areas

1. Central Area
2. Rampart Area
3. Southwest Area
4. Harbor Area
5. Hollywood Area
6. Whitley Area
7. West Los Angeles Area
8. Van Nuys Area
9. West Valley Area
10. Northeast Area

Number of Unsheltered People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>2,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-40</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-70</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-200</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 and over</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2020 Calls for Service**

Involving Possible Mental Illness

Geographical Areas

1. Central Area
2. Rampart Area
3. Southwest Area
4. Harbor Area
5. Hollywood Area
6. Whitley Area
7. West Los Angeles Area
8. Van Nuys Area
9. West Valley Area
10. Northeast Area

Volume of Calls by Reporting District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>2,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Stations</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Map excludes UOF and OIS incidents that occurred outside the Los Angeles city limits.*

Prepared by LAPD/ADSD/GIS Mapping 3/3/2021
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Data from the Los Angeles County Homeless Service Authority 2020 homeless count.
Command and Control is the use of active leadership to direct others while using available resources to coordinate a response, accomplish tasks, and minimize risk.

This photograph was taken prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.
COMMAND AND CONTROL

The guiding value when an officer considers using force is Reverence for Human Life. The Department strove to create a framework that clearly and thoroughly conveyed the training and practices associated with reverence for human life. As noted by former Chief of Police Charlie Beck, “Although the term ‘tactical de-escalation’ was not specifically used by the Department in the past, many of the fundamental techniques and concepts that fall under the tactical de-escalation umbrella have long been incorporated in training curricula and successfully utilized by personnel in the field.”

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

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

There are four key components to command and control:

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

INITIAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

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

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

Note: Reverence for human life, the safety of the officers, and the public are the considerations in developing tactics and strategies to resolve critical incidents. Regarding lethal force, an essential goal of Command and Control includes managing the number of officers who are assigned lethal cover responsibilities. In the event of an officer-involved shooting, the reasonable management of lethal cover will help lessen both the number of officers who discharge their firearms and the number of rounds fired during the incident. Consequently, danger to the community may also be reduced by minimizing the number of rounds fired. Although guided by the person who has assumed Command and Control, the individual officer is ultimately responsible for articulating the reasonableness of their decision to draw, exhibit, and/or discharge their firearm.
Tactical de-escalation involves the use of techniques to reduce the intensity of an encounter with a suspect and enable an officer to have additional options to gain voluntary compliance or mitigate the need to use a higher level of force while maintaining control of the situation.

DE-ESCALATION OPTIONS
- Asking open-ended questions
- Giving clear & direct orders
- Defusing
- Empathy
- Persuasion
- Personal appeal
- Redirecting
- Building rapport
- Deflection
- Verbal warnings
- Reasonable appeal
- Advisements

This photograph was taken prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.
Under rapidly evolving circumstances, especially when a suspect poses an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury, officers may not have sufficient time or reasonable options to resolve the situation without the need to use objectively reasonable force.
Reducing over-response or over-deployment to specific duties and responsibilities; and,
Maintaining officer safety through personnel location and assignment.

INDIVIDUAL OFFICER RESPONSIBILITY
The initial officers at the scene of any incident are responsible for command and control of an incident until relieved by a more senior officer or supervisor. In addition to their initial assessment, individual officers must identify the IC, generally whomever is the most senior officer at that time, unless a supervisor is present. While taking appropriate action based on their assessments, officers must be ready for, and receptive to, direction and orders from the IC. Every officer plays a crucial role in the management and handling of critical incidents and must understand their role within the command and control system. Officers should be ready to deploy or re-deploy as necessary.

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

After appropriate measures have been taken to mitigate risks and preserve human life, the officer who established command and control should update the responding supervisor, who will continue to develop the plan. The plan should include the assignment of tasks to available personnel and the organized use of available resources.

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

SUPERVISOR’S RESPONSIBILITY
Responsibility for command and control lies with the senior officer or any officer on scene who has gained sufficient situational awareness. Supervisors shall take responsibility for exercising command and control when they arrive to the scene of an incident. Supervisors shall also declare themselves the IC until relieved by a higher authority. It is the expectation of this Department that the highest-ranking supervisor at scene assume the role of IC and communicate the transfer of command to all personnel involved.

In July 2018, the Department published the command and control Training Bulletin and in March 2019, implemented training on the Advanced Strategies of Command and Control (ASCC). As we move forward into 2021, the Department will remain focused on further refining the concept of command and control, while continuing to train officers on the ASCC. Critical concepts, such as the Designated Cover Officer, Tactical De-Escalation, and Active Leadership, will continue to be reinforced throughout the Department in an effort to prevent or minimize uses of force.
All officers at the scene of any incident, at some level, are responsible for command and control. In addition to their initial assessment, individual officers must identify the IC - or whoever is responsible for command and control at that time. While taking appropriate action based on their assessments, officers must be ready for, and receptive to, direction and orders from the IC. Every officer plays a crucial role in the management and handling of critical incidents and must understand their role within the command and control scheme. Officers should be ready to deploy or re-deploy as necessary.

Additional Officers/Units/Specialized Unit Request(s): If needed, officers can request additional resources to an incident. These resources can vary from incident to incident and are dependent on the circumstances of a specific event. Resources can include: Air unit, K-9/Bloodhound, Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT), Bomb Squad, Hazardous Materials Unit (HMU), Fire Department, the Mental Evaluation Unit, Dive Team, Traffic, Mutual Aid (i.e. neighboring police departments), etc.

Command Post (CP): A CP is sometimes created when there is a critical incident and coordination of resources is needed. The CP is established in a nearby, safe location as a meeting location for responding personnel and resources.

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

This photograph was taken prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.
CATEGORICAL

FID schedules a 72-Hour Brief where they provide a preliminary presentation of the incident and answers questions directed from the Chief of Police (COP) and other attending staff. The objective is to address issues that require immediate department attention.

Attendees at 72-Hour Brief include the following:
- COP
- Assistant Chief
- Bureau CO
- Presenting CO
- CIRD and TD

SIP(s) attend General Training Update provided by Training Division.

Division CO generates correspondence up the chain of command and obtains approval by chain of command for an officer’s return to field duty.

COs must ensure all 72-Hour Brief restrictions are met and documented per department orders.

COs must ensure all 72-Hour Brief restrictions are met and documented per department orders.

The COP receives UOFRB recommendations and evaluates the incident.

COP determines the outcome for BOPC findings of:
- Administrative Disapproval - Tactics;
- Out of Policy - Drawing and exhibiting; and,
- Out of Policy - Use of Force.

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

USE OF FORCE REVIEW PROCESS

1. CUOF INCIDENT OCCURS
2. 72-HOUR BRIEFING
3. GENERAL TRAINING UPDATE
4. RETURN TO FIELD DUTY (RTD)
5. USE OF FORCE REVIEW BOARD
6. CHIEF OF POLICE
7. BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS
8. CHIEF OF POLICE

Los Angeles County District Attorney’s Office
- LACDA call-out team monitors the Investigation of incidents that meet the criteria.

Justice System Integrity Division
- The LACDA Justice System Integrity Division submits a letter of declination or files charges against the officer.

Personnel Complaint
- A personnel complaint may be initiated as a result of BOPC’s findings. See page 104 for details on the personnel complaint process.
In 2020, 11 of the 27 total OIS incidents, or 41 percent, were categorized in which a suspect was armed with a firearm in hand or position to fire, but did not fire (Type II incident).

58% of the suspects were armed with a firearm

20% of the suspects were armed with an impact device

No officers were injured

In 2020, there was a total of 52 Categorical Use of Force Incidents, accounting for a decrease of one incident, or 1.9 percent, compared to 53 Categorical Use of Force Incidents in 2019.

Incident resulted from a radio call

See page 118 for Use of Deadly Force (other) definition.

Suspect was armed with a firearm

Suspect was armed with a firearm

Incidents involved four handguns and one rifle

Lowest number of incidents in the past 5 years

In 2020, five of the 27 total OIS incidents, or 19 percent, were categorized in which a suspect fired at officers or a third party (Type I incident).

Suspect was armed with a firearm

Incidents involved four handguns and one rifle

Lowest number of incidents in the past 5 years

In 2020, five of the 27 total OIS incidents, or 19 percent, were categorized in which a suspect fired at officers or a third party (Type I incident).
**Number of suspects armed with a firearm or edged weapon during OIS incidents was 81% (decrease of 4% compared to 2019).**

**Number of personnel involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents decreased by six, or 55%, compared to 2019.**

**The percentage of suspects armed with a firearm during OIS incidents was 58% (decrease of 7% compared to 65% in 2019).**

**The number of suspects involved in OIS incidents and experiencing homelessness decreased by six compared to 2019.**

**Number of personnel assigned to Patrol who were involved in OIS incidents decreased by three officers, or 12%, compared to 2019.**

**The number of suspects perceived to have a mental illness during OIS incidents increased by two suspects, or 50% compared to 2019.**

**The number of suspects involved in OIS incidents and experiencing homelessness decreased by six compared to 2019.**

**The number of personnel assigned to Patrol who were involved in OIS incidents decreased by three officers, or 12%, compared to 2019.**

**Ethnicity of Suspects & Officers**

- **Female 13%**
- **Male 84%**
- **Black 39%**
- **Hispanic 42%**
- **Other 6%**
- **Unknown 6%**
- **Asian/Pacific Islander 3%**
- **White 33%**
- **Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, or Queer-Spectrum (LGBTQ+) 3%**

**Gender of Suspects & Officers**

- **Female 13%**
- **Male 84%**

**Unintentional Discharge Incidents**

- **Number of personnel involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents decreased by six, or 55%, compared to 2019.**

**Weapons**

- **50%**
- **4%**
- **7%**

**Suspects**

- **50%**
- **4%**
- **12%**

**Homeless**

- **0%**

**Patrol**

- **12%**

**Ethnicity**

- **Black 5%**
- **Hispanic 42%**
- **Other 3%**
- **Unknown 6%**
- **White 34%**
- **Asian/Pacific Islander 3%**
- **Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, or Queer-Spectrum (LGBTQ+) 3%**

**Number of OIS Incidents Per Year**

- **1990: 89**
- **1991: 71**
- **1992: 64**
- **1993: 43**
- **1994: 56**
- **1995: 38**
- **1996: 38**
- **1997: 43**
- **1998: 44**
- **1999: 51**
- **2000: 43**
- **2001: 36**
- **2002: 39**
- **2003: 37**
- **2004: 46**
- **2005: 44**
- **2006: 44**
- **2007: 33**
- **2008: 25**
- **2009: 27**

**Use of Force Year-End Review**

**Los Angeles Police Department**
Non-Lethal Force (body weight, firm grips, joint locks, physical force, strikes, and takedowns) in NCUOF decreased by 3 percent in 2020.

Less-Lethal Force (40mm Less-Lethal Launcher, Beanbag shotgun, OC Spray, and TASER) in NCUOF incidents decreased by 20 percent compared to 2019.

The total NCUOF incident count in 2020 (2,194 incidents) decreased by 126 incidents, or five percent, as compared to 2019 (2,320 incidents).
OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING INCIDENTS

2020 TAKE AWAYS

SINGLE OFFICER FIRING PER INCIDENT

In 2020, there were 19 OIS incidents with only a single officer discharging their firearm compared to 16 incidents in 2019. This represented a 19 percent increase in 2020 compared to the single officer discharging their firearm that occurred in 2019.

OFFICER INJURIES

In 2020, there were 11 officers that sustained injuries during OIS incidents compared to five officers in 2019. This accounted for a 120 percent increase in 2020 compared to the total number of injured officers in 2019.

