

Biased Policing and Mediation Update – 1st Quarter 2017

July 19, 2017

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

This report summarizes the types of contact resulting in Biased Policing complaints as well as the alleged discriminatory conduct and biases, and provides demographic data on the accused employees. It covers Biased Policing complaints initiated in the first quarter of 2017 and provides comparison data for 2015 and 2016.

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

Also included is an update on the Department's complaint mediation program.

To provide timely, meaningful information, this report is based mainly on information obtained during complaint intake rather than on information from complaint investigations closed a year or more after initiation.

Data

Biased Policing Complaints Initiated

Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2012 through the first quarter of 2017 are shown in the table below. The number for 2012 is based on complaints identified at closing as having Biased Policing allegations.² The data for 2013 represent Biased Policing cases identified at intake or at closing,³ while Biased Policing complaints for 2014 through 2017 were identified manually based primarily on preliminary investigation at the time of intake. During the first quarter of 2017, the Department updated data for 2015 and 2016 to include recently closed complaints in which Biased Policing was not alleged at intake but identified during investigation.⁴

| 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 (YTD) |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| 225 | 281 | 284 | 278 | 218 | 40 |

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

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

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

⁴ A review of recently closed complaints resulted in the addition of 17 complaints for 2015 and 13 complaints for 2016. Tables 1-9 were also updated to reflect the additional complaints, but the additional complaints did not have a significant impact on the data.

Tables 1 through 9 discussed below are attached as separate pages. They provide information about Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2015 through 2017 year-to-date. For tables in which a three-year average column is shown, data from 2014 has been included in order to calculate the average. Some complaints involved multiple complainants and/or accused employees, and some complainants alleged multiple discriminatory actions and/or types of bias. As a result, many of the total counts discussed below exceed the number of complainants and complaints initiated.⁵

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

| Bureau (% of City pop. ⁶) | 2017 YTD (%) | | | | 3-Year Avg. (%) |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|
| | | 2016 (%) | 2015 (%) | 2014 (%) | |
| Central (20.5) | 12 (30.0) | 45 (20.6) | 65 (23.4) | 65 (22.9) | 58.3 (22.4) |
| South (18.2) | 8 (20.0) | 50 (22.9) | 80 (28.8) | 65 (22.9) | 65.0 (25.0) |
| Valley (37.6) | 5 (12.5) | 55 (25.2) | 65 (23.4) | 75 (26.4) | 65.0 (25.0) |
| West (23.7) | 12 (30.0) | 62 (28.4) | 63 (22.7) | 76 (26.8) | 67.0 (25.8) |
| Outside City/Unknown | 3 (7.5) | 6 (2.8) | 5 (1.8) | 3 (1.1) | 4.7 (1.8) |
| Total | 40 | 218 | 278 | 284 | 260.0 |

- During the first quarter of 2017, 40 complaints were identified as containing allegations of Biased Policing, with a projected annual total of 160. The observations below have been made based on the 40 complaints received, but it should be noted that extrapolating beyond the first quarter from this data is problematic since the data set is relatively small.
- In comparing the distribution of Biased Policing complaints initiated among the bureaus in the first quarter of 2017 against the three-year average, Central Bureau (30.0%) and West Bureau (30.0%) had a higher proportion of such complaints than their respective three-year averages (22.4% for Central Bureau and 25.8% for West Bureau). In contrast, Valley Bureau had a much lower proportion of Biased Policing complaints in the first quarter (12.5%) than the three-year average (25.0%).
- When compared to the population data, Valley Bureau had a lower proportion of Biased Policing complaints (12.5%) when compared to the percentage of people residing in Valley Bureau (37.6%), while the proportion of Biased Policing complaints received in Central Bureau (30.0%) and West Bureau (30.0%) were higher than the percentage of residents in Central Bureau (20.5%) and West Bureau (23.7%).
- With respect to the distribution of Biased Policing complaints among the geographic Areas, during the first quarter of 2017, some Areas had a higher proportion of the City's

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

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

Biased Policing complaints when compared against the percentage of people residing in the Area. For example, Central Area had 15.0 percent of the Biased Policing complaints while Central Area residents accounted for 1.6 percent of the City population. Similarly, Southwest Area had 10.0 percent of the Biased Policing complaints while its residents made up 5.0 percent of the City population, and Pacific Area also had 10.0 percent of the Biased Policing complaints while its residents made up 5.4 percent of the population.

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

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

- **Gender representation:** In the first quarter of 2017, of the 56 accused employees for whom gender was known, female employees accounted for 17.9 percent of those accused in Biased Policing complaints, similar to their representation among sworn employees in the Department Deployment Roster (18.5%).⁷ This is an increase compared to prior years. In 2016, female employees were 11.8 percent of the accused but made up 18.4 percent of all sworn employees, and in 2015, female employees were 9.7 percent of the accused but made up 18.8 percent of all sworn employees.

Based on the data in Table 3, Part 2, which breaks down employee gender by assignment, the increase in female officers among the accused during the first quarter of 2017 occurred in Gang Enforcement and Patrol assignments. While 8.8 percent of officers assigned to Gang Enforcement are female, of those Gang Enforcement officers listed as accused in Biased Policing complaints, 23.1 percent were female. In Patrol assignments, 12.9 percent of the officers are female, but for Biased Policing complaints, 20.7 percent of the accused officers in the Patrol assignment were female.

- **Ethnic representation:** Data from the first quarter of 2017 show the ethnic composition of accused employees was generally consistent with that of all sworn personnel.
- **Age and length of service:** Since summarized information on employee age and length of service is not available in the Department rosters, 3,480 police officers in positions likely to have public contact were chosen as a comparison group (See Table 2, Part 2). The distribution of the accused employees among the age and tenure categories reported remains relatively similar to that of the comparison group. Consistent with prior years,

⁷ Sworn Department employee makeup as of March 19, 2017: Gender: Male 81.5% and Female 18.5%; Ethnicity: American Indian 0.3%; Asian 7.5%; Black 10.3%; Filipino 2.3%; Hispanic 46.7%; White 32.6%; and Other 0.3% (Source: Sworn and Civilian Personnel by Sex and Descent, March 19, 2017).

data from the first quarter of 2017 show that accused employees were most frequently in their thirties and forties with less than ten years of service.

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

Part 1 – Accused Employee and Assignment Types:

- During the first quarter of 2017, of the 63 employees accused of Biased Policing, employees assigned to the general Patrol function were the subject of the most Biased Policing complaints, making up 46.0 percent of the accused while in comparison, 21.8 percent of Department employees are assigned to the general Patrol function. Employees assigned to Gang Enforcement were the second most numerous, making up 20.6 percent of the accused in the first quarter of 2017 while in comparison, 3.4 percent of sworn officers are assigned to Gang Enforcement. This was followed by employees assigned to Traffic Enforcement (9.5 percent of the accused compared to 1.9 percent of the Department), Narcotics Enforcement (4.8 percent of the accused compared to 2.0 percent of the Department), and Patrol - Specialized Enforcement⁸ (3.2 percent of the accused compared to 2.8 percent of the Department).

The representation of employees in the various assignment types in the first quarter of 2017 is generally similar to prior years, though their ranking order changes slightly. The table below summarizes the five assignment types with the most Biased Policing complaints, based on number of accused employees, from 2015 to the present.

| Five assignment types with the most BP complaints, based on number of accused employees | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|
| # | 2017 (YTD) | | 2016 | | 2015 | |
| 1 | Patrol | 46.0% | Patrol | 45.1% | Patrol | 50.4% |
| 2 | Gang Enforcement | 20.6% | Metropolitan Div. | 10.3% | Patrol - Spec. Enf. | 10.4% |
| 3 | Traffic Enforcement | 9.5% | Gang Enforcement | 9.2% | Gang Enforcement | 8.1% |
| 4 | Narcotics Enforce. | 4.8% | Patrol - Spec. Enf. | 8.3% | Metropolitan Div. ⁹ | 5.7% |
| 5 | Patrol – Spec. Enf. | 3.2% | Traffic Enforcement | 6.9% | Traffic Enforcement | 4.8% |

- A comparison of the number of Biased Policing complaints initiated for each assignment type against the number of employees in each assignment type in the comparison group

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

⁹ In mid-2015, because of an increase in violent crime, Metropolitan Division was expanded to flexibly deploy specially trained officers in high crime areas. At the end of 2014, the Department had 255 officers deployed at Metropolitan Division. By the end of 2015, 471 officers had been assigned to Metropolitan Division, an increase of 216 officers from the prior year. As of April 2016, there were 471 officers deployed to Metropolitan Division, with 388 of them assigned to field operations.

shows that traffic enforcement officers were the subject of more Biased Policing complaints than employees in other assignments during the first quarter of 2017. Based on the number of complaints per 100 officers in each assignment type, officers assigned to Traffic Enforcement and Gang Enforcement had the most Biased Policing complaints (1.7) per 100 officers during the first quarter of 2017. This was followed by officers assigned to Patrol and Patrol - Specialized Enforcement (0.6), and then Narcotics Enforcement (0.4).

