

Biased Policing and Mediation Update – 2nd Quarter 2017 August 31, 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 two quarters 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 half 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 second quarter of 2017, the Department updated data for 2015 and 2016 to include 25 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	282	239	93

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 4 complaints for 2015 and 21 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 geographic bureau and by Area of occurrence. A summary of the data from Table 1 listing the number of complaints initiated by bureau appears immediately below.

Bureau (% of City pop. ⁶)	2017 YTD (%)	2016 (%)	2015 (%)	2014 (%)	3-Year Avg. (%)
Central (20.5)	23 (24.7)	51 (21.3)	67 (23.8)	65 (22.9)	61.0 (22.7)
South (18.2)	22 (23.7)	57 (23.8)	80 (28.4)	65 (22.9)	67.3 (25.1)
Valley (37.6)	18 (19.4)	57 (23.8)	67 (23.8)	75 (26.4)	66.3 (24.7)
West (23.7)	25 (26.9)	67 (28.0)	63 (22.3)	76 (26.8)	68.7 (25.6)
Outside City/Unknown	5 (5.4)	7 (2.9)	5 (1.8)	3 (1.1)	5.0 (1.9)
Total	93	239	282	284	268.3

- During the first half of 2017, 93 complaints were identified as containing allegations of Biased Policing, with a projected annual total of 186.
- In comparing the distribution of Biased Policing complaints initiated among the bureaus in the first half of 2017 against the three-year average, Valley Bureau had a lower proportion of Biased Policing complaints in the first six months of 2017 (19.4%) than the three-year average (24.7%). The distribution of Biased Policing complaints for the remaining three bureaus was similar to the three-year averages.
- When compared to the population data, Valley Bureau had a lower proportion of Biased Policing complaints (19.4%) when compared to the percentage of people residing in Valley Bureau (37.6%). The proportion of Biased Policing complaints received in each remaining bureau was slightly higher than the percentage of residents in their respective bureaus.
- With respect to the distribution of Biased Policing complaints among the geographic Areas during the first half of 2017, some Areas had a higher proportion of the City’s Biased Policing complaints when compared to the percentage of people residing in the Area. For example, Central, Southwest, and Hollywood Areas each had 9.7 percent of

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%.

the Biased Policing complaints while the residents in those Areas accounted for 1.6 percent, 5.0 percent, and 3.4 percent of the City population, respectively.

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

Table 2 shows 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 half of 2017, of the 144 accused employees for whom gender was known, female employees accounted for 14.6 percent of those accused in Biased Policing complaints, similar to their representation among sworn employees in the Department Deployment Roster (18.4%).⁷ This is a decrease from the prior quarter (17.9%) but an increase compared to prior years. In 2016, female employees were 12.6 percent of the accused but made up 18.4 percent of all sworn employees, and in 2015, female employees were 10.1 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 half of 2017 occurred in Gang Enforcement and Patrol-Specialized Enforcement assignments. While 8.8 percent of Gang Enforcement officers are female, of those Gang Enforcement officers listed as accused in Biased Policing complaints, 15.0 percent were female. For Patrol-Specialized Enforcement assignments, 15.8 percent of the officers are female, but for Biased Policing complaints, 27.3 percent of the accused officers were female.

- **Ethnic representation:** Data from the first half 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. Data from the first half of 2017 show that accused employees were most frequently in their thirties with less than ten years of service.⁸

⁷ Sworn Department employee makeup as of June 11, 2017: Gender: Male 81.6% and Female 18.4%; Ethnicity: American Indian 0.3%; Asian 7.5%; Black 10.2%; Filipino 2.3%; Hispanic 47.0%; White 32.4%; and Other 0.3% (Source: Sworn and Civilian Personnel by Sex and Descent, June 11, 2017).

⁸ In prior years, the accused officers were also most frequently in their thirties 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 assignment types in which Biased Policing complaints were initiated while Part 2 focuses on the gender of accused employees within those assignment types.

Part 1 – Accused Employee and Assignment Types:

- During the first two quarters of 2017, of the 156 employees accused of Biased Policing, employees assigned to the general Patrol function were the subject of the most Biased Policing complaints, making up 44.9 percent of the accused while in comparison, 21.8 percent of Department employees are assigned to the general Patrol function. Employees assigned to Patrol - Specialized Enforcement⁹ were the second most numerous, making up 14.1 percent of the accused in the first half of 2017 while in comparison, 2.8 percent of sworn officers are assigned to Patrol - Specialized Enforcement. This was followed by employees assigned to Gang Enforcement (12.8 percent of the accused compared to 3.4 percent of the Department), Traffic Enforcement (6.4 percent of the accused compared to 1.9 percent of the Department), and Area Detectives/Investigators (3.2 percent of the accused compared to 5.8 percent of the Department).

The representation of employees in the various assignment types in the first half 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	44.9%	Patrol	46.2%	Patrol	50.5%
2	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	14.1%	Metropolitan Div.	9.7%	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	10.7%
3	Gang Enforcement	12.8%	Gang Enforcement	8.7%	Gang Enforcement	8.1%
4	Traffic Enforcement	6.4%	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	8.2%	Metropolitan Div. ¹⁰	5.6%
5	Area Detectives	3.2%	Traffic Enforcement	6.2%	Traffic Enforcement	4.7%

- A comparison of the number of Biased Policing complaints initiated for each assignment type against the number of employees in each assignment type in the comparison group shows that officers assigned to Patrol – Specialized Enforcement were the subject of more Biased Policing complaints than employees in other assignments during the first

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ 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.

half of 2017. Based on the number of complaints per 100 officers in each assignment type, officers assigned to Patrol - Specialized Enforcement had the most Biased Policing complaints (3.7) per 100 officers during the first half of 2017. This was followed by officers assigned to Traffic Enforcement (3.4), Gang Enforcement (2.6), Patrol (1.4), and Traffic Collision 1.0).

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	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	3.7	Traffic Enforcement	8.5	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	8.9
2	Traffic Enforcement	3.4	Patrol - Spec. Enf.	6.3	Traffic Enforcement	8.9
3	Gang Enforcement	2.6	Metropolitan Div.	5.2	Gang Enforcement	5.0
4	Patrol	1.4	Patrol	3.8	Patrol	4.9
5	Traffic Collision Inv.	1.0	Gang Enforcement	3.6	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 two quarters of 2017 (14.6%) is slightly higher than in prior years, when females were 12.6 percent of the accused in 2016, and 10.1 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 Patrol - Specialized Enforcement (27.3%) and Gang Enforcement (15.0%).

