“Every operation embarked upon by the Department, regardless of mission, shall never compromise the indisputable pinnacle of objectives - the reverence for human life.”
It is the mission of the Los Angeles Police Department to safeguard the lives and property of the people we serve, to reduce the incidence and fear of crime, and to enhance public safety while working with the diverse communities to improve their quality of life. Our mandate is to do so with honor and integrity, while at all times conducting ourselves with the highest ethical standards to maintain public confidence.
Federal and state law defines general use of force policy standards and practices for all law enforcement agencies. The City of Los Angeles civilian police oversight body, the Board of Police Commissioners, however, further refines the Department’s use of force policy by establishing administrative standards. As a result, the Department’s prescribed policies and procedures are more restrictive when compared to the broader legal guidelines. Therefore, officer involved shootings can be deemed out of policy by the Department and/or the Board of Police Commissioners, despite the lawfulness of the officer’s decisions and actions.
While the Los Angeles Police Department ("Department") has published previous use of force year-end reviews, this report takes a broader perspective at use of force itself and the many factors that must be taken into consideration when evaluating use of force patterns and trends.

It is important to recognize that each use of force incident involves a unique set of circumstances that must always be taken into account when making analytical conclusions. An officer’s involvement and decision-making process in a use of force incident, and the level of force applied, is based on a suspect’s actions or inactions. Throughout the incident, an officer must continuously reassess the circumstances and adjust his/her response and application of force, when necessary.

To address the topic of use of force, Chief of Police Charlie Beck stated,

“If you view these things in a vacuum or with limited comparative data, it’s hard to draw conclusions. I want to provide enough data that people can see the total picture, not just one small piece of it. I think it’s important that LA be a leader in this and that we try to put some reason behind the conclusions that are being reached.”

It is important to note that a vast majority of police interactions with the public do not involve use of force. In 2015, the Department had 1,503,758 public contacts. During those public contacts, 1,924 resulted in a use of force. These use of force incidents represented only 0.13 percent of the Department’s total public contacts.
**Suspect Ethnicity in 2015 OIS Incidents**

- **Asian/Pacific Islander:** 2
- **Black:** 12
- **Hispanic:** 23
- **White:** 7
- **Other:** 2
- **Unknown:** 2

**2015:** 15

**Increase of suspects with perceived mental illness in OIS incidents**

**2014:** 5

**Decrease of Non-Categorical incidents from 2014**

**2014:** 38

**Perceived suicide by cop situations during OIS incidents.**

**2014:** 12

**Increase of officer injuries during OIS incidents**

**2014:** 5

**2015:** 14
INTRODUCTION

Communities and law enforcement agencies across the nation experienced many challenges in 2015. Unfortunate and controversial events occurred in cities, large and small, including Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Ferguson, and Cleveland. The loss of life, whether civilian or within the ranks of law enforcement, are always tragic and should be treated as a catalyst for betterment and forward progression for all.

Every operation embarked upon by the Department, regardless of mission, shall never compromise the indisputable pinnacle of objectives - the reverence for human life. No investigative outcome or task outweighs the value of life. To emphasize the Department’s commitment to the City of Los Angeles and its residents, management developed new training centered on current issues facing the country. All sworn personnel were assigned to participate in the Public Trust and Preservation of Life class during 2015. Additionally, the Department has a long-standing partnership with the Museum of Tolerance, which facilitates the Building Community Trust course that officers attend on a semi-annual basis. However, additional avenues to train Department personnel are constantly considered and evaluated.

Quality through Continuous Improvement and Respect for People are two of the Department’s core values. As an ever evolving Department, the pursuit of continuous improvement concedes that constructive criticism and thoughtful input from all stakeholders is always encouraged and solicited. Regardless of progress made from past decades, there will never be a time for complacency or satisfaction; not now – not in the future. The collective need to respect each other may never have been greater, and if the City of Los Angeles and the United States as a whole intends to succeed in accomplishing a paradigm change in law enforcement policies and tactics, existing relationships must be fostered, while many new are created.

In response to public concerns, the Department created a new entity in 2015 to make the organization increasingly approachable and to assist in cultivating relationships with the residents it is sworn to protect and serve. Suitably, the Community Relationship Division seeks to build relationships and trust between the Department and the diverse communities in Los Angeles while leveraging best practices in community outreach and community policing.

The Department fully understands that the community’s trust in its intentions and faith in its operations are crucial for both short-term and long-term success. For that trust not to erode, transparency is of paramount importance. At the direction and oversight by the Board of Police Commissioners, the Department seeks to constantly identify areas that require change, while also recognizing successful practices that effectively improve the quality of life for all residents in the City of Los Angeles.

On November 10, 2015, Police Commission President Matthew Johnson stated,

[...] we must fully commit to minimizing the number of use of force incidents. The LAPD Use of Force Policy specifically states that, “The Department’s guiding value when using force shall be reverence for human life.” With that as our guiding principle, I am confident we can significantly reduce the number of use of force incidents while continuing to ensure the safety of our officers. If successful, we will not only reduce the incidents of physical harm to both our residents and our officers, we will also increase the level of trust and respect between the police and our community members. This will also reduce financial harm to the City and reduce the amount of organizational harm that invariably follows use of force incidents.

The Board of Police Commissioners (“Commissioners”) specifically requested for the Department to prepare a comprehensive use of force report detailing what transpired in 2015, as well as a five-year comparison to obtain a thorough understanding of force used by Department personnel. In response, Use of Force Review Division was tasked with the responsibility of creating the 2015 Use of Force Year-End Review.
Based on the current population of 3.96 million residents in Los Angeles, approximately 1.9 million, or 48 percent, are of Hispanic descent. Approximately 1.06 million, or 27 percent, are White. Asian/Pacific Islanders represent 554,400 residents, or 14 percent. There are 356,400 Black residents, which represents nine percent of the population. In addition, 79,200 residents are designated with an “Other” ethnicity, which represents two percent of the population.

In 2015, 14,875 suspects involved in violent crime incidents in the City of Los Angeles were of Hispanic descent, which represented 42 percent of all 35,277 suspects involved in violent crime incidents during the year. During the same period, 14,633 suspects, or 41 percent, were Black. White suspects involved in violent crime incidents represent 2,745 individuals, or eight percent. Lastly, 3,024 suspects, or nine percent, had either unknown or other ethnic designations.
In 2015, 278,530 subjects stopped by LAPD personnel during field detentions were Hispanic, which represented 45 percent of all 617,934 subjects stopped during the year. During the same period, 160,412 subjects, or 26 percent, were Black. White subjects detained during field detentions represented 122,807 individuals, or 20 percent. Lastly, 56,185 subjects, or nine percent, had unknown ethnic designations.

In 2015, 5,926 suspects arrested by the LAPD as a result of incidents involving violent crime were Hispanic, which represented 49 percent of all 12,082 suspects arrested for violent crime incidents during the year. During the same period, 3,980 suspects, or 33 percent, were Black. White suspects arrested for violent crime incidents represented 1,459 individuals, or 12 percent. Lastly, 717 suspects, or six percent, had either unknown or other ethnic designations.
ETHNICITY OF SUSPECTS INVOLVED IN OIS INCIDENTS

In 2015, 23 Hispanic suspects were involved in OIS incidents, which represented 48 percent of the 48 total suspects. Black suspects represented 12 of the 48 suspects, or 25 percent. Additionally, seven White suspects, or 15 percent, were involved in all OIS incidents. Lastly, a combined total of six suspects, or 13 percent, had either unknown or other ethnic designations.

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY FOR CUOF INCIDENTS

In 2015, 44 of the Department’s 99 CUOF incidents, or 44 percent, originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. Twenty-three incidents, or 23 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (e.g. pedestrian and traffic stops). Eight incidents had sources of activity designated as other, which represented eight percent of the total CUOF incidents. The following depicts the remaining category totals in addition to their respective percentages:

- Off-duty: six incidents, or six percent;
- Private person call: four incidents, or four percent;
- Pre-planned activity: four incidents, or four percent;
- On-Duty, Tactical: four incidents, or four percent;
- On-Duty, Non-Tactical: three incidents, or three percent; and,
- Unknown: three incidents, or three percent.
In 2015, 1,006 of the Department’s 1,825 NCUOF incidents, or 55 percent, originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. During the same period, 549 incidents, or 30 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (e.g. pedestrian and traffic stops). The following depicts the remaining category totals in addition to their respective percentages:

- Other: 128 incidents, or seven percent;
- Private person call: 120 incidents, or seven percent;
- Station Call: 20 incidents, or one percent; and,
- Unknown: two incidents, or less than one percent.

FIREARMS RECOVERED BY THE DEPARTMENT

In 2015, there were 6,151 firearm recoveries resulting from all LAPD field operations. This figure excludes firearms acquired through the Department’s 2015 Gun Buyback Program.
In 2015, 77th Street Division accounted for 57,142 calls for service out of the 885,824 total during the year, representing six percent of all calls for service generated for each of the Department’s 21 geographic Divisions, Traffic Divisions, and non-defined City areas. Southwest accounted for 51,757 calls for service, or six percent. Hollywood Division accounted for the third highest radio call count with 43,397 calls, or five percent.

Based on Bureau totals in 2015, Valley Bureau accounted for the most radio calls for service with 267,295 radio calls, or 30 percent of the 885,824 total. West Bureau accounted for the second highest count with 213,001 radio calls, or 24 percent. Central Bureau accounted for the third most with 204,062 radio calls, or 23 percent. Lastly, South Bureau accounted for the least radio calls with 201,418 radio calls, or 23 percent. The remaining 48 radio calls occurred in non-defined City areas.
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CORE VALUES

SERVICE TO OUR COMMUNITIES
We are dedicated to enhancing public safety and reducing the fear and the incidence of crime. People in our communities are our most important customers. Our motto, “To Protect and to Serve,” is not just a slogan - it is our way of life. We will work in partnership with the people in our communities and do our best, within the law, to solve community problems that affect public safety. We value the great diversity of people in both our residential and business communities and serve all with equal dedication.

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

COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP
We believe the Los Angeles Police Department should be a leader in Law Enforcement. We also believe that each individual needs to be a leader in his or her area of responsibility. Making sure that our values become part of our day-to-day work life is our mandate. We must each work to ensure that our co-workers, our professional colleagues and our communities have the highest respect for the Los Angeles Police Department.

INTEGRITY IN ALL WE SAY AND DO
Integrity is our standard. We are proud of our profession and will conduct ourselves in a manner that merits the respect of all people. We will demonstrate honest, ethical behavior in all our interactions. Our actions will match our words. We must have the courage to stand up for our beliefs and do what is right. Throughout the ranks, the Los Angeles Police Department has a long history of integrity and freedom from corruption. Upholding this proud tradition is a challenge we must all continue to meet.
RESPECT FOR PEOPLE
Working with the Los Angeles Police Department should be challenging and rewarding. Our people are our most important resource. We can best serve the many and varied needs of our communities by empowering our employees to fulfill their responsibilities with knowledge, authority and appropriate discretion. We encourage our people to submit ideas, we listen to their suggestions, and we help them develop to their maximum potential. We believe in treating all people with respect and dignity. We show concern and empathy for the victims of crime and treat violators of the law with fairness and dignity. By demonstrating respect for others, we will earn respect for the Los Angeles Police Department.

QUALITY THROUGH CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
We will strive to achieve the highest level of quality in all aspects of our work. We can never be satisfied with the “status quo.” We must aim for continuous improvement in serving the people in our communities. We value innovation and support creativity. We realize that constant change is a way of life in a dynamic city like Los Angeles, and we dedicate ourselves to proactively seeking new and better ways to serve.
THE MOTTO, “TO PROTECT AND TO SERVE,” STATES THE ESSENTIAL PURPOSE OF THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT. THE DEPARTMENT PROTECTS THE RIGHT OF ALL PERSONS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION TO BE FREE FROM CRIMINAL ATTACK, TO BE SECURE IN THEIR POSSESSIONS, AND TO LIVE IN PEACE. THE DEPARTMENT SERVES THE PEOPLE OF LOS ANGELES BY PERFORMING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNCTION IN A PROFESSIONAL MANNER, AND IT IS TO THESE PEOPLE THAT THE DEPARTMENT IS ULTIMATELY RESPONSIBLE.
CITY OF LOS ANGELES

As of 2015, the City of Los Angeles consists of a population of approximately 3.96 million residents and encompasses an area of 468 square miles. As a dynamic economic hub with vibrant tourist locations and attractions, Los Angeles boasts a successful economy and greatly contributes to the economic impact of California, which currently ranks as the world’s eighth-largest economy at $2.3 trillion.

The City of Los Angeles is proudly comprised of a diverse and multi-ethnic population from a vast cultural spectrum. With approximately 3.96 million residents, Los Angeles is California’s most populous city and the second-most populous in the nation after New York City. The median household income from 2009 through 2013 was approximately $49,497. However, for the same period, approximately 22 percent of total population was below the poverty level.

Based on the current population figures in Los Angeles, approximately 1.9 million, or 48 percent, are of Hispanic descent. Approximately 1.06 million, or 27 percent, are White. Asian/Pacific Islanders represent 554,400 residents, or 14 percent. Blacks represent nine percent of the population with 356,000 residents, and 79,200 residents are designated as “other” ethnicities, which is two percent of the population.

DEPARTMENT

As of February 2016, the Los Angeles Police Department employed 9,939 sworn personnel, making it the third largest police department in the nation behind the New York Police Department and the Chicago Police Department, which employed 34,542 and 12,092 sworn personnel respectively.

The Department has 6,812 employees that are at the rank of police officer, which represents 69 percent of the total Department personnel. The following depicts the remaining Department sworn personnel categories according to rank along with their respective totals and percentage breakdowns:

- Commanders and Above: 31 personnel, or less than one percent;
- Captains: 79 personnel, or less than one percent;
- Lieutenants: 278 personnel, or three percent;
- Sergeants: 1,183 personnel, or 12 percent; and,
- Detectives: 1,556 personnel, or 16 percent.

1United States Census Bureau, Los Angeles City QuickFacts, October 14, 2015.
2Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, 2011 Uniform Crime Reports.
Sworn Department personnel of Hispanic descent represent the highest number of employees in the Department with 4,521 individuals out of the 9,939 total, or 45 percent. The following depicts the remaining Department sworn personnel categories according to ethnicity along with their respective totals and percentage breakdowns:

- White: 3,326 personnel, or 33 percent;
- Black: 1,073 personnel, or 11 percent;
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 732 personnel, or seven percent;
- Filipino: 230 personnel, or two percent;
- American Indian: 35 personnel, or less than one percent; and,
- Other: 22 personnel, or less than one percent.

On a per capita basis, the Department has approximately 25 officers per 10,000 residents, compared to the Chicago Police Department and the New York Police Department ratios of 41 and 44 officers per 10,000 residents, respectively. From a geographic perspective, the Department has 21 officers per square mile, compared to Chicago Police Department with 53 officers per square mile, and New York Police Department with 114 officers per square mile.4

The Department’s patrol function is managed through the Office of Operations (OO). There are four bureaus within OO, which are further divided into 21 geographical areas, four traffic divisions, and Criminal Gang and Homicide Division.

---

4Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, 2011 Uniform Crime Reports.
# OFFICE OF OPERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central</th>
<th>South Bureau</th>
<th>Valley Bureau</th>
<th>West Bureau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>Hollywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>Olympic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>South Traffic</td>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>Wilshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Traffic</td>
<td>Criminal Gang and Homicide</td>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>West Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valley Traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP DIVISION
In August 2015, Community Relationship Division (CRD) was formed, aimed at building trust and relationships between the Department and the diverse communities in Los Angeles through outreach, community policing, and digital media. Community Relationship Division personnel were selected based on their exceptional skills in developing community partnerships, supporting field personnel in community engagement efforts, and promoting positive engagement through social media and city-wide community events.

Community Relationship Division is comprised of two sections. The Digital Media and Crime Prevention Section handle all social media accounts, crime prevention programs, and special events. The Community Engagement Section fosters relationships with community-based organizations, leaders, groups, and stakeholders, while simultaneously educating the public of the Department’s mission. It also collaborates with patrol divisions and geographical bureaus on community outreach and relationship-based policing issues.
Effective law enforcement training is evolutionary and adaptable to emerging issues. This is especially the case with respect to the use of force and the development of the modern police officer. The Department has consistently tailored and adapted training methods and curriculum based on academic research and emerging societal trends. The expectation is for police officers to resolve situations safely and with the least amount of force possible. In 2014, the Department evaluated its training to identify areas where improvements could be made, with a particular focus on the subject of use of force. For example, lessons learned from a series of Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) incidents resulted in an extensive assessment of internal and external use of force and OIS data, policies, and a comparative analysis of training with the largest law enforcement agencies in the country. The goal of this review was to develop training and to implement procedures that would improve performance and emphasize de-escalation of force and the continued institutionalization of Preservation of Life.

Preservation of Life and building public trust were immediately identified as essential elements of many law enforcement use of force policies. The goal is to ensure that all officers are being taught the reasoning behind the policy and not just the policy itself. In addition, a byproduct of this review revealed the need to improve transparency, as it became increasingly apparent that releasing timely information to the public in a multifaceted communication and social media-driven culture is important and demanded.

Chief of Police Charlie Beck began championing the concept of “Relationship-Based Policing” (RBP), where he established the expectation for Department personnel to build one-on-one personal relationships with members of the community by breaking down barriers, improving communication, and providing everyone a better understanding of each other’s perspectives and needs.

It was discovered that building public trust encompasses all of the principles of RBP, as the public expects police officers to set good examples, embrace policy changes, and foster personal relationships. The review also disclosed that there is a national debate on four key training topics that will become the focus of how the Department designs and implements future training:

1. Building public trust/preservation of life;
2. Teaching use of force de-escalation techniques;
3. Dealing with persons suspected of being mentally ill; and,
4. Mastering laws of arrest such as consensual encounters, reasonable suspicion, and probable cause.

The Department’s training program operates like a small college or university and has 147 California Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certified courses in its catalogue. In fact, for many years, the Department has used the name “LAPD University” in reference to the many classes it has developed over time. The Academy curriculum teaches basic police concepts, which would be the equivalent of 100 level classes, while the Command Development Courses are considered graduate classes, or at the 500 level. Department training managers are able to gain a better understanding on how to develop career paths for their personnel by utilizing the newly organized online library and creating new courses to address additional training needs.

The Department has also reached out to the University of Southern California and the University of California, Irvine, in efforts to form partnerships and develop a university certificate program, tentatively named Modern Policing: Building Trust, Justice, and Safety. The curriculum will be developed by university professors and intended to offer academic, interdisciplinary, and research-based perspectives on topics such as the evolution of policing, comparative policing models, how social contexts impact human interactions, how to form partnerships, modern data analytics, developing communications strategies, and how to plan, evaluate and assess strategic plans.

Finally, the Department recognized that it required an even greater commitment to improving training. Therefore, it implemented an extensive reorganizational model, which included a disbandment of the former Personnel and Training Bureau and created the new Police Sciences and Training Bureau (PSTB) in March 2015.
TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT

POLICE ACADEMY TRAINING

In 2008, the Department implemented a completely redesigned Academy curriculum, which was geared towards problem based learning (PBL). The Department recognized that the Academy’s tradition of strong, tactical skill training must continue, but it also established that improvements had to be made to maximize critical thinking and capitalize on initiative and human potential. The training goal was implemented to compliment tactical strengths by developing officers who are also self-motivated, interdependent, community oriented, critical thinkers and problem solvers.

Through the examination of best practices in law enforcement training, three key constructs were identified as a lens for all Department training for recruits, active officers and civilians. These constructs, as discussed by the Director of Police Training and Education (PTE) in the article, “Changing the Training Paradigm,” are as follows:

Training the Whole Person - Peak performance is achieved by utilization of all three learning domains: psychomotor domain – physical skills and strength; cognitive domain – critical thinking and problem solving; and affective domain – utilizing emotional intelligence. Preparing people for all facets of their job will develop more resilient individuals, and ultimately, a more resilient workforce.

In a Team, By a Team, to be a Team - Public safety requires team effort. All officers must develop individual skills within the framework of a team. Teamwork should facilitate self-assessment, appreciation for the skills of others, and increases the value on collaboration. Teamwork incorporates respect for other teams both inside the Department and within the community.

Through an Event, Not to an Event - To be comprehensively effective, training must be conducted within an experiential learning environment that requires critical thinking all the way through an event. Training “through an event” includes training not only for the skills needed in a crisis, but for the ongoing response once the tactical operation concludes. Leaders must learn to anticipate the ongoing needs of their people, the political environment, and the resources they need once the crisis is over. Understanding the context and ensuring follow-through with key stakeholders will improve the Department’s response for future incidents.

ACADEMY HOURS

The Academy is 912 hours long, exceeding the POST requirement of 664 hours of mandated training. Class sizes generally range from 30 to 50 recruits. A new recruit class typically starts every four weeks, and each class is in training for six months. At any point, there are as many as six academy classes running simultaneously. The Department’s goal is to exceed all POST minimum training requirements.

ACADEMY TESTING

The design of the Academy is to build confidence through basic scenarios at the beginning of the program and to enhance competency by addressing increasingly more complex scenarios as the Academy progresses. Students must pass 25 POST Learning Domain exams and 14 scenario tests in order to graduate.

IN-SERVICE TRAINING

As a result of the Department’s comprehensive review of its training curriculum, many new courses have been developed and updated procedures have been implemented. Provided below is a brief overview of key subjects:

NATIONAL DISCUSSION ON BUILDING PUBLIC TRUST

A five-hour class delivered to all sworn and reserve officers in 2015. The class was facilitated by staff officers and designed to encourage discussions on topics such as preservation of life, embracing the humanity of policing, history of the Department’s community relations, erosion public trust, the importance of constitutional policing, use of force de-escalation techniques, and addressing the needs of persons with mental illnesses. This class is a prerequisite to the 10-hour Use of Force Update, where officers are placed in practical application scenarios.

USE OF FORCE UPDATE CLASS (10-HOUR)

On October 29, 2015, the Department implemented the mandated 10-hour Use of Force Update for all sworn personnel. The class is critical in addressing contemporary events involving use of force, dealing with persons involved in a mental health crisis, constitutional policing, preservation of human life, and strengthening de-escalation skills. Officers are given the opportunity to practice less lethal force options, including the beanbag shotgun, OC spray, and TASER. Scenarios have been designed to utilize a range of critical thinking and problem-
solving strategies, and to reinforce good communication and de-escalation skills. As of December 3, 2015, nine classes have been completed and 522 officers have participated. The goal is to hold three classes weekly with approximately 60 officers in attendance. The projected time-frame to train the Department’s sworn personnel is currently one year.

**POLICE SCIENCE LEADERSHIP (PSL)**

Police Science Leadership I is a pilot course, which utilizes adult learning concepts and practical applications to teach officers investigative and field operational skills necessary to solve long-term problems in the community while increasing public trust and police legitimacy. This new course was designed to fill a training gap that the Department identified in its curriculum. The PSL program is a unique 80-hour course that returns a complete class of officers to the Academy after they have successfully completed 11 months of probationary experience in the field. It is believed that upon completion of probation, an officer is more receptive to learn advanced concepts in leadership, communications skills, dealing with the mentally ill, how to build public trust, and use of force de-escalation techniques. The leadership skills component will include image and impression management, fair and impartial policing, purposeful communication, and community relationship development. These same officers return for an additional 80-hours of training at the three-year (PSL II) and five-year (PSL III) marks of their careers. Implementing the PSL program shows a strong commitment, with 240 hours of instruction, to developing officers and regularly exposing them to new and innovative ideas in policing. Finally, officers will receive 40-hours of Mental Health Intervention Training on topics such as crisis communications, suicide by cop, substance abuse, autism, and psychopharmacology.

**FIELD TRAINING OFFICER (FTO)**

The Field Training Officer course is currently under curriculum review as a result of State Senate Bill 29, which has directed POST to increase mental health training. This presented the Department an opportunity to integrate updated training on preservation of life, use of force de-escalation, mental illness, and constitutional policing. The Department, in collaboration with POST, developed new curriculum which is anticipated to be implemented during the third quarter of 2016.

**QUALIFICATION COURSE UPDATE**

In 2015, the Department updated its qualification course for the first time in over 26 years. The old course was based on firearm concepts developed decades ago when the Department issued six-shot revolvers to its recruits. After a comprehensive review of the qualification phases, it was determined to be beneficial to update the course to reflect current training and tactics.

**Note:** The Department requires the majority of its officers to qualify four times a year with their firearms, once with a shotgun, and once on a Force Option Simulator (FOS) machine. As a general rule, approximately 95% of officers pass the qualification course on their first attempt. Any officer that fails three or more attempts is required to attend firearms re-integration training, where they receive one-on-one instruction from a Training Division firearms instructor.

**FAIR AND IMPARTIAL POLICING (FIP)**

This course was given to all command staff members in December 2014. The focus of FIP was on the impact of bias policing, implicit bias, contact theory, and counter-stereotype training. Components of a successful FIP program include recruitment and hiring of a diversified workforce, policies prohibiting biased policing, successful Academy and in-service training programs, outreach to diverse communities, leadership, and accountability.

**POST PERISHABLE SKILLS**

POST requires a minimum of 24-hours of Continual Professional Training every two years for certified peace officers. Fourteen training hours shall address perishable skills, such as firearms, arrest and control, driving, and tactical communications. The Department obtained approval from POST to re-write the entire 24-hour curriculum to integrate new topics, including building public trust, preservation of life, and procedural justice. The new curriculum was approved by POST and a pilot class will be conducted in February 2016.

**MUSEUM OF TOLERANCE (MOT)**

The Department has negotiated with MOT to increase the number of presentations for its 10-hour class on “Building Public Trust” to 25 sessions in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-2016, and to 40 sessions in FY 2016-2017. This course was created by combining their POST approved curriculum on “Racial Profiling” and “Beyond Diversity.”

**LAW ENFORCEMENT TACTICAL APPLICATION COURSE (LETAC)**

The Law Enforcement Tactical Application Course is a 32-hour course designed to reinforce and to enhance an officer’s basic tactical knowledge and skills. It includes in-depth discussion on the Department’s use of force policy, force options, command and control, tactical planning and communication, and firearms safety. Students are evaluated using practical combat range and FOS application scenarios.
OTHER TRAINING TOPICS
The Department relies on additional training platforms to maintain proficiency standards for sworn personnel. Force Option Simulators (FOS) present scenarios in a virtual reality-based environment that requires officers to rely on their skills, knowledge, and experience in addressing challenging situations that may require use of force. Tactical Debriefs are designed to address training needs in a collaborative setting with instructors as a result of an actual use of force incident.

FORCE OPTION SIMULATORS
All 21 patrol divisions have been furnished with a FOS, providing officers with the ability to train on a continuous basis. The FOS training enhances articulation skills, presents opportunities to re-evaluate various force options available, and to utilize the optimal option to resolve the situation. FOS also facilitates practice on de-escalation scenarios on various techniques to control emotional response to critical incidents, and helps develop a deeper understanding of “what you can do” versus “what you should do.” For example, the Department increased the number of deadly force incident scenarios to teach and demonstrate that the use of sound tactics can conceivably resolve such situations without lethal force. Use of the FOS has been incorporated into the Mental Health Intervention Training course that also enables officers to practice de-escalation skills.