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

| Five assignment types with most BP complaints, based on complaints per 100 officers | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|
| # | 2017 (YTD) | | 2016 | | 2015 | |
| 1 | Traffic Enforcement | 1.7 | Traffic Enforcement | 8.5 | Traffic Enforcement | 9.3 |
| 2 | Gang Enforcement | 1.7 | Patrol – Spec. Enf. | 5.7 | Patrol – Spec. Enf. | 8.3 |
| 3 | Patrol | 0.6 | Metropolitan Div. | 4.9 | Patrol | 4.8 |
| 4 | Patrol – Spec. Enf. | 0.6 | Patrol | 3.5 | Gang Enforcement | 4.7 |
| 5 | Narcotic Enforcement | 0.4 | Gang Enforcement | 3.3 | Metropolitan Div. | 4.1 |

Part 2 – Gender of Accused Employee and Assignment Type:

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

- As noted in the discussion relating to Table 2 and gender representation, Table 3, Part 2 shows the overall representation of female officers among the accused during the first quarter of 2017 (17.9%) is similar to the overall representation of female officers in the Department (18.9%), but it is greater than in prior years, when females were 11.8 percent of the accused in 2016, and 9.7 percent of the accused in 2015. As previously noted, this increase compared to prior years can be seen in the representation of accused female officers in Gang Enforcement (23.1%) and general Patrol assignments (20.7%).

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

- Based on the number of public contacts during the first quarter of 2017, Biased Policing complaints were initiated 0.012 percent of the time. This is similar to 2016 (0.014%) and 2015 (0.017%).
- Consistent with prior years, the type of contact that most frequently resulted in Biased Policing complaints during the first quarter of 2017 continues to be the traffic stop, accounting for 11 of the 40 complaints (27.5%) initiated. In 2016, traffic stops accounted for 35.3 percent of Biased Policing complaints, and in 2015, they accounted for 39.9 percent of the Biased Policing complaints.
- After traffic stops, radio calls (10) and pedestrian stops (10) were the next most common, each accounting for 25.0 percent of the 40 complaints initiated during the first quarter of 2017.
- The remaining Biased Policing complaints fall into the generic “Other” category, used for all other types of contacts. During the first quarter of 2017, “Other” contacts accounted for 9 of the 40 complaints (22.5%).¹⁰

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

- In the first quarter of 2017, the most commonly complained of discriminatory actions or types of conduct were detentions and arrests. With the exception of the generic “Other” category,¹¹ this is consistent with the past two years, when detention and arrest were also the most commonly complained of discriminatory conduct. The remaining types of allegedly biased conduct appeared less frequently.
- Stop/Detention: The most commonly complained of conduct continues to be the stop or detention itself. During the first quarter of 2017, it appeared in 23 of the 40 Biased Policing complaints (57.5%) initiated and accounted for 47.9 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. In 2016, it appeared in 105 of the 218 Biased Policing complaints (48.2%) and in 2015, it appeared in 162 of the 278 complaints (58.3%).
- Arrest: Arrest was the second most complained of conduct during the first quarter of 2017. It appeared in 5 of 40 complaints (12.5%) and accounted for 10.4 percent of all

¹⁰ “Other” types of contact in the first quarter of 2017 included the following situations: complainants walking up to security checkpoints, complainants walking into a police station, a complainant who believed an officer engaged in Biased Policing after finding a parking ticket on her car, a complaint initiated by a third party after witnessing a dispute involving an off-duty officer, and situations in which complainants would not specify how they came into contact with officers.

¹¹ “Other” alleged discriminatory conduct reported in the first quarter of 2017 included: improper investigations, the issuing of citation, officers favoring the other party in a dispute, being asked the purpose for wanting to see the Mayor in person, being denied entry into City Hall, being asked about loitering, and complaints in which the behavior was not specified.

discriminatory conduct alleged. In 2016, arrest appeared in 33 of 218 complaints (15.1%), and 47 of the 278 complaints (16.9%) in 2015.

- Discourtesy: In the first quarter of 2017, one of the 40 complaints (2.5%) alleged discourtesy based on bias, accounting for 2.1 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. This is lower than in prior years, when Discourtesy appeared in 27 of 218 complaints (12.4%) in 2016, and 33 of 278 complaints (11.9%) in 2015.

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

- Race/Ethnic bias: Complaints of discriminatory conduct based on race/ethnic bias are overwhelmingly the most frequent. During the first quarter of 2017, 39 of the 40 Biased Policing complaints (97.5%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on race or ethnicity. In 2016, 197 of the 218 complaints involved an allegation of ethnic bias (90.4%), and in 2015, when ethnic bias included religious bias, 256 of the 278 complaints (92.1%) involved at least one allegation of ethnic or religious bias.
- Gender bias: In the first quarter of 2017, one of the 40 Biased Policing complaints (2.5%) involved an allegation of gender bias. This has fluctuated in prior years: in 2016, 11 of 218 complaints (5.0%) alleged gender bias, while in 2015, two of the 278 complaints (0.7%) involved at least one allegation of discrimination based on gender.
- No other types of bias were alleged in the 40 complaints received in the first quarter of 2017.

Ethnic Representation of Complainants: Tables 4, 5 and 6 all show that Black males were the most numerous demographic group among the complainants, making up 22 of the 40 complainants (55.0%) in the first quarter of 2017; 89 of the 234 complainants (38.0%) in 2016; and 147 of the 298 (49.3%) in 2015. Their complaints usually resulted from traffic and pedestrian stops and usually involved allegations that the stop was based on ethnic bias. Also of note is that while discriminatory searches are not as frequently reported as other conduct, allegations relating to discriminatory search were often reported by Black complainants. Of the complainants who alleged discriminatory searches in the first quarter of 2017, two of the three complainants (66.7%) were Black. This is similar to 2016 (57.1%) and 2015 (66.7%).

¹² A category for “Other” bias is included, though no Biased Policing complaints in the first quarter of 2017 contained allegations that would have been classified as “Other.” In the past, “Other” biases included such categories as homelessness, appearing to be a criminal street gang member, political affiliation, prior arrests, size, stature, or location of residence. “Other” biases are included in Biased Policing complaints only if alleged in combination with ethnic or another categorized bias.

Table 7 compares the ethnicity of complainants, broken down by geographic bureau of occurrence, against the City's ethnic composition based on census data from 2010. During the first quarter of 2017, Black complainants were the most numerous demographic group. For complaints in which the Area of occurrence could be determined, 26 (70.3%) of the 40 complainants were Black.¹³ This number is higher than in prior years, when Black complainants made up 56.1 percent of the complainants in 2016 and 62.5 percent in 2015. In comparison, the 2010 census data shows that 9.4 percent of the City population is Black.

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

Adjudication

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

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

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

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

¹³ There were 27 Black complainants in the first quarter of 2017, but because one of those complainants was from an Unknown/Outside location, only 26 could be attributed to a specific Area and bureau.

determination must be based on factual, reasonable consideration of the evidence and statements presented in the investigation.

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

An allegation is "Sustained" when the investigation discloses that the act complained of occurred and constitutes misconduct. When the investigation indicates the act complained of did not occur, the allegation is "Unfounded." "Demonstrably False" is used when it is clearly proven an allegation did not occur because the complainant demonstrates an irrational thought process and/or has an established a pattern of making crank complaints; or audio/video evidence captured the entire incident and conclusively shows the alleged misconduct did not occur.

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

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

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

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

Closed Complaints

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

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

Part 1 - Closed complaints with allegations of Biased Policing

In the first quarter of 2017, 60 complaints with 116 Biased Policing allegations were adjudicated.

- Of the 116 Biased Policing allegations adjudicated, 93 Biased Policing allegations (80.2%) were adjudicated as Unfounded, a slight decrease in comparison to the prior three-year average of 87.9 percent.
- Ten allegations (8.6%) closed with the Mediated disposition during the first quarter of 2017. This is consistent with the three-year average of 8.4 percent.
- Ten allegations (8.6%) closed with the disposition Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate, similar to the three-year average (8.2%), though the rate has fluctuated from year to year.
- Two allegations (1.7%) closed as Demonstrably False, both based on video. A summary of the two allegations from the two complaints appears in the next section relating to video in the adjudication process.
- One Biased Policing allegations (0.9%) was adjudicated as Not Resolved during the first quarter of 2017. The current rate of Not Resolved dispositions is slightly lower than the three-year average of 2.3 percent.