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 half of 2017, Biased Policing complaints were initiated 0.013 percent of the time. This is similar to 2016 (0.016%) and 2015 (0.017%).

- Consistent with prior years, the type of contact that most frequently resulted in Biased Policing complaints during the first half of 2017 continues to be the traffic stop, accounting for 26 of the 93 complaints (28.0%) initiated. In 2016, traffic stops accounted for 34.3 percent of Biased Policing complaints, and in 2015, they accounted for 39.7 percent of the Biased Policing complaints.
- After traffic stops, radio calls (23) were the next most common, accounting for 24.7 percent of the 93 complaints initiated during the first half of 2017. This was followed by pedestrian stops (21), accounting for 22.6 percent of the complaints.
- The remaining Biased Policing complaints fall into the generic “Other” category, used for all other types of contacts. During the first two quarters of 2017, “Other” contacts accounted for 23 of the 93 complaints (24.7%).¹¹

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 half 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,¹² this is consistent with the past two years. 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 half of 2017, it appeared in 45 of the 93 Biased Policing complaints (48.4%) initiated and accounted for 39.1 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. In 2016, it appeared in 113 of the 239 Biased Policing complaints (47.3%) and in 2015, it appeared in 164 of the 282 complaints (58.2%).
- Arrest: Arrest was the second most complained of conduct during the first half of 2017. It appeared in 15 of 93 complaints (16.1%) and accounted for 13.0 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. In 2016, arrest appeared in 34 of 239 complaints (14.2%), and 47 of the 282 complaints (16.7%) in 2015.

¹¹ “Other” types of contact in the first half of 2017 included the following situations: complainants approaching or being stopped by officers at security checkpoints, complainants approaching officers who were conducting traffic enforcement with other parties, complainants calling or walking into a police station, a complainant who believed an officer engaged in Biased Policing after finding a parking ticket on her car, complaints initiated by a third party after witnessing a dispute involving an off-duty officer or hearing an officer testify in court, and situations in which complainants would not specify how they came into contact with officers.

¹² “Other” alleged discriminatory conduct reported in the first half of 2017 included: improper investigations, not returning a call, issuing citations, impounding property, favoring the other party in a dispute, asking the purpose for wanting to see the Mayor in person, being denied entry into City Hall, being asked about loitering, being told to stop spray painting at a protest, walking into the complainant’s yard during an investigation, not allowing a lawyer to speak to a suspect taking a sobriety test, telling the complainant to keep back while conducting a traffic stop with another party, and complaints in which the behavior was not specified.

- **Discourtesy:** In the first half of 2017, five of the 93 complaints (5.4%) alleged discourtesy based on bias, accounting for 4.3 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged. This is lower than in prior years, when Discourtesy appeared in 28 of 239 complaints (11.7%) in 2016, and 33 of 282 complaints (11.7%) in 2015.

Table 6 shows the types of bias alleged along with a breakdown of complainants by gender and ethnicity. Effective January 1, 2016, California Penal Code Section 13012 was amended to require that complaints against peace officers be tracked by specific bias categories. While the Department already tracked Biased Policing complaints by bias categories, new categories were added to be consistent with the new law, including: age, gender identity, religion (previously tracked as part of ethnic bias), physical disability, and mental disability (physical and mental disabilities were previously tracked under the general category of disability).¹³

- **Racial/Ethnic bias:** Complaints of discriminatory conduct based on race/ethnicity bias are overwhelmingly the most frequent. During the first half of 2017, 86 of the 93 Biased Policing complaints (92.5%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on race or ethnicity, accounting for 91.5 percent of all biases alleged. In 2016, 216 of the 239 complaints involved an allegation of ethnic bias (90.4%), accounting for 87.1 percent of all biases alleged. In 2015, when ethnic bias included religious bias, 259 of the 282 complaints (91.8%) involved at least one allegation of ethnic or religious bias, accounting for 90.2 percent of all biases alleged.
- **Gender bias:** In the first half of 2017, one of the 93 Biased Policing complaints (1.1%) involved an allegation of gender bias, accounting for 1.1 percent of all biases alleged. This has fluctuated in prior years: in 2016, 11 of 239 complaints (4.6%) alleged gender bias, while in 2015, three of the 282 complaints (1.1%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on gender.
- **Other biases:** Of the 93 Biased Policing complaints received in the first half of 2017, two complaints (2.2%) contained allegations of bias based on physical disability while mental disability was alleged in one complaint (1.1%). Biases based on gender identity/expression (1.1%), sexual orientation (1.1%), and national origin (1.1%) were also alleged in the first half 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 47 of the 95 complainants (49.5%) in the first half of 2017; 99 of the 255 complainants (38.8%) in 2016; and 148 of the 303 (48.8%) 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

¹³ A category for “Other” bias is included, though no Biased Policing complaints in the first half 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.

to discriminatory search were often reported by Black male complainants. Of the complainants who alleged discriminatory searches in the first half 2017, four of the five complainants (80.0%) were Black males. This is similar to 2016 (57.1%) and 2015 (66.7%).

Table 7 compares the ethnicity of complainants, broken down by geographic bureau of occurrence, against the City's ethnic composition based on census data from 2010. During the first half of 2017, Black complainants were the most numerous demographic group. For complaints in which the Area of occurrence could be determined, 61 (67.8%) of the 90 complainants were Black.¹⁴ This number is similar to prior years, when Black complainants made up 56.9 percent of the complainants in 2016 and 62.4 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

¹⁴ There were 62 Black complainants in the first half of 2017, but because one of those complainants was from an Unknown/Outside location, only 61 could be attributed to a specific Area and bureau.

occurred. Preponderance of evidence means the weight of evidence on one side is more convincing than the evidence presented for the other side. The Department manager's determination must be based on factual, reasonable consideration of the evidence and statements presented in the investigation.

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

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

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

"Guilty" and "Not Guilty" are used following a Board of Rights tribunal. "Not Guilty" may also be used to denote the final disposition of a complaint in which a Department adjudication of "Sustained" or a Board of Rights finding of "Guilty" is subsequently overturned, such as by a court of law. The full range of adjudication dispositions 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.¹⁵

¹⁵ 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 based solely on a prohibited bias category and shows how the adjudication of those Biased Policing allegations in the first half 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 half of 2017, 96 complaints with 178 Biased Policing allegations were adjudicated.