TACTICAL DEBRIEFS
The use of Tactical Debriefs affords the involved parties the opportunity to enhance performance, reinforce best practices, and cultivate lessons learned for future training. Officers involved in Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) incidents participate in Tactical Debriefs, which are conducted by the Training Division supervisors who were present during the concerned Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB). Tactical Debriefs have yielded training recommendations such as the utilization of smaller sized targets to simulate changes in shooting distance, quick target switches to induce fast-paced, high stress decision making, and slow fire settings. These recommendations were implemented for both recruit and in-service training on April 1, 2015.
FIREARMS

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS
The Department requires its sworn personnel to qualify with their primary duty weapons on a regular basis. This is to ensure that police officers who are authorized to carry a firearm maintain their shooting proficiency and use sound judgment with regards to the use of lethal force. A qualification schedule has been created, which implements a combination of handgun, shotgun, and Force Option Simulator tests.

Employees are required to qualify once within a two-month cycle, not including the one-month shotgun cycle. There are a total of six qualification cycles in a calendar year. Sworn employees (lieutenants and below), reserve officers, and security officers with less than 20 years of service qualify as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Required Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Shotgun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>February/March</td>
<td>Handgun - Duty Ammunition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>April/May</td>
<td>Handgun - Practice Ammunition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>June/July</td>
<td>Force Option Simulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>September/October</td>
<td>Handgun - Practice Ammunition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>November/December</td>
<td>Handgun - Practice Ammunition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sworn employees (lieutenants and below), reserve officers, and security officers with 20 to 29 years of service qualify as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Required Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Shotgun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>February/March</td>
<td>Handgun - Duty Ammunition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>September/October</td>
<td>Handgun - Practice Ammunition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Captains and above with less than 30 years of service qualify as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Required Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>February/March</td>
<td>Handgun - Duty Ammunition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>September/October</td>
<td>Handgun - Practice Ammunition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All sworn employees (regardless of rank), reserve officers, and security officers with 30 years or more of service are required to qualify one time per calendar year at their convenience during Cycles 2, 3, 5, or 6. This requirement shall be met with their primary duty handgun and duty ammunition.

To qualify on the handgun combat course, sworn employees, reserve officers, and security officers shall meet the minimum qualification requirements. Personnel who fail to achieve a qualifying score shall repeat the course until the minimum score for each target is attained in one relay.

The maximum score is 300 points. When sufficient daylight exists, the minimum passing score is 210 points, with a minimum of 105 points on each target. During the hours of darkness, the minimum passing score is 180 points, with a minimum of 90 points on each target.

The shotgun course is not scored; however, personnel must demonstrate proficiency with the shotgun to satisfy the qualification requirement.

FAILURE TO QUALIFY
Officers who fail to qualify after a third attempt in a qualification cycle are required to attend firearms remediation. The Department does not currently track first or second attempt failures since weapon malfunctions and/or defective ammunition contribute to unsuccessful qualification attempts. A Department Failure to Qualify (FTQ) report is generated for officers who failed to qualify, which is sent to Internal Affairs Group (IAG). The IAG’s Annual Complaint Report contains information on actions taken for FTQs.

When notified that an officer, reserve officer, or security officer under his or her command fails to meet the qualification requirement set forth by the Department and the officer does not have a valid exemption, the concerned commanding officer may initiate a personnel complaint. Commanding officers shall be responsible for ensuring that their personnel receive sufficient training when/if they attempt to qualify but fail to do so, and also responsible for administering disciplinary action for personnel who neglect to qualify.

The Shooting Qualification and Bonus (SQUAB) computer application was established to document shooting qualifications and bonus scores for sworn personnel. Additionally, the system includes inventory and range maintenance functionality and has the capability of recording firearms training sessions. The application is used at multiple locations and by other City entities for weapons qualification.
The information entered into SQUAB appears on an employee’s TEAMS II report, showing a record of the employee’s qualification history for the last five years. The system generates the Department’s FTQ report after each qualification cycle. That report is forwarded by Information Technology Division (ITD) to IAG for dissemination. A report can be generated by ITD upon request.

Information Technology Division tracks FTQs for Department personnel who have failed to receive a passing score after three or more attempts with their handgun. When the Firearms Unit receives the report from ITD, a mandatory two hour remediation class is scheduled for the employee. Even if the employee received a passing score after the third or more attempts, the employee is required to attend firearms remediation. The remediation is completed by Training Division’s firearms instructors at Elysian Park Academy or at the Davis Training Facility. Depending on range availability, remediation is conducted one-on-one with an instructor. The instructor observes, diagnoses, and remediates the employee. The employee then shoots the Department qualification course again to demonstrate proficiency. The remediation is documented on a Training Division Record of Remediation/Supplemental Training Form and the information is entered into the Learning Management System.

MEDICAL EXEMPTIONS
Sworn personnel who are unable to qualify due to an injury shall be examined by a physician. A statement shall be obtained from the physician imposing the medical restriction and an estimate of the length of time for which the officer should be exempt from qualification requirements.

Note: Temporary medical restrictions are valid for 30 days only. If a medical condition persists past 30 days and continues to inhibit an officer from meeting Department qualification standards, the officer must obtain a subsequent doctor’s statement every 30 days until the restriction is rescinded or is classified permanent and stationary.

An officer with a medical exemption who has not qualified with his or her duty firearm for one calendar year shall be served with a “Notice to Meet Firearm Qualification Requirements within 30 Calendar Days” (30-Day Notice). Once served, the officer has 30 days to determine if he or she is medically fit to qualify and successfully pass the minimum firearm qualification standards.

If the officer is unable to qualify with his or her duty firearm by the expiration of the 30-Day Notice, the officer shall be served with an “Order to Relinquish City-Issued Duty Firearm and Police Identification Card, and Restriction of Peace Officer Powers” (Order to Relinquish).

Note: If an officer with either a temporary or permanent restriction believes that he or she is medically fit to meet Department firearm qualification standards, the officer is encouraged to make an appointment with his or her doctor and have the restrictions re-evaluated and possibly rescinded.

VACATION EXEMPTIONS
Officers are not exempt from qualification requirements due to vacation. Exemptions for qualification requirements may be granted for approved extended absences at the discretion of the concerned commanding officer.
In 2015, qualification Cycle 2 contained the highest number of Department sworn personnel qualifying, with 8,730 employees. Comparatively, Cycle 2 in 2014 also contained the highest number of personnel qualifying for the year with 9,139 employees. In comparison, Cycle 2 contained the highest number of personnel qualifying from 2011 through 2014.

Of the 29 personnel who failed to qualify in 2015 and of whom were subject to a personnel complaint, 16 personnel, or 55 percent, received a sustained allegation for neglecting to abide by the Department’s qualification policy. The 2015 percentage exceeded the 2014 average of 22 percent who received a sustained allegation by 33 percentage points. Additionally, the 2015 percentage exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 32 percent by 23 percentage points.

In 2015, 124 Department personnel failed to successfully qualify three or more times in the four firearm qualification cycles throughout the year. There was an increase of 30 personnel, or 32 percent, who failed to successfully qualify in 2015 from the preceding year. Additionally, the 2015 total exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 95 personnel who failed to successfully qualify by 29 employees, or 31 percent.

The failure rate is calculated based on the number of personnel who failed to successfully qualify three or more times within a particular cycle compared to the total of personnel attempting to qualify. In 2015, an average of 0.41 percent of Department personnel failed to successfully qualify throughout the year. The 2015 average exceeded the 2014 average of 0.30 percent by 0.11 percent. Additionally, the 2015 average exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.30 percent by 0.11 percent.

Of the 29 personnel who failed to qualify in 2015 and of whom were subject to a personnel complaint, 16 personnel, or 55 percent, received a sustained allegation for neglecting to abide by the Department’s qualification policy. The 2015 percentage exceeded the 2014 average of 22 percent who received a sustained allegation by 33 percentage points. Additionally, the 2015 percentage exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 32 percent by 23 percentage points.
REINTEGRATION
A sworn employee who has returned to work from a temporary relief from duty, or inactive duty in excess of 365 calendar days shall meet with his/her commanding officer (CO) to begin the reintegration process and accomplish all reintegration tasks as directed by the department. Training Division (TD) is responsible for determining what training is appropriate to bring the employee into compliance with the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and any other Department requirements that are consistent with the employee’s work restrictions. TD will also re-issue all City-issued equipment to the employee; and periodically update the returning employee’s CO as to the status of the employee in the reintegration process.
TASER
The Office of Operations published Notice No. 4 on September 21, 2015, titled, “TASER X26P Deployment,” which directs all patrol officers to carry a TASER on their person. The Department is currently equipped with 3,205 TASERs and holsters. Funding requests for an additional 4,400 units have been made. All Department recruits are trained and certified in the use of the TASER while in the Academy. Additional training for in-service personnel is currently being provided in the 10-hour Use of Force Update class.

LESS LETHAL OPTIONS
The Department is in the process of evaluating and testing new less lethal force options, including, but not limited to, a gel-based OC spray that directs a stream of gel as opposed to an aerosol spray and a 40-millimeter impact launcher. Additionally, beanbag shotgun mounts are expected to be integrated into each patrol vehicle’s main cabin area for faster access, as opposed to the trunk.
IN 2015, THE DEPARTMENT HAD 48 OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTINGS
In 2015, the Department had 48 OIS incidents, which was one fewer than the Chicago Police Department (CPD), but more than the New York Police Department (NYPD), Houston Police Department (HPD), Philadelphia Police Department (PPD), and the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LASD). The LASD and the NYPD had the third highest count, with 34 OIS incidents each.

An analysis of the five year average of OIS incidents from 2011 through 2015 revealed that the CPD were involved in a greater number of shootings than the Department. From 2011 through 2015, the Department had 223 OIS incidents, or an annual average of 44.6. The CPD had 242 OIS incidents in the five year period, or an annual average of 48.4. The LASD had the third highest five year total with 197 incidents, or an annual average of 39.4 incidents. The NYPD had the fourth highest count with 190 incidents, or an annual average of 38 OIS incidents. PPD had the fifth highest count with 175 OIS incidents, or an annual average of 43.8 incidents. Lastly, HPD had a five year total of 172 OIS incidents, or a five year annual average of 34.4 incidents.

PPD’s 2015 OIS data was through September 2015. CPD’s 2011 through 2014 OIS data was retrieved from the City of Chicago Independent Police Review Authority. CPD’s 2015 OIS data was provided by CPD’s Research and Development Division. PPD’s five year annual average for the period of 2011 through 2015 is calculated with data through September 2015, as that was the most recent information available.
DECEASED SUSPECTS IN OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTINGS – COMPARISON

Of the 48 OIS incidents involving Department personnel in 2015, 21 suspects died as a result of police gunfire, representing 44 percent of all OIS incidents. The following depicts the remaining agencies and their deceased suspect totals and percentages in relation to their respective 2015 OIS incident totals:

- LASD: 14 deceased, or 41 percent;
- HPD: 12 deceased, or 40 percent;
- PPD: Two deceased, or 22 percent;⁷
- CPD: Eight deceased, or 16 percent; and,
- NYPD: Information not available.

FIREARMS QUALIFICATION - COMPARISON

Firearms qualification is an essential component of law enforcement training and aptitude. An improvement in marksmanship reduces the risk of unnecessarily jeopardizing innocent bystanders, stopping the threat with minimal force, and improves officers’ ability to protect themselves and the public from harm.

** LAPD:** Qualify four times per year with handguns; once per year with a shotgun and once per year on a Force Options Simulator. There are years-of-service and rank exemptions.

** LASD:** Qualify four times per year with handguns; one time every two years with a shotgun and offers qualification on a Force Options Simulator (not mandatory). There are no years-of-service and/or rank exemptions.

** CHICAGO PD:** Qualify once per year with handguns; unknown with a shotgun and unknown on a Force Options Simulator. There are no years-of-service and/or rank exemptions.

** HOUSTON PD:** Qualify once per year with handguns; once per year with a shotgun and no Force Options Simulator. There are no years-of-service and/or rank exemptions.

** NEW YORK PD:** Qualify twice per year with handguns; unknown with a shotgun and unknown on a Force Options Simulator. There are no years-of-service and/or rank exemptions.

** PHILADELPHIA PD:** Qualify once per year with handguns; twice with a shotgun and no qualification required on a Force Options Simulator. There are no years-of-service and/or rank exemptions.

Of the 223 OIS incidents involving Department personnel from 2011 through 2015, 97 suspects died as a result of police gunfire, representing 43 percent of all OIS incidents. In comparison, the LASD had an equal percentage with 85 suspects who died as a result of deputy gunfire during 197 incidents, or 43 percent. The following depicts the remaining agencies and their five year totals and percentages in relation to their respective five year incident totals:

- CPD: 70 deaths, or 29 percent;
- HPD: 49 deaths, or 28 percent;
- NYPD: Information not available;⁸ and
- PPD: Information not available.⁹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Police Department</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Police Department</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Police Department</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Police Department</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Police Department</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Philadelphia Police Department’s 2015 OIS data is through September 2015.
** New York Police Department’s OIS data for suspects killed is yet to be released.

⁷ PPD’s 2015 OIS data was through September 2015.
⁸ NYPD was excluded from the comparison as their 2015 data was yet to be released.
⁹ HPD was excluded from the comparison as their 2015 data was yet to be released.
On a per capita basis, the Department has approximately 25 officers per 10,000 residents.
LEGAL STANDARDS
The use of force by members of law enforcement is a matter of critical concern both to the public and the law enforcement community. It is recognized that some individuals will not comply with the law or submit to detention or arrest unless compelled to do so by the use of force. Therefore, law enforcement officers are sometimes called upon to use force in the performance of their duties. It is also recognized that members of law enforcement derive their authority from the public, and therefore, must be ever mindful that they are not only guardians, but are also the servants of the public.

The Department’s guiding value when using force shall always be reverence for human life. When warranted, Department personnel may objectively use reasonable force to carry out their duties. Officers who use unreasonable force degrade the confidence of the community they serve, expose the Department and fellow officers to legal and physical hazards, and violate the rights of individuals upon whom unreasonable force was used. Conversely, officers who fail to use force when warranted may endanger themselves, the community, and fellow officers.

FEDERAL LEGAL STANDARDS
Strict legislation and case law dictates how all law enforcement organizations across the nation establish and maintain their use of force policies. The federal legal standard used to determine the lawfulness of a use of force is the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. In *Graham v. Connor*, the United States Supreme Court determined that an objective reasonableness standard should apply to a civilian’s claim that law enforcement officials used excessive force in the course of making an arrest, investigatory stop, or other “seizure” of his/her person. Graham states in part,

*The reasonableness of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight. The calculus of reasonableness must embody allowance for the fact that police officers are often forced to make split-second judgments - in circumstances that are tense, uncertain and rapidly evolving - about the amount of force that is necessary in a particular situation. The test of reasonableness is not capable of precise definition or mechanical application."

In essence, the force must be reasonable under the circumstances known to the officer at the time the force was used. Therefore, the Department examines all uses of force from an objective standard rather than a subjective standard.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA LEGAL STANDARDS
In accordance with California Penal Code Section 835(a), it is the policy of the Department that personnel may use only the force which is “objectively reasonable” to:

- Defend themselves;
- Defend others;
- Effect an arrest or detention;
- Prevent escape; or,
- Overcome resistance.
THE DEPARTMENT’S USE OF FORCE POLICY

It is the policy of the Department that personnel may use only the force which is “objectively reasonable” to:

- Defend themselves;
- Defend others;
- Effect an arrest or detention;
- Prevent escape; or,
- Overcome resistance.

The Department’s use of force policies are more restrictive than state and federal law. For example, State law allows officers to shoot at moving vehicles where the suspect is using the vehicle itself as a weapon, while Department policy prohibits officers from using deadly force in such circumstances. The Department examines reasonableness using Graham v. Connor, the State of California legal standards set forth in California Penal Code Section 835(a), and from the articulable facts from the perspective of a Los Angeles Police Officer with similar training and experience placed in generally the same set of circumstances as those of the evaluated incident. In determining the appropriate level of force, officers shall evaluate each situation in light of the facts and circumstances of each particular case. Those factors may include, but are not limited to:

- The seriousness of the crime or suspected offense;
- The level of threat or resistance presented by the subject;
- Whether the subject was posing an immediate threat to officers or a danger to the community;
- The potential for injury to citizens, officers or subjects;
- The risk or apparent attempt by the subject to escape;
- The conduct of the subject being confronted (as reasonably perceived by the officer at the time);
- The time available to an officer to make a decision;
- The availability of other resources;
- The training and experience of the officer;
- The proximity or access of weapons to the subject;
- Officer versus subject factors such as age, size, relative strength, skill level, injury/exhaustion and number officers versus subjects; and,
- The environmental factors and/or other exigent circumstances.

According to the objectively reasonable standard in Graham, a suspect’s actions and behavior, among other factors, determine whether the officer’s reactions are in policy.

The graph below illustrates the force options available to officers as it relates to the Department’s use of force policy. It should be noted that the force options in the graph do not have to be attempted in a progressive order, but that the officer must constantly assess each situation when evaluating which level of force is justified under the current circumstances (for example, an incident where an officer utilizes a baton strike on a suspect who is actively shooting at a victim would not be required to attempt verbalization strategies as an initial action to stop the suspect due to the exigency of the incident):
Note: Black’s Law Dictionary defines imminent as, “Near at hand; impending; on the point of happening.” Serious bodily injury, as defined in California Penal Code Section 243(f)(4), includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Loss of consciousness;
- Concussion;
- Bone fracture;
- Protracted loss or impairment of function of any bodily member or organ;
- A wound requiring extensive suturing; and,
- Serious disfigurement.

DRAWING AND/OR EXHIBITING FIREARMS
Police officers frequently face dangerous and volatile conditions that carry inherent danger and the potential to result in deadly force situations. During an incident, officers must continuously re-assess the various conditions and circumstances of the incident itself, including the suspect’s actions, in determining whether the use of deadly force could be warranted. Although officers must be prepared to protect themselves and the public from life threatening acts by others, it is equally important that officers refrain from drawing their weapon when such conditions do not exist. Therefore, the Department created a specific policy governing when personnel may draw and/or exhibit duty firearms. Officers shall not draw or exhibit a firearm unless the circumstances surrounding the incident create a reasonable belief that it may be necessary to use the firearm in conformance with this policy.

Note: During a special meeting on September 29, 1977, the Board of Police Commissioners adopted the following as a valid interpretation of this Section:

Unnecessarily or prematurely drawing or exhibiting a firearm limits an officer’s alternatives in controlling a situation, creates unnecessary anxiety on the part of citizens, and may result in an unwarranted or accidental discharge of the firearm. An officer’s decision to draw or exhibit a firearm should be based on the tactical situation and the officer’s reasonable belief there is a substantial risk that the situation may escalate to the point where deadly force may be justified. When an officer has determined that the use of deadly force is not necessary, the officer shall, as soon as practicable, secure or holster the firearm.

DEADLY FORCE
During the rare and unfortunate circumstances where a combination of complex factors warrant the use of deadly force to stop a threat to the public or police officers, the Department authorizes such force to be utilized in any of the following situations:

1. Protect themselves or others from what is reasonably believed to be an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury; or,
2. Prevent a crime where the suspect’s actions place person(s) in imminent jeopardy of death or serious bodily injury; or,
3. Prevent the escape of a violent fleeing felon when there is probable cause to believe the escape will pose a significant threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or others if apprehension is delayed. In this circumstance, officers shall, to the extent practical, avoid using deadly force that might subject innocent bystanders or hostages to possible death or injury.

In response to the decision rendered by the Supreme Court of California in the case of Hayes v. County of San Diego, the Department revised its use of force policy in 2014 to reflect the need to consider an officer’s tactical conduct and decisions leading up to the use of deadly force when evaluating the objective reasonableness of an incident.

WARNING SHOTS
Warning shots shall only be used in exceptional circumstances where it might reasonably be expected to avoid the need to use deadly force. Generally, warning shots shall be directed in a manner that minimizes the risk of injury to innocent persons, ricochet dangers and property damage.

SHOOTING AT OR FROM MOVING VEHICLE
Firearms shall not be discharged at a moving vehicle unless a person in the vehicle is threatening the officer or another person with deadly force by means other than the vehicle itself. The moving vehicle shall not presumptively constitute a threat that justifies an officer’s use of deadly force. An officer threatened by an oncoming vehicle shall move out of its path instead of discharging a firearm at it or any of its occupants. Firearms shall not be discharged from a moving vehicle, except in exigent circumstances and in the immediate defense of life.
**Note:** It is understood that the policy in regards to discharging a firearm at or from a moving vehicle may not cover every situation that may arise. In all situations, Department members are expected to act with intelligence and exercise sound judgment, attending to the spirit of this policy. Any deviations from the provisions of this policy shall be examined rigorously on a case-by-case basis. The involved officer must be able to articulate clearly the reasons for the use of deadly force. Factors that may be considered include whether the officer’s life or the lives of others were in immediate peril and there was no reasonable or apparent means of escape.

**DEPARTMENT CATEGORIZATION OF USES OF FORCE**

The Department classifies use of force incidents as either a Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) or a Non-Categorical Use of Force (NCUOF), depending on the level of force used or severity of injuries sustained by the suspect and/or officer.

**CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE**

A CUOF is defined as:

- An incident involving the use of deadly force (e.g., discharge of a firearm) by a Department employee;
- All uses of an upper body control hold by a Department employee, including the use of a modified carotid, full carotid or locked carotid hold;
- All deaths while the arrestee or detainee is in the custodial care of the Department (also known as an In-Custody Death or ICD);
- A use of force incident resulting in death;
- A use of force incident resulting in an injury requiring hospitalization, commonly referred to as a Law Enforcement Related Injury Investigation, or LERII;
- All intentional head strikes with an impact weapon or device (e.g., baton, flashlight, etc.) and all unintentional (inadvertent or accidental) head strikes that result in serious bodily injury, hospitalization or death.

**Note:** Serious bodily injury, as defined in California Penal Code Section 243(f)(4), includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- Loss of consciousness;
- Concussion;
- Bone fracture;
- Protracted loss or impairment of function of any bodily member or organ;
- A wound requiring extensive suturing; and,
- Serious disfigurement.
■ Officer-involved animal shootings and non-tactical unintentional discharges;
■ An incident in which a member of the public has contact with a Department canine and hospitalization is required. Under Department policy, a canine contact is not a use of force but has been included in this category to satisfy the provisions of the Consent Decree; and,
■ Incidents where the Department has agreed to conduct similar critical incident investigations for a non-Department entity, such as a Los Angeles Fire Department Arson Unit.

All other reportable uses of force, including the discharge of a TASER, the use of a chemical irritant control device, or all unintentional (inadvertent or accidental) head strikes with an impact weapon or device which do not result in serious bodily injury, hospitalization or death which have been approved to be handled as a Level I NCUOF by the Commanding Officer, Force Investigation Division (FID), are classified as NCUOF incidents.

NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE
A reportable NCUOF is defined as an incident in which any on-duty Department employee, or off-duty employee whose occupation as a Department employee is a factor, uses a less-lethal control device or physical force to compel a person to comply with the employee’s direction, overcome resistance of a person during an arrest or a detention, or defend any individual from an aggressive action by another person.

The following incidents are not reportable as a NCUOF incident:
■ The use of a C-grip, firm grip, or joint lock to compel a person to comply with an employee’s direction which does not result in an injury or complained of injury;
■ The use of force reasonable to overcome passive resistance due to physical disability, mental illness, intoxication, or muscle rigidity of a person (e.g., use of a C-grip or firm grip, joint lock, joint lock walk down or body weight) which does not result in an injury or complained of injury;
■ Under any circumstances, the discharge of a less-lethal projectile weapon (e.g., beanbag shotgun, TASER, 37mm or 40mm projectile launcher, any chemical control dispenser or Compressed Air Projectile System) that does not contact a person;
■ Force used by an organized squad in a crowd control situation, or a riotous situation when the crowd exhibits hostile behavior and does not respond to verbal directions from Department employees. Such incidents are documented via an after-action report or Sergeant’s Daily Report; and,

Note: Isolated incidents resulting from a crowd control situation may require a use of force investigation as determined by a supervisor at the scene.

■ Any incident investigated by FID and determined not to rise to the level of a CUOF.

NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE – LEVEL
All NCUOF incidents shall be classified as either a Level I or Level II incident.

A NCUOF shall be reported as a Level I incident under the following circumstances:

1. An allegation of unauthorized force is made regarding the force used by a Department employee(s); or,
2. The force used results in a serious injury, such as a broken bone, dislocation, an injury requiring sutures, etc., that does not rise to the level of a CUOF; or,

Note: If the investigating supervisor is unable to verify the seriousness of an injury or complained of injury, it shall be reported as a Level I incident. If the injury requires admission to a hospital, the incident becomes a CUOF and will be investigated by FID.

3. The injuries to the person upon whom force was used are inconsistent with the amount or type of force reported by involved Department employee(s); or,
4. Accounts of the incident provided by witnesses and/or the subject of the use of force substantially conflict with the involved employee(s) account.

All other reportable NCUOF incidents that do not meet Level I criteria shall be reported as Level II incidents. This includes the use of an impact device or less-lethal munitions with hits.

Note: If the use of an impact device or less-lethal munitions causes a serious injury such as a broken bone, dislocation, or an injury requiring sutures, etc., and does not rise to the level of a CUOF, it shall be reported as a Level I incident.
The Investigation, Review, and Adjudication Process
CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE

The Department, like all other law enforcement agencies, is mandated by law to oversee and investigate all uses of force by its officers. The adjudication process for CUOF incidents involves a precise and systematic process with specific procedures. Officer involved shootings (OIS), for example, take on a different level of investigation and review compared to animal shootings or NCUOF incidents. Unlike NCUOF incidents, all CUOF incidents are followed by a formal adjudication process consisting of a comprehensive investigation, a thorough analysis of the force used by a Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB), recommended findings presented by the UOFRB to the COP, recommended findings by the COP to the BOPC, and the final adopted findings imposed by the BOPC.

PUBLIC SAFETY STATEMENT

Immediately after a CUOF incident occurs, specifically an OIS, a Department supervisor will take a Public Safety Statement (PSS) from substantially involved personnel (SIP). The PSS is a cursory statement of what occurred in order to address public safety concerns. After obtaining sufficient information, the supervisor shall immediately cause the individual separation of SIP or other witness employees and order them not to discuss the incident with anyone other than the assigned investigators and/or the employee’s representative(s).

SEPARATION AND TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONNEL

After the PSS has been obtained and all public safety concerns have been addressed (e.g., establishing a perimeter, protecting the crime scene, locating witnesses/evidence, managing the response of additional resources, etc.), the incident commander shall ensure that additional supervisors transport all SIP’s and witness employees individually to the location of the FID interview as soon as practicable. Separation shall remain in effect until FID interviews all concerned employees.

REAL TIME ANALYSIS AND CRITICAL RESPONSE DIVISION RESPONSIBILITIES

Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response Division (RACR) is responsible for making the following notifications within 20 minutes of being notified by the Area watch commander/incident commander that a CUOF incident has occurred:

- Force Investigation Division;
- Office of the Chief of Police or his designee;
- Chief of Staff; and,
- Office of the Inspector General (OIG) on behalf of the Board of Police Commissioners.

As soon as possible after being notified of a CUOF incident, but not required within 20 minutes, RACR is responsible for making notifications to the following entities:

- Commanding Officer, Professional Standards Bureau;
- Involved employee(s) commanding officer;
- Department Risk Manager; and,
- Los Angeles District Attorney’s Office for those cases identified in the roll out protocol governing such notifications.