ANNUAL AVERAGE OF ROUNDS FIRED PER INCIDENT

In 2020, an average of 5.7 rounds were discharged during an OIS incident compared to an average of 10.1 rounds discharged per incident in 2019. This represented a 44 percent decrease in 2020 compared to the average number of rounds discharged per incident in 2019.

TOTAL NUMBER OF ROUNDS FIRED BY OFFICERS

In 2020, a total of 156 rounds were discharged during OIS incidents compared to 263 total rounds discharged in 2019. This accounted for a 41 percent decrease compared to the total rounds discharged during OIS incidents in 2019.

2021 YEAR TO DATE

SINGLE OFFICER FIRING PER INCIDENT

For 2021 Year to Date, there were ten OIS incidents which involved a single officer discharging a firearm. For 2020 Year to Date, there were six incidents involving a single officer discharging a firearm. The 2021 Year to Date period had an increase of four incidents, or 67 percent, when compared to 2020 Year to Date.

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

For 2021 Year to Date, eight of the Department’s OIS incidents originated from radio calls. For 2020 Year to Date, there were two incidents that originated from radio calls. The 2021 Year to Date period had an increase of six incidents, or 300 percent, when compared to 2020 Year to Date.

ATTACKS ON LAPD OFFICERS

For 2021 Year to Date, there were 299 attacks on LAPD officers. For 2020 Year to Date, there were 255 attacks on LAPD officers. The 2021 Year to Date period had an increase of 44 incidents, or 17 percent, when compared to 2020 Year to Date.

TOTAL OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING INCIDENTS

For 2021 Year to Date, there were a total of 16 OIS incidents. For 2020 Year to Date, there were nine OIS incidents. The 2021 Year to Date period had an increase of seven incidents, or 78 percent, when compared to 2020 Year to Date.

The Year to Date comparison period was January 1, 2020 to April 30, 2020, and January 1, 2021 to April 30, 2021.
In review of the statistics published herein, the Department seeks to identify areas where potentially ineffective or outdated Use of Force related policies and training can be enhanced, and new innovative practices can be implemented.
In 2020, 11 of the 27 total OIS incidents, or 41 percent, were categorized as Classification II shootings. This accounted for a three-percentage point increase compared to 38 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification II shooting incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 39 percent, 2020 experienced a two-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, Classification II shooting incidents were the highest compared to other categories accounting for 67 of the 170 total OIS incidents, or 39 percent.

In 2020, Department personnel were involved in 27 OIS incidents, an increase of one incident, or 3.8 percent, compared to 2019. In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, there were a total of 143 OIS incidents, resulting in an annual average of 35.8 incidents. The 2020 count fell below the 2016 through 2019 annual average by 8.8 incidents, or 25 percent.
In 2020, five of the 27 total OIS incidents, or 19 percent, were categorized as Classification I shootings. This accounted for a 12-percentage point decrease compared to 31 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification I shooting incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 26 percent, 2020 experienced a seven-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, Classification I shooting incidents were the third highest category accounting for 42 of the 170 total OIS incidents, or 25 percent.

In 2020, 11 of the Department’s 27 OIS incidents, or 41 percent, originated from radio calls. This accounted for a one-percentage point decrease compared to 42 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of OIS incidents resulting from radio calls from 2016 through 2019 of 41 percent, 2020 experienced no change. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, radio calls represented the largest source category of OIS incidents, accounting for 69 of the 170 total incidents, or 41 percent.

In 2020, nine of the 27 total OIS incidents, or 33 percent, were categorized as Classification V shootings. This accounted for a ten-percentage point increase compared to 23 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Classification V shooting incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 25 percent, 2020 experienced an eight-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, Classification V shooting incidents were the second highest category accounting for 45 of the 170 total OIS incidents, or 26 percent.

In 2020, three of the Department’s 27 OIS incidents, or 11 percent, originated from pre-planned incidents. This accounted for a three-percentage point increase compared to eight percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of OIS incidents resulting from pre-planned incidents from 2016 through 2019 of nine percent, 2020 experienced a two-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, pre-planned incidents represented the third largest source category of OIS incidents, accounting for 16 of the 170 total incidents, or nine percent.

The remaining five incidents in 2020 occurred during citizen flag down, station call, ambush, and off-duty incidents.
In 2020, seven of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred within the geographic areas of Central Bureau, which was a decrease of five incidents, or 42 percent, compared to 2019. Twenty-six percent of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department - 27; Central Bureau - seven).

In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, 49 OIS incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 12.25 incidents. The Central Bureau count for 2020 fell below the 2016 through 2019 annual average by 5.25 incidents, or 43 percent.

In 2020, nine of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred within the geographic areas of South Bureau, which was an increase of two incidents, or 29 percent, compared to 2019. Thirty-three percent of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department - 27; South Bureau - nine).

In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, 32 OIS incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of eight incidents. The South Bureau count for 2020 exceeded the 2016 through 2019 annual average by one incident, or 13 percent.

In 2020, three of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred within the geographic areas of West Bureau, which was an increase of one incident, or 50 percent, compared to 2019. Eleven percent of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred in West Bureau (Department - 27; West Bureau - 3).

In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, 18 OIS incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 4.5 incidents. The West Bureau count for 2020 fell below the 2016 through 2019 annual average by 1.5 incidents, or 33 percent.

In 2020, six of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred within the geographic areas of Valley Bureau, which was an increase of three incidents, or 100 percent, compared to 2019. Twenty-two percent of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department - 26; Valley Bureau - 6).

In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, 34 OIS incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 8.5 incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2020 fell below the 2016 through 2019 annual average by 2.5 incidents, or 26 percent.
In 2020, two of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographic jurisdiction, which equated to no change compared to 2019. Seven percent of the Department’s OIS incidents occurred outside the geographic jurisdiction (Department - 26, Outside Jurisdiction - two).

In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, ten OIS incidents occurred outside the Department’s geographic jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 2.5 incidents. The Outside Jurisdiction count for 2020 fell below the 2016 through 2019 annual average by 0.5 incidents, or 20 percent.

In 2020, Wednesday represented the day of the week with the most OIS incidents, accounting for six occurrences, or 22 percent. Sunday represented the second most frequent day of the week with five incidents, or 19 percent. Friday and Saturday represented the third most frequent days of the week with four incidents each, or 15 percent. Monday and Thursday represented the fourth most frequent days of the week with three incidents each, or 11 percent. The two remaining incidents, or seven percent, occurred on a Tuesday.

From 2016 through 2020, Monday and Sunday represented the days with the most OIS incidents with 30 incidents each of the 170 total, or 18 percent, occurring on that day. The remaining 110 incidents, or 65 percent, were evenly distributed throughout the remaining days of the week.

In 2020, October represented the month with the most OIS incidents with 20 of the 170 total incidents, or 12 percent. September had the second most with 18 incidents, or 11 percent respectively. January, February, March, and November had the fewest with nine incidents, or five percent. May had the second most with four occurrences, or 15 percent. April, June, and August each had the third most with three incidents each, or 11 percent respectively. January, February, March, and November had the fourth highest counts with two incidents each, or seven percent respectively. The remaining incident occurred in the month of September, or four percent.

From 2016 through 2020, June represented the month with the most OIS incidents with 20 of the 170 total incidents, or 12 percent. September represented the month with the least, accounting for five incidents, or three percent. March had the second fewest with nine incidents, or five percent. The remaining 141 incidents, or 83 percent, were evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

In 2020, October through December: 41 incidents, or 24 percent.

The OIS percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2016 through 2020 was as follows:

- January – March: 37 incidents, or 22 percent;
- April – June: 55 incidents, or 32 percent;
- July – September: 37 incidents, or 22 percent; and,
- October through December: 41 incidents, or 24 percent.

In 2020, nine OIS incidents, or 33 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while 18 incidents, or 67 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The five-year annual average for 2016 through 2020 was 14 OIS incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and 20 incidents between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.
In 2020, 39 Department personnel were involved in the 27 OIS incidents throughout the year, resulting in an average of 1.4 officers per incident. This accounted for a decrease of 22 percent compared to an average of 1.8 officers per incident in 2019. The 2020 officer to incident average was below the 2016 through 2019 aggregate annual average by 0.4 officers per incident or 22 percent.

In 2020, 34 male officers were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 87 percent of the 39 total employees. This accounted for a 13-percentage point decrease compared to 100 percent in 2019. The 2020 officer to incident average was below the 2016 through 2019 aggregate annual average by 0.4 officers per incident or 22 percent.

Officer Gender - OIS Combined

Officer Ethnicity: OIS - Combined

Officer Ethnicity: OIS - Hit

Officer Ethnicity: OIS - Animal

Officer Ethnicity: LERI

Officer Ethnicity: K9 Contact

Officer Ethnicity: Carotid

Officer Ethnicity: Head Strike

Officer Ethnicity: CRCH

In 2020, five female officers were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 13 percent of the 39 total employees. This accounted for a 13-percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2019. The percentage of female officers involved in OIS incidents in 2020 was five percentage points below the Department’s overall female officer total of 31 percent. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved female personnel from 2016 through 2019 of five percent, 2020 experienced no change. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, females accounted for 18 of the 295 total involved employees, or six percent.

In 2020, 13 White officers were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 33 percent of the 39 total employees. This accounted for a three-percentage point increase compared to 30 percent in 2019. The percentage of White officers involved in OIS incidents in 2020 was three-percentage points above the Department’s overall White officer percentage total of 30 percent. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White personnel from 2016 through 2019 of 31 percent, 2020 experienced a two-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, White officers represented the second largest ethnic category of personnel involved in OIS incidents, accounting for 56 percent of the 39 total employees, or 65 percent.

In 2020, one Asian officer and one officer who identified as other were pending BOPO “lethal force” adjudicative findings for their involvement in OIS incidents.
The following depicts the percentage of personnel involved in OIS incidents in 2020 based on their respective years of service classifications:

- Less than one year of service – zero percent (zero out of 39 total officers);
- 1-5 years of service – 49 percent (19 out of 39 total officers);
- 6-10 years of service – ten percent (four out of 39 total officers);
- 11-20 years of service – 28 percent (11 out of 39 total officers); and,
- More than 20 years of service – 13 percent (five out of 39 total officers).

In 2020, there were percentage point increases in three of the five categories, and two decreases compared to 2019. The following depicts these changes:

- Less than one year of service – four-percentage point decrease (four percent in 2019, zero percent in 2020);
- 1-5 years of service – 13-percentage point increase (36 percent in 2019, 49 percent in 2020);
- 6-10 years of service – 18-percentage point decrease (28 percent in 2019, 10 percent in 2020);
- 11-20 years of service – five-percentage point increase (23 percent in 2019, 28 percent in 2020); and,
- More than 20 years of service – four-percentage point increase (nine percent in 2019, 13 percent in 2020).

In 2020, there were percentage point decreases in four of the five years of service categories and one increase in one category when compared to the aggregate percentage of personnel involved in OIS incidents during the four-year period from 2016 through 2019.

The following describes the changes:

- Less than one year of service – three-percentage point decrease (three percent during four-year period, zero percent in 2020);
- 1-5 years of service – 24-percentage point increase (25 percent during four-year period, 49 percent in 2020);
- 6-10 years of service – 18-percentage point decrease (28 percent during four-year period, ten percent in 2020);
- 11-20 years of service – two-percentage point decrease (30 percent during four-year period, 28 percent in 2020); and,
- More than 20 years of service – one-percentage point decrease (14 percent during four-year period, 13 percent in 2020).

Historically, from 2016 through 2020, most officers involved in OIS incidents had 11-20 years of service, accounting for 67 of the 295 total employees, or 23 percent. Officers with 1-5 years of service accounted for the second largest category with a total of 84 employees, or 28 percent. Officers with 6-10 years of service were the third largest group, with 76 employees, or 26 percent, followed by officers with more than 20 years of service, which had 46 employees, or 15 percent. Officers with less than one year of service, which accounted for eight employees, represented only three percent of the total.