- Of 178 Biased Policing allegations adjudicated, 147 allegations (82.6%) were adjudicated as Unfounded, a slight decrease in comparison to the three-year average of 87.9 percent.
- Fifteen allegations (8.4%) closed with the disposition Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate, similar to the three-year average (8.2%), though the rate has fluctuated.
- Eleven allegations (6.2%) closed with the Mediated disposition during the first half of 2017. This is fairly consistent with the three-year average of 8.4 percent.
- Two allegations (1.1%) closed in the first quarter as Demonstrably False, both based on video. There were no additional Demonstrably False dispositions in the second quarter.
- Two allegations (1.1%) from one complaint closed in the second quarter as No Misconduct, but should have been adjudicated as Unfounded instead. Since video of the incident confirmed a legitimate basis for the police action and there was no evidence indicating bias, the appropriate adjudication would have been Unfounded rather than No Misconduct. However, because of statute deadlines, the dispositions could not be altered. A memorandum was sent to the commanding officer explaining the rationale.
- One Biased Policing allegation (0.6%) was adjudicated as Not Resolved during the first half of 2017. The current rate of Not Resolved dispositions is lower than the three-year average of 2.3 percent.

Part 2 - Closed complaints with sustained allegations related to bias

While the complaints in Part 2 do not contain allegations that officers took law enforcement action on the basis of a prohibited bias category, the sustained complaints reported in Part 2

reflect conduct that may be indicative of bias.¹⁶ In the second quarter of 2017, the Department sustained an allegation of Discourtesy-Ethnic against an off-duty officer who, after being called a racial slur by a group of men, repeated the same slur in telling them he was not of that race. The officer was counseled about language choice even when off-duty. The two sustained allegations from the first quarter involved off-duty Unbecoming Conduct.

Video in Adjudication of Biased Policing Complaints

Table 10 summarizes how video/audio recordings were used in adjudicating Biased Policing complaints closed in the first half of 2017 and breaks down the types of media available to the adjudicator. Of the 96 complaints with Biased Policing allegations that closed in the first half 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 47 of the 96 closed complaints (49.0%), the adjudicator had access to video and/or audio recordings during adjudication.

Of the 47 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 46 complaints went through the adjudication process during the first half of 2017. Of those 46 complaints, two Biased Policing complaints (4.3%) were disproven by video (as summarized in the prior quarterly report), and video and/or audio recordings assisted in the adjudication of 29 (65.2%) additional complaints.

Two of the Biased Policing complaints closed in the second quarter of 2017 are summarized below to demonstrate how video is being used during the adjudication process.

- In the first complaint, officers initiated a traffic stop for expired registration. The complainants alleged the stop was based on race, and that officers laughed and made discourteous statements during the entire stop. However, DICV showed that the stop occurred at night, and with tinted windows on the car, the complainants' race could not be determined through the car windows. The DICV also showed that officers did not laugh or make the statements alleged by the complainant.
- In the second complaint, officers responded to a call from a restaurant about a woman behaving erratically, trying to bathe in the restroom, and refusing to leave when asked. When officers arrived, the woman had exited the restaurant and was sitting on a bus bench, so restaurant workers pointed the woman out to the officers. As the officers were talking to her, a third party walked by and began to video record the encounter. The woman, who was on probation with a search condition, had her bag searched by the officers. When the restaurant declined to press charges, the woman was told she could not take baths in the restaurant and released. The woman and the third party later filed

¹⁶ Unlike Part 1, which is a count of allegations, the information in Part 2 is a count of complaints and the discipline imposed as a result of the complaint. Because complaints often contain multiple allegations, the discipline listed in Part 2 reflects the discipline for all sustained allegations, not necessarily the discipline imposed for the allegations indicating possible bias.

separate complaints against the officers, which were combined into one complaint. The woman alleged she was detained illegally, and that officers made sexual remarks to her. The third-party complainant alleged that officers stopped the woman because of her race, illegally searched her, and made ethnic remarks, but declined to provide his video to the investigator. While the DICV did not capture video of the encounter because the bus bench was positioned out of view of the camera, it captured audio of the encounter. There were no sexually harassing remarks or ethnic remarks on the audio recording.

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

As previously described, when IAG disagrees with a chain-of-command adjudication for a Biased Policing complaint, IAG forwards the complaint to the office director in the employee’s chain-of-command. In the second quarter of 2017, IAG disagreed with the chain-of-command adjudication for three Biased Policing complaints. One Biased Policing complaint was referred to the Director, Office of Operations (OO), who agreed with IAG’s recommendation that the complaint be adjudicated as Not Resolved. The two other Biased Policing complaints involved employees assigned to Metropolitan Division, so they were rereferred to the Director, OSO. The OSO Director disagreed with the IAG’s recommendation that the complaints be adjudicated as Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicated and Not Resolved; the complaints were closed as Unfounded. A summary of the dispositions for the three complaints referred to the office directors during the first half of 2017 appears in the table below.

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

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

In total, IAG disagreed with the chain-of-command recommendation for four Biased Policing complaints during the first two quarters of 2017. Those four closed complaints represent 4.2 percent of the 96 Biased Policing complaints closed in the first half of 2017. 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	96	198	264
Closed BP complaints in which IAG disagreed with adjudication	4 (4.2%)	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 additional allegations, may be mediated. The Program guidelines provide that complaints involving the following situations should not be mediated, though the Commanding Officer, IAG, makes the final determination of case eligibility:

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

During the first half of 2017, 146 complaints were referred to the Program for mediation, and 85 complaints were determined to be eligible, a 58.2 percent eligibility rate. In that period, seven complaints (involving seven complainants and eleven employees), closed as Mediated. The table below summarizes the complaints referred to the Program during the first half of 2017 compared to the total number of complaints referred between 2014 and 2016.

Community Police Unification Program¹⁷	2017 (YTD)	2016	2015	2014
Total Complaints Referred	146	289	195	224
Not Eligible	61 (41.8%)	118 (40.8%)	108 (55.4%)	119 (53.1%)
Eligible	85 (58.2%)	171 (59.2%)	87 (44.6%)	105 (46.9%)
Closed after Mediation conducted ¹⁸	6	29	30	15
Closed as Mediated after two No Shows	1	6	4	8

Of the 85 complaints eligible for mediation in the first half of 2017, 69 complaints (81.2%) were reassigned without mediation for full investigation. Beginning in 2016, the Department began

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.