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

While the complaints in Part 2 do not contain allegations that officers took law enforcement action on the basis of a prohibited bias category, the sustained complaints reported in Part 2 reflect conduct that may be indicative of bias.¹⁵ In the first quarter of 2017, the Department sustained two complaints with allegations that indicated possible bias by employees. Both complaints involved off-duty conduct, and the sustained allegations fell into the category of Unbecoming Conduct. In one complaint, a five-day suspension was imposed, while in the

¹⁵ The information in Part 2 is a count of complaints and not a count of allegations as in Part 1.

second complaint, which involved two separate incidents that were consolidated into one complaint, the officer was terminated.¹⁶

Video in Adjudication of Biased Policing Complaints

Table 10 summarizes how the recordings were used in the adjudication process for Biased Policing complaints closed in the first quarter of 2017 and breaks down of the types of media available to the adjudicator. Of the 60 complaints with Biased Policing allegations that closed in the first quarter of 2017, the majority occurred in geographic Areas in which Body Worn Video (BWV) and/or Digital In-Car Video (DICV) had not yet been implemented. However, in 27 of the 60 closed complaints (45.0%), the adjudicator had access to video and/or audio recordings during adjudication.

Of the 27 Biased Policing complaints with video and/or audio recordings, one complaint did not go through the adjudication process because it was referred to mediation and closed as Mediated. The remaining 26 complaints went through the adjudication process. Of the 26 Biased Policing complaints that went through the adjudication process, video or audio recordings assisted in the adjudication of 14 (53.8%) complaints.

In addition, two of the 26 Biased Policing complaints (7.7%) were disproven based on video in the first quarter of 2017. The two complaints are summarized below:

- In a complaint arising from a traffic stop, the driver alleged the officer initiated the stop based solely on the complainant's race. The officer had used his laser speed detector device, which was also equipped with a video camera, from 430 feet away to tag and record the car as it drove by. The speed detector captured the complainant's car traveling 59 miles per hour (MPH) in a 35 MPH zone, and the video captured by the device showed that the complainant's ethnicity could not be discerned through the car's windows.
- The second complaint involved an inmate who alleged he asked a Detention Officer for a blanket, but the Detention Officer ignored the request because of complainant's race. However, surveillance video from the jail facility showed the complainant and the Detention Officer did not interact with each other as alleged by the complainant.

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

As noted in previous reports, IAG forwards Biased Policing complaints to the office director in the employee's chain-of-command when it disagrees with a chain-of-command adjudication. In the first quarter of 2017, IAG disagreed with a chain-of-command adjudication of Unfounded for a Biased Policing complaint but did not refer it to the director because the complaint was too close to the statute date. For training purposes, IAG sent correspondence to the chain-of-

¹⁶ Because complaints often contain multiple allegations, the discipline imposed reflects the penalty for all sustained allegations, not necessarily the discipline imposed for the sustained allegations indicating possible bias.

command explaining the rationale. The table below summarizes, from 2015 to present, the number of complaints in which IAG disagreed with the chain-of-command.

| Closed Biased Policing (BP) Complaints | 2017 (YTD) | 2016 | 2015 |
|---|-------------------|-------------|-------------|
| BP complaints closed | 60 | 198 | 264 |
| Closed BP complaints in which IAG disagreed with adjudication | 1 (1.7%) | 9 (4.5%) | 8 (3.0%) |

Complaint Mediation Program

The Department's complaint mediation program began in 2014, when the Department, in conjunction with the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office (LACA), launched a 36-month pilot program in which selected complaints of Biased Policing were mediated as an alternative to the traditional complaint investigation procedure. In September of 2015, Discourtesy complaints also became eligible for mediation. After the pilot period concluded in 2016, the BOPC approved the Department's request to make mediation a permanent part of the Department's complaint resolution process, and the name changed to the Community Police Unification Program (Program) to reflect its expanded scope and goals.

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

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

During the first quarter of 2017, 66 complaints were referred to the Program for mediation, and 36 complaints were determined to be eligible, a 54.5 percent eligibility rate. In that period, four complaints (involving four complainants and seven employees), closed as Mediated. At the end of the first quarter, the Mediation Coordinator was attempting to contact the parties to 16 additional eligible complaints to obtain the parties' agreement to participate in the Program.

The table below summarizes the complaints referred to the Program during the first quarter of 2017 compared to the total number of complaints referred in 2016 and 2015.

| Community Police Unification Program¹⁷ | 2017 (YTD) | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 |
|--|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total Complaints Referred | 66 | 289 | 195 | 224 |
| Not Eligible | 30 (45.5%) | 118 (40.8%) | 108 (55.4%) | 119 (53.1%) |
| Eligible | 36 (54.5%) | 171 (59.2%) | 87 (44.6%) | 105 (46.9%) |
| Closed after Mediation conducted ¹⁸ | 4 | 29 | 30 | 15 |
| Closed as Mediated after two No Shows | 0 | 6 | 4 | 8 |

Of the 36 complaints eligible for mediation in the first quarter of 2017, 25 complaints (69.4%) were reassigned without mediation for full investigation. Beginning in 2016, the Department began tracking the reason complaints were reassigned. The table below provides a breakdown of the reasons for reassignment.

| Eligible for Mediation but Reassigned | 2017 (YTD) | 2016 | 2015 |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Eligible | 36 | 171 | 87 |
| Reassigned | 25 (69.4%) | 130 (76.0%) | 61 (70.1%) |
| Reason for Reassignment | 25 | 130 | 61 |
| Complainant could not be located/contacted | 4 (16.0%) | 20 (15.4%) | 20 (32.8%) |
| Complainant declined (and reason given) | 11 (44.0%) | 65 (50.0%) | 23 (37.7%) |
| Avoid other party | 1 (9.1%) | 6 (9.2%) | |
| Changed mind/does not wish to pursue | 1 (9.1%) | 6 (9.2%) | |
| Lack of trust in LAPD | 3 (27.3%) | 2 (3.1%) | |
| Too much bother | 3 (27.3%) | 3 (20.0%) | |
| Wants full investigation | 1 (9.1%) | 16 (24.6%) | |
| No reason given | 2 (18.2%) | 22 (33.8%) | |
| Officer declined (and reason given) | 10 (40.0%) | 32 (24.6%) | 16 (26.2%) |
| Avoid other party | 4 (40.0%) | 6 (18.8%) | |
| Too much bother | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (3.1%) | |
| Wants full investigation | 2 (20.0%) | 15 (46.9%) | |
| No reason given | 4 (40.0%) | 10 (31.3%) | |
| Inappropriate for mediation | 0 (0.0%) | 6 (4.6%) | 2 (3.3%) |
| Alternative Complaint Resolution | 0 (0.0%) | 7 (5.4%) | |

Table 11 summarizes in two parts data from the satisfaction surveys received from those who participated in mediation. Part 1 provides information on survey responses received in the first quarter of 2017, while Part 2 provides information on survey responses received from 2014 through the first quarter of 2017. Both show the participants' responses to four of the survey questions relating to satisfaction with the mediation process, whether the process was fair, whether mediation increased understanding of the other party, and whether the participant would recommend mediation to others.

¹⁷ The data in this table include Discourtesy complaints, which became eligible for mediation September 9, 2015. Currently, Discourtesy complaints make up 35.4 percent the eligible cases referred to the Program for mediation.

¹⁸ These complaints could be from the current quarter or a prior quarter.

Part 1 – Survey responses received during the first quarter of 2017

Summarized below are the results for 11 survey responses received from four complainants and seven employees who participated in the four mediations during the first quarter of 2017.

- Satisfaction with the process: All 11 participants (100.0%) were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the mediation process.
- Fairness of the process: Ten of 11 participants (90.9%) indicated the outcome of the mediation process was “somewhat fair” or “completely fair.” In this category, complainants (100.0%) were slightly more likely than officers (85.7%) to believe the process was fair.
- Understanding of the other party: Eight of 11 participants (72.7%) indicated their understanding of the other party increased after the mediation. The percentage of participants who reported an increase in understanding was slightly greater for complainants (75.0%) than it was for officers (71.4%).
- Likelihood of recommending to others: Ten of 11 participants (90.9%) indicated they were either “somewhat likely” or “very likely” to recommend the mediation process to others. The percentage of participants who would recommend mediation to others was higher for officers (100.0%) than for complainants (75.0%).