In 2020, 34 employees at the rank of Police Officer were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 87 percent of the 39 total employees. This accounted for a seven-percentage point decrease compared to 94 percent in 2019. The percentage of officers involved in OIS incidents in 2020 was 17-percentage points above the Department’s overall Police Officer total of 70 percent. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of Police Officer from 2016 through 2019 of 91 percent, 2020 experienced a four-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, most of the personnel involved in OIS incidents were at the rank of Police Officer, accounting for 268 of the 295 total employees, or 91 percent.

In 2020, three employees at the rank of Detective were involved in OIS incidents, which represented eight percent of the 39 total employees. This accounted for a four-percentage point increase compared to four percent in 2019. The percentage of detectives involved in OIS incidents in 2020 was seven percentage points below the Department’s overall Detective total of 15 percent. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of Detective from 2016 through 2019 of six percent, 2020 experienced a two-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, Detectives represented the second largest category of personnel involved in OIS incidents, accounting for 19 of the 295 total employees, or six percent.

The remaining two employees involved in OIS incidents in 2020, representing five percent of the 39 total personnel, were at the rank of Sergeant.
In 2020, eight personnel assigned to Southeast Division were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 21 percent of the 39 total employees. This represented a seven-percentage point decrease compared to 28 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Southeast Division from 2016 through 2019 of nine percent, 2020 experienced a 12-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, Southeast Division personnel were the second most involved in OIS incidents, which represented 21 percent of the 39 total employees. This represented a nine-percentage point increase compared to six percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Southeast Division from 2016 through 2019 of two percent, 2020 represented a 13-percentage point increase compared to two percent in 2019.

In 2020, six personnel assigned to Newton Division were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 15 percent of the 39 total employees. This represented a 15-percentage point increase compared to one percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Newton Division from 2016 through 2019 of zero percent, 2020 represented a 16-percentage point decrease compared to six percent in 2019.

The following is the employee Bureau assignment for the 39 total personnel involved in OIS incidents in 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Area/Bureau</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Traffic Divisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Units</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2020, seven personnel assigned to Southwest Division were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 18 percent of the 39 total employees. This represented a 16-percentage point decrease compared to two percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Southwest Division from 2016 through 2019 of four percent, 2020 experienced a 14-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, personnel assigned to Southwest Division accounted for 17 of the 295 total employees involved in OIS incidents, or six percent.

In 2020, there were percentage point increases in three of the six Bureau categories and decreases in two, when compared to their respective aggregate percentages during the four-year period from 2016 through 2019.

The following depicts these changes:

- **Central Bureau**: three-percentage point decrease (26 percent in 2019, 23 percent in 2020);
- **West Bureau**: two-percentage point increase (13 percent during four-year period, 15 percent in 2020); and,
- **Other**: four-percentage point decrease (four percent in 2019, zero percent in 2020).

In 2020, there were percentage point increases in three of the six Bureau categories and decreases in three, when compared to their respective aggregate percentages during the four-year period, zero percent in 2020.
In 2020, 23 personnel assigned to patrol were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 59 percent of the 39 total personnel. This accounted for a four-percentage point increase compared to 55 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2016 through 2019 of 28 percent, 2020 experienced a ten-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, a majority of officers in OIS incidents were assigned to patrol, accounting for 149 of the 295 total employees, or 51 percent.

In 2020, 11 personnel assigned to specialized assignments were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 28 percent of the 39 total personnel. This accounted for a four-percentage point decrease compared to 32 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to specialized assignments from 2016 through 2019 of 23 percent, 2020 experienced a five-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, personnel assigned to specialized assignments represented the second largest category of personnel involved in OIS incidents, accounting for 71 of the 295 total employees, or 24 percent.

In 2020, four personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division were involved in OIS incidents, which represented ten percent of the 39 total personnel. This accounted for a one-percentage point increase compared to nine percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division from 2016 through 2019 of 20 percent, 2020 experienced a ten-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division represented the third largest category of personnel involved in OIS incidents, accounting for 56 of the 295 total employees, or 19 percent.

In 2020, one personnel assigned to administrative assignments was involved in an OIS incident, which represented three percent of the 39 total personnel. This accounted for a one-percentage point decrease compared to two percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to administrative assignments from 2016 through 2019 of 0.4 percent, 2020 experienced a 2.6-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, personnel assigned to administrative assignments represented the fifth largest category of personnel involved in OIS incidents, accounting for two of the 295 total employees, or 0.7 percent.

In 2020, no personnel assigned to investigative assignments were involved in OIS incidents, which represented zero percent of the 39 total personnel. This accounted for a two-percentage point decrease compared to two percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to investigative assignments from 2016 through 2019 of seven percent, 2020 experienced a seven-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2019, personnel assigned to administrative assignments accounted for 17 of the 295 total employees, or six percent.

No Department personnel were killed during or resulting from OIS incidents during the five-year period from 2016 through 2020. In 2020, 11 officers sustained injuries during the 27 OIS incidents throughout the year. This accounted for a 120 percent increase compared to five injured officers in 2019. Additionally, when compared to the 2016 through 2019 annual average of 0.25 injured officers, 2020 had 1.75 more injured officers, or 19 percent, above the four-year annual average.
In 2020, 36 handguns were utilized during OIS incidents, which represented 52 percent of the 39 total weapon types. This accounted for a seven-percentage point increase compared to 45 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of handguns utilized during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 79 percent, 2020 experienced a 13-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, handguns were the most utilized weapon type during OIS incidents, accounting for 39 of the 297 total weapons, or 13 percent.

In 2020, two rifles were utilized during OIS incidents, which represented five percent of the 39 total weapon types. This accounted for a four-percentage point decrease compared to nine percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of rifles utilized during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 18 percent, 2020 experienced a 13-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, rifles were the second most utilized weapon type during OIS incidents, accounting for 49 of the 297 total weapons, or 16 percent.

In 2020, one shotgun was utilized during OIS incidents, which represented three percent of the 39 total weapon types. This accounted for a three-percentage point decrease compared to six percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of shotguns utilized during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of three percent, 2020 experienced no change. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, shotguns accounted for nine percent of the 297 total weapons, or three percent.

In 2020, five rounds were fired from shotguns during OIS incidents, which represented two percent of the 156 total rounds fired. This accounted for an eight-percentage point decrease compared to ten percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of rounds fired from shotguns utilized during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of two percent, 2020 experienced a six-percentage point increase compared to 89 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of rounds fired from shotguns accounted for 23 of the 1,352 total rounds, or seven percent.

In 2020, three rounds were fired from rifles during OIS incidents, which represented two percent of the 156 total rounds fired. This accounted for an eight-percentage point decrease compared to ten percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of rounds fired from rifles during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 76 percent, 2020 experienced a 21-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, rounds fired from rifles were the second most frequent round type fired during OIS incidents, accounting for 1,056 of the 1,352 total rounds, or 78 percent.

In 2020, an average of 5.7 rounds were fired during OIS incidents. When compared to the 2019 average of 10.1 rounds fired, 2020 experienced a decrease of 4.4 rounds, or 44 percent. Additionally, when compared to the 2016 through 2019 annual average of 8.4 rounds fired per incident, 2020 was 2.7 rounds, or 32 percent, below the four-year annual average.

In 2020, 148 rounds were fired from handguns during OIS incidents, which represented 55 percent of the 156 total rounds fired. This accounted for a six-percentage point increase compared to 89 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of rounds fired from handguns during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 76 percent, 2020 experienced a 19-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, rounds fired from handguns were the most frequent round type fired during OIS incidents, accounting for 1,056 of the 1,352 total rounds, or 78 percent.

In 2020, 233 rounds were fired from shotguns during OIS incidents, which represented three percent of the 156 total rounds fired. This accounted for a one-percentage point increase compared to two percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of rounds fired from shotguns during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 2 percent, 2020 experienced a 21-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, rounds fired from shotguns accounted for 23 of the 1,352 total rounds, or two percent.
In 2020, there were 18 OIS incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired, which represented 67 percent of the 27 total incidents. This accounted for a 17 percentage point increase compared to 50 percent in 2019. In addition, when compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 63 percent, 2020 experienced a four-percentage point decrease.

In 2020, there were six OIS incidents in which 6-10 rounds were fired, which represented 22 percent of the 27 total incidents. This accounted for a three-percentage point increase compared to 19 percent in 2019. In addition, when compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 6-10 rounds were fired during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 13 percent, 2020 experienced a nine-percentage point increase.

In 2020, there were two OIS incidents in which 16-20 rounds were fired, which represented seven percent of the 27 total incidents. This accounted for a five-percentage point decrease compared to 12 percent in 2019. In addition, when compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 16-20 rounds were fired during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of four percent, 2020 experienced a three-percentage point increase.

In 2020, there was one OIS incident in which 31-35 rounds were fired, which represented four percent of the 27 total incidents. This accounted for no percentage point change compared to four percent in 2019. In addition, when compared to the aggregate percentage of incidents in which 31-35 rounds were fired during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of one percent, 2020 experienced a three-percentage point increase.

The 2020 total number of rounds fired compared to the total number of rounds which struck their intended targets resulted in a hit ratio of 19 percent. This accounted for a nine-percentage point decrease compared to 28 percent in 2019. In addition, when compared to the 2016 through 2019 aggregate hit ratio of 32 percent, 2020 experienced a 13-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the hit ratio of all OIS incidents accounting for 362 of the 1,352 total rounds fired, was 28 percent.
In 2020, 13 Hispanic suspects were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 42 percent of the 31 total suspects. This accounted for an eight-percentage point decrease compared to nine percent in 2019. The aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic suspects involved in OIS incidents in 2020 was six-percentage points below the City’s overall Hispanic population total. Additionally, the percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in OIS incidents in 2020 was three-percentage points above the City’s overall Hispanic violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic suspects from 2016 through 2019 of five percent, 2020 experienced a 14-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the Filipino category represented two of the 180 total suspects, or one percent. In 2019, 12 Black suspects were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 39 percent of the 31 total suspects. This accounted for an eight-percentage point increase compared to seven percent in 2019. The percentage of Black suspects involved in OIS incidents in 2020 was 15-percentage points above the City’s overall Black population total. However, the percentage of Black suspects involved in OIS incidents in 2020 was three-percentage points below the City’s overall Black violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Black suspects from 2016 through 2019 of 25 percent, 2020 experienced an 11-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the Other category represented four of the 180 total suspects, or two percent, were involved in OIS incidents. In 2020, two White suspects were involved in OIS incidents, which represented six percent of the 31 total suspects. This accounted for a two-percentage point increase compared to eight percent in 2019. The aggregate percentage of involved White suspects involved in OIS incidents in 2020 was 13-percentage points below the City’s overall White population total. However, the percentage of White suspects involved in OIS incidents in 2020 was 15-percentage points below the city’s overall white violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved White suspects from 2016 through 2019 of six percent, 2020 experienced an 18-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the White category was the third most represented ethnic group involved in OIS incidents with 17 of the 180 total suspects, or nine percent.

In 2020, one Filipino suspect was involved in an OIS incident, which represented three percent of the 31 total suspects. This accounted for a three-percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2019. The percentage of Filipino suspects involved in OIS incidents in 2020 was six-percentage points below the City’s overall Filipino violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Filipino suspects from 2016 through 2019 of 17 percent, 2020 experienced a 24-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the Filipino category represented two of the 180 total suspects, or one percent.