INITIAL NOTIFICATION AND CALL-OUT PROCEDURES

Currently, RACR notifies the on-call FID Officer-in-Charge (OIC) of the CUOF incident, who coordinates for FID personnel to respond to the scene within one hour of notification. The first arriving FID investigator ensures that on-scene personnel have secured the crimes scene(s), generated crime scene logs, and have established a perimeter.
THE INVESTIGATION, REVIEW, AND ADJUDICATION PROCESS

FORCE INVESTIGATION DIVISION (FID)
Upon arrival at the scene of a CUOF incident, FID personnel assume responsibility of the overall investigation. As part of the investigation, FID personnel conduct interviews with all involved parties, locate and collect evidence, manage crime scenes, coordinate the acquisition of photographs, and liaise with other relevant Department and non-Department entities.

Force Investigation Division was established on August 22, 2004 as the Department entity responsible for the administrative investigation of all uses of force determined to be “Categorical” in the Federal Consent Decree (between the Department and the United States Department of Justice). Force Investigation Division is comprised of four Administrative Investigation Sections comprised of two teams each; a Criminal Apprehension Team; an Investigative Support Unit; and an Investigative Support Section.

RESOURCES UTILIZED BY FORCE INVESTIGATION DIVISION
Depending upon the type of CUOF incident, the following Department resources may be utilized:

- Command Post Unit;
- Forensic Science Division (FSD) comprised of Field Investigation, Firearms Analysis, Narcotics Analysis, Quality Assurance, Questioned Documents, Serology/DNA, Toxicology and Trace Analysis Units;
- Technical Investigation Division (TID) comprised of the Electronics, Latent Print, Photography and Polygraph Units; and,
- Air Support Division (aerial photographs).

Additionally, the following Department and/or outside entities may respond:

- Media Relations Section;
- Robbery Homicide Division;
- Office of the Inspector General (OIG);
- Officer Representation Section (ORS);
- Los Angeles Police Protective League;
- Los Angeles County District Attorney’s Office (LADA); and,
- Justice System Integrity Division (JSID);
- Crimes Against Police Officers Section (CAPOS); and,
- Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner.

INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES FOLLOWING THE FIELD INVESTIGATION
Force Investigation Division is obligated to complete the investigation and forward the case to Use of Force Review Division (UOFRD) within 240 days of the date of the CUOF incident date.

FURTHER INVESTIGATION AND FINAL ANALYSIS
As necessary, FID investigators conduct additional investigation and analysis as requested by the COP or BOPC.

INCLUSION OF OTHER INVESTIGATIVE ENTITIES
During the course of the initial investigation, evidence and/or other facts about the incident may emerge, warranting joint-investigations amongst several investigative entities. Factors that contribute to the decision on whether to incorporate joint investigations are typically identified while FID conducts their initial investigation or during the preliminary notification process of information obtained from supervisors who respond to the incident. Such factors include, but are not limited to, the death of, or serious bodily injury sustained by a police officer as a result of the suspect’s actions, the identification of a Department employee as the victim of a crime directly related to the incident being investigated, or allegations of serious misconduct on behalf of the officer are identified. In such events, the Department may involve the following:

- Robbery-Homicide Division;
- Internal Affairs Group; and,
- Los Angeles County District Attorney’s Office, Crimes against Police Officers Section.

FORENSIC SCIENCE DIVISION AND TECHNICAL INVESTIGATION DIVISION
Forensic Sciences Division (FSD) and Technical Investigation Division (TID) include the Criminalistics Laboratory and the Technical Laboratory. In the broadest sense, FSD and TID’s functions are to facilitate the collection, comparison, and interpretation of all types of physical evidence found at crime scenes, or collected from suspects and victims, and to provide expert testimony in these areas. The Criminalistics Laboratory is a part of the Hertzberg-Davis Forensic Science Center at the Los Angeles Regional
The 180,000 square foot forensic science facility is located on the campus of California State University, Los Angeles, and is shared by the Department, the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, California State University, Los Angeles, the California Forensic Science Institute, and the California Criminalistics Institute.

The Criminalistics Laboratory is comprised of the Field Investigation Unit, Firearm Analysis Unit, Narcotics Analysis Unit, Quality Assurance Unit, Questioned Documents Unit, Serology/DNA Unit, and the Toxicology and Trace Analysis Unit. The Technical Laboratory encompasses the Electronics, Latent Print, Photography and Polygraph Units.

**BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE SERVICES**

The Department’s Behavioral Science Services (BSS) is the oldest and most established in-house law enforcement psychological service entity in the U.S. Behavior Sciences Services has consistently been leaders in the field of law enforcement psychology, having introduced not only the first in-house counseling service, but the first field-deployed organizational consultants, early intervention programs for stress and anxiety, psychological intervention programs for Department personnel, and case-specific consultation.

There are four specific situations that Department employees may be involved in that generate a mandated referral to BSS. These situations include OIS incidents, CUOF incidents (other than OIS incidents), bloodborne pathogen exposure, and military deployment. Appointments are arranged by the employee’s commanding officer and are conducted on-duty. The purpose of a mandated referral is to provide employees the opportunity to psychologically debrief a situation that may have the potential to be emotionally traumatizing.

To be reinstated to full duty work status, an employee must receive approval from BSS and concurrence by the COP, via the employee’s chain of command. An employee may also voluntarily seek the services of BSS for psychological services without notification to the Department.

**72-HOUR BRIEFING**

Within 72 Hours of an OIS (or other significant CUOF incident wherein a briefing is deemed necessary by the COP), an initial briefing is scheduled for the COP and other concerned command staff members. During the briefing, FID provides a preliminary presentation of the incident and answers questions by the COP and attending staff members.

Although the briefing is an initial assessment of the incident, based on preliminary information, many basic facts are available at this stage. The objective of the briefing is to address issues that require immediate Department attention. The involved employees of the incident do not attend the briefing.

**GENERAL TRAINING UPDATE**

In addition to the Tactical Debrief, which occurs after adjudication, substantially involved personnel also receive directed training, or the General Training Update (GTU), within 90 days following a CUOF incident. Areas of concern regarding the incident are addressed by any of the levels of initial review. Those subject matters are then conveyed to UOFRD, who coordinates and oversees the completion of the directed training. In addition to topics requested by command staff to be addressed, five mandatory subjects (six if an OIS occurred) are required for CUOF incidents. The mandatory GTU topics include:

- Command and Control;
- Equipment Required and Maintained;
- Tactical Communications;
- Tactical Planning;
- Use of Force Policy; and,
- FOS (for OIS incidents only).

GTUs are typically administered by personnel assigned to the training unit at the involved employee(s) Area or division of assignment. Upon completion of the GTU, the concerned Area or division forwards documentation to UOFRD for tracking and documentation purposes, and the training is updated on the employee’s Training Evaluation and Management System (TEAMS) II Report.

**STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR ADJUDICATION**

To ensure that CUOF incidents are properly reviewed and adjudicated in a timely manner, time limitations are implemented for various levels of investigation and review. These include:

- The statute date, or completion date for the entire process, which is one year from the CUOF incident date (or the date the incident is reported to a Department supervisor);
- FID’s completion of the entire CUOF incident, which is within 240 calendar days from the date of incident; and,
- The COP’s recommended findings, which shall be submitted to the BOPC within 60 calendar days prior to the administrative statute date.
REVIEW AND FINDINGS
Upon completion of FID’s investigation of a CUOF incident, UOFRD receives and completes a comprehensive review and analysis of the incident. Use of Force Review Division then schedules a UOFRB.

In determining the proper adjudication for a CUOF incident, the following sections are extensively evaluated by all levels of review (including the UOFRB, the COP, the OIG, and the BOPC):

FACTORS CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING APPROPRIATE FINDINGS

- Tactics: Was the officer’s tactical decision making during and prior to the incident, considered a substantial deviation from Department training and, if so, was that decision making justifiable?
- Drawing/Exhibiting: Did the officer have a reasonable belief that the tactical situation could potentially escalate to the point where deadly force may be justified?
- Use of Force: Was the officer’s objective reasonableness appropriate in determining the level of force, given the situation?

USE OF FORCE REVIEW BOARD
The UOFRB consists of a representative from each of the following entities:

- Office of Administrative Services (Chair);
- Representative from respective administrative Office;
- Personnel Sciences and Training Bureau;
- Geographic Bureau; and,
- Peer (similar rank of the substantially involved personnel).

Additionally, a representative from the OIG is present at the UOFRB in an oversight capacity.

The UOFRB is presented information and analysis from FID personnel, who brief the UOFRB about the facts of the incident and the subsequent investigation. The commanding officer of the concerned substantially involved employee also attends and offers his/her assessment of the incident and their recommendations. After careful examination, the UOFRB makes its recommendations of the findings and forwards them to the COP.

CHIEF OF POLICE
The COP analyzes and examines all the facts presented by the UOFRB and either concurs with the recommended findings or provides contrasting findings of his/her own. The COP submits correspondence to the BOPC, detailing the recommended administrative findings by the administrative statute deadline.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL AND THE LOS ANGELES DISTRICT ATTORNEY’S OFFICE
Personnel from the OIG and representatives from the LADA are notified of CUOF incidents. The OIG responds to the scene to monitor the conduct of FID’s on-scene investigation, assessing compliance with applicable policy standards. Personnel from LADA respond to OIS and ICD incidents to lend advice to FID regarding criminal law issues as they pertain to the investigation and also to assess whether an independent criminal investigation is required.

---

9 The OIG’s Use of Force Section is a unit dedicated on a full-time basis to reviewing all work performed by FID. Currently staffed by seven Police Special Investigators and headed by an Assistant Inspector General, the Use of Force Section closely reviews all work performed by FID and, on behalf of the Inspector General, prepares a detailed report on each case for the Commission.
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

All FID investigations are closely overseen by the OIG. The OIG’s oversight begins immediately following the occurrence of a CUOF. The OIG has a 24-hour response capability, and is promptly notified following the occurrence of a CUOF. The OIG responds to the scene of CUOF incidents and monitors the conduct of FID’s on-scene investigation, assessing compliance with applicable policy standards, as well as more generally working to ensure the overall quality of the investigative work being performed. As the investigation progresses over the months that follow the incident, the OIG maintains its oversight role. The OIG’s oversight of each investigation culminates in a detailed review of every completed investigation case file, and a written assessment of such to the BOPC of the quality of that investigation. In practice, the OIG works closely with FID in order to ensure that, whenever possible, investigative issues identified during the course of the investigation are addressed and resolved.

Concurrent with the Department’s internal review of each CUOF by the UOFRB and COP, the OIG independently reviews every CUOF case. As it conducts its own review, the OIG’s staff also monitors the progression of the Department’s internal review. This monitoring role includes attendance at every UOFRB, where the OIG may ask questions and provide input to the board members.

Once the COP’s report to the BOPC on a case is completed, it is reviewed by the OIG. The OIG evaluates the COP’s findings and reports its own, independent set of recommendations to the BOPC for use in its adjudication of the case. In those cases where the OIG concurs with the findings of the COP, it will recommend to the BOPC that it adopt those findings. If the OIG believes additional or different analysis is warranted, the OIG will provide that analysis to the BOPC in its report. If the OIG determines that the available evidence supports findings other than those set forth by the COP it will recommend, with supporting analysis, that the BOPC modify the COP’s findings.

BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS

The BOPC reviews and examines the facts of the case while considering the recommended findings proposed by the COP, on behalf of the Department, as well as the independent recommended findings proposed by the OIG. The BOPC adjudicates the case and delivers the adopted findings for each of the concerned Department personnel.

POST ADJUDICATION PROCEDURES

INTERNAL PROCESS REPORT

Upon completion of the adjudication process, UOFRD forwards an Internal Process Report Form, which lists the individual findings for each substantially involved employee, to the involved employee’s commanding officer. The commanding officer personally meets with the employee(s) and discusses the incident and findings of the BOPC. Additionally, the commanding officer shall discuss any adverse actions related to the incident as a result of a finding of administrative disapproval or out of policy.

TACTICAL DEBRIEF, EXTENSIVE RETRAINING, AND DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

Under current policy, an out of policy/administrative disapproval determination will result in one or more of the following: extensive retraining, notice to correct deficiencies, or a personnel complaint. If such findings are adopted, the COP will render a decision on which of the outcomes are most suitable to address the employee’s actions.

The formal de briefing of all CUOF incidents, also referred to as the Tactical Debrief, is a critical part of the process for the employees, the Department, and law enforcement in general. It affords all parties the opportunity to identify what was successful and which areas require improvement. The Tactical Debrief addresses topics that could assist in the modification or enhancement of the Department’s commitment to best practices and overall employee performance. Curriculum and class instruction are formatted to promote dialogue and an open forum between personnel and the instructors, thus allowing a more suitable platform for collaboration and overall enrichment. The Tactical Debrief is facilitated by a member of the Department’s Training Division and occurs within 90 days of the BOPC’s adoption of the findings.

Extensive Retraining is conducted by Training Division. The facilitator of the Extensive Retraining course tailors the training to be incident specific and verifies that the areas of concern are included in the course curriculum.

If a Notice to Correct Deficiencies is ratified, the commanding officer of the employee will complete and submit the necessary documentation, which is to be recorded on the employee’s Training Evaluation and Management System (TEAMS) II Report.
In certain circumstances, it may be appropriate for the Department to initiate a personnel complaint. Those instances include when training alone is insufficient, has already been provided and proven ineffective, and/or the employee intentionally disregarded Department policy or procedure(s). In such cases, the employee could face an official reprimand, demotion, suspension, or termination. In those instances, the Department begins the formal process of referring the concerned employee to a Board of Rights.

A Board of Rights hearing is a Department administrative inquiry wherein a board of three members must ascertain, by majority vote, whether or not there is a preponderance of the evidence to substantiate the charge or charges alleged on an employee as cause for the order of removal from duty, suspension or demotion. If the alleged violations are not proved by a preponderance of the evidence, the officer should promptly be cleared of the charges. In the event that a finding of guilty is made, penalties permitted by Los Angeles City Charter section 1070 must be imposed. The nature and extent of the penalty should be commensurate with the particular conduct of which the accused has been found guilty.

DEPARTMENT TRACKING AND MONITORING PROCEDURES

Following the enactment of the Federal Consent Decree in 2001, the Department was required to implement numerous reform measures to track the trajectory and scope of the its performance and consent decree adherence. One such measure was the development of the computerized TEAMS II.

TEAMS II is the Department’s version of a risk management database, wherein information is collected about each officer’s uses of force, civilian complaints, training activities, commendations, vehicle accidents, and many other performance measures. Once a threshold in any of those fields is reached, the system automatically alerts supervisors about officers whose patterns of activity seem more at risk than their peers. The TEAMS II system is an effective tool for the Department to promote transparency and accountability within the organization.
The adjudication process for NCUOF incidents differs with respect to the chain of investigation, review, analysis, and adoption of findings compared to CUOF incidents. Nonetheless, the implementation of highly precise, systematic, and proficient levels of review ensures that all NCUOF cases receive the highest degree of evaluation and proper disposition by the Department.

INVESTIGATION OF A NCUOF LEVEL I INCIDENT
Supervisors are required to record witness statements, document injuries and medical treatment (when applicable) of involved suspects or employees, and acquire photographs of the NCUOF incident scene and injuries to Department personnel and/or suspects.

INVESTIGATION OF A NCUOF LEVEL II INCIDENT
The process for documenting/reporting Level II incidents shall mirror that of a Level I incident, with the following exceptions:

- Tape-recording non-Department employee witnesses is optional;
- The requirement for an “Incident Overview” is eliminated; and,
- The requirement to document any witness statements in the narrative of the NCUOF Report is eliminated. The related crime and/or arrest report or Employee’s Report will serve as documentation of statements for the subject of the use of force, witnesses, and involved Department employees. Any discrepancies between statements shall still be addressed in “Investigating Supervisor’s Notes.”

Note: Discrepancies that constitute a substantial conflict between witness or suspect accounts and the involved employee(s) account shall be reported as a Level I incident.

WATCH COMMANDER’S RESPONSIBILITY
As part of the watch commander’s evaluation of the NCUOF incident, they shall:

- Evaluate whether or not the amount of force used was reasonable and consistent with actions reported by the involved Department employee(s), ensuring that all relevant tactical, use of force and policy issues are addressed. The watch commander/OIC shall evaluate the force that was used, not the force options that could have been considered;
- Ensure that all supervisors are interviewed regarding their conduct at the scene during the incident; and,
- Evaluate the actions of each of these supervisors.

COMMANDING OFFICER’S RESPONSIBILITY
Upon receipt of a NCUOF investigation, the commanding officer shall:

- Utilize the Area/Division Training Coordinator to evaluate the incident;
- Contact subject matter experts (e.g. Training Division) to obtain additional information, as needed;
- Review all reports and make a recommendation on the disposition; and,
- Notify the employee of Use of Force Review Division’s final disposition as soon as practicable.
COMMANDING OFFICER, USE OF FORCE REVIEW DIVISION
RESPONSIBILITY
The director of the Office of Administrative Services (OAS) is the Department’s review authority for the administrative review of all use of force incidents. For NCUOF incidents, that authority is generally exercised through the Commanding Officer of UOFRD, who shall:

- Review the NCUOF investigation and all related reports to ensure compliance with Department policy and procedure; and,
- Approve or disapprove the recommended disposition and provide a written rationale for any finding that differs from that of the bureau commanding officer;

POST-ADJUDICATION PROCEDURES
Following adjudication of a NCUOF incident, the following shall occur:

- Recordation of training into the concerned employee’s TEAMS II report; and,
- If applicable, initiation of a personnel complaint.
Officer(s) may receive training, and/or discipline.

Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) incident occurs.

Force Investigation Division (FID) personnel respond and begin the CUOF incident investigation.

Chief of Police (COP) 72-hour Briefing (all OIS and other significant CUOF incidents).

General Training Update completed within 90 days of the CUOF incident for all substantially involved personnel (identified by the Area Commanding Officer).

Use of Force Review Division receives completed FID investigation, conducts an analysis of the CUOF incident and schedules a Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB).

The UOFRB is convened, chaired by the Director of the Office of Administrative Services.

The COP receives the UOFRB findings and evaluates the CUOF incident. The COP reports his recommendations to the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC).

The BOPC will receive the COP’s recommendations and evaluate the CUOF incident. The BOPC will the adjudicate the incident and a Tactical Debrief is completed within 90 days.

Officer’s actions may be adjudicated as In Policy, Tactical Debrief or, COP may recommend extensive re-training and/or discipline.

Non-Categorical Use of Force (NCUOF) incident occurs.

Supervisor responds and conducts an investigation.

Watch Commander reviews the supervisor’s completed investigation.

The Divisional Commanding Officer reviews the NCUOF investigation.

The Bureau Commanding officer reviews the NCUOF investigation.

Use of Force Review Division (UOFD) reviews the NCUOF investigation.

UOFD may endorse the Division’s and/or Bureau’s recommendation, or UOFD may recommend training and/or discipline.
In 2015, Department personnel were involved in 38 OIS Hit incidents, an increase of 12 incidents, or 46 percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there were a total of 136 OIS Hit incidents, resulting in an annual average of 34 incidents. The 2015 count exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by four incidents, or approximately 12 percent.

In 2015, thirteen of the 38 OIS Hit incidents, or 34 percent, were categorized as Classification V shootings. Twelve of the incidents, or 32 percent, were Classification II shootings. Classification I shootings accounted for five incidents, or 13 percent, and the remaining eight incidents, or 21 percent, are fairly evenly dispersed amongst Classifications III, IV, and VI shootings. One incident from 2015 is currently being investigated by FID and has yet to be classified. From 2011 through 2014, Classification II shootings were the most represented OIS Hit incidents, with 50 out of 136 incidents, or 37 percent. For the same period, Classification V shootings were the second most frequent with 33 incidents, or 24 percent, followed by Classification I shooting incidents with 30 incidents, or 22 percent.
In 2015, 19 of the Department’s 38 OIS Hit incidents, or 50 percent, originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. Twelve incidents, or 32 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (e.g., pedestrian and traffic stops). The remaining seven incidents, or 18 percent, occurred during citizen flag-downs, pre-planned activities, off-duty incidents, and one incident designated as “other.” From 2011 through 2015, radio calls and observation stops were the most significant sources of OIS Hit incidents, accounting for 107 incidents, or 61 percent, and 39 incidents, or 22 percent, out of 174 total incidents, respectively.

In 2015, 12 of the Department’s OIS Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was an increase of four incidents, or 50 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 32 percent of the Department’s OIS Hit incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department - 38; Central Bureau - 12). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 37 OIS Hit incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 9.3 incidents. The Central Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 2.7 incidents, or approximately 29 percent.
In 2015, seven of the Department’s OIS Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was an increase of three incidents, or 75 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 18 percent of the Department’s OIS Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department - 38; South Bureau - seven). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 37 OIS Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 9.3 incidents. The South Bureau count for 2015 fell below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 2.3 incidents, or approximately 25 percent.

In 2015, eight of the Department’s OIS Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was an increase of two incidents, or 33 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 21 percent of the Department’s OIS Hit incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department - 38; Valley Bureau - eight). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 35 OIS Hit incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 8.8 incidents. The Valley Bureau count for 2015 fell below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.8 incidents, or approximately nine percent.
In 2015, five of the Department’s OIS Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, a decrease of one incident, or 17 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 13 percent of the Department’s OIS Hit incidents occurred in West Bureau (Department - 38; West Bureau - five). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 21 OIS Hit incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 5.3 incidents. The West Bureau count for 2015 fell below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.3 incidents, or approximately six percent.
In 2015, six of the Department’s OIS Hit incidents occurred outside the Department’s jurisdiction, an increase of four incidents, or 200 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 16 percent of the Department’s OIS Hit incidents occurred in areas outside the Department’s jurisdiction (Department - 38; Outside Areas - six). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, six OIS Hit incidents occurred in areas outside the Department’s jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 1.5 incidents. The total incident count for outside areas for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 4.5 incidents, or 300 percent.
Map excludes OIS incidents that occurred outside of the Los Angeles city limits.
In 2015, March and August were the two months with the most OIS Hit incidents, with five incidents each month, or approximately 13 percent collectively, out of 38 total incidents for the year. May and July had the second most incidents with four incidents each month, or approximately 10.5 percent collectively, out of 38 total incidents for the year. The remaining 20 incidents, or approximately 53 percent, were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining months of the year.

From 2011 through 2015, the Department’s 174 OIS Hit incidents were fairly evenly distributed throughout the 12 calendar months. March and December had the most OIS Hit incidents, with 18 incidents, or 10 percent, in each month during the five year period. January, July, and November had the second most OIS Hit incidents, with 16 incidents, or nine percent, in each month during the same five year period.

The percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2011 through 2015 was as follows:
- October through December: 47 OIS Hits; 27 percent,
- July through September: 44 OIS Hits; 25 percent,
- January through March: 43 OIS Hits; 25 percent, and
- April through June: 40 OIS Hits; 23 percent.

In 2015, nine, or 24 percent, of the 38 OIS Hit incidents occurred on Tuesday. Thursday was the second most active day, with seven incidents, or 18 percent, followed by Monday with six incidents, or 16 percent. Friday and Sunday experienced the fewest incidents with a total of three for each day, or eight percent.

From 2011 through 2015, Friday had the most OIS Hit incidents, with 29 out of 174 total incidents, or 17 percent. Sunday and Wednesday had the second most incidents, with 26 incidents, or 15 percent, occurring in each month, followed by Monday, which accounted for 25 incidents, or 14 percent.
In 2015, the OIS Hit incidents were fairly evenly distributed between day and night, or the two time-frames used in this report. Twenty incidents, or 53 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while 18 incidents, or 47 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

However, the time distribution was more distinct from 2011 through 2014, where 56 OIS Hit incidents, or 41 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while 80 incidents, or 59 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

In 2015, 58 male officers, or 94 percent, and four female officers, or six percent, were involved in OIS Hit incidents, for a total of 62 involved officers.

When compared to the 2014 total of 53 male officers, 2015 represented an increase of five additional male officers, or nine percent. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 80.25 male officers, 2015 was 22.25 personnel, or 28 percent, below the four year annual average.

When compared to the 2014 total of three female officers, 2015 represented an increase of one female employee, or 33 percent. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of four female officers, there was no change in the total number of involved female officers in 2015.

Consistently, over the five year period from 2011 through 2015, the majority of officers involved in OIS Hit incidents were male. From 2011 to 2015, there were 379 male officers, or 95 percent, and 20 female officers, or five percent, involved in OIS Hit incidents, for a total of 399 officers.
OFFICER ETHNICITY\textsuperscript{12}

In 2015, 34 Hispanic officers were involved in OIS Hit incidents, which represented 55 percent of the 62 total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of 32, Hispanic officers were involved in two, or six percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 47.25 involved Hispanic officers, 2015 was 13.25 Hispanic officers, or 28 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, 18 White officers were involved in OIS Hit incidents, which represented 29 percent of the 62 total officers. When compared to 2014, the number of involved White officers remained the same for 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 26.5 involved White officers, 2015 was 8.5 White officers, or 32 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, four Asian/Pacific Islander officers were involved in OIS Hit incidents, which represented six percent of the 62 total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of five, Asian/Pacific Islander officers were involved in one, or 20 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 4.25 involved Asian/Pacific Islander officers, 2015 was 0.25 Asian/Pacific Islander officers, or six percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, four Black officers were involved in OIS Hit incidents, which represented six percent of the 62 total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of one, Black officers were involved in three, or 300 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average, there was no change in the total number of involved Black officers in 2015.

\textsuperscript{12} The total number of officers exceeds the total incident count, as multiple officers may have been involved in an incident.

OFFICER YEARS OF SERVICE

In 2015, there were increases in three of the five categories and decreases in two, when compared to 2014. The following represent these changes:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Less than one year of service – decrease of one officer (two in 2014, one in 2015), or 50 percent;
  \item 1-5 years of service – increase of 12 officers (four in 2014, 16 in 2015), or 300 percent;
  \item 6-10 years of service – increase of five officers (20 in 2014, 25 in 2015), or 25 percent;
  \item 11-20 years of service – increase of one officer (16 officers in 2014, 17 in 2015), or six percent; and,
  \item More than 20 years of service – decrease of 11 officers (14 in 2014, three in 2015), or 79 percent.
\end{itemize}

From 2011 through 2015, officers with 6-10 years of service were the group with the most officers involved in OIS Hit incidents, with 129 out of 399 total involved officers, or 32 percent. Officers with 11-20 years of service were the group with the second most officers involved in OIS Hit incidents, with 122 officers, or 31 percent. Officers with 1-5 years of service were the group with the third most officers involved in OIS Hit incidents, with 94 officers, or 24 percent, followed by officers with more than 20 years of service, which had 41 officers, or 10 percent.
OFFICER RANK

In 2015, 57 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in OIS Hit incidents, which represented 92 percent of the 62 total employees. When compared to the 2014 total of 55, police officers were involved in two, or four percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 80.5 police officers, 2015 was 23.5 police officers, or 29 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, three sergeants were involved in OIS Hit incidents, which represented an increase of two employees at the rank of sergeant, or 200 percent, compared to the 2014 total of one.

From 2011 through 2015, employees at the rank of police officer were involved in the majority of the OIS Hit incidents, with a total of 379 out of 399 employees, or 95 percent. The rank of sergeant comprised the second largest category with a total of 14 employees, or four percent, during the same five-year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eleven Department personnel assigned to Hollenbeck Division were involved in an OIS Hit incident in 2015, which represented 18 percent of the 62 total officers. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of nine Hollenbeck Division officers involved in OIS Hit incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was three officers above the annual average of eight involved Hollenbeck Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

Eight Department personnel assigned to Southeast Division were involved in an OIS Hit incident in 2015, which represented 13 percent of the 62 total officers. There was an increase of seven officers when compared to the 2014 total of one Southeast Division officer involved in an OIS Hit incident. In addition, the 2015 total was 3.5 officers above the annual average of 4.5 involved Southeast Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

Six Department personnel assigned to Mission Division were involved in an OIS Hit incident in 2015, which represented 10 percent of the 62 total officers. There was an increase of six officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Mission Division officers involved in OIS Hit incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was 5.25 officers above the annual average of 0.75 involved Mission Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

The remaining 37 Department personnel, or 60 percent, were fairly evenly distributed amongst the remaining Areas/Divisions.