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

Though ratings for the various satisfaction categories have fluctuated since 2014, overall satisfaction levels remain high for both complainants and officers. The data in Part 2 show the Program has been well-received and is helping community members and Department employees develop a better understanding of each other.

The effectiveness of mediation in promoting understanding was demonstrated during the mediation of a Biased Policing complaint from the first quarter of 2017. The complaint arose from a traffic stop. During mediation, the complainant expressed frustration at having been stopped several times previously by other officers and said those encounters led him to believe he was stopped because of his race. The complainant did not initially believe the officers’ stated reason for the stop, but after hearing their explanation, he gave them more credence. They explained that during roll call prior to each shift, they receive briefings on recent crime trends, crime locations and procedures to follow. By the end of the session, the complainant said that if he had known more about the officers’ procedures, he would not have filed the complaint.

Recently, the Program was awarded the Outstanding Criminal Justice Program of the Year for the West Region by the National Criminal Justice Association, a Washington, D.C. based organization that represents local, state, and tribal governments and works to promote understanding of the best criminal justice practices. The award will bolster future grant funding applications for the Program.

Addenda - Tables

Table 1: Complaints by Bureau and Geographic Area

Table 2: Accused Employee Demographics

Table 3: Accused Employee Assignments

Table 4: Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter

Table 5: Discriminatory Conduct Alleged

Table 6: Type of Bias Alleged

Table 7: Complainant Ethnicity by Bureau

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

Table 9: Biased Policing Allegation Dispositions for Closed Complaints

Table 10: Video in the Adjudication of Biased Policing Complaints

Table 11: Mediation Program Survey Responses

Table 1 – Complaints by Bureau and Geographic Area

| BUREAUS/AREAS | Population | | 2017 (YTD) | | 2016 | | 2015 | | 2014 | | 3-Year Avg. (%) (2014-2016) | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------|
| | | | Complaints | | Complaints | | Complaints | | Complaints | | | |
| CENTRAL BUREAU | 780,269 | 20.5% | 12 | 30.0% | 45 | 20.6% | 65 | 23.4% | 65 | 22.9% | 58.3 | 22.4% |
| Central | 61,668 | 1.6% | 6 | 15.0% | 15 | 6.9% | 32 | 11.5% | 20 | 7.0% | 22.3 | 8.6% |
| Hollenbeck | 179,536 | 4.7% | 1 | 2.5% | 7 | 3.2% | 5 | 1.8% | 8 | 2.8% | 6.7 | 2.6% |
| Newton | 146,201 | 3.9% | 1 | 2.5% | 14 | 6.4% | 17 | 6.1% | 16 | 5.6% | 15.7 | 6.0% |
| Northeast | 227,903 | 6.0% | 1 | 2.5% | 4 | 1.8% | 2 | 0.7% | 10 | 3.5% | 5.3 | 2.1% |
| Rampart | 164,961 | 4.3% | 3 | 7.5% | 5 | 2.3% | 9 | 3.2% | 11 | 3.9% | 8.3 | 3.2% |
| SOUTH BUREAU | 689,238 | 18.2% | 8 | 20.0% | 50 | 22.9% | 80 | 28.8% | 65 | 22.9% | 65.0 | 25.0% |
| 77th Street | 178,933 | 4.7% | 3 | 7.5% | 28 | 12.8% | 24 | 8.6% | 12 | 4.2% | 21.3 | 8.2% |
| Harbor | 178,163 | 4.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 1.4% | 5 | 1.8% | 7 | 2.5% | 5.0 | 1.9% |
| Southeast | 141,371 | 3.7% | 1 | 2.5% | 9 | 4.1% | 19 | 6.8% | 16 | 5.6% | 14.7 | 5.6% |
| Southwest | 190,771 | 5.0% | 4 | 10.0% | 10 | 4.6% | 32 | 11.5% | 30 | 10.6% | 24.0 | 9.2% |
| VALLEY BUREAU | 1,427,148 | 37.6% | 5 | 12.5% | 55 | 25.2% | 65 | 23.4% | 75 | 26.4% | 65.0 | 25.0% |
| Devonshire | 216,499 | 5.7% | 1 | 2.5% | 8 | 3.7% | 12 | 4.3% | 10 | 3.5% | 10.0 | 3.8% |
| Foothill | 196,513 | 5.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 1.4% | 6 | 2.2% | 6 | 2.1% | 5.0 | 1.9% |
| Mission | 244,576 | 6.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 10 | 4.6% | 5 | 1.8% | 12 | 4.2% | 9.0 | 3.5% |
| North Hollywood | 203,856 | 5.4% | 2 | 5.0% | 9 | 4.1% | 10 | 3.6% | 12 | 4.2% | 10.3 | 4.0% |
| Topanga | 193,901 | 5.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 13 | 6.0% | 6 | 2.2% | 13 | 4.6% | 10.7 | 4.1% |
| Van Nuys | 177,918 | 4.7% | 1 | 2.5% | 9 | 4.1% | 17 | 6.1% | 16 | 5.6% | 14.0 | 5.4% |
| West Valley | 193,885 | 5.1% | 1 | 2.5% | 3 | 1.4% | 9 | 3.2% | 6 | 2.1% | 6.0 | 2.3% |
| WEST BUREAU | 900,515 | 23.7% | 12 | 30.0% | 62 | 28.4% | 63 | 22.7% | 76 | 26.8% | 67.0 | 25.8% |
| Hollywood | 128,999 | 3.4% | 3 | 7.5% | 20 | 9.2% | 19 | 6.8% | 17 | 6.0% | 18.7 | 7.2% |
| Olympic | 186,615 | 4.9% | 3 | 7.5% | 7 | 3.2% | 4 | 1.4% | 14 | 4.9% | 8.3 | 3.2% |
| Pacific | 203,623 | 5.4% | 4 | 10.0% | 22 | 10.1% | 20 | 7.2% | 20 | 7.0% | 20.7 | 7.9% |
| West Los Angeles | 230,275 | 6.1% | 1 | 2.5% | 1 | 0.5% | 6 | 2.2% | 9 | 3.2% | 5.3 | 2.1% |
| Wilshire | 151,003 | 4.0% | 1 | 2.5% | 12 | 5.5% | 14 | 5.0% | 16 | 5.6% | 14.0 | 5.4% |
| OUTSIDE CITY/ UNKNOWN LOCATION | NA | NA | 3 | 7.5% | 6 | 2.8% | 5 | 1.8% | 3 | 1.1% | 4.7 | 1.8% |
| TOTAL | 3,797,170 | | 40 | | 218 | | 278 | | 284 | | 260.0 | |

(upd.. 5/11/2017)

Table 2 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 1)

Ethnicity and Gender

| Year | Gender | Ethnicity | | | | | | | Gender Total | |
|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|----------|----------|-------|-------|--------------|---------|
| | | American Indian | Asian | Black | Filipino | Hispanic | White | Other | | Unknown |
| 2017 (YTD) | Female | | 1 | | | 8 | 1 | | | 10 |
| | Male | | 5 | 3 | | 21 | 17 | | | 46 |
| | Unknown | | | | | | | | 7 | 7 |
| | Ethnicity Total | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 18 | 0 | 7 | 63 |
| 2016 | Female | | 3 | 4 | | 21 | 9 | | 1 | 38 |
| | Male | 1 | 33 | 28 | | 128 | 89 | 2 | 2 | 283 |
| | Unknown | | | | | | | | 27 | 27 |
| | Ethnicity Total | 1 | 36 | 32 | 0 | 149 | 98 | 2 | 30 | 348 |
| 2015 | Female | | 3 | 3 | | 25 | 9 | | | 40 |
| | Male | 3 | 37 | 34 | 2 | 180 | 107 | | 8 | 371 |
| | Unknown | | | | | | | | 43 | 43 |
| | Ethnicity Total | 3 | 40 | 37 | 2 | 205 | 116 | 0 | 51 | 454 |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

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

Age at Date of Incident

| Year | Age in Years | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|-------|-------|------|---------|
| | 20-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50/+ | Unknown |
| 2017 (YTD) | 11 | 25 | 16 | 3 | 8 |
| 2016 | 58 | 124 | 94 | 28 | 44 |
| 2015 | 94 | 171 | 100 | 27 | 62 |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

Length of Service at Date of Incident

| Year | Years of Service | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-----|-------|-------|------|---------|
| | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-14 | 15-19 | 20/+ | Unknown |
| 2017 (YTD) | 18 | 16 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 7 |
| 2016 | 65 | 109 | 48 | 43 | 40 | 43 |
| 2015 | 81 | 158 | 59 | 57 | 41 | 58 |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