In 2020, one suspect, or three percent of the 31 total suspects, involved in an OIS incident was categorized as “Unknown.” This accounted for a three-percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved unknown suspects from 2016 through 2019 of 1 percent, 2020 experienced a 2.4-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, a minority of suspects involved in OIS incidents were female, representing seven of the 180 total suspects, or four percent. In 2020, one female suspect was involved in an OIS incident, which represented 13 percent of the 31 total suspects. This accounted for a nine-percentage point increase compared to four percent in 2019.
In 2020, six of the 31 total suspects, or 19 percent, involved in OIS incidents were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis. This accounted for a four-percentage point increase compared to 15 percent in 2019.

When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis from 2016 through 2019 of 23 percent, 2020 experienced a four-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, suspects who were perceived to suffer from a mental illness and/or a mental health crisis accounted for 40 of the 180 total suspects, or 22 percent.

In 2020, the 24-29 age group represented the third largest age category with four of the 31 total suspects, or 13 percent. The 24-29 age category accounted for a two-percentage point decrease compared to 15 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 24-29 age range from 2016 through 2019 of 20 percent, 2020 experienced a seven-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the 24-29 age group represented the third largest age category of suspects involved in OIS incidents with 34 of the 180 total suspects, or 19 percent.

In 2020, the 24-29 age group represented the third largest age category with six of the 31 total suspects, or 19 percent. The 24-29 age category accounted for a two-percentage point decrease compared to 15 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 24-29 age range from 2016 through 2019 of 20 percent, 2020 experienced a seven-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the 24-29 age group represented the third largest age category of suspects involved in OIS incidents with 34 of the 180 total suspects, or 19 percent.

The seven remaining suspects, or 23 percent, in 2020 were in the age ranges of 0-17, 40-49, 50-59, and “unknown” age designation with one suspect in the 0-17, and two suspects each in the 40-49, 50-59 and “unknown” categories.

In 2020, there were no homeless suspects involved in OIS incidents, compared to six homeless suspects in 2019. This accounted for a 23-percentage point decrease compared to 23 percent in 2019.

Historically, from 2016 through 2020, homeless suspects involved in OIS incidents accounted for 15 of the 180 total suspects, or eight percent.

Toxicology results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s) in OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 86 percent, 2020 experienced a seven-percentage point decrease compared to 86 percent of positive cases in 2018. When compared to the aggregate percentage of decedents with positive toxicology results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s) in OIS incidents from 2016 through 2018 of 86 percent, 2019 experienced an 11-percentage point decrease.

The 2019 percentage of cases with positive alcohol and/or a controlled substance results, representing 75 percent, accounted for a 11-percentage point decrease compared to 86 percent of positive cases in 2018. When compared to the aggregate percentage of decedents with positive toxicology results for alcohol and/or a controlled substance(s) in OIS incidents from 2016 through 2018 of 86 percent, 2019 experienced an 11-percentage point decrease.

The Department was directed by the BOPC to track homeless data for suspects involved in CUOF incidents starting in 2016. Force Investigation Division has since implemented new procedures to capture this statistic.
In 2019, six of the 12 OIS decedents, or 50 percent, had positive results for methamphetamine. The 2019 percentage experienced no change when compared to 2018 OIS incidents. Historically, 29 of the 62 decedents involved in 2016 through 2019 OIS incidents, representing 47 percent, had positive toxicology results for methamphetamine.

In 2019, five of the 12 OIS decedents, or 42 percent, had positive results for marijuana. The 2019 percentage accounted for an eight-percentage point decrease compared to 2018 OIS incidents. Historically, 26 of the 62 decedents involved in 2016 through 2019 OIS incidents, representing 42 percent, had positive toxicology results for marijuana.

In 2019, five of the 12 OIS decedents, or 42 percent, had positive results for alcohol. The 2019 percentage accounted for a 21-percentage point increase compared to 2018 OIS incidents. Historically, 16 of the 62 decedents involved in 2016 through 2019 OIS incidents, representing 26 percent, had positive toxicology results for alcohol.

Toxicology reports for decedents in 2020 are pending and were not completed at the publication of this report from the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner’s Office. Complete toxicology for 2020 at the publication of this report from the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner’s Office. Toxicology reports for decedents in 2020 are pending and were not completed.

In 2020, 18 firearms were utilized by suspects during OIS incidents, which represented 58 percent of the 31 total weapon types. This accounted for a seven-percentage point decrease compared to 65 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of firearms utilized by suspects during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 59 percent, 2020 experienced a one-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, firearms were the most utilized weapon type by suspects during OIS incidents, representing 106 of the 180 total weapons, or 59 percent.

In 2020, seven edged weapons were utilized by suspects during OIS incidents, which represented 23 percent of the 31 total weapon types. This accounted for a four-percentage point increase compared to 19 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of edged weapons utilized by suspects during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 17 percent, 2020 experienced a six-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, edged weapons were the second most utilized weapon type by suspects during OIS incidents, representing 32 of the 180 total weapons, or 18 percent.

In 2020, one suspect used an automobile as a force during an OIS incident, which represented three percent. This accounted for a three-percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of automobile force utilized by suspects during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of three percent, 2020 experienced a one-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, automobile force represented five of the 180 total weapons, or three percent, utilized by suspects during OIS incidents.

In 2020, there was one perception-based OIS incident, which represented three percent. This accounted for a three-percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of perceived weapons utilized by suspects during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of five percent, 2020 experienced a two-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, perceived weapons represented eight of the 180 total weapons, or four percent, utilized by suspects during OIS incidents.

The remaining four weapon types utilized by suspects during OIS incidents were placed in the weapon type categories of “other” and “none” which represented 13 percent of the 31 total weapon types. The categories of “other” and “none” accounted for two incidents each.
In 2020, seven suspects died from police gunfire, or 23 percent of the 31 total suspects involved in OIS incidents. This accounted for a 23-percentage point decrease in comparison to 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of deceased suspects during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019, of 42 percent, 2020 experienced a 19-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, deceased suspects represented the third highest ethnic decedent count, accounting for ten of the 70 total decedents, or 14 percent.

In 2020, two suspects, or six percent of the 31 total suspects involved in OIS incidents, were placed in the “unknown injuries” category. When compared to the aggregate percentage of unknown injuries suspects sustained during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019, of 38 percent, 2020 experienced a one-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2019, of 38 percent, 2020 experienced a three-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, injured suspects during OIS incidents accounted for 69 of the 180 total suspects, or 38 percent.

In 2020, 12 suspects sustained non-fatal injuries, or 39 percent of the total 31 total suspects involved in OIS incidents. This accounted for a one-percentage point increase in comparison to 38 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of injured suspects during OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019, of 38 percent, 2020 experienced a one-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, injured suspects during OIS incidents accounted for 69 of the 180 total suspects, or 38 percent.

Of the seven decedents involved in OIS incidents in 2020, four individuals, or 57 percent, were Hispanic. This accounted for a nine-percentage point decrease compared to 66 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved deceased Hispanic suspects from OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 62 percent, 2020 experienced a five-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, a majority of deceased suspects involved in OIS incidents were Hispanic, accounting for 43 of the 70 total decedents, or 61 percent.

Of the seven decedents involved in OIS incidents in 2020, one individual, or 14 percent, was Black. This accounted for a two-percentage point decrease compared to 16 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved deceased Black suspects from OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 19 percent, 2020 experienced a five-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, Black suspects represented the second highest ethnic decedent count, accounting for 13 of the 70 total decedents, or 19 percent.

Of the seven decedents involved in OIS incidents in 2020, one individual, or 14 percent was White. This accounted for a six-percentage point increase compared to eight percent in 2019.

When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved deceased White suspects from OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 14 percent, 2020 experienced no change. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, White suspects represented the third highest ethnic decedent count, accounting for ten of the 70 total decedents, or 14 percent.

Of the seven decedents involved in OIS incidents in 2020, one individual, or 14 percent was of Filipino ethnicity. This accounted for a 14-percentage point increase compared to zero percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved deceased Filipino suspects from OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of three percent, 2020 experienced an 11-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, Filipino suspects accounted for two of the 70 total decedents, or three percent.

Of the seven decedents involved in OIS incidents in 2020, no individuals, or zero percent were of other ethnicity. This accounted for an eight-percentage point decrease compared to eight percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved deceased other suspects from OIS incidents from 2016 through 2019 of three percent, 2020 experienced a three-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, other suspects accounted for two of the 70 total decedents, or three percent.

Note: Two suspects died from self-inflicted gunshot wounds in two OIS-No HI incidents in 2018 and were not counted in the comparison with 2019.
In 2019, 34% of the 48 total OIS OIS Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing 71 percent, were adjudicated as “Tactical Debrief.” This accounted for a 11-percentage point increase compared to 60 percent in 2018. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Tactical Debrief” OIS Drawing/Exhibiting findings from 2016 through 2018 of 98 percent, 2019 experienced a one-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2019, a majority of adjudicated OIS findings resulted in a “Tactical Debrief” outcome, accounting for 184 of the 256 total OIS findings, or 72 percent.

In 2019, 45 of the 48 total OIS Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing 94 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” This accounted for a four-percentage point decrease compared to 98 percent in 2018. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “In Policy (No Further Action)” OIS Drawing/Exhibiting findings from 2016 through 2018 of 98 percent, 2019 experienced an eight-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2019, most of the adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, accounting for 214 of the 256 total findings, or 84 percent.

In 2019, 43 of the 48 total Lethal force findings, representing 90 percent, were adjudicated as “In Policy (No Further Action).” This accounted for a five-percentage point increase compared to 85 percent in 2018. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “In Policy (No Further Action)” Lethal force findings from 2016 through 2018 of 82 percent, 2019 experienced an eight-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2019, most of the adjudicated Lethal force findings resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome, accounting for 214 of the 256 total findings, or 84 percent.

In 2019, five of the 48 total Lethal force findings, representing ten percent, were adjudicated as “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).” This accounted for a five-percentage point decrease compared to 15 percent in 2018. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” Lethal force findings from 2016 through 2018 of 18 percent, 2019 experienced an eight-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2019, 42 of the 256 total Lethal force findings, representing 16 percent, were adjudicated as “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).”

In 2019, 14 of the 48 total OIS Tactics findings, representing 29 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Disapproval.” This accounted for an 11-percentage point decrease compared to 40 percent in 2018. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Disapproval” Tactics findings from 2016 through 2018 of 28 percent, 2019 experienced a one-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2019, 72 of the 256 total Tactics findings, accounting for 28 percent, resulted in an “Administrative Disapproval” outcome.

In 2019, three of the 48 total OIS Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing six percent, was adjudicated as “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).” This accounted for a four-percentage point increase compared to two percent in 2018. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” Drawing/Exhibiting findings from 2016 through 2018, of 24 percent, 2019 experienced a 5.96-percentage point increase. In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, four of the 257 Drawing/Exhibiting findings, representing one percent, were adjudicated as “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).”

\[\text{Adjustment data for 2020 was omitted from the Report since the vast majority of the CUOF incidents will be adjudicated by the BOPC in 2021.}\]
All involved personnel will be part of the NCUOF investigation.

1. A supervisor responds and conducts the NCUOF investigation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

CIRD reviews the NCUOF investigation.