The following is the officer Bureau assignment for the 62 total personnel involved in OIS Hit incidents for 2015:

- Central Bureau: 20 personnel, or 32 percent;
- Valley Bureau: 15 personnel, or 24 percent;
- South Bureau: 13 personnel, or 21 percent;
- West Bureau: eight personnel, or 13 percent;
- CTSOB: five personnel, or eight percent; and,
- Other: one personnel, or two percent.
OFFICER UNIT ASSIGNED

In 2015, officers assigned to patrol were involved in the most OIS Hit incidents with 52 out of 62 employees, or 84 percent. When compared to the 2014 total of 32, patrol officers were involved in 20, or 63 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 53.25 involved patrol officers, 2015 was 1.25 patrol officers, or two percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, officers assigned to specialized assignments were involved in the second most OIS Hit incidents with seven out of 62 employees, or 11 percent. When compared to 2014, the number of employees involved from specialized assignment, remained the same in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 14.5 involved specialized assignment employees, 2015 was 7.5, or 52 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, officers assigned to Metropolitan Division were involved in the third most OIS Hit incidents with two out of 62 employees, or three percent. When compared to the 2014 total of 17, Metropolitan Division officers were involved in 15, or 88 percent, fewer incidents in 2015.

From 2011 through 2015, patrol officers were involved in the most OIS Hit incidents, with 265 out of 399 total involved officers, or 66 percent. Officers assigned to specialized units were involved in the second most OIS Hit incidents, with 65 officers, or 16 percent, and officers assigned to Metropolitan Division were the third largest group with 59 officers, or 15 percent.

OFFICER INJURIES

No Department personnel were killed during OIS Hit incidents for the period from 2011 through 2015. However, 39 officers sustained injuries as a result of OIS Hit incidents for the same five year period.

In 2015, 11 officers sustained injuries as a result of OIS Hit incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of five, officers injured during OIS incidents increased by six officers, or 120 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 average of seven officers injured, 2015 was four officers, or 57 percent, above the four year annual average.

The highest number of Department personnel injured during OIS Hit incidents for the period of 2011 through 2015 occurred in both 2011 and 2015, with 11 for each year.
In 2015, there were 24 single officer OIS Hit incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of 13, single officer OIS Hit incidents increased by 11 incidents, or 85 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 16.5 single officer OIS Hit incidents, 2015 was 7.5 incidents, or 45 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, there were eight OIS Hit incidents involving two officers. When compared to the 2014 total of 10, OIS Hit incidents involving two officers increased by two incidents, or 20 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 9.5 OIS Hit incidents involving two officers, 2015 was 1.5 incidents, or 16 percent, below the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, the majority of OIS Hit incidents involved only one officer firing a weapon. A total of 90 incidents, or 52 percent, out of 174 incidents involved only one officer firing a weapon. The group representing two officers firing per incident was the second largest category with a total of 46 OIS Hit incidents, or 26 percent, during the five year period.

In 2015, 57 handguns were utilized in OIS Hit incidents, which represented 92 percent out of the 62 total weapons used. When compared to the 2014 total of 35, handguns were utilized 22, or 63 percent, more times in 2015.

From 2011 through 2015, 311 handguns were utilized in OIS Hit incidents, which represented 77 percent out of the 404 total weapons used.

In 2015, two rifles were utilized in OIS Hit incidents, which represented three percent out of the 62 total weapons used. When compared to the 2014 total of 17, rifles were utilized 15, or 88 percent, fewer times in 2015. From 2011 through 2015, 63 rifles were utilized in OIS Hit incidents, which represented 16 percent out of the 404 total weapons used.

From 2011 through 2015, 30 shotguns were utilized in OIS Hit incidents, which represented seven percent out of the 404 total weapons used.
In 2015, 229 rounds were fired during OIS Hit incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of 249, rounds fired during 2015 OIS Hit incidents decreased by 20 rounds, or eight percent. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 498 rounds fired, 269 less rounds were fired in 2015, or 54 percent reduction.

In 2015, an average of 6.0 rounds were fired during 2015 OIS Hit incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of 9.6, average rounds fired during OIS Hit incidents decreased by 3.6 rounds, or 37 percent. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 14.6 rounds fired per incident, 2015 was 8.6 rounds fired, or 59 percent, below the four year annual average.
In 2015, 223 rounds were fired from handguns during OIS Hit incidents, which represented 97 percent out of 229 total rounds fired. When compared to the 2014 total of 164, rounds fired from handguns increased by 59 rounds, or 36 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 372 rounds fired from handguns, 2015 was 149 rounds, or 40 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, 223 rounds were fired from shotguns during OIS Hit incidents, which represented one percent out of 229 total rounds fired. When compared to the 2014 total of 78, rounds fired from shotguns, 2015 was 16 rounds, or 80 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, four rounds were fired from shotguns during OIS Hit incidents, which represented two percent out of 229 total rounds fired. When compared to the 2014 total of seven, rounds fired from shotguns decreased by three rounds, or 43 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 20 rounds fired from shotguns, 2015 was 16 rounds, or 80 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, two rounds were fired from rifles during OIS Hit incidents, which represented one percent out of 229 total rounds fired. When compared to the 2014 total of 78, rounds fired from rifles decreased by 76 rounds, or 97 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 20 rounds fired from rifles, 2015 was 104 rounds, or 98 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, there were 27 OIS Hit incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired. When compared to the 2014 total of 17, OIS Hit incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired increased by 10 incidents, or 59 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 18 OIS Hit incidents per year in which 1-5 rounds were fired, 2015 was nine incidents, or 50 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, there were six OIS Hit incidents in which 6-10 rounds were fired. When compared to the 2014 total of four, OIS Hit incidents in which 6-10 rounds were fired increased by two incidents, or 50 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 6.25 OIS Hit incidents per year in which 6-10 rounds were fired, 2015 was 0.25 incidents, or four percent, below the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, the majority of OIS Hit incidents involved 1-5 rounds fired by Department personnel, with 99 incidents, or 57 percent, of the 174 total incidents. The 6-10 rounds per incident group were the second largest category, with 31 incidents, or 18 percent.
In 2015, the average shooting distance for OIS Hit incidents was 46.3 feet. When compared to the 2014 average shooting distance of 121.6 feet, 2015 was 75.3 feet, or 62 percent, below the 2014 average. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average shooting distance of 112.2 feet, 2015 was 65.9 feet, or 59 percent, below the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, 2012 experienced the highest average distance of 125.5 feet.

The 2015 total rounds fired compared to the total number of rounds which struck their intended targets calculated the hit ratio of 38 percent. When compared to the 2014 total of 32 percent, 2015 experienced a six percentage point increase. Additionally, the 2015 hit ratio percentage exceeded the 2011 through 2014 average hit ratio percentage of 26.5 percent by 11.5 percentage points.

---

* The 2015 OIS Hit Ratio was calculated based on preliminary numbers, pending completion of Coroner’s reports and FID investigations.
OFFICERS INVOLVED IN MULTIPLE OIS INCIDENTS FROM 2011 THROUGH 2015

From 2011 through 2015, a total of 36 Department personnel were involved in more than one OIS Hit incident. The following is the percentage breakdown of these officers according to the prescribed category:

Number of Shootings In Five Year Period

Thirty-three personnel, or 92 percent, were involved in two OIS incidents in the five year period; and three personnel, or eight percent, were involved in three OIS incidents in the five year period.

Officer Gender

Thirty-six personnel, or 100 percent, were male.

Officer Ethnicity

Sixteen personnel, or 44 percent, were White; 14 personnel, or 39 percent, were Hispanic; three personnel, or eight percent, were Black; and three personnel, or eight percent, were Asian/Pacific Islander;
Sixteen personnel, or 44 percent, were within the 11-20 years of service group; 11 personnel, or 31 percent, had more than 20 years of service; nine personnel, or 25 percent, were within the 6-10 years of service group.

Sixteen personnel, or 44 percent, were assigned to CTSOB; seven personnel, or 19 percent, were assigned to Central Bureau; five personnel, or 14 percent, were assigned to South Bureau; three personnel, or eight percent, were assigned Valley Bureau; two personnel, or six percent, were assigned to West Bureau; two personnel, or six percent, were assigned to an Administrative function; one employee, or three percent, was assigned to a Traffic division.

Thirty-five personnel, or 97 percent, were of the rank of police officer; one employee, or three percent, was of the rank of detective.
In 2015, 22 Hispanic suspects were involved in OIS Hit incidents, which represented 58 percent of the 38 total suspects. When compared to the 2014 total of 10, Hispanic suspects were involved in 12, or 120 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 16.75, 2015 was 5.25 Hispanic suspects, or 31 percent, above the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, Hispanic suspects were involved in the most OIS Hit incidents with 89 out of 174 total suspects, or 51 percent.

In 2015, eight Black suspects were involved in OIS Hit incidents, which represented 21 percent of the 38 total suspects. When compared to the 2014 total of 10, Black suspects were involved in two, or 20 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 11, 2015 was three Black suspects, or 27 percent, below the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, Black suspects were involved in the second most OIS Hit incidents with 52 out of 174 total suspects, or 30 percent.

In 2015, five White suspects were involved in OIS Hit incidents, which represented 13 percent of the 38 total suspects. When compared to the 2014 total of four, White suspects were involved in one, or 25 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of five, there was no change in the total number of White suspects in 2015. From 2011 through 2015, White suspects were involved in the third most OIS Hit incidents with 25 out of 174 total suspects, or 14 percent.

The Asian/Pacific Islander and Other categories had a combined total of eight suspects, or five percent, involved in OIS Hit incidents from 2011 through 2015.

In 2015, 36 male suspects, or 95 percent, and two female suspects, or five percent, were involved in OIS Hit incidents, for a total of 38 suspects.

When compared to the 2014 total of 25, male suspects were involved in 11, or 44 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 32 male suspects, 2015 was four male suspects, or 13 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, female suspects increased from one to two suspects, when compared to 2014. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of two female suspects, 2015 remained the same.

From 2011 through 2015, male suspects were overwhelmingly represented with 164, or 94 percent, out of 174 total suspects.
In 2015, most suspects involved in OIS Hit incidents were in the 30-39 age group. Specifically, 20 of the 38, or 53 percent, were included in this age group, which was an increase by 16 individuals, or 400 percent, compared to the 2014 total of four. The age group of suspects between 18-23 years of age has experienced a consistent decrease over the past five years, which was a trend that continued in 2015, with four suspects.

The following number of suspect totals and percentage changes occurred between 2014 and 2015 for each age group:

- **0-17** - 2014: zero, 2015: one; no percentage change;
- **18-23** - 2014: five, 2015: four; 20 percent decrease;
- **24-29** - 2014: six, 2015: six; no percentage change;
- **30-39** - 2014: four, 2015: 20; 400 percent increase;
- **40-49** - 2014: seven, 2015: four; 75 percent decrease;
- **50-59** - 2014: two, 2015: zero; 100 percent decrease; and,
- **60 and above** - 2014: two, 2015: zero; 100 percent decrease.

From 2011 through 2015, the 30-39 age group represented 45 out of 174 total suspects, or 26 percent, involved in OIS Hit incidents. The 18-23 age group was the second largest, with 38 suspects, or 22 percent, followed by the 24-29 age group with 37 suspects, or 21 percent.

In 2015, 14 of the 38 suspects involved in OIS Hit incidents, or 37 percent, had an indication(s) of mental illness. The 2015 percentage of suspects who had an indication(s) of mental illness experienced a year-over-year increase of 18 percentage points when compared to 19 percent in 2014. Additionally, the 2015 percentage exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 18 percent by 19 percentage points.
Of the 21 suspects who died as a result of OIS Hit incidents in 2015, eight decedents, or 38 percent, were determined as being under the influence of a controlled substance. Nine decedents, or 43 percent, currently have an unknown under the influence designation, pending completion of the investigation by FID. In 2014, 14 out of 18 decedents, or 78 percent, were determined to be under the influence of a controlled substance. The 2014 total was 10 percentage points below the 2011 through 2013 annual percentage average of 88 percent.

Of the 38 suspects involved in OIS Hit incidents in 2015, 13 suspects, or 34 percent, were verified as documented gang members. The remaining 25 suspects were either not documented as gang members, or had an unknown gang affiliation. From 2011 through 2015, 65 of the 174 total suspects, or 37 percent, involved in OIS Hit incidents were verified as documented gang members.
In 2015, firearms were the most frequently used weapon during OIS Hit incidents, with thirteen out of 38 weapons used, or 34 percent. Edged weapons were the second largest category, with 10 weapons used, or 26 percent. Replica and/or pellet guns were the third largest category, with five weapons used, or 13 percent.

The following categories experienced increases in 2015 compared to 2014:

- Edged weapons – 2014: eight incidents, 2015: 10 incidents (25 percent increase);
- Physical force – 2014: one incident, 2015: two incidents (100 percent increase);
- Replica/pellet gun – 2014: one incident, 2015: five incidents (400 percent increase);
- Other – 2014: zero incidents, 2015: two incidents;
- None – 2014: zero incidents, 2015: one incident; and,

From 2011 through 2015, a total of 93 out of 174 suspects in OIS Hit incidents, or 53 percent, were armed with a firearm. For the same period, 40 suspects, or 23 percent, were armed with an edged weapon. The third most common category involved a deadly threat perception by the officer, with a total of 13 suspects, or seven percent. OIS Hit incidents involving a replica or pellet gun, and those when the suspect physically assaulted an officer were the fourth and fifth largest categories, with 10 suspects, or six percent, and seven suspects, or four percent, respectively.
In 2015, 21 suspects died as a result of OIS Hit incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of 18, the number of deceased suspects increased by three suspects, or 17 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 19 deceased suspects, 2015 was two deceased suspects, or 11 percent, above the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, an average of 19.4 suspects involved in OIS Hit incidents died as a result of police gunfire each year. The year with the highest deceased suspect count occurred in 2011, when 26 died.

In 2015, 17 suspects sustained injuries as a result of OIS Hit incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of 10, the number of injured suspects increased by seven suspects, or 70 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 16 injured suspects, 2015 was one suspect, or six percent, above the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, an average of 16.2 the suspects involved in OIS Hit incidents were wounded by police gunfire. The year with the highest injured suspect count was in 2011, when 21 sustained injuries.

---

**Suspect Injuries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 The total number of suspects exceeds the total incident count, as multiple suspects may have been involved in an incident.
Of the 21 decedents involved in OIS Hit incidents in 2015, 12 individuals, or 57 percent, were Hispanic. The 2015 count of Hispanic suspects represented an increase of six individuals, or 100 percent, compared to the 2014 total of six Hispanic decedents. In addition, the 2015 total exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 10 deceased Hispanics involved in OIS Hit incidents by two individuals, or 20 percent.

Of the 21 decedents involved in OIS Hit incidents in 2015, four individuals, or 19 percent, were Black. The 2015 count of Black suspects represented a decrease of five individuals, or 56 percent, compared to the 2014 total of nine Black decedents. In addition, the 2015 total fell below the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 5.5 deceased Black suspects involved in OIS Hit incidents by 1.5 individuals, or 27 percent.

Of the 21 decedents involved in OIS Hit incidents in 2015, four individuals, or 19 percent, were White. The 2015 count of White suspects represented an increase of two individuals, or 100 percent, compared to the 2014 total of two White decedents. In addition, the 2015 total exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 2.5 deceased White suspects involved in OIS Hit incidents by 1.5 individuals, or 60 percent.

Of the 21 decedents involved in OIS Hit incidents in 2015, one individual, or five percent, was an Asian/Pacific Islander. The 2015 count of Asian/Pacific Islander suspects remained unchanged compared to the 2014 total of one Asian/Pacific Islander decedent. The 2015 total exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.5 deceased Asian/Pacific Islander suspects involved in OIS Hit incidents by 0.5 individuals, or 100 percent.

During the five year period from 2011 through 2015, Hispanics represented the largest decedent count with 52 individuals out of the 97 total, or 54 percent. Black suspects represented the second highest count with 26 individuals, or 27 percent. White suspects represented the third highest count with 14 individuals, or 14 percent.

The following depicts the remaining ethnic categories and their five year totals and percentages:

- Asian/Pacific Islander: three individuals, or three percent;
- Other: two individuals, or two percent;
- American Indian: zero; and,
- Filipino: zero.
ADJUDICATION

ADJUDICATION IN-POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJUDICATION OUT OF POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tactics
In 2015, one adjudicated Tactics finding resulted in a “Tactical Debrief” outcome for closed 2015 OIS Hit incidents.

In 2014, 50 out of 57, or 88 percent, of OIS Hit adjudications were “Tactical Debrief” findings for Tactics. Seven findings, or 12 percent, received a finding of “Administrative Disapproval.”

The 2014 percentage for “Tactical Debrief” findings for the Tactics portion of OIS Hit incidents fell below the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 92 percent by four percentage points.

Drawing and Exhibiting
In 2015, one adjudicated Drawing and Exhibiting finding resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome for closed 2015 OIS Hit incidents.

In 2014, 55 out of 57, or 96 percent, of OIS Hit adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Drawing and Exhibiting. Two findings, or four percent, were “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).”

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Drawing and Exhibiting portion of OIS Hit incidents fell below the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent by four percentage points.

Lethal Force
In 2015, one adjudicated Lethal Force finding resulted in an “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” outcome for closed 2015 OIS Hit incidents.

In 2014, 55 out of 58, or 95 percent, of OIS Hit adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Lethal Force. Three findings, or five percent, were “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).”

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Lethal Force portion of OIS Hit incidents remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 95 percent.

A majority of the 2015 OIS Hit incidents had yet to be adjudicated at the time the data was collected for the year-end report, as the investigative process was still ongoing.
SUSPECT WEAPONS RECOVERED AT THE CRIME SCENES OF 2015 OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING INCIDENTS.
OFFICER
INVOLVED SHOOTINGS - NO HIT

ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS

In 2015, Department personnel were involved in 10 OIS No Hit incidents, which was an increase of six incidents, or 150 percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there were a total of 39 OIS No Hit incidents, resulting in an annual average of 9.75 OIS No Hits. The total 2015 count exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.25 incidents, or approximately three percent.

CLASSIFICATION OF OIS INCIDENTS

In 2015, five of the 10 OIS No Hit incidents, or 50 percent, were categorized as Classification I shootings. Four of the incidents, or 40 percent, were Classification II shootings. The remaining incident (10 percent) was categorized as a Classification VI shooting. From 2011 through 2014, Classification II shootings were the most represented OIS No Hit incidents, with 41 percent of the total count. For the same period, Classification I shootings were the second most frequent with 33 percent of the total, followed by Classification IV shootings, with 15 percent.
SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

In 2015, three of the Department’s 10 OIS No Hit incidents, or 30 percent, originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. Four incidents, or 40 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (e.g. pedestrian and traffic stops). The remaining 30 percent transpired during the following:

- 10 percent, or one incident, from a pre-planned activity; and,
- 20 percent, or two incidents, during an officer’s “off-duty” status.

From 2011 through 2014, observation stops, radio calls and pre-planned activities were the most significant sources of OIS No Hit incidents, accounting for 46 percent, 26 percent, and 18 percent, respectively.

BUREAU OF OCCURRENCE

CENTRAL BUREAU

In 2015, two of the Department’s OIS No Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2014. Twenty percent of the Department’s OIS No Hit incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department - 10; Central Bureau - two). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, six OIS No Hit incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.5 incidents. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.5 incidents, or approximately 33 percent.
In 2015, three of the Department’s OIS No Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was an increase of one incident, or 50 percent, compared to 2014. Thirty percent of the Department’s OIS No Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department - 10; South Bureau - three). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 20 OIS No Hit incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of five incidents. The total South Bureau count for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by two incidents, or approximately 40 percent.

In 2015, three of the Department’s OIS No Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was an increase of two incidents, or 200 percent, compared to 2014. Thirty percent of the Department’s OIS No Hit incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department - 10; Valley Bureau - three). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, five OIS No Hit incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.25 incidents. The total Valley Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 1.75 incidents, or approximately 140 percent.
In 2015, none of the Department’s OIS No Hit incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was consistent with the total number of incidents compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, six OIS No Hit incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.5 incidents.

In 2015, two of the Department’s OIS No Hit incidents occurred outside the Department’s jurisdiction, which was an increase of two incidents compared to 2014. Twenty percent of the Department’s OIS No Hit incidents occurred in areas outside the Department’s jurisdiction (Department - 10; Outside Areas - 2). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, two OIS No Hit incidents occurred in areas outside of the Department’s jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 0.5 incidents. The total incident count for outside areas for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 1.5 incidents, or approximately 300 percent.
Los Angeles Police Department
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3. Southwest Area
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6. Hollywood Area
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8. West Los Angeles Area
9. Van Nuys Area
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19. Mission Area
20. Olympic Area
21. Topanga Area

OIS No Hit Incidents:
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Map excludes OIS incidents that occurred outside of the Los Angeles city limits.
In 2015, January had the most OIS No Hit incidents, with four out of the 10 total incidents for the year, or 40 percent. March had the second most incidents with three, or 30 percent. The remaining three incidents, or 30 percent, occurred in February, June, and September.

From 2011 through 2015, March had the most OIS No Hit incidents, with nine out of 49 total incidents, or 18 percent. January and June had the second most, with seven incidents occurring each month, or 14 percent, for the same five year period.

The percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2011 through 2015 is as follows:

- January through March: 18 OIS No Hits; 37 percent,
- April through June: 13 OIS No Hits; 27 percent,
- October through December: 10 OIS No Hits; 20 percent; and,
- July through September: eight OIS No Hits; 16 percent.
In 2015, three, or 30 percent, of the 10 OIS No Hit incidents occurred on Sunday. Monday and Tuesday were the second most active day, with two incidents occurring each day, or 20 percent. No OIS No Hit incidents occurred on Friday.

From 2011 through 2015, Wednesday had the most OIS No Hit incidents, with 12 out of 49 total incidents, or 24 percent. Tuesday and Sunday had the second most incidents, with eight incidents occurring each day, or 16 percent. Thursday had the third most incidents, with six incidents, or 12 percent.

In 2015, the OIS No Hit incidents occurred most often at night. Four incidents, or 40 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while six incidents, or 60 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The time distribution from 2011 through 2014 was similar to the percentage disbursement of 2015, where 15 OIS No Hit incidents, or 38 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while 24 incidents, or 62 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The five year average for 2011 through 2015 was 3.8 OIS No Hit incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and six incidents between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.
In 2015, 13 male officers, or 93 percent, and one female officer, or seven percent, were involved in OIS No Hit incidents, for a total of 14 involved officers.

When compared to the 2014 total of four, male officers were involved in nine, or 225 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 11.25 male officers, 2015 was 1.75 male officers, or 16 percent, above the four year annual average.

Consistently over the five year period from 2011 through 2015, the majority of officers involved in OIS No Hit incidents were male. For the five year period, there were 58 male officers, or 94 percent, and four female officers, or six percent, involved in OIS No Hits, for a total of 62 officers.

In 2015, eight Hispanic officers were involved in OIS No Hit incidents, which represented 57 percent of the 14 total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of three, Hispanic officers were involved in five, or 167 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 7.75 Hispanic officers, 2015 was 0.25 Hispanic officers, or 33 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, six White officers were involved in OIS No Hit incidents, which represented 43 percent of the 14 total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of two, White officers were involved in four, or 200 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of four White officers, 2015 was two White officers, or 50 percent, above the four year annual average.
OFFICER YEARS OF SERVICE

There were increases in four of the five categories and one category that remained unchanged in 2015 compared to 2014. The following are the categories that experienced increases:

- 1-5 years of service – increase of two officers (one in 2014, three in 2015), or 200 percent;
- 6-10 years of service – increase of three officers (two in 2014, five in 2015), or 150 percent;
- 11-20 years of service – increase of two officers (two officers in 2014, four in 2015), or 100 percent; and,
- More than 20 years of service – increase of two officers (zero in 2014, two in 2015).

Officers with less than one year of service remained unchanged in 2015 from 2014 at zero.

OFFICER RANK

In 2015, 12 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in OIS No Hit incidents, which represented 86 percent of the 14 involved employees. Two employees at the rank of detective, or 14 percent, represented the remaining personnel involved in OIS No Hit incidents for the year.

When compared to the 2014 total of five, police officers were involved in seven, or 140 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 11.25 police officers, 2015 was 0.75 police officers, or seven percent, above the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, employees at the rank of police officer were involved in most of the OIS No Hit incidents, with a total of 57 out of 62 employees, or 92 percent. The rank of detective comprised the second largest category with a total of three employees, or five percent, during the same five-year period.
Five Department personnel assigned to 77th Street Division were involved in an OIS No Hit incident in 2015, which represented 36 percent of the 14 total officers. There was an increase of three officers when compared to the 2014 total of two 77th Street Division officers involved in OIS No Hit incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was 1.75 officers above the annual average of 3.25 involved 77th Street Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

Two Department personnel assigned to Topanga Division were involved in an OIS No Hit incident in 2015, which represented 14 percent of the 14 total officers. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Topanga Division officers involved in OIS No Hit incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was two officers above the annual average of zero involved Topanga Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

Two Department personnel assigned to Specialized Units were involved in an OIS No Hit incident in 2015, which represented 14 percent of the 14 total officers. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Specialized Unit officers involved in OIS No Hit incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was 1.5 officers above the annual average of 0.5 involved Specialized Unit officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

Two Department personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division were involved in an OIS No Hit incident in 2015, which represented 14 percent of the 14 total officers. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Metropolitan Division officers involved in OIS No Hit incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was 1.5 officers above the annual average of 0.5 involved Metropolitan Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

The remaining three involved Department personnel, or 21 percent, for 2015 were assigned to Foothill Division, Northeast Division, and Southwest Division.

The following is the officer Bureau assignment for the 14 total personnel involved in OIS No Hit incidents for 2015:

- South Bureau: six personnel, or 43 percent;
- CTSOB: four personnel, or 29 percent;
- Valley Bureau: three personnel, or 21 percent;
- Central Bureau: one personnel, or seven percent;
- West Bureau: zero personnel; and,
- Other: zero personnel.
In 2015, officers assigned to specialized assignments were involved in the most OIS No Hit incidents with six out of 14 employees, or 43 percent. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, officers assigned to specialized assignments were involved in six more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 3.5 officers assigned to specialized assignments, 2015 was 2.5 officers, or 71 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, officers assigned to patrol were involved in the second most OIS No Hit incidents with four out of 14 employees, or 29 percent. When compared to the 2014 total of five, patrol officers were involved in one, or 20 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 6.25 patrol officers, 2015 was 2.25 officers, or 36 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, officers assigned to Metropolitan Division were involved in the third most OIS No Hit incidents with two out of 14 employees, or 14 percent. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, officers assigned to Metropolitan Division were involved in two more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.5 officers assigned to Metropolitan Division, 2015 was 1.5 officers, or 300 percent, above the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, personnel assigned to an investigative assignment represented seven personnel, or 11 percent, of the five year total of 62. However, this category only accounted for one out of 14 employees, or seven percent, for 2015 totals.
No Department personnel were killed during OIS No Hit incidents for the period of 2011 through 2015. However, 10 sustained injuries during OIS No Hit incidents for the same five year period.