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	2014
Eligible	85	171	87	105
Reassigned	69 (81.2%)	130 (76.0%)	61 (70.1%)	72 (68.6%)
Reason for Reassignment	69	130	61	72
Complainant could not be located/contacted	24 (34.8%)	20 (15.4%)	20 (32.8%)	19 (26.4%)
Complainant declined (and reason given)	24 (34.8%)	65 (50.0%)	23 (37.7%)	30 (41.7%)
Avoid other party	1 (4.2%)	6 (9.2%)		
Changed mind/does not wish to pursue	1 (4.2%)	6 (9.2%)		
Lack of trust in LAPD	4 (16.7%)	2 (3.1%)		
Too much bother	7 (29.2%)	3 (20.0%)		
Wants full investigation	8 (33.3%)	16 (24.6%)		
No reason given	3 (12.5%)	22 (33.8%)		
Officer declined (and reason given)	18 (26.1%)	32 (24.6%)	16 (26.2%)	19 (26.4%)
Avoid other party	6 (33.3%)	6 (18.8%)		
Too much bother	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.1%)		
Wants full investigation	6 (33.3%)	15 (46.9%)		
No reason given	6 (33.3%)	10 (31.3%)		
Inappropriate for mediation	1 (1.4%)	6 (4.6%)	2 (3.3%)	4 (5.6%)
Alternative Complaint Resolution	2 (2.9%)	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 two quarters of 2017, while Part 2 provides information on survey responses received from 2014 through the first half of 2017. Both tables show the participants' responses to four of the survey questions relating to satisfaction with the mediation process, whether the process was fair, whether mediation increased understanding of the other party, and whether the participant would recommend mediation to others.

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

Summarized below are results from the survey responses received from the six complainants and nine employees who participated in mediations during the first two quarters of 2017.

- **Satisfaction with the process:** Fourteen of the 15 participants (93.3%) were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the mediation process. Officers (100.0%) were slightly more likely to be satisfied than complainants (83.3%)
- **Fairness of the process:** Fourteen participants (93.3%) indicated the outcome of the mediation process was “somewhat fair” or “completely fair.” The percentage of participants who thought that the outcome was fair was roughly for the same for officers (88.9%) and complainants (100.0%).

- Understanding of the other party: Ten of the 15 participants (66.7%) indicated their understanding of the other party increased after the mediation. The percentage of participants who reported an increase in understanding was the same for officers (66.7%) and complainants (66.7%).
- Likelihood of recommending to others: Twelve of 15 participants (80.0%) 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 (88.9%) than it was for complainants (66.7%).

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

Though ratings for the various satisfaction categories have fluctuated since 2014, overall satisfaction levels remain high for both complainants and officers. The data in Part 2 show the Program has been well-received and is helping community members and Department employees develop a better understanding of each other. On average, 86.7 percent of participants since 2014 were satisfied with the process 92.1 percent believed the outcome to be fair, 68.7 percent reported an increase in understanding of the other party, and 85.6 percent would recommend mediation.

A recently resolved complaint, which involved a deaf complainant and the assistance of an American Sign Language interpreter, highlights the value of mediation in increasing understanding. The complainant alleged he was stopped because of racial bias while driving home after midnight. When he noticed police officers in the area, he tried to avoid them by making several fast turns because he did not have license plates. Noting the fast turns and lack of license plates, the officers initiated a stop. Before approaching the car, the officers asked the driver to roll down his tinted windows. Unable to hear the officers, the complainant did not roll down his windows and began sounding his horn. In response, the officers requested back up, drew their weapons, and waited. When additional officers arrived, one recognized the complainant from a prior encounter and advised the other officers that he was deaf.

During mediation, the complainant said he made the turns to avoid the officers because he was afraid. When the officers did not approach, he became even more nervous and used his horn to attract witnesses. The officers explained that cars without license plates often turn out to be stolen. When the complainant made the quick turns, and sounded the horn instead of opening his windows, their safety concerns were heightened. The officers recommended the complainant get license plates to avoid being stopped in the future, and to have a card with him to explain that he is deaf. The mediation was successful in that both sides gained an increased understanding of the other party’s perspective.

Efforts to Expand and Increase Participation

As requested at the August 8, 2017 BOPC meeting, IAG is in the process of evaluating how to further expand the Program by making additional public complaints eligible for mediation. Though the Program is now limited to Biased Policing and Discourtesy complaints, the existing eligibility guidelines generally allow other types of complaints to be mediated if they do not involve serious misconduct. The Mediation Coordinator is currently working with IAG’s

Complaint Classification Unit to evaluate whether other types of public complaints could be mediated. The LACA Dispute Resolution Program (DRP) is also being consulted to determine whether expansion of the Program will impact their need for resources.

To increase Program participation by complainants, the Mediation Coordinator is working with the DRP to communicate the Program objectives more effectively and stress the neutrality of the volunteer mediators. This includes having DRP staff contact complainants who are hesitant to participate, and in some cases, accompanying the Mediation Coordinator when contacting the complainant in person. An early sign of success includes an instance in which the complainant, who declined to speak with the Mediation Coordinator, agreed to mediation after speaking with DRP staff.

Additionally, the Mediation Coordinator is making a concerted effort to clarify how the Program works to encourage hesitant officers and those who have expressed a belief that mediation may negatively affect their complaint history. This includes in-depth discussions with officers to explain the Program, and making presentations at supervisor meetings and divisional roll calls to correct misconceptions. The Mediation Coordinators often asks officers from prior mediations to attend and provide a personal account of the process.

Sworn Employee Training on Implicit Bias

At the end of March 2017, the Department began training all sworn employees below the rank of captain on the subject of implicit bias.¹⁹ The mandatory four-hour course, titled “Implicit Bias and Community Policing,” consists of live instruction designed to expose officers to the concept of implicit bias, its causes and impact on community policing, and possible solutions. Training Division reports that as of August 21, 2017, 70.6 percent of officers assigned to the operational Bureaus have completed the course, and overall, 64.4 percent of all officers (which includes those in administrative assignments) have completed the training. The Department’s goal is to have all active sworn employees complete the training by November, 2017.