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

POSSIBLE DISPOSITIONS
- No Action
- Incident Debrief
- Informal meeting/counseling
- Divisional training
- Formal training
- Comment Card
- Notice to correct deficiencies
- Personnel complaint
- Modified field duties
- Assigned to non-field duties
- Tactical Debrief

NCUOF INCIDENT OCCURS

SUPERVISOR

WATCH COMMANDER

AREA COMMANDING OFFICER

BUREAU COMMANDING OFFICER

CRITICAL INCIDENT REVIEW DIVISION

NON-CATEGORICAL

USE OF FORCE REVIEW PROCESS

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

No Action
- Incident Debrief
- Informal meeting/counseling
- Divisional training
- Formal training
- Comment Card
- Notice to correct deficiencies
- Personnel complaint
- Modified field duties
- Assigned to non-field duties
- Tactical Debrief
In a crowd control situation, a Use of Force Report is not required when officer(s) become involved in an incident where force is used to push or move individuals who exhibit unlawful or hostile behavior and who do not respond to verbal directions by the police. This applies only to officers working in organized squad and platoon sized units directly involved in a crowd control mission. Additionally, should force be utilized under these circumstances, officers shall notify their immediate supervisor of the use of force once the tactical situation had been resolved. The supervisor shall report the actions on Incident Command System (ICS) Form 214.

A Use of Force Report is required when an officer(s) becomes involved in an isolated incident with an individual during a crowd control situation, which goes beyond the mission of the skirmish line. This Report does not capture Use of Force incidents related to crowd control operations that have been reported on ICS Form 214.

In 2020, Department personnel were involved in 2,194 NCUOF incidents, a decrease of 126 incidents, or five percent, compared to 2019. In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, there were a total of 8,493 incidents, resulting in an annual average of 2,123 incidents. The 2020 incident count exceeded the 2016 through 2019 annual average by 70.75 incidents, or three percent.

In 2020, 133 NCUOF incidents were Level I occurrences, which represented six percent of the 2,194 total incidents. This accounted for a one-percentage point decrease when compared to seven percent in 2019. Similarly, when compared to the aggregate percentage of Level I NCUOF incidents from 2016 through 2019 of eight percent, 2020 experienced a two-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the majority of NCUOF incidents were Level II occurrences, accounting for 9,866 of the 10,687 total incidents, or 92 percent.

In 2020, a total of 2,061 NCUOF incidents were Level II occurrences, which represented 94 percent of the 2,194 total incidents. This accounted for a one-percentage point increase compared to 93 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of Level II NCUOF incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 92 percent, 2020 experienced a two-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the majority of NCUOF incidents were Level II occurrences, accounting for 9,866 of the 10,687 total incidents, or 92 percent.
In 2020, TASERs were utilized in 217, or ten percent, of the 2,194 NCUOF incidents. This accounted for a one-percentage point decrease compared to seven percent in 2019. Similarly, when compared to the aggregate percentage of effective TASER activations during NCUOF incidents in which TASERs were utilized, resulting in an average of 2.51 activations per incident. This accounted for a 0.48-percentage point decrease compared to the 2019 average activations per incident of 2.03. When compared to the aggregate annual average of TASER activations per incident from 2016 through 2019 of 2.19, 2020 experienced an increase of 0.32 activations per incident, or 15 percent.

In 2020, Department personnel activated a TASER 545 times during 217 NCUOF incidents in which TASERs were utilized, resulting in an average of 2.51 activations per incident. This accounted for a 0.48-percentage point increase compared to the 2019 average activations per incident of 2.03. When compared to the aggregate annual average of TASER activations per incident from 2016 through 2019 of 2.19, 2020 experienced an increase of 0.32 activations per incident, or 15 percent.

ANNUAL EFFECTIVENESS TOTALS & PERCENTAGES

In 2020, 40mm Less-Lethal Launchers were utilized in 68, or three percent, of the 2,194 NCUOF incidents. This accounted for a no change when compared to three percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of effective 40mm Launcher discharges during NCUOF incidents in which 40mm Less-Lethal Launchers were utilized, resulting in an average of 2.19 activations per incident. This accounted for a 0.48-percentage point decrease compared to the 2019 average activations per incident of 2.69. When compared to the aggregate annual average of 40mm Launcher activations per incident from 2016 through 2019 of 2.51, 2020 experienced an increase of 0.32 activations per incident, or 13 percent.

In 2020, batons or other impact devices were utilized in 33, or two percent, of the 2,194 NCUOF incidents. This accounted for a no change when compared to one percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of batons or other impact devices utilized during NCUOF incidents from 2016 through 2019 of one percent, 2020 experienced an approximate two-percentage point decrease. In 2019, similar when compared to the aggregate percentage of 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher usage during NCUOF incidents from 2016 through 2019 of one percent, 2020 experienced an approximate two-percentage point increase.

In 2020, 2,069 Tasers were utilized in 68, or three percent, of the 2,194 NCUOF incidents. This accounted for a no change when compared to three percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of TASER discharges during NCUOF incidents in which TASERs were utilized, resulting in an average of 2.51 activations per incident. This accounted for a 0.48-percentage point decrease compared to the 2019 average activations per incident of 2.03. When compared to the aggregate annual average of TASER activations per incident from 2016 through 2019 of 2.19, 2020 experienced an increase of 0.32 activations per incident, or 15 percent.

In 2020, Department personnel activated a TASER 545 times during 217 NCUOF incidents in which TASERs were utilized, resulting in an average of 2.51 activations per incident. This accounted for a 0.48-percentage point increase compared to the 2019 average activations per incident of 2.03. When compared to the aggregate annual average of TASER activations per incident from 2016 through 2019 of 2.19, 2020 experienced an increase of 0.32 activations per incident, or 15 percent.

In 2020, TASER activations were effective 278 times during NCUOF incidents, which represented 51 percent of the 545 total activations. This accounted for a two-percentage point decrease, compared to 53 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of effective TASER activations from 2016 through 2019 of 56 percent, 2020 experienced a five-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, TASER activations were effective 2,415 times of the 4,390 total activations, or 55 percent.
In 2020, Department personnel discharged a 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher rounds were effective 48 times during NCUOF incidents, which represented 41 percent of the 118 total rounds discharged. This accounted for a 12-percentage point decrease compared to the aggregate annual average of 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher discharges per incident from 2016 through 2019 of 1.8. 2020 experienced a decrease of 0.1 discharges per incident, or 6 percent.

Note: The Department began tracking the effectiveness of the 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher in late 2016. As such, an aggregate comparison of the 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher’s effectiveness could not be completed at the time of this writing.

In 2020, Department personnel discharged a 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher 118 times during 68 NCUOF incidents in which 40mm Less-Lethal Launchers were utilized, resulting in an average of 1.7 rounds discharged per incident. This accounted for a 12-percentage point decrease compared to the aggregate annual average of 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher discharges per incident from 2016 through 2019 of 1.8. 2020 experienced a decrease of 0.1 discharges per incident, or 6 percent.

Note: The Department began tracking the effectiveness of the 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher in late 2016. As such, an aggregate comparison of the 40mm Less-Lethal Launcher’s effectiveness could not be completed at the time of this writing.

In 2020, Department personnel discharged a Beanbag shotgun 70 times during 32 NCUOF incidents in which Beanbag shotguns were utilized, resulting in an average of 2.2 rounds discharged per incident. This accounted for a 5.5-percentage point increase compared to the 2019 average activations per incident of 1.7. When compared to the aggregate annual average of Beanbag rounds discharged per incident from 2016 through 2019 of 2.2, 2020 experienced no change.

Note: The Department began tracking the effectiveness of the Beanbag shotgun in late 2016. As such, an aggregate comparison of the Beanbag shotgun’s effectiveness could not be completed at the time of this writing.
LESS-LETHAL FORCE OPTION MISSES - NO CONTACT

In 2020, there were three separate incidents in which less-lethal force options were intentionally deployed, but did not contact the involved suspects. Two incidents involved the use of our 40mm Less-Lethal Launchers, one involved the use of the TASER; all of which were deployed to stop the suspect’s actions. None of the munitions in each of these three incidents contacted the suspects; therefore, were not reportable as Non-Categorical uses of force. Each of the suspects were taken into custody without further incident.

FIREARM POINTED AT PERSON

In 2020, Los Angeles Police Department officers documented public contacts of 1,443,077 persons, which include those detained for calls for service and field detentions. Officers drew and pointed their firearms at a total of 7,277 persons, or 0.5 percent, of the Department’s NCUOF incidents, or seven percent, compared to 2019. Approximately 30 percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in Central Bureau, which was a decrease of 48 incidents, or five percent, compared to 2019. In 2020, 652 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred within the geographic areas of Central Bureau, which was a decrease of 48 incidents, or five percent, compared to 2019. Approximately 30 percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department – 2,194; Central Bureau – 652).

In 2020, 544 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred within the geographic areas of South Bureau, which was a decrease of 77 incidents, or nine percent, compared to 2019. Approximately 25 percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department – 2,194; South Bureau – 544).

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

In 2020, a total of 1,331 of the Department’s 2,194 NCUOF incidents, or 61 percent, originated from radio calls. This accounted for a four-percentage point increase when compared to 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of NCUOF incidents resulting from radio calls from 2016 through 2019 of 57 percent, 2020 experienced a four-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, radio calls represented the largest source category of NCUOF incidents, accounting for 6,141 of the 10,687 total incidents, or 57 percent.

In 2020, 552 of the Department’s 2,194 NCUOF incidents, or 25 percent, originated from field detentions based on officers’ observations (i.e. pedestrian and traffic stops). This accounted for a two-percentage point decrease when compared to 27 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of NCUOF incidents resulting from field detentions based on officers’ observations from 2016 through 2019 of 28 percent, 2020 experienced a three-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, field detention based on officers’ observations represented the second largest source category of NCUOF incidents, accounting for 2,987 of the 10,687 total incidents, or 27 percent.

The remaining 311 NCUOF incidents, or 14 percent, in 2020 occurred during citizen-flag downs, station calls, occurrences with “other” designations, and those with “unknown” classifications.

OPERATIONS: CENTRAL BUREAU

In 2020, 652 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred within the geographic areas of Central Bureau, which was a decrease of 48 incidents, or seven percent, compared to 2019. Approximately 30 percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department – 2,194; Central Bureau – 652).

In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, a total of 2,569 NCUOF incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 642.3 incidents. The Central Bureau count for 2020 exceeded the 2016 through 2019 annual average by 9.7 incidents, or approximately two percent.

In 2020, 544 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred within the geographic areas of South Bureau, which was a decrease of 77 incidents, or nine percent, compared to 2019. Approximately 25 percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department – 2,194; South Bureau – 544).

In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, a total of 2,108 NCUOF incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 527 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2020 was above the 2016 through 2019 annual average by 17 incidents, or approximately three percent.
In 2020, 409 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred within the geographic areas of West Bureau, which was an increase of 20 incidents, or five percent, compared to 2019. Approximately 19 percent of the Department’s NCUOF incident occurred in West Bureau (Department – 2,194; West Bureau – 409).

In the four-year period from 2016 through 2019, a total of 1,508 NCUOF incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 377 incidents. The West Bureau count for 2020 exceeded the 2016 through 2019 annual average by 32 incidents, or approximately eight percent.

In 2020, 33 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred outside the Department’s jurisdiction, which was a decrease of 12 incidents, or 27 percent, compared to 2019. Approximately two percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in areas outside the Department’s jurisdiction (Department – 2,194; Outside Areas – 33).

In 2020, April represented the month with the most NCUOF incidents with 233 occurrences, or approximately 11 percent of the 2,194 total incidents throughout the year. May had the second highest count with 224 incidents or ten percent, respectively. March had the third highest count with 210 occurrences, or approximately nine percent. January had the fourth highest count with 195 occurrences, or approximately nine percent. The remaining 1,335 incidents, or 61 percent, were evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

The NCUOF percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2016 through 2020 was as follows:

- January through March: 2,587 incidents, or approximately 24 percent;
- April through June: 2,863 incidents, or approximately 27 percent;
- July through September: 2,709 incidents, or approximately 25 percent;
- October through December: 2,528 incidents or approximately 24 percent.