In 2015, three officers sustained injuries as a result of OIS No Hit incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, officers injured during OIS No Hit incidents increased by three officers, or 100 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 1.75 injured officers per year, 2015 was 1.25 officers, or 71 percent, above the four year annual average.

The highest number of officers injured during OIS No Hit incidents for the period of 2011 through 2015 occurred in 2013, with four personnel, or 40 percent. Three personnel, or 30 percent, were injured during OIS No Hit incidents in 2011 and 2015 for a combined total of six employees, or sixty percent. No personnel were injured in 2012 or 2014.

In 2015, there were seven single officer OIS No Hit incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of three, single officer OIS No Hit incidents increased by four incidents, or 133 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 7.5 single officer incidents, 2015 was 0.5 incidents, or seven percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, there were two OIS No Hit incidents involving two officers. When compared to the 2014 total of one, incidents involving two officers increased by one incident, or 50 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 2.25 incidents, 2015 was 0.25, or 11 percent, below the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, the majority of OIS No Hit incidents involved only one officer firing a weapon. A total of 37 incidents, or 76 percent, out of 49 incidents had only one officer shooting. The group representing two officers firing per incident was the second largest category with a total of 11 OIS No Hits, or 22 percent, during the same five year period.
OFFICER WEAPON SYSTEM

In 2015, 13 handguns were utilized in OIS No Hit incidents, which represented 81 percent out of the 16 total weapons used. When compared to the 2014 total of five, handguns were utilized eight, or 160 percent, more times in 2015. In addition, the 2015 total exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 11.25 by 1.75 more handgun incidents, or 16 percent. From 2011 through 2015, 58 handguns were utilized in OIS No Hit incidents, which represented 91 percent out of the 64 total weapons used. From 2011 through 2015, rifles and shotguns were both utilized in three OIS No Hit incidents, or five percent, of the 64 total weapons used.

TOTAL ROUNDS FIRED BY OFFICERS

In 2015, 72 rounds were fired during OIS No Hit incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of 16, rounds fired during OIS No Hit incidents increased by 56 rounds, or 350 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 55 round fired, 2015 was 17 rounds, or 31 percent, above the four year annual average.
In 2015, an average of 7.2 rounds were fired during OIS No Hit incidents. When compared to the 2014 average of four, average rounds fired during OIS No Incidents increased by 3.2 rounds, or 80 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 5.2 rounds fired per incident, 2015 was two rounds, or 38 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, there were six OIS No Hit incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired. When compared to the 2014 total of three, OIS No Hit incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired increased by three incidents, or 100 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of seven OIS No Hit incidents in which 1-5 rounds were fired, 2015 was one incident, or 14 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, there was one OIS No Hit incident in which 6-10 rounds were fired. When compared to 2014, there was no change in the total number of incidents. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.75 OIS No Hit incidents in which 6-10 rounds were fired, 2015 was 0.25 incidents, or 33 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, there was one OIS No Hit incident in which 11-15 rounds were fired. When compared to 2014, there was no change in the total number of incidents. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 1.25 OIS No Hit incidents in which 11-15 rounds were fired, 2015 was 0.25 incidents, or 20 percent, below the four year annual average.

Consistently over the five year period of 2011 through 2015, a majority of OIS No Hit incidents involved shootings with 1-5 total rounds fired by Department personnel, with 34 incidents, or 69 percent, out of 49 total incidents. The 11-15 rounds per incident category was the second largest category, with six incidents, or 12 percent, followed by the 6-10 rounds per incident category, with four incidents, or eight percent.
In 2015, 66 rounds were fired from handguns during OIS No Hit incidents, which represented 92 percent of the 72 total rounds fired. When compared to the 2014 total of 16, rounds fired from handguns increased by 50 rounds, or 313 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 53 rounds fired from handguns, 2015 was 13 rounds, or 25 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, three rounds were fired from shotguns during OIS No Hit incidents, which represented four percent of the 72 total rounds fired. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, rounds fired from shotguns increased by three rounds in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.25 rounds fired from shotguns, 2015 was 2.75 rounds above the four year average.

In 2015, three rounds were fired from rifles during OIS No Hit incidents, which represented four percent of the 72 total rounds fired. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, rounds fired from rifles increased by three rounds in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 1.5 rounds fired from rifles, 2015 was 1.5 rounds, or 100 percent, above the four year annual average.
CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE, OIS NO HIT

AVERAGE SHOOTING DISTANCE OF OFFICERS

In 2015, the average shooting distance for OIS No Hit incidents was 150.3 feet. When compared to the 2014 average shooting distance of 79.8 feet, 2015 was 70.5 feet, or 88 percent, above the 2014 average. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average shooting distance of 70.3 feet, 2015 was 80 feet, or 114 percent, farther than the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, 2015 experienced the highest average distance at 150.3 feet.

SUSPECT INFORMATION

SUSPECT GENDER

In 2015, 10 male suspects were involved in OIS No Hit incidents.

When compared to the 2014 total of four, male suspects were involved in six, or 150 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 9.5 male suspects, 2015 was 0.5 male suspects, or five percent, above the four year annual average.

When compared to 2014, there was no change in the total number of female suspects in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2015 annual average, there was no change in the total number of female suspects in 2015.

From 2011 through 2015, male suspects were overwhelmingly represented with 48, or 98 percent, of the 49 total suspects. One suspect with an “unknown” gender designation in 2011 represents the remaining individual, or two percent, in the five year analysis.
In 2015, four Black suspects were involved in OIS No Hit incidents, which represented 40 percent out of 10 total suspects. When compared to the 2014 total of two, Black suspects were involved in two, or 100 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 5.25 Black suspects, 2015 was 1.25 Black suspects, or 24 percent, below the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, Black suspects were involved in the most OIS No Hit incidents with 25 out of 49 total suspects, or 51 percent.

In 2015, two White suspects were involved in OIS No Hit incidents, which represented 20 percent of the 10 total suspects. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, White suspects were involved in two more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.75 White suspects, 2015 was 1.25 White suspects, or 167 percent, above the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, White suspects were involved in the third most OIS No Hit incidents with five out of 49 total suspects, or 10 percent.

In 2015, one Hispanic suspect was involved in an OIS No Hit incident, which represented 10 percent of the 10 total suspects. When compared to the 2014 total of two, Hispanic suspects were involved in one, or 50 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 3.5 Hispanic suspects, 2015 was 2.5 Hispanic suspects, or 71 percent, below the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, Hispanic suspects were involved in the second most OIS No Hit incidents with 15 out of 49 total suspects, or 31 percent.

From 2011 through 2015, the Other and Unknown categories had a total of one suspect, or two percent, and three suspects, or six percent, respectively.
In 2015, of the 10 suspects involved in OIS No Hit incidents, two suspects, or 20 percent, were represented in each of the following age groups:

- 18-23;
- 24-29; and,
- Unknown age.

The 18-23 age group remained unchanged at two individuals compared to 2014, while the 24-29 age group increased by one individual to a total of two suspects compared to 2014.

The following number of suspect totals and percentage changes occurred between 2014 and 2015 for each age group:

- 0-17 – 2014: zero, 2015: one;
- 18-23 – 2014: two, 2015: two; no percentage change;
- 24-29 – 2014: one, 2015: two; 100 percent increase;
- 30-39 – 2014: one, 2015: one; no percentage change;
- 40-49 – 2014: zero, 2015: one;
- 60 & Above – 2014: zero, 2015: one; and,
- Unknown – 2014: zero, 2015: two, or 100 percent increase.

The following details the 2015 suspect totals by age group compared to their respective annual average for the period of 2011 through 2014:

- 0-17 – 2015: one, Average: 0.5; 100 percent above;
- 18-23 – 2015: two, Average: 3.5; 43 percent below;
- 24-29 – 2015: two, Average: 1.5; 33 percent above;
- 30-39 – 2015: one, Average: 2.25; 56 percent below;
- 40-49 – 2015: one, Average: 0.75; 33 percent above;
- 50-59 – 2015: zero, Average: 0.5 and,
- 60 and above – 2015: one, Average: zero.

From 2011 through 2015, the 18-23 age group represented 16 out of the total 49 suspects, or 33 percent, involved in OIS No Hit incidents. The 30-39 age group was the second largest, with 10 suspects, or 20 percent, followed by the 24-29 age group with eight suspects, or 16 percent.
In 2015, one of the 10 suspects involved in OIS No Hit incidents, or 10 percent, had indication(s) of mental illness. The 2015 percentage of suspects who had an indication(s) of mental illness experienced a year-over-year increase of 100 percentage points when compared to zero percent in 2014. Additionally, the 2015 percentage exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of five percent by five percentage points.

In 2015, of the 10 suspects involved in OIS No Hit incidents, five suspects, or 50 percent, were verified as documented gang members. The remaining five suspects were either not documented as gang members, or had an unknown gang affiliation. From 2011 through 2015, 29 of the 49 total suspects, or 59 percent, involved in OIS No Hit incidents were verified as documented gang members.
SUSPECT WEAPON

In 2015, firearms were the most frequently used weapon during OIS No Hit incidents, with eight out of 10 weapons used, or 80 percent. Physical force and a pellet/replica gun represent the two remaining incidents, or a combined total of 20 percent.

The following categories experienced increases in 2015 compared to 2014:

- Firearms – 2014: three incidents, 2015: eight incidents (167 percent increase); and,

SUSPECT INJURIES

From 2011 through 2015, no suspects died or sustained injuries as a direct result of Department gunfire during OIS No Hit incidents. The data reflects injuries sustained by suspects other than those caused by police gunfire.

In 2015, one suspect sustained an injury as a result of an OIS No Hit incident. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, the number of injured suspects increased by one incident in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 2.25 injured suspects, 2015 was 1.25 suspects, or 56 percent, below the four year annual average.

For the five year period between 2011 and 2015, an average of two suspects involved in OIS No Hit incidents sustained injuries. 2013 experienced the highest number, wherein four suspects were injured.
ADJUDICATION

ADJUDICATION IN POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Drawing and Exhibiting portion of OIS No Hit incidents exceeded the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 98 percent by two percentage points.

Lethal Force

In 2015, one adjudicated Lethal Force finding resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome for closed 2015 OIS Hit incidents.

In 2014, four out of five, or 80 percent, of OIS No Hit adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Lethal Force. One finding, or 20 percent, was “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).”

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Lethal Force portion of OIS No Hit incidents fell below the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 81 percent by one percentage point.

A majority of the 2015 OIS No Hit incidents had yet to be adjudicated at the time the data was collected for the year-end report, as the investigative process was still ongoing.

Tactics

In 2015, one adjudicated Tactics finding resulted in a “Tactical Debrief” outcome for closed 2015 OIS No Hit incidents.

In 2014, three out of five, or 60 percent, of OIS No Hit adjudications were “Tactical Debrief” findings for Tactics. Two findings, or 40 percent, were “Administrative Disapproval.”

The 2014 percentage for “Tactical Debrief” findings for the Tactics portion of OIS No Hit incidents exceeded the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 58 percent by two percentage points.

Drawing and Exhibiting

In 2015, one adjudicated Drawing and Exhibiting finding resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome for closed 2015 OIS No Hit incidents.

In 2014, five out of five, or 100 percent, of OIS No Hit adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Drawing and Exhibiting.
In 2015, Department personnel were involved in eight Animal Shooting incidents, which was a decrease of one incident, or 11 percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there were a total of 74 Animal Shooting incidents, resulting in an annual average of 18.5 incidents. The total 2015 count fell below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 10.5 incidents, or approximately 57 percent.

In 2015, four of the Department’s eight Animal Shooting incidents, or 50 percent, originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. One, or 12.5 percent, occurred during a field detention conducted based on officers’ observations (e.g. pedestrian or a traffic stop). The remaining three incidents, or 37.5 percent, occurred during the following:

- One incident, or 12.5 percent, from an officer’s “off-duty” status; and,
- Two incidents, or 25 percent, were classified with as Unknown.

From 2011 through 2015, radio calls, pre-planned activities, and observation stops were the most significant sources of Animal Shooting incidents, accounting for 46 percent, 23 percent, and 17 percent of the 82 total incidents, respectively.
In 2015, one of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which represented no change compared to 2014. Approximately, 13 percent of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department - eight; Central Bureau - one). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 11 Animal Shooting incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.75 incidents. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 1.75 incidents, or approximately 64 percent.

In 2015, five of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was an increase of three incidents, or 150 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 63 percent of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department - eight; South Bureau - five). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 33 Animal Shooting incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 8.25 incidents. The total South Bureau count for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 3.25 incidents, or approximately 39 percent.
In 2015, none of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was a decrease of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 16 Animal Shooting incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of four incidents. The total Valley Bureau count for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by four incidents, or 100 percent.

In 2015, one of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which represented no change compared to 2014. Approximately 13 percent of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred in West Bureau (Department - eight; West Bureau - one). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, five Animal Shooting incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.25 incidents. The total West Bureau count for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.25 incidents, or approximately 20 percent.
In 2015, one of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred outside the Department’s jurisdiction, which was a decrease of three incidents, or 75 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 13 percent of the Department’s Animal Shooting incidents occurred in areas outside of the Department’s jurisdiction (Department - eight; Outside Areas - one). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, nine Animal Shooting incidents occurred in areas outside the Department’s jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 2.25 incidents. The total incident count for outside areas for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 1.25 incidents, or approximately 56 percent.

In 2015, August represented the most Animal Shooting incidents with three out of eight total incidents for the year, or 38 percent. Three additional incidents, or 38 percent, occurred in each month during the first quarter of the year (January, February, and March). The two remaining incidents, or 25 percent collectively, occurred in September and December.

From 2011 through 2015, August had the most Animal Shooting incidents, with 10 incidents, or 12 percent, out of 82 total incidents. February and September had the second most incidents with nine incidents each, or 11 percent. April, May, and July had seven incidents each, or nine percent.

The percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2011 through 2015 is as follows:

- July through September: 26 Animal Shootings; 32 percent,
- January through March: 22 Animal Shootings; 27 percent,
- April through June: 19 Animal Shootings; 23 percent, and
- October through December: 15 Animal Shootings; 18 percent.
In 2015, Animal Shooting incidents were fairly evenly distributed during the seven days of the week. Wednesdays and Fridays were the most active days with two incidents. No incidents occurred on Sunday in 2015.

From 2011 through 2015, Friday had the most Animal Shooting incidents, with 16 out of 82 total incidents, or 20 percent. Tuesday had the second most incidents, with 15 incidents, or 18 percent. Sunday had the fewest incidents, with seven incidents, or nine percent.

In 2015, Animal Shooting incidents occurred most frequently during the day. Six incidents, or 75 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while two incidents, or 25 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The time distribution during the four year period from 2011 through 2014 was similar to the percentage disbursement in 2015, where 52 Animal Shooting incidents, or 70 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while 22 incidents, or 30 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The five year average for 2011 through 2015 was 11.6 Animal Shooting incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and 4.8 incidents between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.
In 2015, four Hispanic officers were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 50 percent of the eight total officers. When compared to 2014, there was no change in the total number of involved Hispanic officers. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 10 involved Hispanic officers, 2015 was six Hispanic officers, or 60 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, three White officers were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, which represented 38 percent of the eight total officers. When compared to 2014, there was no change in the total number of involved White officers. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 6.75 involved White officers, 2015 was 3.75 White officers, or 56 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, one Black officer was involved in an Animal Shooting incident, which represented 13 percent of the eight total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of two, Black officers were involved in one, or 50 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 2.5 involved Black officers, 2015 was 1.5 Black officers, or 60 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, seven male officers, or approximately 88 percent, and one female officer, or approximately 12 percent, were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, for a total of eight involved officers.

When compared to the 2014 total of eight, male officers were involved in one, or 12 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 18.75 male officers, 2015 was 11.75 male officers, or approximately 63 percent, below the four year annual average.

When compared to the 2014 total of two, female officers were involved in one, or 50 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 2.25 female officers, 2015 was 1.25 female officers, or 56 percent, below the four year annual average.

Consistently, over the five year period from 2011 through 2015, the majority of officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents were male. From 2011 to 2015, there were 82 male officers, or 89 percent, and 10 female officers, or 11 percent, involved in Animal Shooting incidents, for a total of 92 officers.
### OFFICER YEARS OF SERVICE

The categories below depict the 2014 and 2015 totals in addition to the year-to-year percentage changes:

- Less than one year of service – no change (zero in 2014, zero in 2015);
- 1-5 years of service – decrease of four officers (four in 2014, zero in 2015);
- 6-10 years of service – no change (one in 2014, one in 2015);
- 11-20 years of service – increase of three officers (four officers in 2014, seven in 2015), or 75 percent; and,

From 2011 through 2015, officers with 11-20 years of service were the group with the most officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents, with 33 out of 92 total involved officers, or 36 percent. Officers with 6-10 years of service were the group with the second most officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents with 31 officers, or 34 percent. Officers with 1-5 years of service were the group with the third most officers involved with 20 officers, or 22 percent.

In 2015, eight employees at the rank of police officer were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, represent all employees, or 100 percent, for the year. When compared to the 2014 total of 10, police officers were involved in two, or 20 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 19.75 of police officers, 2015 was 11.75 police officers, or 59 percent, below the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, employees at the rank of police officer were involved in the majority of Animal Shooting incidents, with 87 out of 92 employees, or 95 percent. The rank of sergeant comprised the second largest category with three personnel, or three percent, during the same five-year period.

### OFFICER RANK

In 2015, eight employees at the rank of police officer were involved in Animal Shooting incidents, represent all employees, or 100 percent, for the year. When compared to the 2014 total of 10, police officers were involved in two, or 20 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 19.75 of police officers, 2015 was 11.75 police officers, or 59 percent, below the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, employees at the rank of police officer were involved in the majority of Animal Shooting incidents, with 87 out of 92 employees, or 95 percent. The rank of sergeant comprised the second largest category with three personnel, or three percent, during the same five-year period.
OFFICER AREA/DIVISION ASSIGNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Area/Bureau</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Traffic Divisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three Department personnel assigned to 77th Street Division were involved in an Animal Shooting incident in 2015, which represented 38 percent of the eight total officers. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of one 77th Street Division officer involved in Animal Shooting incidents. The 2015 total was 1.5 officers below the annual average of 4.5 involved 77th Street Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

Two Department personnel assigned to Newton Division were involved in an Animal Shooting incident in 2015, which represented 25 percent of the eight total officers. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Newton Division officers involved in Animal Shooting incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was 1.25 officers above the annual average of 0.75 involved Newton Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

The remaining three involved Department personnel, or 38 percent, for 2015 were assigned to Devonshire Division, Harbor Division, and Hollywood Division.

The following is the officer Bureau assignment for the 14 total personnel involved in Animal Shooting incidents for 2015:

- South Bureau: four personnel, or 50 percent;
- Central Bureau: two personnel, or 25 percent;
- Valley Bureau: one personnel, or 12.5 percent;
- West Bureau: one personnel, or 12.5 percent;
- CTSOB: zero personnel; and,
- Other: zero personnel.
OFFICER UNIT ASSIGNED

In 2015, officers assigned to patrol were involved in the most Animal Shooting incidents with seven out of eight employees, or approximately 88 percent. One officer was categorized as “unknown,” pending completion of the initial FID investigation. When compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 12 patrol officers, 2015 was five patrol officers, or 42 percent, below the four year annual average.

OFFICER INJURIES

No Department personnel were killed during Animal Shooting incidents from 2011 through 2015. However, two officers sustained injuries during incidents in 2014.

OFFICER WEAPON SYSTEM

In the five year period from 2011 through 2015, shotguns were the second most frequently used weapon system utilized by Department personnel, comprising of eight out of 92 weapons used, or nine percent. During the same five year period, rifles were not utilized during Animal Shooting incidents.
In 2015, 12 rounds were fired during Animal Shooting incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of 27, rounds fired during Animal Shooting incidents decreased by 15 rounds, or 56 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 42.5 rounds fired, 2015 was 30.5 rounds, or 72 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, a total of 12 rounds were fired during Animal Shooting incidents with all rounds, or 100 percent, fired from handguns. When compared to the 2014 total of 27, rounds fired from handguns decreased by 15 rounds, or 56 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 40 rounds fired from handguns, 2015 was 28 rounds, or 70 percent, below the four year annual average.

The 2015 total number of shotgun rounds fired also fell below the four year annual average of 2.5 rounds by 2.5 rounds, or 100 percent. No rounds were fired by a rifle during any of the Animal Shooting incidents in the five year period from 2011 through 2015.
In 2015, the average shooting distance for Animal Shooting incidents was 4.9 feet. When compared to the 2014 average shooting distance of 5.6 feet, 2015 was 0.7 feet, or 12 percent, below the 2014 average. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average shooting distance of 6.1 feet, 2015 was 1.2 feet, or 20 percent, below the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, 2011 experienced the highest average shooting distance of 6.6 feet.
## ADJUDICATION

### ADJUDICATION IN-POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tactics**

All eight Animal Shooting incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Tactics finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, 10 out of 10, or 100 percent, of Animal Shooting adjudications were “Tactical Debrief” findings for Tactics.

The 2014 percentage for “Tactical Debrief” findings for the Tactics portion of Animal Shooting incidents exceeded the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 99 percent by one percentage point.

**Drawing and Exhibiting**

All eight Animal Shooting incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Drawing and Exhibiting finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, 10 out of 10, or 100 percent, of Animal Shooting adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Drawing and Exhibiting.

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Drawing and Exhibiting portion of Animal Shooting incidents remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent.

**Lethal Force**

All eight Animal Shooting incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Lethal Force finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, 10 out of 10, or 100 percent, of Animal Shooting adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Lethal Force.

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Lethal Force portion of Animal Shooting incidents remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent.

---

### CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE, ANIMAL SHOOTINGS

---

## ADJUDICATION OUT OF POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tactics**

All eight Animal Shooting incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Tactics finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, 10 out of 10, or 100 percent, of Animal Shooting adjudications were “Tactical Debrief” findings for Tactics.

The 2014 percentage for “Tactical Debrief” findings for the Tactics portion of Animal Shooting incidents exceeded the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 99 percent by one percentage point.

**Drawing and Exhibiting**

All eight Animal Shooting incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Drawing and Exhibiting finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, 10 out of 10, or 100 percent, of Animal Shooting adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Drawing and Exhibiting.

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Drawing and Exhibiting portion of Animal Shooting incidents remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent.
ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS

In 2015, Department personnel were involved in three Carotid Restraint Control Hold (CRCH) incidents, which was an increase of two incidents, or 200 percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there were a total of four CRCH incidents, resulting in an annual average of one incident. The total 2015 count exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by two incidents, or 200 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carotid Restraint Control Hold</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUREAU OF OCCURRENCE

CENTRAL BUREAU

In 2015, one of the Department’s CRCH incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was the same compared to 2014. Thirty-three percent of the Department’s CRCH incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department – three; Central Bureau – one). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, one CRCH incident occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.25 incidents. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.75 incidents, or 300 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOUTH BUREAU

In 2015, one of the Department’s CRCH incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was an increase of one incident compared to 2014. Thirty-three percent of the Department’s CRCH incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department – three; South Bureau – one). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, no CRCH incidents occurred in South Bureau.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALLEY BUREAU

In 2015, one of the Department’s CRCH incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was an increase of one incident compared to 2014. Thirty-three percent of the Department’s CRCH incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department – three; Valley Bureau – one). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, two CRCH incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.5 incidents. The total Valley Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.5 incidents, or 50 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WEST BUREAU

In 2015, none of the Department’s CRCH incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was the same compared to 2011 through 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

In 2015, all three of the Department’s CRCH incidents originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. From 2011 through 2014, radio calls and off-duty incidents were the only sources of CRCH incidents, each accounting for two, or 50 percent, of the four total incidents during the four year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Person Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MONTH OF OCCURRENCE

In 2015, two of the three CRCH incidents, or 67 percent, occurred in December. The remaining incident, or 33 percent, occurred in August.

From 2011 through 2015, the Department’s seven CRCH incidents were fairly evenly distributed throughout the 12 calendar months. August and December had the most CRCH incidents, with two incidents, or 29 percent, in each month during the five year period. March, May, and November had the second most CRCH incidents, with one incident, or 14 percent, in each month during the same five year period.

The percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis for the period of 2011 through 2015 was as follows:

- October through December: Three CRCH incidents; 43 percent,
- July through September: Two CRCH incidents; 29 percent,
- January through March: One CRCH incident; 14 percent, and
- April through June: One CRCH incident; 14 percent.
**DAY OF OCCURRENCE**

In 2015, Monday, Wednesday, and Saturday each had one CRCH incident, or approximately 33 percent, while Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday did not have any CRCH incidents.

From 2011 through 2015, Sunday had the most CRCH incidents, with two out of seven total incidents, or 29 percent. Tuesday and Friday each had one incident, or 14 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIME OF OCCURRENCE**

In 2015, one CRCH incident, or approximately 33 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while two incidents, or approximately 67 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

From 2011 through 2014, one CRCH incident, or 25 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and three incidents, or 75 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The five year average for 2011 through 2015 was 0.4 CRCH incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and one incident between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600 - 1759</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 - 0559</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFFICER INFORMATION OFFICER ETHNICITY**

In 2015, four Hispanic officers were involved in CRCH incidents, which represented 80 percent of the five total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, Hispanic officers were involved in four more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.25 involved Hispanic officers, 2015 was 3.75 Hispanic officers above the four year annual average.

In 2015, one White officer was involved in a CRCH incident, which represent 20 percent of the five total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, White officers were involved in one more incident in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.5 involved White officers, 2015 was 0.5 White officers, or 100 percent, above the four year annual average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICER GENDER

In 2015, five male officers, or 100 percent, and no female officers were involved in CRCH incidents, for a total of five involved officers.

When compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of one involved male officer, 2015 was four male officers, or 400 percent, above the four year annual average. The four year annual average of zero involved female officers equaled the number of involved female officers in 2015.

From 2011 through 2015, all nine officers involved in CRCH incidents were male.

---

OFFICER YEARS OF SERVICE

There were increases in three of the five categories and two that experienced no change in 2015 compared to 2014. The following represent these changes:

- Less than one year of service – no change at zero officers (zero in 2014, zero in 2015);
- 1-5 years of service – increase of one officer (zero in 2014, one in 2015);
- 6-10 years of service – increase of one officer (zero in 2014, one in 2015);
- 11-20 years of service – increase of two officers (one in 2014, three in 2015), or 200 percent; and,

From 2011 through 2015, officers with 11-20 years of service were the group with the most officers involved in CRCH incidents, with five out of nine total involved officers, or 56 percent. Officers with 1-5 years of service were the group with the second most officers involved in CRCH incidents with two officers, or 22 percent. Officers with 6-10 years of service and officers with more than 20 years of service were the groups with the third most officers involved in CRCH incidents with one officer each, or 11 percent. Officers with less than one year of service were not involved in any CRCH incidents during the five year period.
OFFICER UNIT ASSIGNED

In 2015, the five officers, or 100 percent, involved in CRCH incidents were assigned to Patrol. When compared to the 2014 total of one, patrol officers were involved in four, or 400 percent, more incidents in 2015.