Table 2 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 2)

Age and Length of Service Comparisons

| Age in Years | Comparison Group | | Accused Employee Percentage | | |
|--------------|------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|
| | Officers | Percentage | 2017 (YTD) | 2016 | 2015 |
| 20-29 | 757 | 21.8% | 20.0% | 19.1% | 24.0% |
| 30-39 | 1501 | 43.1% | 45.5% | 40.8% | 43.6% |
| 40-49 | 954 | 27.4% | 29.1% | 30.9% | 25.5% |
| 50/+ | 268 | 7.7% | 5.5% | 9.2% | 6.9% |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

| Years of Service | Comparison Group | | Accused Employee Percentage | | |
|------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|
| | Officers | Percentage | 2017 (YTD) | 2016 | 2015 |
| 0-4 | 799 | 23.0% | 32.1% | 21.3% | 20.5% |
| 5-9 | 1348 | 38.7% | 28.6% | 35.7% | 39.9% |
| 10-14 | 454 | 13.0% | 14.3% | 15.7% | 14.9% |
| 15-19 | 553 | 15.9% | 14.3% | 14.1% | 14.4% |
| 20/+ | 326 | 9.4% | 10.7% | 13.1% | 10.4% |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

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

Comparison Group – 3480 Police Officers

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

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

Table 3 – Accused Employee Assignments (Part 1)

| Assignment Type | Comparison Group ¹ | 2017 (YTD) | | | 2016 | | | 2015 | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| | # of Employees | # of Accused | # of Complaints | Complaints per 100 | # of Accused | # of Complaints | Complaints per 100 | # of Accused | # of Complaints | Complaints per 100 |
| Detective/Investigator - Area | 726 (5.8%) | 1 (1.6%) | 1 | 0.1 | 11 (3.2%) | 8 | 1.1 | 13 (2.9%) | 9 | 1.2 |
| Detective/Investigator - Specialized | 864 (6.9%) | | | | 5 (1.4%) | 4 | 0.5 | 5 (1.1%) | 4 | 0.5 |
| Uniformed Detective ² | 159 (1.3%) | | | | 1 (0.3%) | 1 | 0.6 | 11 (2.4%) | 6 | 3.8 |
| Gang Enforcement | 422 (3.4%) | 13 (20.6%) | 7 | 1.7 | 32 (9.2%) | 14 | 3.3 | 37 (8.1%) | 20 | 4.7 |
| Metropolitan Division ³ | 388 (3.1%) | 1 (1.6%) | 1 | 0.3 | 36 (10.3%) | 19 | 4.9 | 26 (5.7%) | 16 | 4.1 |
| Narcotics Enforcement | 245 (2.0%) | 3 (4.8%) | 1 | 0.4 | 2 (0.6%) | 1 | 0.4 | 1 (0.2%) | 1 | 0.4 |
| Patrol | 2,730 (21.8%) | 29 (46.0%) | 17 | 0.6 | 157 (45.1%) | 95 | 3.5 | 229 (50.4%) | 132 | 4.8 |
| Patrol - Specialized Enforcement ⁴ | 348 (2.8%) | 2 (3.2%) | 2 | 0.6 | 29 (8.3%) | 20 | 5.7 | 47 (10.4%) | 29 | 8.3 |
| Traffic Collision Investigation | 199 (1.6%) | | | | 5 (1.4%) | 4 | 2.0 | 4 (0.9%) | 4 | 2.0 |
| Traffic Enforcement | 236 (1.9%) | 6 (9.5%) | 4 | 1.7 | 24 (6.9%) | 20 | 8.5 | 22 (4.8%) | 22 | 9.3 |
| Other Sworn ⁵ | 2,975 (23.7%) | 1 (1.6%) | 1 | 0.03 | | | | 5 (1.1%) | 4 | 0.1 |
| Detention Officer | 306 (2.4%) | | | | | | | 2 (0.4%) | 1 | 0.3 |
| Police Service Representative | 608 (4.8%) | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Civilian | 1,795 (14.3%) | | | | 2 (0.6%) | 1 | 0.1 | 1 (0.2%) | 1 | 0.1 |
| Unassigned ⁶ /Unknown ⁷ | 545 (4.3%) | 7 (11.1%) | 7 | 1.3 | 44 (12.6%) | 37 | 6.8 | 51 (11.2%) | 44 | 8.1 |
| Total | 12,546 | 63 | 40 ⁸ | 0.3 | 348 | 218 ⁸ | 1.7 | 454 | 278 ⁸ | 1.7 |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| (upd. 5/11/2017) | Comparison Group | | 2017 (YTD) | | 2016 | | 2015 | |
|---|------------------|----------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|
| Detective/Investigator - Area | 726 | 5.8% | 1 | 1.6% | 11 | 3.2% | 13 | 2.9% |
| Female | 197 | 27.1% | | | 6 | 54.5% | 2 | 15.4% |
| Male | 529 | 72.9% | 1 | 100.0% | 5 | 45.5% | 11 | 84.6% |
| Detective/Investigator - Specialized | 864 | 6.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 1.4% | 5 | 1.1% |
| Female | 233 | 27.0% | | | 1 | 20.0% | 1 | 20.0% |
| Male | 631 | 73.0% | | | 4 | 80.0% | 4 | 80.0% |
| Uniformed Detective | 159 | 1.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.3% | 10 | 2.2% |
| Female | 40 | 25.2% | | | | | 3 | 30.0% |
| Male | 119 | 74.8% | | | 1 | 100.0% | 7 | 70.0% |
| Gang Enforcement | 422 | 3.4% | 13 | 20.6% | 32 | 9.2% | 37 | 8.1% |
| Female | 37 | 8.8% | 3 | 23.1% | 3 | 9.4% | 3 | 8.1% |
| Male | 385 | 91.2% | 10 | 76.9% | 29 | 90.6% | 34 | 91.9% |
| Metropolitan Division | 388 | 3.1% | 1 | 1.6% | 36 | 10.3% | 26 | 5.7% |
| Female | 19 | 4.9% | | | | | | |
| Male | 369 | 95.1% | 1 | 100.0% | 36 | 100.0% | 26 | 100.0% |
| Narcotic Enforcement | 245 | 2.0% | 3 | 4.8% | 2 | 0.6% | 1 | 0.2% |
| Female | 28 | 11.4% | 1 | 33.3% | 1 | 50.0% | | |
| Male | 217 | 88.6% | 2 | 66.7% | 1 | 50.0% | 1 | 100.0% |
| Patrol | 2,730 | 21.8% | 29 | 46.0% | 157 | 45.1% | 229 | 50.4% |
| Female | 353 | 12.9% | 6 | 20.7% | 16 | 10.2% | 27 | 11.8% |
| Male | 2,377 | 87.1% | 23 | 79.3% | 141 | 89.8% | 202 | 88.2% |
| Patrol - Specialized Enforcement | 348 | 2.8% | 2 | 3.2% | 29 | 8.3% | 47 | 10.4% |
| Female | 55 | 15.8% | | | 5 | 17.2% | 4 | 8.5% |
| Male | 293 | 84.2% | 2 | 100.0% | 24 | 82.8% | 43 | 91.5% |
| Traffic Collision Investigation | 199 | 1.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 1.4% | 4 | 0.9% |
| Female | 22 | 11.1% | | | | | | |
| Male | 177 | 88.9% | | | 5 | 100.0% | 4 | 100.0% |
| Traffic Enforcement | 236 | 1.9% | 6 | 9.5% | 24 | 6.9% | 22 | 4.8% |
| Female | 6 | 2.5% | | | | | | |
| Male | 230 | 97.5% | 6 | 100.0% | 24 | 100.0% | 22 | 100.0% |
| Other Sworn | 2,975 | 23.7% | 1 | 0.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 1.1% |
| Female | 746 | 25.1% | | | | | | |
| Male | 2,229 | 74.9% | 1 | 100.0% | | | 5 | 100.0% |
| Detention Officer | 306 | 2.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.4% |
| Female | 103 | 33.7% | | | | | | |
| Male | 203 | 66.3% | | | | | 2 | 100.0% |
| Police Service Representative | 608 | 4.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Female | 501 | 82.4% | | | | | | |
| Male | 107 | 17.6% | | | | | | |
| Other Civilian | 1,795 | 14.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.6% | 1 | 0.2% |
| Female | 1,027 | 57.2% | | | 1 | 50.0% | | |
| Male | 768 | 42.8% | | | 1 | 50.0% | 1 | 100.0% |
| Unassigned (comparison group) | 545 | 4.3% | | | | | | |
| Female | 122 | 22.4% | | | | | | |
| Male | 423 | 77.6% | | | | | | |
| Unknown (accused employee) | | | 7 | 11.1% | 44 | 12.6% | 52 | 11.5% |
| Female | | | | | 5 | 11.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Male | | | | | 12 | 27.3% | 9 | 17.3% |
| Unknown Gender | | | 7 | 100.0% | 27 | 61.4% | 43 | 82.7% |
| Total | 12,546 | 100.0% | 63 | 100.0% | 348 | 100.0% | 454 | 100.0% |
| Total with Known Gender | 9,837 | (sworn) | 56 | 100.0% | 321 | 100.0% | 411 | 100.0% |
| Female | 1,858 | 18.9% | 10 | 17.9% | 38 | 11.8% | 40 | 9.7% |
| Male | 7,979 | 81.1% | 46 | 82.1% | 283 | 88.2% | 371 | 90.3% |