From 2016 through 2020, April represented the month with the most NCUOF with 966 of the 10,687 total incidents, or nine percent. February represented the month with the fewest incidents during the same time period with 792 incidents, or approximately seven percent.
In 2020, Wednesday represented the day with the most NCUOF incidents, accounting for 320 occurrences, or approximately 15 percent. Thursday had the second highest count with 318 occurrences, or 14 percent.

In 2016, a total of 6,118 female officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented less than one percent of the 9,047 total employees. This accounted for 4,787 of the 39,219 total involved employees, or 12 percent.

During the five-year period from 2016 through 2020, a total of 2,544 NCUOF incidents occurred between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 11:59 p.m., which represented 24 percent of the 10,687 total incidents. The time category with the second highest count was 4:00 a.m. to 7:59 a.m., which accounted for 2,466 incidents, or 23 percent. The time category with the fewest number of NCUOF incidents was 4:00 a.m. to 7:59 a.m., which accounted for 769 incidents, or seven percent.

In 2020, a total of 5,166 Hispanic officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 57 percent of the 9,047 total employees. This accounted for 4,787 of the 39,219 total involved employees, or 12 percent. The percentage of Hispanic officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2020 was four-percentage points below the Department’s overall Hispanic officer total.

In 2020, a total of 5,166 Hispanic officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 4,787 of the 39,219 total involved employees, or 12 percent. The percentage of Hispanic officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2020 exceeded over a 99-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2019 of less than one percent, 2020 accounted for a 100-percentage point increase when compared to zero percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic personnel from 2016 through 2019 of less than one percent, 2020 accounted for an increase of 0.3 officers per incident compared to an average of 3.8 officers per incident in 2019. The percentage of Hispanic officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2020 was seven-percentage points above the Department’s overall Hispanic officer total.

In 2020, a total of 1,223 female officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 88 percent of the 9,047 total employees. From 2016 through 2020, Wednesday represented the day with the fewest number of incidents with 1,502 occurrences, or 14 percent.

In 2020, a total of 4,787 female officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 34,429 of the 39,219 total involved employees, or 88 percent. The percentage of female officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2020 was four-percentage points below the Department’s overall female officer total.

In 2020, a total of 1,223 female officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 88 percent of the 9,047 total employees. From 2016 through 2020, Wednesday represented the day with the fewest number of incidents with 1,502 occurrences, or 14 percent.

In 2020, a total of 7,822 male officers were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 86 percent of the 9,047 total employees. This accounted for a one-percentage point decrease when compared to 87 percent 2019. The percentage of male officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2020 was for a one-percentage point increase when compared to 87 percent 2019. The percentage of male officers involved in NCUOF incidents in 2020 accounted for an increase of 0.3 officers per incident compared to an average of 3.8 officers per incident in 2019. The 2020 average exceeded the 2016 through 2019 aggregate annual average by 0.5 or 14 percent.

During the five-year period from 2016 through 2020, a total of 2,544 NCUOF incidents occurred between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 11:59 p.m., which represented 24 percent of the 10,687 total incidents. The time category with the second highest count was 4:00 a.m. to 7:59 a.m., which accounted for 2,466 incidents, or 23 percent. The time category with the fewest number of NCUOF incidents was 4:00 a.m. to 7:59 a.m., which accounted for 769 incidents, or seven percent.
In 2020, a total of 210 employees at the rank of Detention Officer were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented two percent of the 9,047 total employees. This accounted for a one-percentage point decrease when compared to three percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel at the rank of detention officer from 2016 through 2019 of the three percent, 2020 experienced a one-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, detention officers accounted for 1,141 of the 39,219 total personnel involved in NCUOF incidents, or three percent.

In 2020, a total of 7,487 personnel assigned to patrol were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 83 percent of the 9,047 total personnel. This accounted for a two-percentage point increase compared to 81 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to patrol from 2016 through 2019 of 78 percent, 2020 experienced a five-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the majority of personnel involved in NCUOF incidents were assigned to patrol, accounting for 31,146 of the 39,219 total employees, or 79 percent.

In 2020, a total of 780 personnel assigned to specialized assignments were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented nine percent of the 9,047 total personnel. This accounted for no change compared to nine percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved personnel assigned to specialized assignments from 2016 through 2019 of 10 percent, 2020 experienced a one-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, personnel assigned to specialized assignments represented the second largest category of personnel involved in NCUOF incidents, accounting for 4,130 of the 39,219 total employees, or 11 percent.

The remaining 159 employees, or two percent, involved in 2020 NCUOF incidents included six command staff personnel, 23 lieutenants, six reserve officers, 73 detectives, and 51 civilian personnel.
In 2020, 746 officers sustained injuries during the 2,194 NCUOF incidents, which represented 20 percent of the 2,323 total suspects. This accounted for no change compared to 2019.

The remaining 13 suspects, or less than one percent, involved in 2020 NCUOF incidents had an unknown gender classification.

In 2020, a total of 1,851 male suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 20 percent of the 2,323 total suspects. This accounted for no change compared to 20 percent in 2016. When compared to the 2016 through 2019 annual average of 746.75 injured officers, 2020 was 0.75 officers, or 0.1 percent, below the four-year annual average.

The suspect sections below include data for all individuals that Department personnel applied NCUOF against.

### Injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>6,478</td>
<td>7,260</td>
<td>7,937</td>
<td>8,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,118</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,180</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,073</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,801</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,117</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2020, 993 Hispanic suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 41 percent of the 2,323 total suspects. This accounted for a one-percentage point increase compared to 40 percent in 2019. The percentage of Hispanic suspects involved in NCUOF incidents in 2020 was five-percentage points below the City’s overall Hispanic violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Hispanic suspects from 2016 through 2019 of 44 percent, 2020 experienced a one-percentage point decrease.

The remaining 13 suspects, or less than one percent, involved in 2020 NCUOF incidents had an unknown gender classification.

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>6,478</td>
<td>7,260</td>
<td>7,937</td>
<td>8,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,118</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,180</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,073</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,801</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,117</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2020, 863 Black suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents, which represented 33 percent of the 2,323 total suspects. This accounted for no change compared to 35 percent in 2019. The percentage of Black suspects involved in NCUOF incidents in 2020 was two-percentage points below the City’s overall Black violent crime offender total. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved Black suspects from 2016 through 2019 of 38 percent, 2020 experienced a two-percentage point decrease.

The remaining 13 suspects, or less than one percent, involved in 2020 NCUOF incidents had an unknown gender classification.
In 2020, the 28-32 age group represented the largest age category, with 526 of the 2,323 total suspects, or 23 percent. This accounted for a two-percentage point increase for this specific age category when compared to 21 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 28-32 age range from 2016 through 2019 of 18 percent, 2020 experienced a five-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the 28-32 age group represented the second largest age category of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents with 2,122 of the 11,119 total suspects, or 19 percent.

In 2020, the 23-27 age group represented the second largest age category, with 504 of the 2,323 total suspects, or 22 percent. The 23-27 age category accounted for a one-percentage point increase compared to 21 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 23-27 age range from 2016 through 2019 of 22 percent, 2020 experienced no change. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the 23-27 age group represented the third largest age category of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents with 2,452 of the 11,119 total suspects, or 22 percent.

In 2020, the 33-37 age group represented the third largest age category, with 318 of the 2,323 total suspects or 14 percent. The 33-37 age category accounted for a one-percentage point increase compared to 13 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 33-37 age range from 2016 through 2019 of 13 percent, 2020 experienced a one-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the 33-37 age group represented the fourth largest age category of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents with 1,473 of the 11,119 total suspects, or 13 percent.

In 2020, the 18-22 age group represented the fourth largest age category, with 262 of the 2,323 total suspects, or 11 percent. The 18-22 age category accounted for a two-percentage point increase. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the 18-22 age group represented the third largest age category, with 262 of the 2,323 total suspects, or 11 percent. The 18-22 age category accounted for a one-percentage point decrease compared to 12 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects within the 18-22 age range from 2016 through 2019 of 15 percent, 2020 experienced a four-percentage point decrease. Historically, from 2016 through 2020, the 18-22 age group represented the third largest age category of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents with 1,595 of the 11,119 total suspects, or 14 percent. Consistent with 2016 through 2019 figures, the remaining 2020 NCUOF suspect age categories experienced diminishing totals as the age of the suspect increased.
In 2020, 804 of the 2,323 total suspects, or 35 percent, involved in NCUOF incidents were perceived to be homeless. This accounted for a one-percentage point increase compared to 34 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved NCUOF suspects who were perceived to be homeless from 2016 through 2019 of 30 percent, 2020 experienced a five-percentage point increase.

Historically, from 2016 through 2020, suspects perceived to be homeless accounted for 3,432 of the 11,119 total NCUOF suspects, or 31 percent.

In 2020, a total of 1,589 suspects sustained injuries during the 2,194 NCUOF incidents throughout the year, which represented 68 percent of the 2,323 total suspects. This accounted for a six-percentage point decrease compared to 74 percent in 2019. When compared to the aggregate percentage of involved suspects who sustained injuries during NCUOF incidents from 2016 through 2019 of 80 percent, 2020 experienced a 12-percentage point decrease.

Historically, from 2016 through 2020, suspects that sustained injuries accounted for 8,607 of the 11,119 total NCUOF suspects, or 77 percent.

In 2019, a total of 8,789 of the 8,939 NCUOF Tactics findings, representing 98 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Approval.” This accounted for no change compared to 98 percent of “Administrative Approval” Tactics findings in 2018. When compared to the aggregate percentage of “Administrative Approval” Tactics findings from 2016 through 2018 of 98 percent, 2019 experienced no change. Historically, from 2016 through 2019, the vast majority of adjudicated Tactics findings resulted in an “Administrative Approval” outcome, accounting for 29,798 of the 30,330 total tactics findings, or 98 percent.

In 2019, a total of 27,992 of the 28,079 total NCUOF Force findings, representing 99 percent, were adjudicated as “Administrative Approval.” This accounted for no change when compared to 99 percent of “Administrative Approval” Force findings in 2018. When compared to the 2016 through 2018 aggregate percentage of “Administrative Approval” Force findings of 99 percent, 2019 experienced no change. Historically, from 2016 through 2019, the vast majority of adjudicated Force findings resulted in an “Administrative Approval” outcome, accounting for 91,003 of the 91,469 total Force findings, or 99 percent.
DEFINITIONS

CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE ADJUDICATION FINDINGS:
Tactics, drawing/exhibiting a firearm, and UOF shall be evaluated during the adjudication process (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.10).

DRAWING AND EXHIBITING AND/OR USE OF FORCE-
ADMINISTRATIVE DISAPPROVAL-OUT OF POLICY:
Finding, supported by a preponderance of the evidence that the actions of the employee relative to drawing/exhibiting a firearm or UOF were not within the Department’s policies (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.10).

ADMINISTRATIVE DISAPPROVAL – NEGLIGENT DISCHARGE:
Finding, where it was determined that the unintentional discharge of a firearm resulted from operator error, such as the violation of a firearm safety rule (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

TACTICS-ADMINISTRATIVE DISAPPROVAL:
A finding, supported by a preponderance of the evidence that the tactics employed during a CUOF incident unjustifiably and substantially deviated from approved Department tactical training (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

ANIMAL SHOOTING:
An incident in which a Department employee intentionally discharges a firearm at an animal.