From 2011 through 2015, seven of the nine total officers, or 78 percent, involved in CRCH incidents were assigned to Patrol. The remaining two officers, or 22 percent, were off-duty at the time of the incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER AREA/DIVISION ASSIGNED

Two Department personnel assigned to Central Division were involved in a CRCH incident in 2015, which represented 40 percent of the five total officers. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Central Division officers involved in CRCH incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was two officers above the annual average of zero involved Central Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

Two Department personnel assigned to North Hollywood Division were involved in a CRCH incident in 2015, which represented 40 percent of the five total officers. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero North Hollywood Division officers involved in CRCH incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was two officers above the annual average of zero involved North Hollywood Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

One Department personnel assigned to Harbor Division was involved in a CRCH incident in 2015, which represented 20 percent of the five total officers. There was an increase of one officer when compared to the 2014 total of zero Harbor Division officers involved in CRCH incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was one officer above the annual average of zero involved Harbor Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.

The following is the officer Bureau assignment for the five total personnel involved in CRCH incidents for 2015:

- Valley Bureau: two personnel, or 40 percent;
- Central Bureau: two personnel, or 40 percent;
- South Bureau: one personnel, or 20 percent;
- CTSOB: zero personnel;
- West Bureau: zero personnel; and,
- Other: zero personnel.
OFFICER RANK

From 2011 through 2015, all nine officers, or 100 percent, involved in CRCH incidents were of the rank of police officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER INJURIES\(^{16}\)

From 2011 through 2015, no officers were killed during CRCH incidents. However, seven out of seven officers, or 100 percent, were injured.

In 2015, three officers sustained injuries during, or as a result of, CRCH incidents, which represented no change compared to 2014. When compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of one injured officer, 2015 was two officers, or 100 percent, above the four year annual average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT INFORMATION

SUSPECT ETHNICITY

In 2015, one suspect was Black, one suspect was Hispanic, and one suspect was of an unknown ethnicity, pending completion of the initial investigation by FID.

From 2011 through 2015, Hispanic suspects were the largest ethnic group involved in CRCH incidents, consisting of three out of the seven total suspects, or 43 percent. Black suspects were the second largest ethnic group representing two suspects, or 29 percent. One suspect was White, or 14 percent, and one suspect was of an unknown ethnicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{16}\) The total number of injured officers exceeds the number of involved officers as some did not have force findings, and was therefore, excluded.
**SUSPECT GENDER**

From 2011 through 2015 all seven suspects were male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUSPECT AGE**

In 2015, two of the three suspects, or 67 percent, involved in CRCH incidents were in the 24-29 years of age group. When compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.5 suspects, 2015 was 1.5 suspects, or 150 percent, above the four year annual average.

The additional suspect in 2015, representing 33 percent, was in the 50-59 years of age group, which was the only incident involving an individual of that age range in the five year period from 2011-2015.

For the period of 2011 through 2015, suspects between the ages of 24-29 were the most represented age group with four out of seven suspects, or 57 percent. The following age groups contained one suspect, or 14 percent, during the same five year period:

- 18-23;
- 30-39; and,
- 50-59.

No suspects were represented in the following age group categories during the five year period:

- 0-17;
- 40-49; and,
- 60 and above.

**SUSPECT WEAPON**

In 2015, three out of three suspects, or 100 percent, utilized physical force during CRCH incidents.

From 2011 through 2015, seven out of a total of seven suspects, or 100 percent, utilized physical force, resulting in the utilization of a CRCH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon Type</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged Weapon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Device</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replica/Pellet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUSPECT INJURIES

In 2015, two suspects sustained injuries and one was categorized as having unknown injuries pending the completion of the initial investigation by FID. When compared to the 2014 total of one, the number of injured suspects increased by one suspect, or 100 percent, in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of one injured suspect, 2015 was one injured suspect, or 100 percent, above the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, no suspects were killed during CRCH incidents. Six suspects, or 86 percent, however, sustained injuries during, or as a result of CRCH incidents.

ADJUDICATION

Tactics
All three CRCH incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Tactics finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, one adjudicated Tactics finding resulted in a “Tactical Debrief” outcome for the one closed 2014 CRCH incident, representing 100 percent “Tactical Debrief” findings.

The 2014 percentage for “Tactical Debrief” findings for the Tactics portion of the one CRCH incident remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent.

Lethal Force
All three CRCH incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Lethal Force finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, one adjudicated Lethal Force finding resulted in an “In Policy (No Further Action)” outcome for the one closed 2014 CRCH incident, representing 100 percent “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings.

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Lethal Force portion of CRCH incidents remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent.
ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS

In 2015, one Department employee was involved in a Head Strike incident, which was a decrease of two incidents, or 67 percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there were a total of six Head Strike incidents, resulting in an annual average of 1.5 Head Strike incidents. The total 2015 count was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.5 incidents, or approximately 33 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Strike</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

In 2015, the one Head Strike incident currently has an unknown source of activity designation, as the incident is still being investigated by FID. For the period from 2011 through 2014, radio calls, observation stops and pre-planned activities were the primary sources of the six total Head Strike incidents, evenly distributed amongst the categories with two incidents, or 33 percent, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Person Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Planned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUREAU OF OCCURRENCE

CENTRAL BUREAU

In 2015, none of the Department’s Head Strike incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was a decrease of two incidents, or 100 percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, three Head Strike incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.75 incidents. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.75 incidents, or 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTH BUREAU

In 2015, none of the Department’s Head Strike incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, no Head Strike incidents occurred in South Bureau. The total South Bureau count for 2015 was equal to the 2011 through 2014 average with no Head Strike incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALLEY BUREAU

In 2015, one of the Department’s Head Strike incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was an increase of one incident compared to 2014. One hundred percent of the Department’s Head Strike incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department - one; Valley Bureau - one). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, one Head Strike incident occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.25 incidents per year. The total Valley Bureau count for 2015 exceed the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.75 incidents, or approximately 300 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEST BUREAU

In 2015, none of the Department’s Head Strike incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was a decrease of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, two Head Strike incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.5 incidents. The total West Bureau count for 2015 fell below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.5 incidents, or 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTSIDE JURISDICTION

In 2015, none of the Department’s Head Strike incidents occurred outside of the Department’s jurisdiction, which was the same as in the four year period from 2011 through 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside Jurisdiction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MONTH OF OCCURRENCE

In 2015, the single Head Strike incident occurred in May. From 2011 through 2015, the seven Head Strike incidents were fairly evenly distributed throughout the 12 calendar months, except for the month of May, which accounted for two incidents, or 29 percent. February, March, June, August, and October, had one incident, or 14 percent, during the same five year period.

The percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis for the period of 2011 through 2015 was as follows:
- April through June: Three Head Strikes; 43 percent,
- January through March: Two Head Strikes; 29 percent,
- July through September: One Head Strike; 14 percent; and,
- October through December: One Head Strikes; 14 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAY OF OCCURRENCE

From 2011 through 2015, the seven Head Strike incidents occurred during the following days of the week:
- Tuesday: two incidents, 29 percent;
- Wednesday: one incident, 13 percent;
- Friday: two incidents, 29 percent; and,
- Sunday: two incidents, 29 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIME OF OCCURRENCE

In 2015, the one Head Strike incident occurred during nighttime hours, or 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m. No incidents occurred during daytime hours, or 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m.

During the four year period from 2011 through 2014, four Head Strike incidents, or 66 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while two incidents, or 33 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The five year annual average for 2011 through 2015 was 0.4 Head Strike incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and one incident between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600 - 1759</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 - 0559</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICER INFORMATION

OFFICER ETHNICITY

In 2015, one White officer was involved in a Head Strike incident, which represented 100 percent of the total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, White officers were involved in one more incident in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.25 involved White officers, 2015 was 0.75 White officers, or 300 percent, above the four year annual average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER GENDER

In 2015, one male officer, or 100 percent, and no female officers were involved in Head Strike incidents, for a total of one involved officer.

There was a decrease of one officer in 2015 when compared to the 2014 total of two officers. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 1.25 male officers, 2015 was 0.25 male officers below the four year annual average.

When compared to the 2014 total of one, female officers were involved in one, or 100 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.25 female officers, 2015 was 0.25 female officers below the four year annual average.

2014 annual average of 0.25 female officers, 2015 was 0.25 female officers below the four year annual average.

Consistently over the five year period from 2011 through 2015, the majority of officers involved in Head Strike incidents were male, comprising of six out of seven employees, or 86 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER YEARS OF SERVICE

In 2015, the only Department employee involved in a Head Strike incident was in the 11-20 years of service category. When compared to 2014, there was no change in the number of officers in the 11-20 years of service category. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of one involved officer in the 11-20 years of service category, there was no change in the number of involved officers in 2015.

Additionally, from 2011 through 2015, officers in the 11-20 years of service category represented five, or 71 percent, out of seven total employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OFFICER RANK

From 2011 through 2015, all Department personnel involved in Head Strike incidents were of the rank of police officer. When compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 1.5 involved police officers, 2015 was 0.5 police officers, or 33 percent, below the four year annual average.

### OFFICER UNIT ASSIGNED

In 2015, the only officer involved in a Head Strike incident was assigned to patrol. When compared to the 2014 total of three, patrol officers were involved in two, or 67 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of one involved patrol officer, there was no change in the number of involved patrol officers in 2015. During the five year period from 2011 through 2015, most personnel involved in Head Strike incidents were patrol officers, with five out of seven total employees, or 71 percent.

### OFFICER AREA/DIVISION ASSIGNED

One Department personnel assigned to Mission Division was involved in a Head Strike incident in 2015, which represented the only Head Strike incident throughout the City for the year. There was an increase of one officer when compared to the 2014 total of zero Mission Division officers involved in Head Strike incidents. The 2015 total was one officer above the annual average of zero involved Mission Division officers for the period of 2011 through 2014.
OFFICER INJURIES

No Department employees were killed during Head Strike incidents for the period of 2011 through 2015. However, two officers sustained injuries in 2014, which was the only year personnel were reported to have sustained injuries in the same five year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT INFORMATION

SUSPECT ETHNICITY

In 2015, the only suspect involved in a Head Strike incident was Hispanic. When compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of one Hispanic suspect, there was no change in 2015. From 2011 through 2015, five out of seven suspects, or 71 percent, were Hispanic. In the same five year period, one Black (in 2012) and one White (in 2011) suspect were involved in a Head Strike incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT GENDER

In 2015, the suspect’s gender is currently categorized as “unknown,” pending the completion of the initial FID investigation. From 2011 through 2014, male suspects were overwhelmingly represented with five, or 83 percent, out of six total suspects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT AGE

In 2015, the suspect’s age is currently categorized as unknown pending the completion of the initial FID investigation. From 2011 through 2015, most of the suspects involved in Head Strike incidents were 30-39 years of age, accounting for three out of six suspects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUSPECT WEAPON

In 2015, the suspect’s weapon is currently categorized as “unknown,” pending completion of the initial FID investigation. For the period from 2011 through 2015, three out of seven suspects, or 43 percent, used physical force.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon Type</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged Weapon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Device</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replica/Pellet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT INJURIES

In 2015, one suspect has an injury currently categorized as “unknown,” pending completion of the initial FID investigation. When compared to the 2014 total of three, two fewer suspects, or 67 percent, were injured in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 1.5 injured suspects, 2015 was 0.5 suspects, or 33 percent, below the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, an annual average of 1.2 suspects involved in Head Strike incidents were injured as a result of police action each year. No suspects died during or as a result of Head Strike incidents during the same five year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ADJUDICATION**

**Tactics**
The one Head Strike incident in 2015 is currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Tactics finding information is not available.

In 2014, two out of three, or 67 percent, of Head Strike adjudications were “Tactical Debrief” findings for Tactics. One finding, or 33 percent, was “Administrative Disapproval”.

The 2014 percentage for “Tactical Debrief” findings for the Tactics portion of Head Strike incidents fell below the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent by 33 percentage points.

**Less Lethal Force**
The one Head Strike incident in 2015 is currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Less Lethal Force finding information is not available.

In 2014, none of the three Head Strike incidents received Less Lethal Force findings.

In 2011, two out of two, or 100 percent, of Head Strike adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Less Lethal Force, which were the only Less Lethal Force findings for all Head Strike incidents from 2011 through 2014.

**Lethal Force**
The one Head Strike incident in 2015 is currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Lethal Force finding information is not available.

In 2014, two out of three, or 67 percent, of Head Strike adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Lethal Force. One finding, or 33 percent, was “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).”

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Lethal Force portion of Head Strike incidents fell below the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent by 33 percentage points.

---

**ADJUDICATION IN-POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADJUDICATION OUT OF POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2015, Department personnel were involved in 12 In-Custody Death (ICD) incidents, which was an increase of eight incidents, or 200 percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there were a total of 21 ICD incidents, resulting in an annual average of 5.25 incidents. The total 2015 count exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 6.75 incidents, or approximately 129 percent.

In 2015, five of the Department’s 12 ICD incidents, or 42 percent, originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. Two incidents, or 17 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (e.g. pedestrian and traffic stops). The remaining five incidents, or 42 percent, occurred during incidents designated as “other” pending completion of the initial FID investigation. From 2011 through 2015, radio calls and observation stops were the most significant sources of ICD incidents, accounting for 45 percent and 21 percent, respectively.
In 2015, five of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was an increase of two incidents, or 67 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 42 percent of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department – 12; Central Bureau – five). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 11 ICD incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.75 incidents. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 2.25 incidents, or approximately 82 percent.

In 2015, three of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was an increase of three incidents compared to 2014. Twenty-five percent of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department – 12; South Bureau – three). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, two ICD incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.5 incidents. The total South Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 2.5 incidents, or 500 percent.

In 2015, three of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was an increase of two incidents, or 200 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 25 percent of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department – 12; Valley Bureau – three). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, seven ICD incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.75 incidents. The total Valley Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 1.25 incidents, or approximately 71 percent.
WEST BUREAU

In 2015, one of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was an increase of one incident compared to 2014. Approximately eight percent of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred in West Bureau (Department – 12; West Bureau – one).

In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, one ICD incident occurred in West Bureau in 2012, resulting in an annual average of 0.25 incidents. The total West Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.75 incidents, or approximately 300 percent.

OUTSIDE JURISDICTION

In 2015, none of the Department’s ICD incidents occurred outside of the Department’s jurisdiction, which was the same as in 2011 through 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2015, June and December were the two months with the most ICD incidents, with three incidents each month, or 50 percent collectively, out of the 12 total incidents for the year. The remaining six incidents were fairly evenly distributed throughout the remaining calendar months.

From 2011 through 2015, the Department’s 33 ICD incidents were most prevalent between the months of March through July, wherein 21 of the Department’s 33 ICD incidents, or 64 percent, occurred.

For the same five year period, June experienced the highest number of ICD incidents, with six incidents, or 18 percent. April and December had the second most with five incidents, or 15 percent, in each month for the same five year period.

The percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis for the period of 2011 through 2015 was as follows:

- April through June: 14 ICD incidents; 42 percent,
- July through September: Eight ICD incidents; 24 percent,
- October through December: Seven ICD incidents; 21 percent, and
- January through March: Four ICD incidents; 12 percent.

In 2015, four out of 12 ICD incidents, or 33 percent, occurred on Thursday. Monday, Wednesday, and Friday were the second most active days, with two ICD incidents, or 17 percent, each day. Saturday and Sunday each had one ICD incident, or eight percent, each day. No ICD incidents occurred on Tuesday.

From 2011 through 2015, Monday had the most ICD incidents, with nine out of 33 incidents, or 27 percent. Thursday had the second most incidents, with seven incidents, or 21 percent. Wednesday, Saturday and Sunday had the third most incidents, with four incidents, or 12 percent, in each day.
TIME OF OCCURRENCE

In 2015, the ICD incidents were fairly evenly distributed between day and night, or the two time-frames used within this report. Five incidents, or 42 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while seven incidents, or 58 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The time distribution was consistent during the four year period from 2011 through 2014, where nine ICD incidents, or 43 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while 12 incidents, or 57 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The five-year annual average for 2011 through 2015 was 2.8 ICD incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while 3.8 incidents between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

OFFICER INFORMATION

OFFICER GENDER

In 2015, 12 male officers, or 92 percent, and one female officer, or eight percent, were involved in ICD incidents, for a total of 13 involved officers.

When compared to the 2014 total of 13, male officers were involved in one, or eight percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 1.5 female officers, 2015 was 0.5 female officers, or 33 percent, below the four year annual average.

When compared to 2014, there was no change in the total number of involved female officers. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 1.5 female officers, 2015 was 0.5 female officers, or 33 percent, below the four year annual average.

Consistently over the five year period from 2011 through 2015, the majority of officers involved in ICD incidents were male, representing 86 out of the 93 total personnel, or 92 percent. For the same five year period, females comprised of seven involved personnel, or eight percent.
In 2015, six Hispanic officers were involved in ICD incidents, which represented 46 percent of the 13 total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of eight, Hispanic officers were involved in two, or 25 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 11.25 involved Hispanic officers, 2015 was 5.25 Hispanic officers, or 47 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, three White officers were involved in ICD incidents, which represented 23 percent of the 13 total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of four, White officers were involved in one, or 25 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 6.25 involved White officers, 2015 was 3.25 White officers, or 52 percent, below the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, officers with 1-5 years and 6-10 years of service represented the largest percentage of officers involved in ICD incidents, with 31 employees in each group (93 total officers involved for the five year period), or 33 percent. Officers with 11-20 years of service were the second largest group with 16 officers, or approximately nine percent, followed by officers with less than one year of service, which had seven officers, or approximately eight percent.
OFFICER RANK

In 2015, 13 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in ICD incidents, representing all employees, or 100 percent, for the year. When compared to the 2014 total of 11, two more police officers, or 18 percent, were involved in ICD incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 17.75 police officers involved, 2015 was 4.75 police officers, or 27 percent, below the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, police officers consisted of the highest number of personnel involved in ICD incidents with 84 out of 93 employees, or 90 percent. The rank of sergeant consisted of the second highest with five personnel, or five percent.

OFFICER UNIT ASSIGNED

In 2015, all 13 officers involved in ICD incidents were assigned to patrol. When compared to the 2014 total of nine, four more patrol officers, or approximately 45 percent, were involved in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 14.5 patrol officers, 2015 was 1.5 patrol officers, or 10 percent, below the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, patrol officers were overwhelmingly the largest personnel group involved in ICD incidents, with a total of 71, or 76 percent, out of 93 employees. Personnel assigned to Custody Services Division were the second most represented group with 11 employees, or 12 percent, followed by officers assigned to Specialized Units with eight employees, or approximately nine percent.
Six Department personnel assigned to Harbor Division were involved in an ICD incident in 2015, which represented 46 percent of the 13 total officers. There was an increase of six officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Harbor Division officers involved in ICD incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was six officers above the annual average of zero involved Harbor Division officers for the period from 2011 through 2014.

Five Department personnel assigned to Pacific Division were involved in an ICD incident in 2015, which represented 38 percent of the 13 total officers. There was an increase of five officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Pacific Division officers involved in ICD incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was five officers above the annual average of zero involved Pacific Division officers for the period from 2011 through 2014.

Two Department personnel assigned to Southeast Division were involved in an ICD incident in 2015, which represented 15 percent of the 13 total officers. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Southeast Division officers involved in ICD incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was 0.5 officers above the annual average of 1.5 involved Southeast Division officers for the period from 2011 through 2014.
In 2015, ten male suspects, or 83 percent, and two female suspects, or 17 percent, were involved in ICD incidents, for a total of 12 suspects.

When compared to the 2014 total of four, male suspects were involved in six, or 150 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 4.75 male suspects, 2015 was 5.25 male suspects, or approximately 111 percent, above the four year annual average.

When compared to the 2014 total of zero, female suspects were involved in two more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.5 female suspects, 2015 was 1.5 female suspects, or 300 percent, above the four year annual average.

Over the five year period between 2011 and 2015, male suspects were overwhelmingly represented during ICD incidents with 29 out of 33 total suspects, or 88 percent.
In 2015, six of the 12 suspects, or 50 percent, involved in ICD incidents were White. When compared to the 2014 total of one, White suspects were involved in five, or 500 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 1.25 White suspects, 2015 was 4.75 White suspects, or 380 percent, above the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, 11 out of the 33 total suspects, or 33 percent, were White.

In 2015, four of the 12 suspects, or 33 percent, involved in ICD incidents were Hispanic. When compared to the 2014 total of three, Hispanic suspects were involved in one, or 33 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 2.25 Hispanic suspects, 2015 was 1.75 Hispanic suspects, or 77 percent, above the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, 13 out of 33 suspects, or 39 percent, were Hispanic.

In 2015, two out of the 12 suspects, or 17 percent, involved in ICD incidents were Black. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, Black suspects were involved in two more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.25 Black suspects, 2015 was 0.25 Black suspects, or approximately 14 percent, above the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, nine out of 33 suspects, or 27 percent, were Black.
SUSPECT PERCEIVED MENTAL ILLNESS

In 2015, none of the 12 suspects involved in ICD incidents, or zero percent, had indication(s) of mental illness. The 2015 percentage of suspects who had an indication(s) of mental illness experienced a year-to-year decrease of 25 percent when compared to 25 percent in 2014. Additionally, the 2015 percentage fell below the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 14 percent by 14 percentage points.

The following details the 2015 suspect totals by age group compared to their respective annual average for the period from 2011 through 2014:

- 0-17 – 2015: zero, Average: zero;
- 18-23 – 2015: zero, Average: 0.5; 100 percent decrease;
- 24-29 – 2015: one, Average: 0.25; 300 percent increase;
- 30-39 – 2015: three, Average: 2.25; 33 percent increase;
- 40-49 – 2015: four, Average: one; 300 percent increase;
- 50-59 – 2015: two, Average: one; 100 percent increase; and,
- 60 and above – 2015: zero, Average: 0.25; 100 percent decrease.

SUSPECT AGE

In 2015, four out of 12 suspects involved in ICD incidents, or 33 percent, were within the age group of 40-49. This particular category experienced a year-over-year increase of two suspects, or 100 percent, compared to the 2014 total of two.

The following number of suspect totals and percentage changes occurred between 2014 and 2015 for each age group:

- 0-17 – 2014: zero, 2015: zero;
- 24-29 – 2014: zero, 2015: one;
- 30-39 – 2014: one, 2015: three; 200 percent increase;
- 40-49 – 2014: two, 2015: four; 100 percent increase;
- 50-59 – 2014: one, 2015: two; 100 percent increase; and,
SUSPECT UNDER THE INFLUENCE

Of the 12 suspects who died as a result of ICD incidents in 2015, six decedents, or 50 percent, were identified as being under the influence of a controlled substance. Five decedents, or 42 percent, currently have an unknown under the influence designation, pending completion of the investigation by FID. In 2014, all four decedents, or 100 percent, were determined to be under the influence of a controlled substance. The 2014 total was 12 percentage points above the 2011 through 2013 annual percentage average of 88 percent.

Of the five pending 2015 ICD cases, three had an indication of being under the influence of alcohol and/or narcotics.

SUSPECT WEAPON

In 2015, three out of 12 suspects, or 25 percent, used physical force during ICD incidents. During one ICD incident, or eight percent, the weapon type was categorized as “unknown,” and in eight, or 67 percent, the suspects were believed to have died from causes other than those attributed to Department related force, and thus no weapon was used.

From 2011 through 2015, a total of 14 out of 33 suspects involved in ICD incidents, or 42 percent, used physical force. For the same period, three suspects, or nine percent, used an edge weapon. Fourteen suspects are believed to have died from causes other than those attributed to Department related force during the same five year period, and thus no weapon was used.
In 2015, three of the 12 decedents involved in ICD incidents, or 25 percent, died as a result of an overdose. Two decedents, or 17 percent, died from suicide. One decedent, or eight percent, died as a result of police force, and thus their death was ruled a homicide. An additional decedent, or eight percent, died from accidental causes. The determination of the cause and manner of death for five remaining decedents in 2015, or 42 percent, are still pending per the Coroner’s Office.

In 2015, three of the 12 decedents involved in ICD incidents, or 25 percent, died as a result of an overdose. Two decedents, or 17 percent, died from suicide. One decedent, or eight percent, died as a result of police force, and thus their death was ruled a homicide. An additional decedent, or eight percent, died from accidental causes. The determination of the cause and manner of death for five remaining decedents in 2015, or 42 percent, are still pending per the Coroner’s Office.

Overdose related ICD incidents in 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 2.5 deaths by 0.5 decedents, or 20 percent. Suicides also exceeded the four year annual average of one death by one decedent, or 100 percent. One accidental death and one homicide related incident in 2015 exceeded the four year average of 0.75, respectively, by 0.25 decedents, or 33 percent.

During the five year period from 2011 through 2015, overdoses were the most frequent causes of death of decedents involved in ICD incidents with a count of 16 out of 33 individuals, or 48 percent. Suicides comprised of the second highest cause of death with six decedents, or 18 percent. Accidental deaths and homicides were the third most frequent cause/manner of deaths for the five year period, comprising of four decedents each, or 12 percent. One death was ruled undetermined per the Coroner’s Office in 2012.

5 Additional information was received subsequent to the printing of the 2015 Use of Force Year-End Review Executive Summary, which reclassified the cause/manner of death for one of the ICD incidents from an overdose to a homicide. The County of Los Angeles Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner indicated in the autopsy report that the decedent died as a result of being under the influence of narcotics (cocaine), pre-existing medical conditions, and from the use of a Department TASER.
ADJUDICATION

ADJUDICATION IN-POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tactics**

All 12 ICD incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Tactics finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, 13 out of 14, or 93 percent, of ICD adjudications were “Tactical Debrief” findings for Tactics. One finding, or seven percent, was “Administrative Disapproval.”

The 2014 percentage for “Tactical Debrief” findings for the Tactics portion of ICD incidents fell below the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 97 percent by four percentage points.

**Less Lethal Force**

All 12 ICD incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Lethal Force finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, none of the four ICD incidents received Lethal Force findings.

In 2012, one ICD adjudication was an “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” finding for Lethal Force, which was the only Lethal Force finding for all ICD incidents from 2011 through 2014.

**Non-Lethal Force**

All 12 ICD incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Non-Lethal Force finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, 13 out of 13, or 100 percent, of ICD adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Non-Lethal Force.

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Non-Lethal Force portion of ICD incidents exceeded the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 98 percent by two percentage points.

**ADJUDICATION OUT OF POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2014 percentage for “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” finding for Lethal Force, which was the only Lethal Force finding for all ICD incidents from 2011 through 2014.
ANNUAL DEPARTMENT TOTALS

In 2015, Department personnel were involved in five K9 Contact incidents, which was an increase of two incidents, or 67 percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there was a total of eight K9 Contact incidents, resulting in an annual average of approximately two incidents. The total 2015 count exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by three incidents, or approximately 150 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K-9 Contact</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

In 2015, one of the Department’s K9 Contact incidents, or 20 percent, originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. One incident, or 20 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (e.g. pedestrian and traffic stops). One incident, or 20 percent, occurred during a pre-planned operation (e.g. search warrant). The remaining two incidents, or 40 percent, occurred during incidents designated as “other.” From 2011 through 2015, radio calls and observation stops were the most significant sources of K9 Contact incidents, accounting for 38 percent and 23 percent respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Person Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Planned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BURO UE OF OCCURRENCE

CENTRAL BUREAU

In 2015, one of the Department’s K9 Contact incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was a decrease of one incident, or 50 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 20 percent of the Department’s K9 Contact incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department – five; Central Bureau – one). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, three K9 Contact incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.8 incidents. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.2 incidents, or approximately 25 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2015, two of the Department’s K9 Contact incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 40 percent of the Department’s K9 Contact incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department – five; South Bureau – two). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, two K9 Contact incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.5 incidents. The total South Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 average by 1.5 incidents, or approximately 300 percent.