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

| Year | Total Contacts with Public* | Total Biased Policing Complaints Initiated | Biased Policing Complaints Initiated by Type of Contact | | | |
|------------|-----------------------------|--|---|------------|--------------|------------|
| | | | Pedestrian Stop | Radio Call | Traffic Stop | Other |
| 2017 (YTD) | 336,092 | 40 (0.012%) | 10 (25.0%) | 10 (25.0%) | 11 (27.5%) | 9 (22.5%) |
| 2016 | 1,521,365 | 218 (0.014%) | 37 (17.0%) | 55 (25.2%) | 77 (35.3%) | 49 (22.5%) |
| 2015 | 1,647,863 | 278 (0.017%) | 64 (23.0%) | 53 (19.1%) | 111 (39.9%) | 50 (18.0%) |

(Upd. 6/2/2017)

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

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

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

| 2017 (YTD) Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender | | Ethnicity Total | Pedestrian Stop | Radio Call | Traffic Stop | Other |
|---|-----|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------|
| American Indian | F | 0 | | | | |
| | M | | | | | |
| Asian | F | 0 | | | | |
| | M | | | | | |
| Black | F | 27 | | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | M | | 6 | 3 | 6 | 7 |
| Filipino | F | 0 | | | | |
| | M | | | | | |
| Hispanic | F | 9 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| | M | | 1 | 2 | 2 | |
| White | F | 0 | | | | |
| | M | | | | | |
| Other | F | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | M | | | | | |
| Unknown | F | 3 | | 1 | | 1 |
| | M | | 1 | | | |
| | UNK | | | | | |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

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

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

| 2016 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender | | Ethnicity Total | Pedestrian Stop | Radio Call | Traffic Stop | Other |
|---|-----|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------|
| American Indian | F | 0 | | | | |
| | M | | | | | |
| Asian | F | 4 | | 1 | | |
| | M | | | 1 | | 2 |
| Black | F | 130 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 10 |
| | M | | 18 | 18 | 41 | 12 |
| Filipino | F | 0 | | | | |
| | M | | | | | |
| Hispanic | F | 46 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 9 |
| | M | | 4 | 3 | 15 | 3 |
| White | F | 22 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| | M | | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| Other | F | 6 | | 1 | | 2 |
| | M | | | | 2 | 1 |
| Unknown | F | 26 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | M | | 3 | 3 | 5 | 6 |
| | UNK | | 1 | | | 1 |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

| 2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender | | Ethnicity Total | Pedestrian Stop | Radio Call | Traffic Stop | Other |
|---|-----|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------|
| American Indian | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | |
| Asian | F | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | |
| Black | F | 185 | 3 | 10 | 14 | 11 |
| | M | | 39 | 18 | 68 | 22 |
| Filipino | M | 3 | | | 1 | |
| | F | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Hispanic | F | 50 | 4 | 3 | 6 | |
| | M | | 9 | 10 | 14 | 4 |
| White | F | 20 | | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | M | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Other | F | 12 | 1 | 2 | | 2 |
| | M | | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Unknown | F | 28 | 2 | 1 | | 9 |
| | M | | 5 | | 5 | 6 |
| | UNK | | | | | |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

Table 5 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 1)

| Year | Arrested | Detained | Handcuffed | Impounded Vehicle | Objectionable Remark | Refused to Provide Service | Searched | Was Discourteous | Other |
|-------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------|
| 2017 (YTD) | 5 (10.4%) | 23 (47.9%) | 4 (8.3%) | 1 (2.1%) | | 1 (2.1%) | 3 (6.3%) | 1 (2.1%) | 10 (20.8%) |
| 2016 | 33 (12.5%) | 105 (39.6%) | 14 (5.3%) | 8 (3.0%) | 12 (4.5%) | 12 (4.5%) | 14 (5.3%) | 27 (10.2%) | 40 (15.1%) |
| 2015 | 47 (13.3%) | 162 (45.8%) | 12 (3.4%) | 3 (0.8%) | 11 (3.1%) | 4 (1.1%) | 12 (3.4%) | 33 (9.3%) | 70 (19.8%) |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

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

Table 5 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 2)

| 2017 (YTD) | | Arrested | Detained | Handcuffed | Impounded Vehicle | Objectionable Remark | Refused to Provide Service | Searched | Was Discourteous | Other |
|---|-----|----------|----------|------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------|------------------|-------|
| Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender | | | | | | | | | | |
| American Indian | F | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian | F | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | F | | 3 | | | | | | | 2 |
| | M | 4 | 13 | 4 | | | 1 | 2 | | 6 |
| Filipino | F | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | F | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | M | 1 | 4 | | | | | | | |
| White | F | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | F | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | M | | | | | | | | | |
| Unknown | F | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| | M | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | UNK | | | | | | | | | |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

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

Table 5 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 2)

| 2016 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender | | Arrested | Detained | Handcuffed | Impounded Vehicle | Objectionable Remark | Refused to Provide Service | Searched | Was Discourteous | Other |
|---|-----|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| American Indian | F | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian | F | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |
| Black | F | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 5 |
| | M | 19 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 2 | 8 | 56 | 3 |
| Filipino | F | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | F | 4 | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 4 | 6 |
| | M | 3 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 2 |
| White | F | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| | M | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 3 | | | 5 | 2 |
| Other | F | | | | | | 2 | | | 2 |
| | M | | | | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| Unknown | F | | | | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 1 |
| | M | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 10 | |
| | UNK | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

| 2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender | | Arrested | Detained | Handcuffed | Impounded Vehicle | Objectionable Remark | Refused to Provide Service | Searched | Was Discourteous | Other |
|---|-----|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| American Indian | F | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian | F | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | F | 8 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 4 | 5 | 10 |
| | M | 27 | 96 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 33 |
| Filipino | F | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | M | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 |
| Hispanic | F | 2 | 7 | 2 | | 1 | | | 3 | 5 |
| | M | 5 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 |
| White | F | | 4 | | | | | | 2 | 3 |
| | M | 2 | 4 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 4 |
| Other | F | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| | M | 3 | 1 | | | | | | 3 | |
| Unknown | F | | 3 | 1 | | | | | 2 | 7 |
| | M | 1 | 9 | 1 | | 2 | | | 2 | 5 |
| | UNK | | | | | | | | | |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

Table 6 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 1)

| Year | Age | Gender | Gender Identity/ Expression | Physical Disability ¹ | Mental Disability ¹ | Race/ Ethnicity ² | Religion ² | Sexual Orientation (LGBQ) ³ | National Origin | Other | Not Specified |
|------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|-------------|---------------|
| 2017 (YTD) | | 1 (2.5%) | | | | 39 (97.5%) | | | | | |
| 2016 | 4 (1.8%) | 11 (4.8%) | 3 (1.3%) | 2 (0.9%) | 1 (0.4%) | 197 (86.8%) | 2 (0.9%) | 5 (2.2%) | 2 (0.9%) | | |
| 2015 | n/a | 2 (0.7%) | n/a | 8 (2.8%) | | 256 (90.5%) | | 5 (1.8%) | | 3 (1.1%) | 9 (3.2%) |

(upd. 5/11/2017)

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

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

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

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

Table 6 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 2)

| 2017 (YTD) Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender | Age | Gender | Gender Identity/ Expression | Physical Disability | Mental Disability | Race/ Ethnicity | Religion | Sexual Orientation (LGBQ) | National Origin | Other | Not Specified |
|---|-----|--------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------|---------------|
| American Indian | F | | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian | F | | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | F | | | | | 5 | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | 22 | | | | | |
| Filipino | F | | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | F | | 1 | | | 3 | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | 5 | | | | | |
| White | F | | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | F | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unknown | F | | | | | 2 | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | UNK | | | | | | | | | | |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