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

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%	23	24.7%	51	21.3%	67	23.8%	65	22.9%	61.0	22.7%
Central	61,668	1.6%	9	9.7%	17	7.1%	33	11.7%	20	7.0%	23.3	8.7%
Hollenbeck	179,536	4.7%	2	2.2%	7	2.9%	5	1.8%	8	2.8%	6.7	2.5%
Newton	146,201	3.9%	4	4.3%	16	6.7%	18	6.4%	16	5.6%	16.7	6.2%
Northeast	227,903	6.0%	1	1.1%	5	2.1%	2	0.7%	10	3.5%	5.7	2.1%
Rampart	164,961	4.3%	7	7.5%	6	2.5%	9	3.2%	11	3.9%	8.7	3.2%
SOUTH BUREAU	689,238	18.2%	22	23.7%	57	23.8%	80	28.4%	65	22.9%	67.3	25.1%
77th Street	178,933	4.7%	5	5.4%	31	13.0%	24	8.5%	12	4.2%	22.3	8.3%
Harbor	178,163	4.7%	2	2.2%	3	1.3%	5	1.8%	7	2.5%	5.0	1.9%
Southeast	141,371	3.7%	6	6.5%	10	4.2%	19	6.7%	16	5.6%	15.0	5.6%
Southwest	190,771	5.0%	9	9.7%	13	5.4%	32	11.3%	30	10.6%	25.0	9.3%
VALLEY BUREAU	1,427,148	37.6%	18	19.4%	57	23.8%	67	23.8%	75	26.4%	66.3	24.7%
Devonshire	216,499	5.7%	2	2.2%	8	3.3%	12	4.3%	10	3.5%	10.0	3.7%
Foothill	196,513	5.2%	1	1.1%	3	1.3%	6	2.1%	6	2.1%	5.0	1.9%
Mission	244,576	6.4%	1	1.1%	10	4.2%	6	2.1%	12	4.2%	9.3	3.5%
North Hollywood	203,856	5.4%	4	4.3%	10	4.2%	10	3.5%	12	4.2%	10.7	4.0%
Topanga	193,901	5.1%	1	1.1%	14	5.9%	7	2.5%	13	4.6%	11.3	4.2%
Van Nuys	177,918	4.7%	4	4.3%	9	3.8%	17	6.0%	16	5.6%	14.0	5.2%
West Valley	193,885	5.1%	5	5.4%	3	1.3%	9	3.2%	6	2.1%	6.0	2.2%
WEST BUREAU	900,515	23.7%	25	26.9%	67	28.0%	63	22.3%	76	26.8%	68.7	25.6%
Hollywood	128,999	3.4%	9	9.7%	20	8.4%	19	6.7%	17	6.0%	18.7	7.0%
Olympic	186,615	4.9%	4	4.3%	8	3.3%	4	1.4%	14	4.9%	8.7	3.2%
Pacific	203,623	5.4%	7	7.5%	25	10.5%	20	7.1%	20	7.0%	21.7	8.1%
West Los Angeles	230,275	6.1%	3	3.2%	1	0.4%	6	2.1%	9	3.2%	5.3	2.0%
Wilshire	151,003	4.0%	2	2.2%	13	5.4%	14	5.0%	16	5.6%	14.3	5.3%
OUTSIDE CITY/ UNKNOWN LOCATION	NA	NA	5	5.4%	7	2.9%	5	1.8%	3	1.1%	5.0	1.9%
TOTAL	3,797,170		93		239		282		284		268.3	

(upd. 7/28/2017)

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		2	1		15	1	2		21
	Male		10	11		60	39	1	2	123
	Unknown								12	12
	Ethnicity Total	0	12	12	0	75	40	3	14	156
2016	Female		3	4		26	11		1	45
	Male	2	34	32		145	96	2	2	313
	Unknown								32	32
	Ethnicity Total	2	37	36	0	171	107	2	35	390
2015	Female		3	3		26	11			43
	Male	3	37	34	2	185	112		8	381
	Unknown								43	43
	Ethnicity Total	3	40	37	2	211	123	0	51	467

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

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)	39	60	32	9	16
2016	69	132	107	33	49
2015	99	174	104	28	62

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

Length of Service at Date of Incident

Year	Years of Service					
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20/+	Unknown
2017 (YTD)	51	41	19	18	12	15
2016	78	115	51	49	49	48
2015	84	162	61	57	45	58

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

Table 2 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 2)

Age and Length of Service Comparisons

Age in Years	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2017 (YTD)	2016	2015
20-29	757	21.8%	27.9%	20.2%	24.4%
30-39	1501	43.1%	42.9%	38.7%	43.0%
40-49	954	27.4%	22.9%	31.4%	25.7%
50/+	268	7.7%	6.4%	9.7%	6.9%

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

Years of Service	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2017 (YTD)	2016	2015
0-4	799	23.0%	36.2%	22.8%	20.5%
5-9	1348	38.7%	29.1%	33.6%	39.6%
10-14	454	13.0%	13.5%	14.9%	14.9%
15-19	553	15.9%	12.8%	14.3%	13.9%
20/+	326	9.4%	8.5%	14.3%	11.0%

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

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
Detective/Investigator - Area	726 (5.8%)	5 (3.2%)	3	0.4	11 (2.8%)	8	1.1	15 (3.2%)	10	1.4
Detective/Investigator - Specialized	864 (6.9%)				5 (1.3%)	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%)	20 (12.8%)	11	2.6	34 (8.7%)	15	3.6	38 (8.1%)	21	5.0
Metropolitan Division ³	388 (3.1%)	4 (2.6%)	3	0.8	38 (9.7%)	20	5.2	26 (5.6%)	16	4.1
Narcotics Enforcement	245 (2.0%)	3 (1.9%)	1	0.4	6 (1.5%)	3	1.2	1 (0.2%)	1	0.4
Patrol	2,730 (21.8%)	70 (44.9%)	39	1.4	180 (46.2%)	103	3.8	236 (50.5%)	135	4.9
Patrol - Specialized Enforcement ⁴	348 (2.8%)	22 (14.1%)	13	3.7	32 (8.2%)	22	6.3	50 (10.7%)	31	8.9
Traffic Collision Investigation	199 (1.6%)	2 (1.3%)	2	1.0	6 (1.5%)	5	2.5	4 (0.9%)	4	2.0
Traffic Enforcement	236 (1.9%)	10 (6.4%)	8	3.4	24 (6.2%)	20	8.5	22 (4.7%)	21	8.9
Other Sworn ⁵	2,975 (23.7%)	2 (1.3%)	2	0.1	1 (0.3%)	1	0.0	5 (1.1%)	5	0.2
Detention Officer	306 (2.4%)	2 (1.3%)	1	0.3	1 (0.3%)	1	0.3	2 (0.4%)	1	0.3
Police Service Representative	608 (4.8%)									
Other Civilian	1,795 (14.3%)	1 (0.6%)	1	0.1	2 (0.5%)	1	0.1	1 (0.2%)	1	0.1
Unassigned ⁶ /Unknown ⁷	545 (4.3%)	15 (9.6%)	14	2.6	49 (12.6%)	42	7.7	51 (10.9%)	44	8.1
Total	12,546	156	93 ⁸	0.7	390	239 ⁸	1.9	467	282 ⁸	2.2