CANINE (K9) CONTACT:
An incident in which a member of the public has contact with a Department K9 and hospitalization is required (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

CAROTID RESTRAINT CONTROL HOLD:
All uses of an upper body control hold by a Department employee, including the modified carotid, full carotid, and locked carotid hold (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

CATEGORICAL UOF INCIDENT
A CUOF is defined as:

- An incident involving the use of deadly force (e.g., discharge of a firearm) by a Department employee;
- All uses of an upper body control hold by a Department employee, including the use of a modified carotid, full carotid or locked carotid hold;
- All deaths while the arrestee or detainee is in the custodial care of the Department (also known as an In-Custody Death or ICD);
- A UOF incident resulting in death;
- A UOF incident resulting in an injury requiring hospitalization (commonly referred to as a LERI);
- All intentional head strikes with an impact weapon or device (e.g., baton, flashlight, etc.) and all unintentional (inadvertent or accidental) head strikes that results in serious bodily injury, hospitalization or death;
- All other unintentional head strikes shall be investigated as Level I NCUOF incidents;
- Officer involved animal shootings;
- Non-tactical unintentional discharges; and,
- An incident in which a member of the public has contact with a Department canine and hospitalization is required (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

CRIME
Part I Crime: The FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program classifies the following offenses as Part I crimes: criminal homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny theft (except motor vehicle theft), motor vehicle theft, and arson.

Part II Crime: The FBI’s UCR Program classifies all violations of state or local laws not specifically identified as Part I offenses (except traffic violations) as Part II crimes.

Violent Crime: The FBI defines violent crime in its UCR program as those offenses which involve force or threat of force. As such, violent crime is comprised of four offenses (criminal homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault).

FIELD DETENTION:
Refer to Public Contact.

FORCE OPTIONS:
All Department-approved physical force techniques (e.g. firm grip, strike, takedown) or devices (e.g. OC spray, baton, TASER) available to an officer. Force Options fall into the following three categories: Deadly Force; Less-Lethal force (e.g. TASER, bean bag), and Non-Lethal force (e.g. firm grip, takedown).

GENERAL TRAINING UPDATE:
Standardized training provided by the employee’s command or Training Division personnel to personnel involved in a CUOF incident. The General Training Update is not an inquiry into the specific details of the CUOF. The intent of the update is to provide involved personnel with standardized training material in tactical issues and actions readily identified in the CUOF incident as well as an update on the UOF policy. Training should be provided as soon as practicable. (2020 LAPD Manual 3/796.35).

HEAD STRIKES:
An intentional head strike with an impact weapon or device (e.g., baton, flashlight) and all unintentional (inadvertent or accidental) head strikes that results in serious bodily injury, hospitalization, or death (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

HOMELESSNESS:
Per the Department’s Special Order No. 13, Policy Regarding Police Contacts with Persons Experiencing Homelessness, dated June 22, 2016, the terms “homelessness,” “homeless individual,” and “homeless person” shall refer to the following:

- An individual or family who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence;
- An individual or family with a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings (including a car, park, abandoned building, bus or train station, airport, or camping ground);
- An individual or family living in a supervised publicly or privately-operated shelter designated to provide temporary living arrangements (including hotels and motels paid for by federal, state, or local government programs for low-income individuals or by charitable organizations, congregate shelters, and transitional housing); or,
- An individual who resided in a shelter or place not meant for human habitation and who is exiting an institution where he or she temporarily resided.

IN-CUSTODY DEATH:
The death of any arrestee or detainee who is in the custodial care of the Department (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

LAWENFORCEMENT RELATED INJURY INVESTIGATION:
A UOF incident resulting in an injury requiring hospitalization, commonly referred to as a LERI (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

MANNER OF DEATH:
The Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner defines the different manners of death based on the following criteria:

- Natural: Due entirely (or nearly so) to natural disease processes;
- Homicide: Due to a volitional act of another person;
- Suicide: Due to injury that occurred with the intent to induce self-harm or cause one’s own death;
- Accident: Due to injury when there is no evidence of intent to harm (for purposes of this Report, accidental deaths are further categorized into causes of death attributed to narcotic/alcohol overdose); and,
- Undetermined: Inadequate information regarding the circumstances of death to determine manner.

Example: An individual is found unconscious with massive subdural hemorrhage. In the absence of information on the events leading up to death, it is impossible to determine if the hemorrhage was due to accidental fall, homicidal violence, etc.

NON-CATEGORICAL UOF:
An incident in which any on-duty Department employee, or off-duty employee whose occupation as a Department employee is a factor, uses physical force or a control device to compel a person to comply with the employee’s direction; defend themselves, defend others, effect an arrest or detention, prevent escape overcome resistance (2020 LAPD Manual 4/245.05).

OBJECTIVELY REASONABLE:

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

PART I CRIME:
Refer to Crime.

PART II CRIME:
Refer to Crime.

PUBLIC CONTACT:
For this report, public contacts are comprised of calls for service and field detentions:

- Calls for Service: Any radio call generated by communications in response to a call from the public.
- Field Detentions: Those incidents where officers utilize lights, emergency lights & siren, or a verbal command for a person to stop. The person stopped is not free to leave during the encounter. The detention is based on the reasonable suspicion that the suspect(s) to be stopped are involved in criminal activity.
- Pedestrian Stop: A detention of a person who is on foot.
- Vehicle Stop: A detention of either a driver and/or a passenger in a motor vehicle.
SERIOUS BODILY INJURY: California Penal Code Section 243(f)(4), defines Serious Bodily Injury as including but not limited to: loss of consciousness, concussion; bone fracture, protracted loss or impairment of function of any bodily member, organ, a wound requiring extensive suturing, and serious disfigurement (2020 LAPD Manual 1/556.10).

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY:
- Radio Call: Call for service directed by Communications Division;
- Observation: Contact initiated by officers based on reasonable suspicion, probable cause, or as a consensual encounter;
- Citizen Flag Down: Private person alert officers to a subject, an activity, or a location not otherwise observed by officers or reported to Communications Division;
- Pre-Planned: Any type of activity that requires an operational plan (e.g. search/arrest warrant services, task force);
- Station Call: Non-coded or low priority incidents where officers are directed to a location by Department personnel, other than Communications Division;
- Ambush: An act or an instance to attack by surprise or lure officers resulting in an officer involved shooting; and,
- Off-Duty: Incident where officers are off-duty and not conducting official Department business.

SUBSTANTIALLY INVOLVED PERSONNEL: Employee(s) applying force or who had a significant tactical or decision making role in the incident (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

SUICIDE BY COP: Those incidents where the suspect appeared to intentionally provoke officers into believing that he posed a deadly threat that resulted in an OIS.

TACTICAL DEBRIEF: The collective review of an incident to identify those areas where actions and decisions were effective and those areas where actions and decisions could have been improved. The intent of a Tactical Debrief is to enhance future performance. The Tactical Debrief is conducted by the Categorical Use of Force Debrief Facilitator (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

UNINTENTIONAL DISCHARGE: The unintentional discharge of a firearm regardless of cause. Unintentional discharges are evaluated then determined to be Accidental Discharges or Negligent Discharges (2020 LAPD Manual 3/792.05).

USE OF DEADLY FORCE (OTHER): An incident involving the use of deadly force by Department personnel. This type of force will encompass those forces that are not included in other CUOF classifications such as Firearm, CRCH, and Head Strike.

USE OF FORCE: In a complex urban society, officers are confronted daily with situations where control must be exercised to effect arrests and to protect the public safety. Control may be exercised through advice, warnings, persuasion, or by use of physical force. Officers are permitted to use force that is objectively reasonable to defend themselves or others, to effect an arrest or detention, and/or to prevent escape or overcome resistance, consistent with the Department’s Policy on the UOF (2020 LAPD Manual 1/240.10).

USE OF FORCE - TACTICS DIRECTIVE: A written directive that contains procedure and/or insight into UOF and tactics issues. Use of Force policy will continue to be expressed in the Department Manual but may be reiterated in UOF-Tactics Directives. All Use of Force-Tactics Directives will be reviewed and approved by the Chief of Police. Use of Force-Tactics Directives supersedes any Training Bulletins that have been published regarding the subject matter of the directives (2020 LAPD Manual 1/240.12).

USE OF FORCE REVIEW BOARD: The UOF Review Board shall convene at the direction of the Chair of the Board and shall: Avail itself of any facilities of the Department necessary to conduct a complete examination of the circumstances involved in the incident under investigation, report its findings and to the Chief of Police and upon adjournment, forward the UOF Internal Process Report, and other related reports to the Chief of Police (2020 LAPD Manual 2/092.50).

VIOLENT CRIME: Refer to Crime.

WARNING SHOTS: It is the policy of this Department that warning shots shall only be used in exceptional circumstances where it might reasonably be expected to avoid the need to use deadly force. Generally, warning shots shall be directed in a manner that minimizes the risk of injury to innocent persons, ricochet dangers and property damage (2020 LAPD Manual 1/556.10).