In 2015, one of the Department’s K9 Contact incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 20 percent of the Department’s K9 Contact incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department – five; Valley Bureau – one). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, one K9 Contact incident occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.3 incidents. The total Valley Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.7 incidents, or approximately 233 percent.

In 2015, one of the Department’s K9 Contact incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was an increase of one incident, or 100 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 20 percent of the Department’s K9 Contact incidents occurred in West Bureau (Department – five; West Bureau – one). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, one K9 Contact incident occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.3 incidents. The total West Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.7 incidents, or approximately 233 percent.

In 2015, none of the Department’s K9 Contact incidents occurred outside of the Department’s jurisdiction, which was the same as in 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, one K9 Contact incident occurred outside of the Department’s jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 0.3 incidents. The total K9 Contact incidents outside of the Department’s jurisdiction for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.3 incidents, or 100 percent.
MONTH OF OCCURRENCE

In 2015, three of the five K9 Contact incidents, or 60 percent, occurred in May. The remaining two incidents, or 40 percent collectively, occurred in June and August.

From 2011 through 2015, the Department’s K9 Contact incidents were fairly evenly distributed throughout the 12 calendar months. May had the most K9 Contact incidents with a total of three, or 23 percent, during the five year period. February, July, and August had the second most K9 Contact incidents with a total of two incidents, or 15 percent, in each month for the same five year period.

The percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis for the period of 2011 through 2015 was as follows:

- April through June: Five K9 Contacts; 39 percent,
- July through September: Four K9 Contacts; 31 percent,
- January through March: Three K9 Contacts; 23 percent,
- October through December: One K9 Contact; eight percent.

DAY OF OCCURRENCE

In 2015, three, or 60 percent, of the five K9 Contact incidents occurred on Friday. Monday and Tuesday each had one incident, or 20 percent, on each day. Sunday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Saturday did not represent any incidents in 2015.

From 2011 through 2015, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday had the most K9 Contact incidents, with two incidents, or 25 percent, each day. Tuesday and Thursday had the second most incidents, with one incident, or approximately 13 percent, each day. Sunday and Monday did not have any incidents from 2011 through 2015.
TIME OF OCCURRENCE

In 2015, K9 Contact incidents predominantly occurred at night. Four, or 80 percent, of the incidents occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m., while one incident, or 20 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m.

However, the time distribution was inversed during the four year period from 2011 through 2014, where seven K9 Contact incidents, or 88 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while one incident, or 13 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

OFFICER INFORMATION

OFFICER GENDER

In 2015, all personnel involved in K9 Contact incidents were male.

When compared to the 2014 total of three, male officers were involved in two, or 67 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of two male officers, 2015 was three, or 150 percent, above the four year annual average.

In the five year period between 2011 through 2015, all officers involved in K9 Contact incidents were male.

OFFICER ETHNICITY

In 2015, three Asian/Pacific Islander officers were involved in K9 Contact incidents, which represented 60 percent of the five total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of one, Asian/Pacific Islander officers were involved in two, or 200 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.5 involved Asian/Pacific Islander officers, 2015 was 2.5 Asian/Pacific Islander officers, or 500 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, two White officers were involved in K9 Contact incidents, which represented 40 percent of the five total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of one, White officers were involved in one, or 100 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of one White officer, 2015 was one White officer, or 100 percent, above the four year annual average.
OFFICER YEARS OF SERVICE

The categories below depict the 2014 and 2015 totals in addition to the year-to-year percentage changes:

- Less than one year of service – no change (zero in 2014, zero in 2015);
- 1-5 years of service – no change (zero in 2014, zero in 2015);
- 6-10 years of service – no change (zero in 2014, zero in 2015);
- 11-20 years of service – increase of one officer (three in 2014, four in 2015), or 33 percent; and,
- More than 20 years of service – increase of one officer (zero in 2014, one in 2015).

From 2011 through 2015, officers with 11-20 years of service were the group representing the largest percentage of officers involved in K9 Contact incidents, with ten officers (13 total officers for the five year period), or 77 percent. Officers with 20 or more years of service were the second largest group with three officers, or 23 percent.

OFFICER RANK

All 13 employees involved in K9 Contact incidents for the period of 2011 through 2015 were of the rank of police officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICER AREA/DIVISION ASSIGNED

All Department personnel involved in a K9 Contact incident in 2015 were assigned to Metropolitan Division, which is consistent with the fact that Metropolitan Division (in addition to Gangs and Narcotics Division) personnel are the only employees who are assigned canines. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of three Metropolitan Division officers involved in K9 Contact incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was three officers above the annual average of two involved Metropolitan Division officers during the four year period from 2011 through 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Area/Bureau</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmewood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miraleon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PacIFD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whisbro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Traffic Divisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER UNIT ASSIGNED

All K9 Contact incidents between 2011 and 2015 occurred with officers assigned to Metropolitan Division, with 13 total involved officers. It should be noted that personnel assigned to Metropolitan Division (in addition to Gangs and Narcotics Division) are the only department employees who deploy canines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICER INJURIES

No officers were killed during K9 Contact incidents during the period from 2011 through 2015. However for the same five year period, two out of 13 officers, or 15 percent, sustained injuries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT INFORMATION

SUSPECT GENDER

From 2011 through 2015, 12 out of 13 suspects, or 92 percent, were male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT ETHNICITY

In 2015, three Hispanic suspects were involved in K9 Contact incidents, which represented 60 percent of the five total suspects. When compared to the 2014 total of two Hispanic suspects, Hispanic suspects were involved in one, or 50 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of one Hispanic suspect, 2015 was two Hispanic suspects, or 200 percent, above the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, seven out of 13 suspects, or 54 percent, were Hispanic.

In 2015, one White suspect was involved in a K9 Contact incident, which represented 20 percent of the five total suspects. When compared to the 2014 total of zero, White suspects were involved in one more incident in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.5 White suspects, 2015 was 0.5 White suspects, or 100 percent, above the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, three out of 13 suspects, or 23 percent, were White.

In 2015, no Black suspects were involved in K9 Contact incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of one, Black suspects were involved in one, or 100 percent, fewer incident in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.5 Black suspects, 2015 was 0.5 Black suspects, or 100 percent, below the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, two out of 13 suspects, or 15 percent, were Black.

From 2011 through 2015 no other ethnic groups were involved in K9 Contact incidents.
SUSPECT AGE

In 2015, most suspects involved in K9 Contact incidents were in the 18-23 years of age group. Specifically, two of the five suspects, or 40 percent, were included in this category, which was an increase by two individuals compared to the 2014 total of zero.

The following number of suspect totals and percentage changes occurred between 2014 and 2015 for each age group:

- 0-17 – 2014: zero, 2015: one; 100 percent increase;
- 18-23 – 2014: zero, 2015: two; 200 percent increase;
- 24-29 – 2014: one, 2015: zero; 100 percent decrease;
- 30-39 – 2014: one, 2015: zero; 100 percent decrease;
- 40-49 – 2014: one, 2015: one; no percentage change;
- 50-59 – 2014: zero, 2015: zero; no percentage change; and,
- 60 and above – 2014: zero, 2015: zero; no percentage change.

The following details the 2015 suspect totals by age group compared to their respective annual average for the period of 2011 through 2014:

- 0-17 – 2015: one, Average: zero; 100 percent increase;
- 18-23 – 2015: two, Average: 0.25; 700 percent increase;
- 24-29 – 2015: zero, Average: 0.25; 100 percent de-
crease;
- 30-39 – 2015: zero, Average: one; 100 percent de-
crease;
- 40-49 – 2015: one, Average: 0.25; 300 percent in-
crease;
- 50-59 – 2015: zero, Average: 0.25; 100 percent de-
crease; and,
- 60 and above – 2015: zero, Average: zero; no percent-
age change.

From 2011 through 2015, the 30-39 age group represented four out of the total 13 suspects, or 31 percent, involved in K9 Contact incidents. The 18-23 age group was the second largest, with three suspects, or 23 percent, followed by the 40-49 age group with two suspects, or 15 percent.
SUSPECT WEAPON

In 2015, the most frequently used weapon type by suspects during K9 Contact incidents was physical force. One suspect, or 20 percent, of the five suspects used physical force. Three suspects, or 60 percent, used an unknown type of weapon.

From 2011 through 2015, two out of 13 suspects involved in K9 Contact incidents, or 15 percent, used physical force. For the same period, one suspect, or eight percent, was armed with a firearm. Four suspects, or 31 percent, were armed with an unknown type of weapon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon Type</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged Weapon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Device</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replica/Pellet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT INJURIES

In 2015, four suspects sustained injuries as a result of K9 contacts. From 2011 through 2015, no suspects died as a result of K9 Contact incidents. However, 12 suspects were injured as a result of K9 Contact incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADJUDICATION

Tactics
All five K9 Contact incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Tactics finding information is not available for the year.

Of the three K9 Contact incidents in 2014, no Tactics findings were adjudicated.

In 2013, one K9 Contact adjudication was a “Tactical Debrief” finding for Tactics, which was the only Tactics finding for all K9 Contact incidents from 2011 through 2014.

Deployment of K9
All five K9 Contact incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, K9 Deployment finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, three out of three, or 100 percent, of K9 Contact adjudications were “consistent with established criteria” findings for K9 Deployment.

The 2014 percentage for “consistent with established criteria” findings for the K9 Deployment portion of K9 Contact incidents remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent.

Contact of K9
All five K9 Contact incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, K9 Contact finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, three out of three, or 100 percent, of K9 Contact adjudications were “consistent with established criteria” findings for K9 Contact.

The 2014 percentage for “consistent with established criteria” findings for the K9 Contact portion of K9 Contact incidents remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent.

Post K9 Contact Procedures
All five K9 Contact incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Post K9 Contact Procedures finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, three out of three, or 100 percent, of K9 Contact adjudications were “consistent with established criteria” findings for Post K9 Contact Procedures.

The 2014 percentage for “consistent with established criteria” findings for the Post K9 Contact Procedure portion of K9 Contact incidents remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent.

Other Issues
In 2014, one K9 Contact adjudication received a “consistent with established criteria” finding for Other Issues identified, which was the only “Other Issues” finding for all K9 Contact incidents from 2011 through 2014.

---

ADJUDICATION IN-POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-9 Deployment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-9 Contact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-9 Post Contact Procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-9 Other Issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJUDICATION OUT OF POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-9 Deployment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-9 Contact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-9 Post Contact Procedures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-9 Other Issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
In 2015, Department personnel were involved in 14 LE-RII incidents, which was the same number of incidents as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there were a total of 34 LERII incidents, resulting in an annual average of 8.5 incidents. The 2015 count exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 5.5 incidents, or approximately 65 percent.

In 2015, nine of the Department’s 14 LERII incidents, or 64 percent, originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. Three incidents, or 21 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observation (e.g. pedestrian and traffic stops). The remaining two incidents, or 14 percent, occurred during private person calls. From 2011 through 2015, radio calls and observation stops were the most significant sources of LERII incidents, accounting for 59 percent and 35 percent, respectively.
In 2015, four of the Department’s LERII incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was a decrease of one incident, or 20 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 29 percent of the Department’s LERII incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department – 14; Central Bureau – four). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 13 LERII incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 3.25 incidents. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.75 incidents, or approximately 23 percent.

In 2015, three of the Department’s LERII incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was an increase of one incident, or 50 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 21 percent of the Department’s LERII incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department – 14; South Bureau – three). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, four LERII incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of one incident. The total South Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by two incidents, or 200 percent.

In 2015, five of the Department’s LERII incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was an increase of one incident, or 25 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 36 percent of the Department’s LERII incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department – 14; Valley Bureau – five). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, seven LERII incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.75 incidents. The total Valley Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 3.25 incidents, or approximately 186 percent.
In 2015, two of the Department’s LERII incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was a decrease of one incident, or 33 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 14 percent of the Department’s LERII incidents occurred in West Bureau (Department – 14; West Bureau – two). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, ten LERII incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 2.5 incidents. The total West Bureau count for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.5 incidents, or 20 percent.

In 2015, none of the Department’s LERII incidents occurred outside of the Department’s jurisdiction, which was the same as in 2011 through 2014.
In 2015, July had the most LERII incidents with four out of 14 total incidents for the year, or 29 percent. February had the second most incidents with three incidents, or 21 percent. May and September had the third most incidents with two incidents, or 29 percent collectively. The remaining three incidents occurred in June, August, and October.

From 2011 through 2015, the Department’s 48 LERII incidents were fairly evenly distributed throughout the 12 calendar months. May and July had the most LERII incidents, with nine incidents, or 19 percent, occurring in each month. February had the second most incidents, with six incidents, or 13 percent. August, September, October, and November each had four incidents, or eight percent.

The percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis for the period from 2011 through 2015 was as follows:

- July through September: 17 LERII incidents; 35 percent,
- April through June: 13 LERII incidents; 27 percent,
- January through March: Nine LERII incidents; 19 percent; and,
- October through December: Nine LERII incidents; 19 percent.
In 2015, four, or 29 percent, of the 14 LERII incidents occurred on Friday. Thursday and Saturday were the second most active days with three incidents, or 21 percent, each day. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Sunday each had one incident, or seven percent, each day.

From 2011 through 2015, Thursday had the most LERII incidents, with 11 out of the 48 total incidents, or 23 percent. Tuesday had the second most incidents, with eight incidents, or 17 percent. Monday had the fewest incidents with three, or six percent.

In 2015, LERII incidents occurred most frequently during the day. Nine incidents, or 64 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while five incidents, or 36 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

However, LERII incidents occurred most frequently at night during the period from 2011 through 2014, where 13 LERII incidents, or 38 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while 21 incidents, or 62 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The five year annual average from 2011 through 2015 was 4.4 LERII incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and 5.2 incidents between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.
In 2015, 32 male officers, or 94 percent, and one female officer, or three percent, were involved in LERII incidents, for a total of 33 involved officers.

When compared to the 2014 total of 62, male officers were involved in 30, or 48 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 31 male officers, 2015 was one male officer, or three percent, above the four year annual average.

When compared to the 2014 total of six, female officers were involved in five, or 83 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 2.25 female officers, 2015 was 1.25 female officers, or 56 percent, below the four year annual average.

Consistently over the five year period from 2011 through 2015, the majority of officers involved in LERII incidents were male. From 2011 to 2015, 156 male officers, or 93 percent, and 10 female officers, or six percent, were involved in LERII incidents, for a total of 167 officers.

In 2015, twenty-one Hispanic officers were involved in LERII incidents, which represented 62 percent of the 34 total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of 29, Hispanic officers were involved in eight, or 28 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 16.25 involved Hispanic officers, 2015 was 4.75 Hispanic officers, or 29 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, seven White officers were involved in LERII incidents, which represented 21 percent of the 34 total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of 34, White officers were involved in 27, or 79 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 12.75 involved White officers, 2015 was 5.75 officers, or 45 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, three Black officers were involved in LERII incidents, which represented nine percent of the 34 total officers. When compared to 2014, there was no change in the total number of involved Black officers. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 2.25 involved Black officers, 2015 was 0.75 officers, or 33 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, two Asian/Pacific Islander officers and one officer with an unknown ethnicity, or nine percent collectively, represented the remaining personnel involved in LERII incidents.
OFFICER YEARS OF SERVICE

The categories below depict the 2014 and 2015 totals in addition to the year-over-year percentage changes:

- Less than one year of service – increase by one officer (two in 2014, three in 2015), or 50 percent;
- 1-5 years of service – decrease by two officers (nine in 2014, seven in 2015), or 22 percent;
- 6-10 years of service – decrease by 22 officers (36 in 2014, 14 in 2015), or 61 percent;
- 11-20 years of service – decrease by 13 officers (19 in 2014, six in 2015), or 68 percent; and,
- More than 20 years of service – increase by one officers (two in 2014, three in 2015), or 50 percent.

From 2011 through 2015, officers with 6-10 years of service were the group representing the largest percentage of officers involved in LERII incidents, with 71 out of the 167 total officers, or 43 percent. Officers with 11-20 years of service were the second largest group with 42 employees, or 25 percent. Officers with 1-5 years of service were the third largest group with a 33 officers, or 20 percent. Categories involving officers with less than one year of service and more than 20 years of service each comprised of 10 involved officers, or six percent.

OFFICER RANK

In 2015, 33 employees at the rank of police officer were involved in LERII incidents, which represented 97 percent of the 34 total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of 66, police officers were involved in 33, or 50 percent, fewer LERII incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 32 police officers, 2015 was 1.2 police officers, or four percent, above the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, employees at the rank of police officer were involved in the majority of LERII incidents, with a total of 160 out of 167 employees, or 96 percent. The rank of sergeant comprised the second largest category with a total of four employees, or two percent, during the same five-year period.
Thirteen Department personnel assigned to Central Division were involved in a LERII incident in 2015, which represented 38 percent of the 34 total officers. There was an increase of five officers when compared to the 2014 total of eight Central Division officers involved in LERII incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was 9.75 officers above the annual average of 3.25 involved Central Division officers for the four year period from 2011 through 2014.

Four Department personnel assigned to Mission Division were involved in a LERII incident in 2015, which represented 12 percent of the 34 total officers. There was an increase of four officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Mission Division officers involved in LERII incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was 3.5 officers above the annual average of 0.5 involved Mission Division officers for the four year period from 2011 through 2014.

Three Department personnel assigned to Foothill Division were involved in a LERII incident in 2015, which represented nine percent of the 34 total officers. There was an increase of three officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Foothill Division officers involved in LERII incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was three officers above the annual average of zero involved Foothill Division officers for the four year period from 2011 through 2014.

Three Department personnel assigned to Hollywood Division were involved in a LERII incident in 2015, which represented nine percent of the 34 total officers. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of one Hollywood Division officer involved in a LERII incident. The 2015 total was 1.25 officers below the annual average of 4.25 involved Hollywood Division officers for the four year period from 2011 through 2014.

The remaining 11 Department personnel, or 32 percent, were assigned to 77th Street Division, North Hollywood Division, Northeast Division, Olympic Division, Southeast Division, Van Nuys Division, and Metropolitan Division.

The following is the officer Bureau assignment for the 34 total personnel involved in LERII incidents for 2015:

- Central Bureau: 14 personnel, or 41 percent;
- Valley Bureau: 11 personnel, or 32 percent;
- West Bureau: five personnel, or 15 percent;
- South Bureau: three personnel, or nine percent;
- CTSOB: one personnel, or three percent; and,
- Other: zero personnel.
In 2015, officers assigned to patrol were involved in the most LERII incidents with 30 out of 34 employees, or approximately 88 percent. When compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 26.75 patrol officers, 2015 was 3.25 patrol officers, or 12 percent, above the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, patrol officers were overwhelmingly the largest personnel group involved in LERII incidents, with 137 officers out of the 167 total, or 82 percent. Officers assigned to specialized units were the second most represented group with 24 officers, or 14 percent. Officers assigned to Metropolitan Division and Investigative functions both comprised of three involved employees in the five year period, or two percent.

In 2015, five Department personnel sustained injuries during LERII incidents. When compared to the 2014 total of 16, 11 fewer Department personnel sustained injuries in 2015. Additionally, the 2015 total of five Department personnel was the same as the 2011 through 2014 annual average.

No Department personnel were killed during LERII incidents for the period from 2011 through 2015. However, 25 sustained injuries during the same five year period.
In 2015, 13 male suspects, or 93 percent, and one female suspect, or seven percent, were involved in LERII incidents, for a total of 14 suspects.

When compared to the 2014 total of 11, male suspects were involved in two, or 18 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 7.75 male suspects, 2015 was 5.25 male suspects, or 68 percent, above the four year annual average.

When compared to the 2014 total of three, female suspects were involved in two, or 67 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 0.75 female suspects, 2015 was 0.25 female suspects, or 33 percent, above the four year annual average.

From 2011 through 2015, male suspects were overwhelmingly represented with 44, or 92 percent, out of 48 total suspects.

In 2015, eight Hispanic suspects were involved in LERII incidents, which represented 57 percent of the 14 total suspects. When compared to the 2014 total of six, Hispanic suspects were involved in two, or 33 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 7.75 male suspects, 2015 was 5.25 male suspects, or 68 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, three Black suspects were involved in LERII incidents, which represented 21 percent of the total 14 suspects. When compared to the 2014 total of five, Black suspects were involved in two, or 40 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 2.25 Black suspects, 2015 was 0.75 Black suspects, or 33 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, three White suspects were involved in LERII incidents, which represented 21 percent of the total 14 suspects. When compared to the 2014 total of two, White suspects were involved in one, or 50 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 2.5 White suspects, 2015 was 0.5 White suspects, or 20 percent, above the four year annual average.

The Asian/Pacific Islander category comprised of two suspects, or four percent, during 2011 through 2015. The ethnicity of one suspect in 2015 is unknown pending completion of the initial investigation by FID.
SUSPECT AGE

In 2015, five of the 14 suspects, or 36 percent, involved in LERII incidents were in the 24-29 years of age group, which was an increase of three suspects, or 150 percent, from 2014. Additionally, five of the 14 suspects, or 36 percent, involved in LERII incidents were in the 40-49 years of age group, which was an increase of two suspects, or 67 percent, from 2014.

The following number of suspect totals and percentage changes occurred between 2014 and 2015 for each age group:

- **0-17** – 2014: zero, 2015: zero;
- **18-23** – 2014: one, 2015: two; 100 percent increase;
- **24-29** – 2014: two, 2015: five; 150 percent increase;
- **30-39** – 2014: five, 2015: two; 60 percent decrease;
- **40-49** – 2014: three, 2015: five; 66 percent increase;
- **50-59** – 2014: two, 2015: zero; and
- **60 and above** – 2014: one, 2015: zero.

The following details the 2015 suspect totals by age group compared to their respective annual average for the period from 2011 through 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and Above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2011 through 2015, the 40-49 age group represented 14 out of 48 total suspects, or 29 percent, involved in LERII incidents. The 24-29 age group, as well as the 30-39 age group, were the second largest groups, with 11 suspects, or 23 percent, each. The 18-23 age group had five suspects, or 10 percent.

SUSPECT PERCEIVED MENTAL ILLNESS

In 2015, one of the 14 suspects involved in LERII incidents, or seven percent, had indication(s) of mental illness. The 2015 percentage of suspects who had an indication(s) of mental illness experienced a year-over-year decrease of 15 percentage points when compared to 29 percent in 2014. Additionally, the 2015 percentage fell below the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 18 percent by four percentage points.
In 2015, physical force was the most frequently used weapon type by suspects during LERII incidents, comprising of six, or 43 percent, of the 14 suspects. The following represent the additional suspects and their respective categories, along with their percentages for 2015:

- Firearm – one suspect, or seven percent;
- Edged weapon – one suspect, or seven percent;
- Unknown weapon – one suspect, or seven percent;
- Other – three, or 21 percent; and,
- No weapon – two, or 14 percent.

From 2011 through 2015, a total of 32 out of 48 suspects in LERII incidents, or 67 percent, used physical force. For the same period, four suspects, or eight percent, were armed with an edged weapon. Three suspects, or six percent, were armed with weapons classified as “other.” Two suspects, or four percent, were not armed with a weapon and one suspect’s weapon is unknown.

As the category indicates, LERII incidents are those wherein suspects sustained injuries as a result of Department action. Thus, suspects who died during incidents as a result of force used by Department personnel are categorized in the In-Custody Death (ICD) section.

In 2015, 14 suspects sustained injuries during LERII incidents. As such, there was no change when compared to 2014. The number of suspects injured during LERII incidents in 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 8.25, by 5.75 suspects, or 70 percent.

2014 and 2015 experienced the highest number of injured suspects with 14.
ADJUDICATION

ADJUDICATION IN-POLICY

Tactics
All 14 LERII incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Tactics finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, 65 out of 68, or 96 percent, of LERII adjudications were “Tactical Debrief” findings for Tactics. Three findings, or four percent, were “Administrative Disapproval.”

The 2014 percentage for “Tactical Debrief” findings for the Tactics portion of LERII incidents exceeded the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 89 percent by seven percentage points.

Non-Lethal Force
All 14 LERII incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Non-Lethal Force finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, 57 out of 59, or 97 percent, of LERII adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Non-Lethal Force. Two findings, or three percent, were Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval).

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Non-Lethal Force portion of LERII incidents fell below the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 98 percent by one percentage point.

Less Lethal Force
All 14 LERII incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Less Lethal Force finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, 15 out of 15, or 100 percent, of LERII adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Less Lethal Force.

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Less Lethal Force portion of LERII incidents remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent.

Lethal Force
All 14 LERII incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Lethal Force finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, two out of two, or 100 percent, of LERII adjudications were “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” findings for Lethal Force.

The 2014 percentage for “Out of Policy (Administrative Disapproval)” findings for the Lethal Force portion of LERII incidents was a contrast to the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent “In Policy (No Further Action).”
In 2015, Department personnel were involved in eight Unintentional Discharge incidents, which was a decrease of one incident, or 11 percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there were a total of 40 Unintentional Discharge incidents, resulting in an annual average of 10 incidents. The total 2015 count was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by two incidents, or 20 percent.

In 2015, four of the Department’s eight Unintentional Discharge incidents, or 50 percent, occurred during on-duty tactical situations (field operation circumstances wherein deployment of the weapon system was warranted). Three, or approximately 38 percent, occurred during on-duty non-tactical situations (e.g. non-field operation circumstances – conducting a weapon check, cleaning the weapon, etc.). Lastly, one incident, or approximately 13 percent, occurred during an officer’s off-duty status.

From 2011 through 2015, on-duty non-tactical situations were the most significant source of Unintentional Discharge incidents, accounting for 23 incidents, or 48 percent, of the 48 total. Off-duty situations were the second most significant, accounting for 14 incidents, or approximately 29 percent. On-duty tactical situations were the third most significant, accounting for 11 incidents, or approximately 23 percent.
In 2015, one of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which represented no change compared to 2014. Approximately 13 percent of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department - eight; Central Bureau - one).

In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, eight Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of two incidents. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by one incident, or 50 percent.

In 2015, none of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was a decrease of three incidents compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, seven Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 1.75. The total South Bureau count for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 1.75 incidents, or 100 percent.

In 2015, three of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was no change compared to 2014. Approximately 38 percent of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department - eight; Valley Bureau - three). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 12 Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of three incidents. The total Valley Bureau count for 2015 equaled the 2011 through 2014 annual average.

In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, eight Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of two incidents. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by one incident, or 50 percent.
In 2015, three of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was an increase of three incidents compared to zero in 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, three Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 0.75 incidents. The total West Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 2.25 incidents, or 300 percent.

In 2015, one of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred outside the Department’s jurisdiction, which was a decrease of one incident, or 50 percent, compared to two in 2014. Approximately 13 percent of the Department’s Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in areas outside the Department’s jurisdiction (Department - eight; Outside Areas - one). In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 10 Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred in areas outside the Department’s jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 2.5 incidents. The total incident count for outside areas for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 1.5 incidents, or 60 percent.
In 2015, April and December had the most Unintentional Discharge incidents, with two incidents each month, or 50 percent collectively, out of the eight total incidents for the year. The remaining four incidents occurred sporadically throughout the year.