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(upd. 7/28/2017)	Comparison Group		2017 (YTD)		2016		2015	
Detective/Investigator - Area	726	5.8%	5	3.2%	11	2.8%	15	3.2%
Female	197	27.1%	1	20.0%	6	54.5%	3	20.0%
Male	529	72.9%	4	80.0%	5	45.5%	12	80.0%
Detective/Investigator - Specialized	864	6.9%	0	0.0%	5	1.3%	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	2.1%
Female	40	25.2%			0	0.0%	3	30.0%
Male	119	74.8%			1	100.0%	7	70.0%
Gang Enforcement	422	3.4%	20	12.8%	34	8.7%	38	8.1%
Female	37	8.8%	3	15.0%	3	8.8%	3	7.9%
Male	385	91.2%	17	85.0%	31	91.2%	35	92.1%
Metropolitan Division	388	3.1%	4	2.6%	38	9.7%	26	5.6%
Female	19	4.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Male	369	95.1%	4	100.0%	38	100.0%	26	100.0%
Narcotic Enforcement	245	2.0%	3	1.9%	6	1.5%	1	0.2%
Female	28	11.4%	1	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%
Male	217	88.6%	2	66.7%	4	66.7%	1	100.0%
Patrol	2,730	21.8%	70	44.9%	180	46.2%	236	50.5%
Female	353	12.9%	9	12.9%	21	11.7%	29	12.3%
Male	2,377	87.1%	61	87.1%	159	88.3%	207	87.7%
Patrol - Specialized Enforcement	348	2.8%	22	14.1%	32	8.2%	50	10.7%
Female	55	15.8%	6	27.3%	5	15.6%	4	8.0%
Male	293	84.2%	16	72.7%	27	84.4%	46	92.0%
Traffic Collision Investigation	199	1.6%	2	1.3%	6	1.5%	4	0.9%
Female	22	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Male	177	88.9%	2	100.0%	6	100.0%	4	100.0%
Traffic Enforcement	236	1.9%	10	6.4%	24	6.2%	22	4.7%
Female	6	2.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Male	230	97.5%	10	100.0%	24	100.0%	22	100.0%
Other Sworn	2,975	23.7%	2	0.4%	1	0.3%	5	1.1%
Female	746	25.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Male	2,229	74.9%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	5	100.0%
Detention Officer	306	2.4%	2	1.3%	1	0.3%	2	0.4%
Female	103	33.7%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Male	203	66.3%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
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%	1	0.6%	2	0.5%	1	0.2%
Female	1,027	57.2%	1	100.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
Male	768	42.8%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	100.0%
Unassigned (comparison group)	545	4.3%						
Female	122	22.4%						
Male	423	77.6%						
Unknown (accused employee)			15	9.6%	49	12.6%	52	11.1%
Female			0	0.0%	5	10.2%	0	0.0%
Male			3	20.0%	12	24.5%	9	17.3%
Unknown Gender			12	80.0%	32	65.3%	43	82.7%
Total	12,546	100.0%	156	100.0%	390	100.0%	467	100.0%
Total with Known Gender	9,837	(sworn)	144	100.0%	358	100.0%	424	100.0%
Female	1,858	18.9%	21	14.6%	45	12.6%	43	10.1%
Male	7979	81.1%	123	85.4%	313	87.4%	381	89.9%

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

Year	Total Public Contacts/ Encounters*	Biased Policing Complaints Initiated (% of encounters)	Biased Policing Complaints Initiated by Type of Contact			
			Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
2017 (YTD)	707,429	93 (0.013%)	21 (22.6%)	23 (24.7%)	26 (28.0%)	23 (24.7%)
2016	1,521,365	239 (0.016%)	39 (16.3%)	61 (25.5%)	82 (34.3%)	57 (23.8%)
2015	1,647,863	282 (0.017%)	65 (23.0%)	54 (19.1%)	112 (39.7%)	51 (18.1%)

(Upd. 8/14/2017)

* **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	1				
	M					1
Asian	F	1				
	M				1	
Black	F	62	1	5	5	4
	M		15	10	13	9
Filipino	F	0				
	M					
Hispanic	F	16	2	1	1	3
	M		2	3	4	
White	F	4		2		
	M				1	1
Other	F	5		2	1	
	M					2
Unknown	F	6		1	1	3
	M		1			
	UNK					

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

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	144	6	11	17	11
	M		20	21	41	17
Filipino	F	0				
	M					
Hispanic	F	50	1	9	3	9
	M		4	4	17	3
White	F	24	1	5	3	2
	M		4	4	3	2
Other	F	7		1		2
	M				3	1
Unknown	F	26	1	2	2	2
	M		3	3	5	6
	UNK		1			1

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
American Indian						
	M					
Asian	F	1				
	M			1		
Black	F	188	3	10	16	11
	M		40	18	68	22
Filipino	M	3			1	
	F		1			1
Hispanic	F	50	4	3	6	
	M		9	10	14	4
White	F	21		3	3	3
	M		2	4	2	4
Other	F	12	1	2		2
	M		2	3	1	1
Unknown	F	28	2	1		9
	M		5		5	6
	UNK					

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

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)	15 (13.0%)	45 (39.1%)	8 (7.0%)	2 (1.7%)	5 (4.3%)	4 (3.5%)	5 (4.3%)	5 (4.3%)	26 (22.6%)
2016	34 (11.6%)	113 (38.7%)	15 (5.1%)	9 (3.1%)	13 (4.5%)	14 (4.8%)	14 (4.8%)	28 (9.6%)	52 (17.8%)
2015	47 (13.1%)	164 (45.8%)	12 (3.4%)	3 (0.8%)	11 (3.1%)	4 (1.1%)	12 (3.4%)	33 (9.2%)	72 (20.1%)

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

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) Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
American Indian	F									
	M					1				
Asian	F									
	M	1							1	
Black	F			1	1	4			6	3
	M	10	7	1	3	12	3	4	26	
Filipino	F									
	M									
Hispanic	F				1	2	1	1	1	1
	M	2	1						8	
White	F					2				
	M	1							1	
Other	F		1			2			1	
	M					2				
Unknown	F	1		1		1			1	1
	M								1	
	UNK									

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

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

Table 5 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 2)