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

Table 6 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 2)

| 2016 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender | | Age | Gender | Gender Identity/ Expression | Physical Disability | Mental Disability | Race/ Ethnicity | Religion | Sexual Orientation (LGBQ) | National Origin | Other | Not Specified |
|---|-----|-----|--------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------|------------------|
| American Indian | F | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian | F | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | M | 1 | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| Black | F | | 1 | | | | 41 | | | | | |
| | M | 1 | 1 | | | | 87 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Filipino | F | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | F | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 16 | | 2 | 1 | | |
| | M | | | | | | 24 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| White | F | 2 | 2 | | 1 | | 5 | | | | | |
| | M | | 2 | 2 | | | 7 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Other | F | | 1 | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| Unknown | F | | 3 | | | | 4 | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | 1 | 16 | | | | | |
| | UNK | | | | | | 2 | | | | | |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

| 2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender | | Disability | Ethnic | Gender | LGBTQ | National Origin | Other | Unspecified |
|---|-----|------------|--------|--------|-------|--------------------|-------|-------------|
| American Indian | F | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | |
| Asian | F | | | | | | | |
| | M | | | | | | | |
| Black | F | 1 | 38 | 1 | | | | |
| | M | | 144 | | 1 | | | 2 |
| Filipino | F | | 1 | | | | | |
| | M | | 2 | | | | | |
| Hispanic | F | 1 | 10 | | 2 | | | |
| | M | 1 | 34 | | | | 2 | 2 |
| White | F | | 8 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | M | 3 | 7 | | 1 | | | |
| Other | F | | 4 | | 1 | | | |
| | M | | 6 | 1 | | | | |
| Unknown | F | 1 | 11 | | | | | |
| | M | 1 | 11 | | | | | 4 |
| | Unk | | | | | | | |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

Table 7 - Complainant Ethnicity by Bureau

(upd 5/15/17)

| | Population | | 2017 (YTD) | | 2016 | | 2015 | |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|
| | | | | | | | | |
| CENTRAL BUREAU | 780,269 | 20.5% | Complainants: 12 | | Complainants: 51 | | Complainants: 66 | |
| American Indian | 2,135 | 0.3% | | | | | | |
| Asian | 104,891 | 13.4% | | | | | | |
| Black | 41,431 | 5.3% | 9 | 75.0% | 31 | 60.8% | 41 | 62.1% |
| Hawaiian/Pac. Islander | 710 | 0.1% | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | 525,180 | 67.3% | 2 | 16.7% | 13 | 25.5% | 16 | 24.2% |
| Multiple Race | 2,907 | 0.4% | | | | | | |
| Other | 2,169 | 0.3% | | | 1 | 2.0% | 1 | 1.5% |
| White | 100,846 | 12.9% | | | 5 | 9.8% | 6 | 9.1% |
| Unknown | | | 1 | 8.3% | 1 | 2.0% | 2 | 3.0% |
| SOUTH BUREAU | 689,238 | 18.2% | Complainants: 8 | | Complainants: 52 | | Complainants: 94 | |
| American Indian | 1,769 | 0.3% | | | | | | |
| Asian | 29,303 | 4.3% | | | | | | |
| Black | 192,009 | 27.9% | 6 | 75.0% | 37 | 71.2% | 72 | 76.6% |
| Hawaiian/Pac. Islander | 1,678 | 0.2% | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | 395,688 | 57.4% | 2 | 25.0% | 8 | 15.4% | 9 | 9.6% |
| Multiple Race | 8,011 | 1.2% | | | | | | |
| Other | 2,985 | 0.4% | | | | | | |
| White | 57,795 | 8.4% | | | 1 | 1.9% | | |
| Unknown | | | | | 6 | 11.5% | 13 | 13.8% |
| VALLEY BUREAU | 1,427,148 | 37.6% | Complainants: 5 | | Complainants: 59 | | Complainants: 68 | |
| American Indian | 4,778 | 0.3% | | | | | | |
| Asian | 157,831 | 11.1% | | | 1 | 1.7% | | |
| Black | 60,238 | 4.2% | 2 | 40.0% | 26 | 44.1% | 28 | 41.2% |
| Hawaiian/Pac. Islander | 2,488 | 0.2% | | | | | 1 | 1.5% |
| Hispanic | 660,981 | 46.3% | 1 | 20.0% | 15 | 25.4% | 19 | 27.9% |
| Multiple Race | 6,780 | 0.5% | | | | | | |
| Other | 5,203 | 0.4% | 1 | 20.0% | 4 | 6.8% | 7 | 10.3% |
| White | 528,849 | 37.1% | | | 9 | 15.3% | 10 | 14.7% |
| Unknown | | | 1 | 20.0% | 4 | 6.8% | 3 | 4.4% |
| WEST BUREAU | 900,515 | 23.7% | Complainants: 12 | | Complainants: 66 | | Complainants: 65 | |
| American Indian | 2,813 | 0.3% | | | | | | |
| Asian | 162,413 | 18.0% | | | 3 | 4.5% | | |
| Black | 64,534 | 7.2% | 9 | 75.0% | 34 | 51.5% | 42 | 64.6% |
| Hawaiian/Pac. Islander | 1,632 | 0.2% | | | | | 1 | 1.5% |
| Hispanic | 258,047 | 28.7% | 3 | 25.0% | 10 | 15.2% | 5 | 7.7% |
| Multiple Race | 5,923 | 0.7% | | | | | | |
| Other | 4,175 | 0.5% | | | 1 | 1.5% | 4 | 6.2% |
| White | 400,978 | 44.5% | | | 6 | 9.1% | 4 | 6.2% |
| Unknown | | | | | 12 | 18.2% | 9 | 13.8% |
| ALL BUREAUS | 3,797,170 | 100.0% | Complainants: 37 | | Complainants: 228 | | Complainants: 293 | |
| American Indian | 11,495 | 0.3% | | | | | | |
| Asian | 454,438 | 12.0% | | | 4 | 1.8% | | |
| Black | 358,212 | 9.4% | 26 | 70.3% | 128 | 56.1% | 183 | 62.5% |
| Hawaiian/Pac. Islander | 6,508 | 0.2% | | | | | 2 | 0.7% |
| Hispanic | 1,839,896 | 48.5% | 8 | 21.6% | 46 | 20.2% | 49 | 16.7% |
| Multiple Race | 23,621 | 0.6% | | | | | | |
| Other | 14,532 | 0.4% | 1 | 2.7% | 6 | 2.6% | 12 | 4.1% |
| White | 1,088,468 | 28.7% | | | 21 | 9.2% | 20 | 6.8% |
| Unknown | | | 2 | 5.4% | 23 | 10.1% | 27 | 9.2% |
| UNKNOWN LOCATION | | | Complainants: 3 | | Complainants: 6 | | Complainants: 5 | |
| Black | | | 1 | 33.3% | 2 | 33.3% | 2 | 40.0% |
| Filipino | | | | | | | 1 | 20.0% |
| Hispanic | | | 1 | 33.3% | | | 1 | 20.0% |
| White | | | | | 1 | 16.7% | | |
| Unknown | | | 1 | 33.3% | 3 | 50.0% | 1 | 20.0% |
| TOTAL | | | Complainants: 40 | | Complainants: 234 | | Complainants: 298 | |

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

| Year | Accused Ethnicity | Complainant Ethnicity | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|-------|----------|----------|-------|-------|---------|
| | | American Indian | Asian | Black | Filipino | Hispanic | White | Other | Unknown |
| 2017 (YTD) | American Indian | | | | | | | | |
| | Asian | | | 3 | 3 | | | | |
| | Black | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| | Hispanic | | | 20 | 8 | | | 1 | |
| | White | | | 13 | 4 | | | | 1 |
| | Other | | | | | | | | |
| | Unknown | | | 5 | | | | | 1 |
| 2016 | American Indian | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | Asian | | | 22 | | 10 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| | Black | | 1 | 14 | | 6 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| | Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| | Hispanic | | 2 | 107 | | 19 | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| | White | | 2 | 59 | | 22 | 2 | 5 | 8 |
| | Other | | | | | 1 | | | |
| | Unknown | | | 10 | | 3 | 1 | | 13 |
| 2015 | American Indian | | | 3 | | | | | |
| | Asian | | | 34 | | 3 | | 1 | 2 |
| | Black | | | 23 | | 8 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | Filipino | | | | | 2 | | | |
| | Hispanic | | | 153 | | 28 | 12 | 7 | 14 |
| | White | | | 94 | 2 | 18 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| | Other | | | | | | | | |
| | Unknown | | | 31 | 1 | 6 | | 1 | 9 |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