WEAPONS OTHER THAN FIREARM: Weapons other than a firearm pose a threat to the public and officers and generally fall into two categories: edged weapons and blunt weapons. Edged weapons include any object capable of cutting, slashing, or stabbing. A blunt weapon is any object that can be used to strike a person and inflict serious bodily injury or death.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>2020 USE OF FORCE YEAR-END REVIEW</th>
<th>121</th>
<th>LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOPC</strong> – <strong>BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS</strong></td>
<td><strong>BSS</strong> – <strong>BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE SERVICES</strong></td>
<td><strong>FOS</strong> – <strong>FORCE OPTION SIMULATOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHIT</strong> – <strong>MENTAL HEALTH INTERVENTION TRAINING</strong></td>
<td><strong>PTE</strong> – <strong>POLICE TRAINING AND EDUCATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BWV</strong> – <strong>BODY-WORN VIDEO</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAPOS</strong> – <strong>CRIMES AGAINST POLICE OFFICERS SECTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>FSD</strong> – <strong>FORENSIC SCIENCE DIVISION</strong></td>
<td><strong>MOT</strong> – <strong>MUSEUM OF TOLERANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RBC</strong> – <strong>RECRUIT BASIC COURSE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCU</strong> – <strong>COMPLAINT CLASSIFICATIONS UNIT</strong></td>
<td><strong>CEG</strong> – <strong>COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT GROUP</strong></td>
<td><strong>FTO</strong> – <strong>FIELD TRAINING OFFICER</strong></td>
<td><strong>NAMI</strong> – <strong>NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR THE MENTALLY ILL</strong></td>
<td><strong>REPORT</strong> – <strong>USE OF FORCE YEAR-END REVIEW</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CID</strong> – <strong>CRITICAL INCIDENT REVIEW DIVISION</strong></td>
<td><strong>CPD</strong> – <strong>CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>FTQ</strong> – <strong>FAILURE TO QUALIFY</strong></td>
<td><strong>NCUOF</strong> – <strong>NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>RESET</strong> – <strong>RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT AND SERVICES ENFORCEMENT TEAM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO</strong> – <strong>COMMANDING OFFICER</strong></td>
<td><strong>COP</strong> – <strong>CHIEF OF POLICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>GTU</strong> – <strong>GENERAL TRAINING UPDATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>NYPD</strong> – <strong>NEW YORK POLICE DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>RFC</strong> – <strong>RELEASE FROM CUSTODY (ARREST REPORT)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CDD</strong> – <strong>COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION</strong></td>
<td><strong>CPT</strong> – <strong>CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL TRAINING</strong></td>
<td><strong>ICD</strong> – <strong>IN-CUSTODY DEATH</strong></td>
<td><strong>OC</strong> – <strong>OLEORESIN CAPSICUM (SPRAY)</strong></td>
<td><strong>RMEC</strong> – <strong>RISK MANAGEMENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COP</strong> – <strong>CHIEF OF POLICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>CPS</strong> – <strong>CATEGORIES OF USE OF FORCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ICDC</strong> – <strong>INTEGRATING COMMUNICATION, DE-ESCALATION, AND CROWD CONTROL</strong></td>
<td><strong>OCPP</strong> – <strong>OFFICE OF CONSTITUTIONAL POLICING AND POLICY</strong></td>
<td><strong>SIP</strong> – <strong>SUBSTANTIALLY INVOLVED PERSONNEL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPD</strong> – <strong>CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>CSO</strong> – <strong>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</strong></td>
<td><strong>IPR</strong> – <strong>INTERNAL PROCESS REPORT</strong></td>
<td><strong>OIC</strong> – <strong>OFFICER-IN-CHARGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>SMART</strong> – <strong>SYSTEM-WIDE MENTAL ASSESSMENT RESPONSE TEAM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPT</strong> – <strong>CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL TRAINING</strong></td>
<td><strong>CDD</strong> – <strong>CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE DEPARTMENT (OR LAPD) – LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>ITG</strong> – <strong>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GROUP</strong></td>
<td><strong>OIG</strong> – <strong>OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>SQUAB</strong> – <strong>SHOOTING QUALIFICATION AND BONUS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRCH</strong> – <strong>CAROTID RESTRAINT CONTROL HOLD</strong></td>
<td><strong>CSD</strong> – <strong>CUSTODY SERVICES DIVISION</strong></td>
<td><strong>K-9</strong> – <strong>CANINE</strong></td>
<td><strong>OIS</strong> – <strong>OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING</strong></td>
<td><strong>SWAT</strong> – <strong>SPECIAL WEAPONS AND TACTICS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CU</strong> – <strong>CUSTODY USE OF FORCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>CUOF</strong> – <strong>CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>LACDA</strong> – <strong>LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY</strong></td>
<td><strong>OO</strong> – <strong>OFFICE OF OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>TASER</strong> – <strong>THOMAS A. SWIFT ELECTRIC RIFLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT (OR LAPD) – LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>DICVS</strong> – <strong>DIGITAL IN-CAR VIDEO SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td><strong>LAHSA</strong> – <strong>LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICE AUTHORITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>OSO</strong> – <strong>OFFICE OF SPECIAL OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>TD</strong> – <strong>TRAINING DIVISION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DMH</strong> – <strong>DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH</strong></td>
<td><strong>DOC</strong> – <strong>DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS CENTER</strong></td>
<td><strong>LAPD</strong> – <strong>(SEE DEPARTMENT)</strong></td>
<td><strong>OSS</strong> – <strong>OFFICE OF SUPPORT SERVICES</strong></td>
<td><strong>TEAMS</strong> – <strong>TRAINING EVALUATION AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOJ</strong> – <strong>DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>FBI</strong> – <strong>FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>LASD</strong> – <strong>LOS ANGELES SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>PATROL</strong> – <strong>PLANNING, ASSESSMENT, TIME, REDEPLOYMENT (AND/OR CONTAINMENT), OTHER RESOURCES, AND LINES OF COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>TID</strong> – <strong>TECHNICAL INVESTIGATION DIVISION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FBI</strong> – <strong>FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>LERI</strong> – <strong>LAW ENFORCEMENT-RELATED INJURY</strong></td>
<td><strong>PCG</strong> – <strong>PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS GROUP</strong></td>
<td><strong>TTRC</strong> – <strong>TACTICS AND TRAINING REVIEW COMMITTEE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FID</strong> – <strong>FORCE INVESTIGATION DIVISION</strong></td>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>LETAC</strong> – <strong>LAW ENFORCEMENT TACTICAL APPLICATION COURSE</strong></td>
<td><strong>POST</strong> – <strong>CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING</strong></td>
<td><strong>UCR</strong> – <strong>UNIFORM CRIME REPORTING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>LMS</strong> – <strong>LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td><strong>PPD</strong> – <strong>PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>UD</strong> – <strong>UNINTENTIONAL DISCHARGE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>MC</strong> – <strong>MAJOR CAPSAICINOID CONTENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSB</strong> – <strong>PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BUREAU</strong></td>
<td><strong>UODF</strong> – <strong>USE OF DEADLY FORCE (OTHER)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>MEU</strong> – <strong>MENTAL EVALUATION UNIT</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSD</strong> – <strong>POLICE SERVICE DOG</strong></td>
<td><strong>UOF</strong> – <strong>USE OF FORCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>MHIT</strong> – <strong>MENTAL HEALTH INTERVENTION TRAINING</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSL</strong> – <strong>POLICE SCIENCES LEADERSHIP</strong></td>
<td><strong>UOFBR</strong> – <strong>USE OF FORCE REVIEW BOARD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>FIP</strong> – <strong>FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING</strong></td>
<td><strong>MOT</strong> – <strong>MUSEUM OF TOLERANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSS</strong> – <strong>PUBLIC SAFETY STATEMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>VKS</strong> – <strong>VARIABLE KINETIC SYSTEM, PEPPER BALL LAUNCHER</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS

The Department classifies incidents as CUOF’s when a suspect dies in our custody, a suspect is hospitalized as a result of a UOF and when various types of force are used, i.e.: firearms, intentional head strikes, upper body control holds, etc. The FID investigation may reveal that multiple force options were used during an incident. Each one of the force options could potentially be classified as different CUOF categories if captured separately. For tracking purposes, and to avoid duplicate records of an incident, the Department classifies an incident based on the highest level of force used by Department personnel. All aspects of CUOF’s are fully investigated and adjudicated, including additional force options not captured under the primary classification.

Critical Incident Review Division queried the CUOF data for the 2020 Use of Force Year-End Review from the Department’s internal databases. Although FID was instrumental in providing outstanding information on cases from their records, they were unable to provide information on every open case as some cases were still being investigated at the time of this Report.

ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS

The query period included all CUOF incidents from January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020.

BUREAU AND AREA/DIVISION OF OCCURRENCE

The Bureau and Area/Division of occurrence is the location where the CUOF incident occurred, regardless of where the incident originated or where the involved personnel were assigned. The exception is ICD incidents, where CSD is the Area/Division of occurrence, not the geographic Area where the jail facility is located.

INVOLVED DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

For purposes of this Report, only Department personnel who received an adjudication finding, or have a pending finding, in the concerned force type for each respective CUOF incident are counted as involved employees. Department personnel are often at scene as part of the tactical situation, but do not apply force or have a part in the tactical decision-making. The personnel who did not utilize the relevant force or who were not involved in a tactical decision-making were not counted as “involved” in this Report.

All employee statistics were based on their current status as of the date of the UOF incident.

DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL BY CUOF INCIDENT TYPE

This Report included all employees who received, or were pending, BOPC adjudicated findings for their involvement in the following types of incidents:

- Officer Involved Shootings (OIS)
- Animal Shootings
- Unintentional Discharges (UD)
- Warning Shots
- Carotid Restraint Control Hold (CRCH)
- Head Strike Incidents
- K-9 Contact Incidents Resulting in Hospitalization
- Law Enforcement Related Injuries (LERI)
- In Custody Deaths (ICD)

Note: The County of Los Angeles Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner, determines the cause and manner of death of a suspect. ICD’s are classified as CUOF’s when the Coroner rules that a UOF was a primary or contributing factor to a suspect’s cause of death, where the death is ruled a suicide or is undetermined.

OFFICER - INJURIES

Officer injuries were recorded based on the number of those who sustained injuries during CUOF incidents, regardless if the injuries were caused by the suspect’s actions or other factors.

INVOLVED SUSPECTS

Suspects included in this Report were those subject to categorical force used by Department personnel. The exception is ICD incidents, which also included individuals whose death occurred while in the custodial care of a Department employee, or the Department, regardless if force was used.

METHODOLOGY
SUSPECT – INJURIES
Suspect injuries include self-inflicted injuries, pre-existing medical conditions that were aggravated during the incident, accidental injuries, and those caused by Department personnel. The manner of death of decedents is determined by the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner.

DECEASED SUSPECT TOXICOLOGY RESULTS
Toxicology results for deceased suspects were obtained by FID from the County of Los Angeles Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner. It is uncommon for suspects to release their medical records to the Department. Therefore, toxicology results could only be obtained for deceased suspects involved in OIS-Hit and ICD incidents.

Suspect – Perceived Mental Illness
A suspect was identified as having a perceived mental illness based on the following:
1. Officer(s) and/or investigator(s) perception of the suspect;
2. Suspect having self-reported mental illness;
3. Third-party statement; and/or;
4. Prior MEU contact resulting in a 5150 WIC hold or referral.

Suspect – Homelessness
Per Department Special Order No. 13 - Policy Regarding Police Contacts with Persons Experiencing Homelessness, dated June 22, 2016, the terms “homelessness,” “homeless individual,” and “homeless person” shall refer to the following:
- An individual or family who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence;
- An individual or family with a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings (including a car, park, abandoned building, bus or train station, airport, or camping ground);
- An individual or family living in a supervised public or privately-operated shelter designated to provide temporary living arrangements (including hotels and motels paid for by federal, state, or local government programs for low-income individuals or by charitable organizations, congregate shelters, and transitional housing); or;
- An individual who resided in a shelter or place not meant for human habitation and who is exiting an institution where he or she temporarily resided.

Prior to 2016, the Department did not capture the homeless status of suspects involved in CUOF incidents. At the request of the BOPC, FID captured this information starting in 2016.

Suspect – Perceived Suicide by Cop
Those incidents where the suspect appeared to intentionally provoke officers into believing the suspect posed a deadly threat, resulting in an OIS.

NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS
With assistance from Application Development and Support Division, CIRD queried the NCUOF data for the 2020 Use of Force Year-End Review from TEAMS II.

Annual Department Totals
The query period included all NCUOF incidents from January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020.

Bureau And Area/Division Of Occurrence
Incident by Bureau and Area detailed where the NCUOF incident occurred, rather than where the involved officers were assigned.

Force Option Used
Regardless of the number of times the force option was applied by one or more Department personnel, each force option was counted only once per incident. The force options were not mutually exclusive, as multiple force options could have been utilized in a single incident. In such cases, all force options used were counted once per incident.

TASER
TASER Activations
TASER activations were measured by the total number of times a TASER device was activated on a suspect during a NCUOF incident. All TASER activations were included in the total count when multiple activations occurred in an incident. Therefore, the total number of TASER activations exceeds the number of incidents in which a TASER was used.

TASER Effectiveness
Effectiveness captured whether a TASER activation caused the suspect to submit to arrest. Multiple TASER activations may have been required for the force option to prove effective.

Involved Department Personnel
For purposes of this Report, only Department personnel who received or are pending an adjudication finding, in the concerned force type for each respective NCUOF incident are counted as involved employees. Department personnel are often at scene as part of the tactical situation, but do not apply force. The officers who did not utilize the relevant force were not counted as “involved” in this Report. All employee statistics were based on their current status as of the date of the UOF incident.

Officer – Injuries
Officer injuries included all injuries sustained by a Department employee during the NCUOF incident regardless of whether they were caused by the suspect’s actions or other factors.

Involved Suspects
Suspects included in this Report are those subject to Non-Categorical force used by Department personnel.

Suspect – Perceived Mental Illness
A suspect’s perceived mental illness for NCUOF incidents was determined based on officers’ observations and was not verified by MEU.

Suspect – Perceived Impairment
Officers’ observations were used to determine if a suspect was under the influence of alcohol and/or narcotics for NCUOF incidents. Suspects’ impairment status was not verified through field sobriety tests.

Suspect – Perceived Homelessness
Perceived homelessness for NCUOF incidents was determined based on officers’ observations and statements made by suspects.

Suspect - Injuries
Suspect injuries included injuries sustained by a suspect during a NCUOF incident that were caused by Department personnel.

OTHER
Attacks On Police Officers
Attacks on Police Officers include all battery and assault with a deadly weapon incidents against Department personnel.
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