2016 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
American Indian	F									
	M									
Asian	F	1								
	M						1		2	1
Black	F	5	20	3	3	2	1	1	5	13
	M	19	58	7	5	4	3	8	3	17
Filipino	F									
	M									
Hispanic	F	4	4		1	3	3		6	4
	M	3	20	3		1	1	1	2	3
White	F	1	1	1		1	1	1	5	3
	M	2	5	1	1				3	4
Other	F						2		2	
	M	1	3			1	1			1
Unknown	F		3			1			1	2
	M	2	10	1	1		1	3		3
	UNK	1								1

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
American Indian	F									
	M									
Asian	F									
	M									1
Black	F	8	25	1	1	2		4	5	10
	M	27	97	7	1	6	1	10	9	33
Filipino	F		1							
	M		1							1
Hispanic	F	2	7	2		1			3	5
	M	5	22	1	1	1	1	1	5	9
White	F		4						2	3
	M	2	4				1		1	5
Other	F	2	1				1		1	2
	M	3	1						3	
Unknown	F		3	1					2	7
	M	1	9	1		2			2	5
	UNK									

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

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 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.1%)	1 (1.1%)	86 (91.5%)		1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)		1 (1.1%)
2016	4 (1.6%)	11 (4.4%)	4 (1.6%)	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.4%)	216 (87.1%)	3 (1.2%)	5 (2.0%)	2 (0.8%)		
2015	n/a	3 (1.0%)	n/a	8 (2.8%)		259 (90.2%)		5 (1.7%)		3 (1.0%)	9 (3.1%)

(upd. 7/28/2017)

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					1					
Asian	F										
	M					1					
Black	F			1	1	12					1
	M		1			46					
Filipino	F										
	M										
Hispanic	F	1		1		5					
	M					9		1			
White	F					2					
	M					2					
Other	F					3					
	M					2					
Unknown	F					4			1		
	M					1					
	UNK										

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

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								0			
	M											
Asian	F						1					
	M	1					3					
Black	F		1				45					
	M	1	1				97	1	1			
Filipino	F											
	M											
Hispanic	F		1	2	1		17		2	1		
	M						27		1	1		
White	F	2	2		1		6					
	M		2	3			7	1	1			
Other	F		1				3					
	M						3	1				
Unknown	F		3				4					
	M					1	16					
	UNK						2					

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

2015 Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
American Indian	F		1					
	M							
Asian	F							
	M							
Black	F	1	38	3				
	M		145		1			2
Filipino	F		1					
	M		2					
Hispanic	F	1	10		2			
	M	1	34				2	2
White	F		8				1	1
	M	3	8		1			
Other	F		4		1			
	M		6	1				
Unknown	F	1	11					
	M	1	11					4
	Unk							

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

Table 7 - Complainant Ethnicity by Bureau

(upd 7/28/2017)

	Population		2017 (YTD)		2016		2015	
			Complainants:		Complainants:		Complainants:	
CENTRAL BUREAU	780,269	20.5%	Complainants:	24	Complainants:	57	Complainants:	69
American Indian	2,135	0.3%						
Asian	104,891	13.4%						
Black	41,431	5.3%	17	70.8%	34	59.6%	44	63.8%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	710	0.1%						
Hispanic	525,180	67.3%	5	20.8%	15	26.3%	16	23.2%
Multiple Race	2,907	0.4%						
Other	2,169	0.3%			1	1.8%	1	1.4%
White	100,846	12.9%	1	4.2%	6	10.5%	6	8.7%
Unknown			1	4.2%	1	1.8%	2	2.9%
SOUTH BUREAU	689,238	18.2%	Complainants:	22	Complainants:	59	Complainants:	94
American Indian	1,769	0.3%						
Asian	29,303	4.3%						
Black	192,009	27.9%	17	77.3%	42	71.2%	72	76.6%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	1,678	0.2%						
Hispanic	395,688	57.4%	3	13.6%	9	15.3%	9	9.6%
Multiple Race	8,011	1.2%						
Other	2,985	0.4%	2	9.1%				
White	57,795	8.4%			2	3.4%		
Unknown					6	10.2%	13	13.8%
VALLEY BUREAU	1,427,148	37.6%	Complainants:	19	Complainants:	61	Complainants:	70
American Indian	4,778	0.3%						
Asian	157,831	11.1%	1	5.3%	1	1.6%	1	1.4%
Black	60,238	4.2%	8	42.1%	26	42.6%	28	40.0%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	2,488	0.2%						
Hispanic	660,981	46.3%	3	15.8%	16	26.2%	19	27.1%
Multiple Race	6,780	0.5%						
Other	5,203	0.4%	2	10.5%	5	8.2%	7	10.0%
White	528,849	37.1%	3	15.8%	9	14.8%	11	15.7%
Unknown			2	10.5%	4	6.6%	3	4.3%
WEST BUREAU	900,515	23.7%	Complainants:	25	Complainants:	71	Complainants:	65
American Indian	2,813	0.3%						
Asian	162,413	18.0%			3	4.2%		
Black	64,534	7.2%	19	76.0%	39	54.9%	42	64.6%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	1,632	0.2%					1	1.5%
Hispanic	258,047	28.7%	4	16.0%	10	14.1%	5	7.7%
Multiple Race	5,923	0.7%						
Other	4,175	0.5%	1	4.0%	1	1.4%	4	6.2%
White	400,978	44.5%			6	8.5%	4	6.2%
Unknown			1	4.0%	12	16.9%	9	13.8%
ALL BUREAUS	3,797,170	100.0%	Complainants:	90	Complainants:	248	Complainants:	298
American Indian	11,495	0.3%						
Asian	454,438	12.0%	1	1.1%	4	1.6%	1	0.3%
Black	358,212	9.4%	61	67.8%	141	56.9%	186	62.4%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	6,508	0.2%					2	0.7%
Hispanic	1,839,896	48.5%	15	16.7%	50	20.2%	49	16.4%
Multiple Race	23,621	0.6%						
Other	14,532	0.4%	5	5.6%	7	2.8%	12	4.0%
White	1,088,468	28.7%	4	4.4%	23	9.3%	21	7.0%
Unknown			4	4.4%	23	9.3%	27	9.1%
UNKNOWN LOCATION			Complainants:	5	Complainants:	7	Complainants:	5
American Indian			1	20.0%				
Black			1	20.0%	3	42.9%	2	40.0%
Filipino							1	20.0%
Hispanic			1	20.2%			1	20.0%
White					1	14.3%		
Unknown			2	40.0%	3	42.9%	1	20.0%
TOTAL			Complainants:	95	Complainants:	255	Complainants:	303