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

| Year Closed | 2017 (YTD) | | | | 3-Year Average (2013-2015) |
|--|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| | | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | |
| BIASED POLICING COMPLAINTS CLOSED | 60 | 270 | 264 | 283 | 272.3 |
| BIASED POLICING ALLEGATIONS | 116 | 474 | 434 | 493 | 467 |
| Disposition of Allegations | | | | | |
| Demonstrably False | 2 (1.7%) | | | | |
| Exonerated | | | | | |
| Guilty | | | | | |
| Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate | 10 (8.6%) | 48 (10.1%) | 34 (7.8%) | 25 (5.1%) | 35.7 (8.2%) |
| Mediated ¹ | 10 (8.6%) | 32 (6.8%) | 51 (11.8%) | 27 (5.5%) | 36.7 (8.4%) |
| No Department Employee | | | | | |
| No Misconduct | | | | | |
| Not Guilty | | | | | |
| Not Resolved | 1 (0.9%) | 8 (1.7%) | 8 (1.8%) | 14 (2.8%) | 10.0 (2.3%) |
| Out of Statute | | | 2 (0.5%) | | 0.7 (0.2%) |
| Sustained | | | | | |
| Sustained - No Penalty | | | | | |
| Unfounded | 93 (80.2%) | 384 (81.0%) | 339 (78.1%) | 427 (86.6%) | 383.3 (87.9%) |
| Withdrawn by COP | | 2 (0.4%) | | | 0.7 (0.2%) |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

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

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

| Year Closed | 2017 (YTD) | | | | 3-Year Average (2013-2015) |
|--|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 | |
| Complaints Closed with Sustained Allegation | 2 | 7 | 16 | 6 | 9.7 |
| Penalty Imposed: | | | | | |
| Admonishment | | 1 (14.3%) | 4 (25.0%) | 1 (16.7%) | 2.0 (20.7%) |
| Official Reprimand | | 1 (14.3%) | 2 (12.5%) | | 1.0 (10.3%) |
| Demotion | | | | | |
| Suspension: 22 days or less | 1 (50.0%) | 4 (57.1%) | 6 (37.5%) | 1 (16.7%) | 3.7 (37.9%) |
| Suspension: More than 22 days | | | 1 (6.3%) | 1 (16.7%) | 0.7 (6.9%) |
| Termination | 1 (50.0%) | | | 1 (16.7%) | 0.3 (3.4%) |
| Resigned/Retired in Lieu of Termination | | 1 (14.3%) | 3 (18.8%) | 2 (33.3%) | 2.0 (20.7%) |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

Table 10 - Video in the Adjudication of Biased Policing Complaints

| Video in Biased Policing (BP) Complaints | 2017 (YTD) | | | | | | 2016 | |
|--|------------|----------|---------------------------------|----------|----------|----------------|-----------|----------|
| | Complaints | | Complaints by type of recording | | | | | |
| BP complaints closed | 60 | % | DICV | BWV | DICV+BWV | Other | 198 | % |
| No video/audio recording available | 33 | 55.0% | | | | | 127 | 64.1% |
| Video/audio recording was available | 27 | 45.0% | 14 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 71 | 35.9% |
| Closed BP complaints that had video | 27 | % | 14 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 71 | % |
| Not adjudicated (closed as Mediated) | 1 | 3.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 12.7% |
| Went through adjudication process | 26 | 96.3% | 14 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 62 | 87.3% |
| Adjudicated BP complaints that had video | 26 | % | 14 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 62 | % |
| Video did not assist in adjudication/Not stated | 10 | 38.5% | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 ¹ | 13 | 21.0% |
| Video helped in adjudication of some allegations | 14 | 53.8% | 8 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 44 | 71.0% |
| Video proved/disproved entire complaint | 2 | 7.7% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 ² | 5 | 8.1% |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

1. – Video from complaints in which “Other” recording types did not assist in adjudication included video captured by a cell phone, and video from the police station security camera.
- 2 – Video from complaints in which “Other” video disproved the entire complaint included video captured by the officer’s laser speed detector device and security video from the jail facility.

Table 11 - Mediation Program Survey Responses (Part 1)

| 1st Quarter 2017 - Participant Mediation Survey Responses | | Complainants (4) | | Employees (7) | | Total (11) | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|-------|------------------|-------|---------------|-------|
| Category | Rating | Total | % | Total | % | Total | % |
| Satisfaction with Complaint Mediation Process | Very Satisfied | 3 | 75.0% | 6 | 85.7% | 9 | 81.8% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | 1 | 25.0% | 1 | 14.3% | 2 | 18.2% |
| | Somewhat Dissatisfied | | | | | | |
| | Not Satisfied at All | | | | | | |
| | Did Not Answer | | | | | | |
| Fairness of Outcome of Complaint Mediation Process | Completely Fair | 3 | 75.0% | 6 | 85.7% | 9 | 81.8% |
| | Somewhat Fair | 1 | 25.0% | | | 1 | 9.1% |
| | Not Very Fair | | | 1 | 14.3% | 1 | 9.1% |
| | Not Fair at All | | | | | | |
| | Did Not Answer | | | | | | |
| Increased Understanding of Police Work / Community Member | Increased a Great Deal | 1 | 25.0% | 3 | 42.9% | 4 | 36.4% |
| | Increased Somewhat | | | | | | |
| | Increased a Little | 2 | 50.0% | 2 | 28.6% | 4 | 36.4% |
| | Did Not Increase | 1 | 25.0% | 2 | 28.6% | 3 | 27.3% |
| | Did Not Answer | | | | | | |
| Likelihood of Recommending Complaint Mediation Process | Very Likely | 3 | 75.0% | 5 | 71.4% | 8 | 72.7% |
| | Somewhat Likely | | | 2 | 28.6% | 2 | 18.2% |
| | Not Very Likely | 1 | 25.0% | | | 1 | 9.1% |
| | Not Likely at All | | | | | | |
| | Did Not Answer | | | | | | |

(Upd. 5/11/2017)

Table 11 - Mediation Program Survey Responses (Part 2)

| Survey Categories and Ratings | | 2017 (through 4/30/2017) | | | 2016 | | | 2015 | | | 2014 | | |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------|--------------|-----------|-------|--------------|-----------|-------|--------------|-----------|
| Category | Rating | Total | Complainants | Employees | Total | Complainants | Employees | Total | Complainants | Employees | Total | Complainants | Employees |
| Satisfaction with Complaint Mediation Process | Very Satisfied | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 83.3% | 83.3% | 83.3% | 81.7% | 70.0% | 90.2% | 88.6% | 77.8% | 96.2% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Somewhat Dissatisfied | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 13.9% | 10.0% | 16.7% | 18.3% | 30.0% | 9.8% | 11.4% | 22.2% | 3.8% |
| | Not Satisfied at All | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Did Not Answer | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.8% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Fairness of Outcome of Complaint Mediation Process | Completely Fair | 90.9% | 100.0% | 85.7% | 90.3% | 80.0% | 97.6% | 91.5% | 86.7% | 95.1% | 93.2% | 83.3% | 100.0% |
| | Somewhat Fair | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Not Very Fair | 9.1% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 5.6% | 10.0% | 2.4% | 7.0% | 10.0% | 4.9% | 6.8% | 16.7% | 0.0% |
| | Not Fair at All | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Did Not Answer | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.2% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Increased Understanding of Police Work / Community Member | Increased a Great Deal | 72.7% | 75.0% | 71.4% | 63.9% | 73.3% | 57.1% | 64.8% | 63.3% | 65.9% | 79.5% | 77.8% | 80.8% |
| | Increased Somewhat | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Increased a Little | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Did Not Increase | 27.3% | 25.0% | 28.6% | 31.9% | 20.0% | 32.4% | 32.4% | 33.3% | 31.7% | 18.2% | 16.7% | 19.2% |
| | Did Not Answer | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.2% | 6.7% | 2.4% | 2.8% | 3.3% | 2.4% | 2.3% | 5.6% | 0.0% |
| Likelihood of Recommending Complaint Mediation Process | Very Likely | 90.9% | 75.0% | 100.0% | 84.7% | 80.0% | 88.1% | 84.5% | 86.7% | 82.9% | 93.2% | 83.3% | 100.0% |
| | Somewhat Likely | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Not Very Likely | 9.1% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 12.5% | 13.3% | 11.9% | 11.3% | 6.7% | 14.6% | 6.8% | 16.7% | 0.0% |
| | Not Likely at All | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Did Not Answer | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.8% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 4.2% | 6.7% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

(upd. 5/11/2017)