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	1		7		3			1
	Black			5		1	1	3	1
	Filipino								
	Hispanic		1	53		11	5	2	1
	White		1	29		8		1	1
	Other			2				1	
	Unknown			8			1		2
2016	American Indian			1		1			
	Asian			22		10	2	2	3
	Black		1	15		7	8	2	2
	Filipino								
	Hispanic		2	120		26	7	2	8
	White		2	64		24	2	5	8
	Other					1			
	Unknown			14		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		2	95	2	18	6	3	3
	Other								
	Unknown			31	1	6		1	9

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

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

Year Closed	2017 (YTD)				3-Year Average (2014-2015)
		2016	2015	2014	
BIASED POLICING COMPLAINTS CLOSED	96	270	264	283	272.3
BIASED POLICING ALLEGATIONS	178	474	434	493	467
DISPOSITION OF ALLEGATIONS:					
Demonstrably False	2 (1.1%)				
Exonerated					
Guilty					
Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	15 (8.4%)	48 (10.1%)	34 (7.8%)	25 (5.1%)	35.7 (8.2%)
Mediated ¹	11 (6.2%)	32 (6.8%)	51 (11.8%)	27 (5.5%)	36.7 (8.4%)
No Department Employee					
No Misconduct	2 (1.1%)				
Not Guilty					
Not Resolved	1 (0.6%)	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	147 (82.6%)	384 (81.0%)	339 (78.1%)	427 (86.6%)	383.3 (87.9%)
Withdrawn by COP		2 (0.4%)			0.7 (0.2%)

(Upd. 7/28/2017)

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 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 reported in Table 9 may differ from the number reported in the section on the Program.

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

Year Closed	2017 (YTD)				3-Year Average (2014-2016)
		2016	2015	2014	
Complaints with Sustained Allegation	3	7	16	6	9.7
Discipline 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					
Sustained- Training/Counseling	1 (33.3%)				
Suspension: 22 days or less	1 (33.3%)	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 (33.3%)			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. 7/28/2017)

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	96	%	DICV	BWV	DICV+BWV	Other	198	%
No video/audio recording available	49	51.0%					127	64.1%
Video/audio recording was available	47	49.0%	25	5	6	11	71	35.9%
Closed BP complaints that had video	47	%	25	5	6	11	71	%
Not adjudicated (closed as Mediated)	1	2.1%	0	0	0	1	9	12.7%
Went through adjudication process	46	97.9%	25	5	6	10	62	87.3%
Adjudicated BP complaints that had video	46	%	25	5	6	10	62	%
Video did not assist in adjudication/Not stated	14	30.4%	9	2	0	3 ¹	13	21.0%
Video helped in adjudication of some allegations	30	65.2%	16	3	6	5 ²	44	71.0%
Video proved/disproved entire complaint	2	4.3%	0	0	0	2 ³	5	8.1%

(Upd. 7/31/2017)

1 – Video from complaints in which “Other” recording types did not assist in adjudication included video captured by a cell phone, an officer’s personal body camera, and video from the police station security camera.

3 – Video from complaints in which “Other” recording types assisted in adjudication included video captured by an officer’s handheld video camera, surveillance cameras from a nearby business, and officers’ personal body camera.

2 – Video from complaints in which “Other” video disproved the entire complaint (both from the first quarter) 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)

2017 YTD - Participant Mediation Survey Responses		Complainants (6)		Employees (9)		Total (15)	
Category	Rating	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Satisfaction with Complaint Mediation Process	Very Satisfied	4	66.7%	7	77.8%	11	73.3%
	Somewhat Satisfied	1	16.7%	2	22.2%	3	20.0%
	Somewhat Dissatisfied						
	Not Satisfied at All	1	16.7%			1	6.7%
	Did Not Answer						
Fairness of Outcome of Complaint Mediation Process	Completely Fair	5	83.3%	8	88.9%	13	86.7%
	Somewhat Fair	1	16.7%			1	6.7%
	Not Very Fair			1	11.1%	1	6.7%
	Not Fair at All						
	Did Not Answer						
Increased Understanding of Police Work / Community Member	Increased a Great Deal	2	33.3%	3	33.3%	5	33.3%
	Increased Somewhat			1	11.1%	1	6.7%
	Increased a Little	2	33.3%	2	22.2%	4	26.7%
	Did Not Increase	2	33.3%	3	33.3%	5	33.3%
	Did Not Answer						
Likelihood of Recommending Complaint Mediation Process	Very Likely	4	66.7%	6	66.7%	10	66.7%
	Somewhat Likely			2	22.2%	2	13.3%
	Not Very Likely	1	16.7%	1	11.1%	2	13.3%
	Not Likely at All	1	16.7%			1	6.7%
	Did Not Answer						

(Upd. 8/23/2017)

Biased Policing and Mediation Update – 2nd Quarter 2017

Survey Categories and Ratings		2017 (through 6/30/2017)			2016			2015			2014		
Category	Rating	Total	Complainants	Employees	Total	Complainants	Employees	Total	Complainants	Employees	Total	Complainants	Employees
Satisfaction with Complaint Mediation Process	Very Satisfied	93.3%	83.3%	100.0%	83.3%	83.3%	83.3%	81.7%	70.0%	90.2%	88.6%	77.8%	96.2%
	Somewhat Satisfied												
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	6.7%	16.7%	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	93.3%	100.0%	88.9%	90.3%	80.0%	97.6%	91.5%	86.7%	95.1%	93.2%	83.3%	100.0%
	Somewhat Fair												
	Not Very Fair	6.7%	0.0%	11.1%	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	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%	63.9%	73.3%	57.1%	64.8%	63.3%	65.9%	79.5%	77.8%	80.8%
	Increased Somewhat												
	Increased a Little												
	Did Not Increase	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	31.9%	20.0%	32.4%	32.4%	33.3%	31.7%	18.2%	16.7%	19.2%
	Did Not Answer	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	6.7%	2.4%	2.8%	3.3%	2.4%	2.3%	5.6%	0.0%
Likelihood of Recommending Complaint Mediation Process	Very Likely	80.0%	66.7%	88.9%	84.7%	80.0%	88.1%	84.5%	86.7%	82.9%	93.2%	83.3%	100.0%
	Somewhat Likely												
	Not Very Likely	20.0%	33.3%	11.1%	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. 7/31/2017)