From 2011 through 2015, the months of April and December had the most Unintentional Discharge incidents, with seven occurring during each month, or approximately 15 percent, out of 48 total incidents for the five year period. July and November were the second most frequent, with five incidents occurring during each month, or 10 percent, during the same five year period.

The percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis from 2011 through 2015 is as follows:

- October through December: 16 Unintentional Discharges; 33 percent,
- April through June: 13 Unintentional Discharges; 27 percent,
- July through September: 11 Unintentional Discharges; 23 percent; and,
- January through March: eight Unintentional Discharges; 17 percent.
In 2015, four, or 50 percent, of the eight Unintentional Discharge incidents occurred on Wednesday. Sunday had the second most incidents, with two incidents, or 25 percent.

From 2011 through 2015, Wednesday had the most Unintentional Discharge incidents with 10 out of 48 total incidents, or 21 percent. Sunday the second most incidents, with nine incidents, or approximately 19 percent. Tuesday had the third most incidents, with eight incidents, or 17 percent.

In 2015, five Unintentional Discharge incidents, or 63 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while three incidents, or 37 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The time distribution during the period from 2011 through 2014 was consistent with the percentage distribution for 2015, where 23 Unintentional Discharge incidents, or 58 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., while 17 incidents, or 43 percent, occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The five year average for 2011 through 2015 was 5.6 incidents occurring between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m., and four incidents between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.
In 2015, five male officers, or approximately 63 percent, and three female officers, or approximately 38 percent, were involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents, for a total of eight involved officers.

When compared to the 2014 total of nine, male officers were involved in four, or 44 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 8.75 male officers, 2015 was 3.75 male officers, or 43 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, four White officers were involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents, which represented 50 percent of the eight total officers. When compared to the 2014 total of three, White officers were involved in one, or 33 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 3.25 involved White officers, 2015 was 0.75 White officers, or 23 percent, above the four year annual average.

In 2015, three Hispanic officers were involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents, which represented 38 percent of the eight total officers. When compared to 2014, there was no change in the total number of involved Hispanic officers in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of four involved Hispanic officers, 2015 was one Hispanic officer, or 25 percent, below the four year annual average.

One officer with an unknown ethnicity comprised of the remaining employee, or 13 percent, of the 2015 total of eight involved officers.
Compared to 2014, the following categories experienced changes in 2015:

- 1-5 years of service – increase of one officer (two in 2014, three in 2015), or 50 percent;
- 6-10 years of service – no change (three in 2014, three in 2015);
- 11-20 years of service – decrease of one officer (three officers in 2014, two in 2015), or 33 percent; and,

Officers with less than one year of service remained unchanged in 2015 from 2014 at zero.

From 2011 through 2015, officers with 11-20 years of service were the group representing the largest percentage of officers involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents, with 16 out of 48 officers, or 33 percent. Officers with one to five years of service were the second largest group with 15 employees, or 31 percent. Officers with six to 10 years of service were the third largest group with a total of 11 personnel, or 23 percent.

In 2015, seven employees at the rank of police officer were involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents, which represented 88 percent of the eight total employees. When compared to the 2014 total of eight, police officers were involved in one, or 12 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 8.5 police officers, 2015 was 1.5 police officers, or 18 percent, below the four year annual average.

In 2015, one detective, or approximately 13 percent of the eight total employees, was involved in an Unintentional Discharge, which was no change compared to 2014.

From 2011 through 2015, employees at the rank of police officer were involved in the majority of Unintentional Discharge incidents, with a total of 41 out of 48, or 85 percent. The rank of detective comprised the second largest category with a total of four employees, or eight percent, during the same five-year period.
Two Department personnel assigned to Rampart Division were involved in an Unintentional Discharge incident in 2015, which represented 25 percent of the eight total officers. There was an increase of two officers when compared to the 2014 total of zero Rampart Division officers involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents. In addition, the 2015 total was 1.5 officers above the annual average of 0.5 involved Rampart Division officers during the period from 2011 through 2014.

The remaining six Department personnel, or 75 percent, were assigned to Foothill Division, Harbor Division, Hollywood Division, Mission Division, Wilshire Division, and a Bureau assignment.

The following is the officer Bureau of assignment for the eight total personnel involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents for 2015:

- Central Bureau: two personnel, or 25 percent;
- Valley Bureau: two personnel, or 25 percent;
- West Bureau: two personnel, or 25 percent;
- South Bureau: one personnel, or 12.5 percent;
- Other: one personnel, or 12.5 percent; and,
- CTSOB: zero personnel.
In 2015, officers assigned to patrol were involved in the most Unintentional Discharge incidents with four out of eight employees, or 50 percent. When compared to the 2014 total of six, patrol officers were involved in two, or 33 percent, fewer incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 5.5 patrol officers, 2015 was 1.5 patrol officers, or 27 percent, below the four year annual average. From 2011 through 2015, patrol officers were involved in the most Unintentional Discharge incidents with 26 out of 48 total involved personnel, or 54 percent.

In 2015, officers assigned to specialized assignments were involved in the second most Unintentional Discharge incidents with two out of eight employees, or 25 percent. When compared to the 2014 total of one, officers assigned to specialized assignments were involved in one, or 100 percent, more incidents in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of one officer assigned to specialized assignments, 2015 was one officer, or 100 percent, above the four year annual average.

One officer assigned to an administrative function and one assigned to an investigative function, or 25 percent collectively, represent the two remaining employees of the eight total involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents in 2015.

No Department personnel died during or as a result of Unintentional Discharge incidents during 2011 through 2015. However, three sustained injuries during incidents in 2013 and 2014. No personnel were injured in 2015.
In 2015, six handguns were utilized in Unintentional Discharge incidents, which represented 75 percent out of the eight total weapons used. When compared to 2014, there was no change in the total number of handguns used in 2015. Additionally, when compared to the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 7.25 handguns used, 2015 was 1.25 handguns, or 17 percent, below the four year annual average.

Rifles comprised of the second most frequent weapon system with seven incidents, or approximately 15 percent. However, there were no incidents involving a rifle in 2015, and four incidents in 2012 caused an increase in the overall variance.

Unintentional Discharges involving a shotgun were the third most frequent during the five year period with six incidents, or approximately 13 percent.

From 2011 through 2015, 35 handguns were utilized in Unintentional Discharge incidents, which represented 73 percent out of the 48 total weapons used. In the same five year period, rifles were utilized in seven out of 48 weapons used, or 14 percent, and shotguns were utilized in six out of 48 weapons used, or approximately 13 percent.

In 2015, five of the eight incidents, or approximately 63 percent, involved Glock handguns. One incident, or approximately 13 percent, involved a Smith and Wesson handgun, and two incidents, or 25 percent, involved shotguns. 2015 accounted for the only incident involving a Smith and Wesson handgun in the five year period from 2011 through 2015.

Overwhelmingly in the five year period, Glock handguns represented the majority of weapon systems involved in Unintentional Discharge incidents with 27 out of 48 total weapons, or 56 percent.
In all Unintentional Discharges from 2011 through 2015, only one round was fired during each incident.
## ADJUDICATION
### ADJUDICATION IN-POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintentional Discharge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADJUDICATION OUT OF POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintentional Discharge</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tactics

All eight Unintentional Discharge incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Tactics finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, seven out of nine, or 78 percent, of Unintentional Discharge adjudications were “Tactical Debrief” findings for Tactics. Two findings, or 22 percent, were “Administrative Disapproval.”

The 2014 percentage for “Tactical Debrief” findings for the Tactics portion of Unintentional Discharge incidents fell below the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent by 22 percentage points.

### Drawing and Exhibiting

All eight Unintentional Discharge incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, Tactics finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, three out of three, or 100 percent, of Unintentional Discharge adjudications were “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Drawing and Exhibiting.

The 2014 percentage for “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for the Drawing and Exhibiting portion of Unintentional Discharge incidents remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent.

### Unintentional Discharge

All eight Unintentional Discharge incidents in 2015 are currently pending adjudication. Therefore, finding information is not available for the year.

In 2014, nine out of nine, or 100 percent, of Unintentional Discharge adjudications were “Negligent (Administrative Disapproval)” findings.

The 2014 percentage for “Negligent (Administrative Disapproval)” findings for Unintentional Discharge incidents remained consistent with the 2011 through 2013 annual average of 100 percent.
DEPARTMENT TOTALS

In 2015, Department personnel were not involved in any Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there was a total of one Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident, resulting in an annual average of approximately 0.25 incidents per year. The total 2015 count was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.25 incidents, or 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Lethal Force (Other)</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

From 2011 through 2015, the Department’s only Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident originated from a citizen flag-down.

From 2011 through 2015, no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurred in Central Bureau. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 was the same as the 2011 through 2014 annual average with no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurring during that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Person Call</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTH BUREAU

In 2015, no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurred in South Bureau. The total South Bureau count for 2015 was the same as the 2011 through 2014 annual average with no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurring during that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALLEY BUREAU

In 2015, no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurred in Valley Bureau. The total Valley Bureau count for 2015 was the same as the 2011 through 2014 annual average with no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurring during that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEST BUREAU

In 2015, no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, one Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident occurred in West Bureau. The total West Bureau count for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.25 incidents, or 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTSIDE JURISDICTION

In 2015, no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurred outside of the Department’s jurisdiction, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurred outside of the Department’s jurisdiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside Jurisdiction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MONTH OF OCCURRENCE

From 2011 through 2015, only July had a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident with one occurring in that month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAY OF OCCURRENCE

From 2011 through 2015, only Wednesday had a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident with one occurring on that day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIME OF OCCURRENCE

From 2011 through 2015, no Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurred between the hours of 6 a.m. and 5:59 p.m. During the same five year period, one Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600 - 1759</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 - 0559</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER INFORMATION

OFFICER GENDER

From 2011 through 2015, two Male officers were involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident. No female officers were involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER ETHNICITY

From 2011 through 2015, two White officers were involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident. No other ethnicities were involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICER YEARS OF SERVICE

From 2011 through 2015, the two officers involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident had between 11-20 years of service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER RANK

From 2011 through 2015, the two sworn employees involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident were of the rank of Police Officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER DIVISION OF ASSIGNMENT

From 2011 through 2015, the two sworn employees involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident were assigned to Metropolitan Division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Area/Bureau</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Traffic Divisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICER UNIT ASSIGNED

From 2011 through 2015, the two officers involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident were assigned to Metropolitan Division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER INJURIES

From 2011 through 2015, no officers were killed, but two officers were injured as a result of a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT INFORMATION

SUSPECT GENDER

From 2011 through 2015, one male suspect was involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident. No female suspects were involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT ETHNICITY

From 2011 through 2015, one White suspect was involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident. No other ethnicities were involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT AGE

From 2011 through 2015, one suspect between 18-23 years of age was involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident. No other age groups were involved in a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUSPECT WEAPON

From 2011 through 2015, one suspect used physical force during a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon Type</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edged Weapon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Device</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replica/Pellet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUSPECT INJURIES

From 2011 through 2015, one suspect was injured during a Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJUDICATION

In 2013, two Use of Lethal Force (Other) adjudications received “Tactical Debrief” findings for Tactics, which were the only Tactics findings representing the one Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident from 2011 through 2015.

In 2013, two Use of Lethal Force (Other) adjudications received “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Non-Lethal Force, which were the only Non-Lethal findings representing the one Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident from 2011 through 2015.

In 2013, two Use of Lethal Force (Other) adjudications received “In Policy (No Further Action)” findings for Lethal Force, which were the only Lethal findings representing the one Use of Lethal Force (Other) incident from 2011 through 2015.

No Use of Lethal Force (Other) incidents occurred in 2015, thus there are no pending adjudication findings for the year.

ADJUDICATION IN POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJUDICATION OUT OF POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEPARTMENT TOTALS

In 2015, Department personnel were not involved in any Warning Shot incidents, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there was a total of one Warning Shot incident, resulting in an annual average of 0.25 incidents per year. The total 2015 count was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.25 incidents, or 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warning Shot</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE OF ACTIVITY

From 2011 through 2015, the Department’s only Warning Shot incident occurred outside of the Department’s jurisdiction by an off-duty officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Person Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Planned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Call</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUREAU OF OCCURRENCE

CENTRAL BUREAU

In 2015, no Warning Shot incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, no Warning Shot incidents occurred in Central Bureau. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 was the same as the 2011 through 2014 annual average with no Warning Shot incidents occurring during that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTH BUREAU

In 2015, no Warning Shot incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, no Warning Shot incidents occurred in South Bureau. The total South Bureau count for 2015 was the same as the 2011 through 2014 annual average with no Warning Shot incidents occurring during that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALLEY BUREAU

In 2015, no Warning Shot incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, no Warning Shot incidents occurred in Valley Bureau. The total Valley Bureau count for 2015 was the same as the 2011 through 2014 annual average with no Warning Shot incidents occurring during that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEST BUREAU

In 2015, no Warning Shot incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, no Warning Shot incidents occurred in West Bureau. The total West Bureau count for 2015 was the same as the 2011 through 2014 annual average with no Warning Shot incidents occurring during that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTSIDE JURISDICTION

In 2015, no Warning Shot incidents occurred outside of the Department’s jurisdiction, which was the same as compared to 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, one Warning Shot incident occurred outside of the Department’s jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 0.25 incidents per year. The total incident count for outside areas for 2015 was below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 0.25 incidents, or 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside Jurisdiction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MONTH OF OCCURRENCE
From 2011 through 2015, December represented the only Warning Shot incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DAY OF OCCURRENCE
From 2011 through 2015, Friday represented the only Warning Shot incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TIME OF OCCURRENCE
From 2011 through 2015, one Warning Shot incident occurred between the hours of 6 p.m. and 5:59 a.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600 - 1759</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 - 0559</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OFFICER INFORMATION
### OFFICER GENDER
From 2011 through 2015, one Male officer was involved in a Warning Shot incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICER ETHNICITY

From 2011 through 2015, one Hispanic officer was involved in a Warning Shot incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER YEARS OF SERVICE

From 2011 through 2015, the one officer involved in a Warning Shot incident had between 11-20 years of service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER RANK

From 2011 through 2015, the one sworn employee involved in a Warning Shot incident was of the rank of Police Officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain and Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICER DIVISION OF ASSIGNMENT

From 2011 through 2015, the one sworn employee involved in a Warning Shot incident had an Area/Division of assignment designated as “Other Area.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Area/Bureau</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77th Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollenbeck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Nuys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West LA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Traffic Divisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICER UNIT ASSIGNED

From 2011 through 2015, the one officer involved in a Warning Shot incident was off-duty at the time of the incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Duty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICER INJURIES

From 2011 through 2015, no officers were killed or injured as a result of the one Warning Shot incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJUDICATION

The officer involved in the 2011 Warning Shot incident received an adjudication of “In Policy (No Further Action)” for Lethal Force.

No Warning Shot incidents occurred in 2015, thus there are no pending adjudication findings for the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJUDICATION IN POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJUDICATION OUT OF POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Exhibiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADJUDICATION OF Categorical Use of Force Incidents
The following represents the adjudication of CUOF incidents, for which a Notice to Correct Deficiencies, Extensive Retraining, and/or a Personnel Complaint were issued:

**NOTICE TO CORRECT**
In 2011, one Notice to Correct was imposed regarding an Unintentional Discharge incident.

**EXTENSIVE RETRAINING**
From 2011 through 2015, a total of 69 Extensive Retraining adjudicated findings were imposed. The following depicts the total number according to incident:

- UD: 38, or 55 percent;
- OIS Hit: 17, or 25 percent;
- OIS No Hit: nine, or 13 percent,
- ICD: two, or three percent;
- LERII: two, or three percent; and,
- Head Strikes: one, or one percent.

**PERSONNEL COMPLAINTS**
From 2011 through 2015, a total of 28 Personnel Complaint findings were imposed. The following depicts the totals and percentages according to incident:

- OIS No Hit: eight, or 29 percent;
- OIS Hit: seven, or 25 percent;
- UD: six, or 21 percent;
- ICD: three, or 11 percent;
- LERII: three, or 11 percent; and,
- Head Strikes: one, or three percent.

Of the 28 Personnel Complaints generated during the five year period as a result of Administrative Disapproval and/or Out of Policy findings regarding CUOF incidents, 24 were sustained and four are currently pending adjudication. The following depicts the breakdown of the 24 sustained Personnel Complaints for the five year period according to their respective adjudicated finding totals and percentages:

- Suspensions: 11 or 46 percent;
- Official Reprimands: seven, or 29 percent;
- Terminations: three, or 13 percent;
- Other: two, or eight percent; and,
- Admonishment: one four percent.
NON-CATEGORICAL

Use of Force Statistical Analysis
In 2015, Department personnel were involved in 1,825 NCUOF incidents, which was a decrease of 38 incidents, or two percent, compared to 2014. In the four year period of 2011 through 2014, there were a total of 7,153 NCUOF incidents, resulting in an annual average of approximately 1,788.

The total 2015 count exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 37 incidents, or approximately two percent.

The Department experienced a reduction in Level I incidents in 2015, when compared to 2014. Specifically, there were 133 Level I NCUOF incidents in 2015, which was 58 fewer than in 2014, or 30 percent. Seven percent of all NCUOF incidents were classified as Level I in 2015, compared to 10 percent in 2014.

Level I NCUOF incidents fell below the four-year annual average of 171 incidents during the period of 2011 through 2014, by 38 incidents, or 22 percent.

However, the Department experienced a minor increase in Level II incidents in 2015, when compared to 2014. Specifically, there were 1,692 Level II NCUOF incidents in 2015, which was 20 more than in 2014, or one percent. Ninety-three percent of all NCUOF incidents were classified as Level II in 2015, compared to 90 percent in 2014.

Level II NCUOF incidents exceeded the four-year annual average of 1,618 incidents during the period of 2011 through 2014, by 207 incidents, or 13 percent.
There were 1,825 NCUOF incidents in 2015. A TASER was deployed in 519 incidents, or 28 percent, of the 2015 NCUOF incidents, and beanbag shotguns were utilized in 71 incidents, or four percent. The TASER utilization percentage (per incident) increased by six percentage points in 2015, when compared to 22 percent in 2014, and the beanbag shotgun rate increased by one percentage point when compared to three percent in 2014. All other force options remained unchanged or decreased when compared to 2014.

When compared to the four-year period from 2011 through 2014, TASER usage in 2015 exceeded the annual average of 385 incidents by 134, or 35 percent. Beanbag shotguns exceeded the four-year annual average of 50 incidents by 21, or 42 percent.
In 2015, 1,006 of the Department’s 1,825 NCUOF incidents, or 55 percent, originated from radio calls generated by Communications Division. Five hundred and forty-nine incidents, or 30 percent, occurred during field detentions based on officers’ observations (e.g. pedestrian and traffic stops). The remaining 270 incidents, or 15 percent, transpired during private person calls, station calls, and incidents designated as “other.”

During the period of 2011 through 2014, radio calls and observation stops were the most significant sources of NCUOF incidents, accounting for 3,534 incidents out of 7,153, or 49 percent, and 2,481 incidents, or 35 percent, respectively.

The TASER effectiveness rate decreased significantly in 2015 when compared to 2014. The 1,101 TASER activations were effective 585 times, or 53 percent. In 2014, out of 818 activations, TASER activations were effective 522 times, or 64 percent.

In addition, 2015 experienced the lowest TASER effective rate in the five-year period from 2011 through 2015, with 2013 being the second lowest with 60 percent.
In 2015, 554 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred within the geographical area of Central Bureau, which was an increase of 22 incidents, or four percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 30 percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in Central Bureau (Department – 1,825; Central Bureau – 554).

In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 1,966 NCUOF incidents occurred in Central Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 492 incidents. The total Central Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 62 incidents, or approximately 13 percent.

In 2015, 473 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred within the geographical area of South Bureau, which was an increase of one incident, or less than one percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 26 percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in South Bureau (Department – 1,825; South Bureau – 473).

In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 1,865 NCUOF incidents occurred in South Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 466 incidents. The total South Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by approximately seven incidents, or two percent.
In 2015, 428 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred within the geographical area of Valley Bureau, which was a decrease of 87 incidents, or 17 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 23 percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in Valley Bureau (Department – 1,825; Valley Bureau – 428).

In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 1,944 NCUOF incidents occurred in Valley Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 486 incidents. The total Valley Bureau count for 2015 fell below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 58 incidents, or approximately 12 percent.

In 2015, 350 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred within the geographical area of West Bureau, which was an increase of 36 incidents, or 11 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately 19 percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in West Bureau (Department – 1,825; West Bureau – 350).

In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 1,273 NCUOF incidents occurred in West Bureau, resulting in an annual average of 318 incidents. The total West Bureau count for 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average by 32 incidents, or approximately 10 percent.
In 2015, 20 of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred outside the Department’s jurisdiction, which was a decrease of 10 incidents, or 33 percent, compared to 2014. Approximately one percent of the Department’s NCUOF incidents occurred in areas outside the Department’s jurisdiction (Department – 1,825; Outside Areas – 20).

In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, 105 NCUOF incidents occurred in areas outside the Department’s jurisdiction, resulting in an annual average of 26 incidents. The total incident count for outside areas for 2015 fell below the 2011 through 2014 annual average by six incidents, or approximately 23 percent.
In 2015, March and October were the two months with the highest number of NCUOF incidents, with 189 and 172 incidents, respectively, out of the annual total of 1,825. December and April had the lowest number of NCUOF incidents, with 135 and 136, respectively. The remaining eight months were close to the 2015 annual average of 152 incidents per month.

During the period of 2011 through 2015, the Department’s 8,978 NCUOF incidents were fairly evenly distributed throughout the 12 calendar months. The 2011 through 2015 monthly average was 150 incidents.

The percentage breakdown on a quarterly basis for the period of 2011 through 2015 was as follows:

- July through September: 2,305 NCUOF incidents; 26 percent,
- January through March: 2,282 NCUOF incidents; 25 percent,
- April through June: 2,256 NCUOF incidents; 25 percent; and,
- October through December: 2,135 NCUOF incidents; 24 percent.
Two hundred and eighty-six, or 16 percent, of the overall 1,825 NCUOF incidents occurred on a Wednesday in 2015. Saturday had the second most incidents, with 281 incidents, or 15 percent, followed by Thursday, with 276 incidents, or 15 percent. Monday and Tuesday experienced the fewest NCUOF incidents with a total of 216 incidents, or 12 percent, and 241 incidents, or 13 percent, respectively.

During the period of 2011 through 2015, Saturday had the overall highest count, with 1,405 out of the 8,978 total NCUOF incidents, or 16 percent.

In 2015, most NCUOF incidents (by percentage) occurred between the hours of 2000 and 2359 (8 p.m. and 11:59 p.m.). Specifically, 455 out of 1,825 incidents, or 25 percent, were reported during said hours. The category with the second most incidents was 1600 through 1959 hours (4 p.m. through 7:59 p.m.), with 406 incidents, or 22 percent. The fewest incidents occurred between the hours of 0400 and 0759 (4 a.m. through 7:59 a.m.), with 134 incidents, or seven percent.

These statistics were consistent throughout the five year period from 2011 through 2015.
In 2015, 4,983 male officers, or 90 percent, and 535 female officers, or 10 percent, for a total of 5,518 total officers, were involved in a NCUOF incident.

When compared to 2014, the number of male officers increased by 260 in 2015, or six percent, from 4,723 officers. The 2015 total was 552 officers, or approximately 12 percent, above the 2011 through 2014 average of 4,431 male officers per year.

Female officers increased by 27 officers, or five percent, in 2015 when compared to 508 officers in 2014. The 2015 total was 51 officers, or approximately 11 percent, above the 2011 through 2014 average of 484 female officers per year.

Two thousand nine hundred and ten Hispanic officers were involved in NCUOF incidents in 2015, which represented 53 percent of the 5,518 total officers. There was an increase of 278 officers, or 11 percent, when compared to the 2014 total of 2,632 Hispanic officers. In addition, the 2015 total was 478 officers, or 20 percent, above the annual average of 2,432 involved Hispanic officers during the period of 2011 through 2014.

One thousand seven hundred and eighteen White officers were involved in NCUOF incidents in 2015, which represented 31 percent of the 5,518 total officers. There was a decrease of 29 officers, or two percent, when compared to the 2014 total of 1,747 White officers. In addition, the 2015 total was 72 officers, or four percent, above the annual average of 1,646 involved White officers during the period of 2011 through 2014.

Four hundred and sixty-nine Asian officers were involved in NCUOF incidents in 2015, which represented nine percent of the 5,518 total officers. There was an increase of 29 officers, or seven percent, when compared to the 2014 total of 440 Asian officers. In addition, the 2015 total was 19 officers, or four percent, above the annual average of 450 involved Asian officers during the period of 2011 through 2014.

Three hundred and eighty-three Black officers were involved in NCUOF incidents in 2015, which represented seven percent of the 5,518 total officers. There was an increase of four officers, or one percent, when compared to the 2014 total of 379 Black officers. In addition, the 2015 total was 23 officers, or six percent, above the annual average of 360 involved Black officers during the period of 2011 through 2014.
**OFFICER RANK**

In 2015, of the total 5,518 employees involved in a NCUOF incident, 4,756, or 86 percent, were the rank of police officer. This was an increase of 148 officers, or three percent, compared to the 2014 total of 4,608.

In addition, the 2015 total was 386 employees, or nine percent, above the annual average of 4,370 involved police officers during the period of 2011 through 2014.

A total of 436 employees at the rank of sergeant were involved in NCUOF incidents in 2015, which represented an increase of 56 employees, or 15 percent, compared to the 2014 total of 380. This was 122 employees, or 39 percent, above the annual average of 314 involved sergeants during the period of 2011 through 2014.

During the five year period of 2011 through 2015, police officers were overwhelmingly the largest rank involved in NCUOF incidents, with a total of 22,237 officers, or 88 percent, out of 25,178.

---

**OFFICER UNIT ASSIGNED**

Officers assigned to patrol represented the largest portion of officers involved in NCUOF incidents, with 4,081 out of 5,518 employees, or 74 percent, in 2015. Patrol had a modest year-over-year increase from 3,985 officers in 2014 to 4,081 in 2015. The additional 96 employees resulted in a two percent increase. However, 2015 exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 3,818 officers by 263 employees, or seven percent.

Custody Services Division experienced the most significant increase of personnel involved in NCUOF incidents in 2015 when compared to 2014. Namely, Custody Services Division experienced an increase of 135 officers, or 54 percent, to 385 personnel in 2015 compared to 250 the preceding year. In addition, Custody Services Division exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 202 officers by 183 employees, or 91 percent, in 2015.

One hundred and eighty-three officers in administrative assignments were involved in NCUOF incidents in 2015. This was an increase of 60 officers, or 49 percent, when compared to the 2014 total of 123 officers. Further, administrative assignments exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 150 officers by 33 employees, or 22 percent, in 2015.

During the five year period of 2011 through 2015, patrol officers were overwhelmingly the largest personnel group involved in NCUOF incidents, with a total of 19,352 officers, or 77 percent, out of 25,178.
SUSPECT INFORMATION

SUSPECT ETHNICITY

Eight hundred and seventy Hispanic suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents in 2015, which represented 46 percent of the 1,894 total suspects. There was an increase of 26 suspects, or three percent, when compared to the 2014 total of 844 Hispanic suspects. In addition, the 2015 total was 31 suspects, or four percent, above the annual average of 839 involved Hispanic suspects during the period of 2011 through 2014.

Six hundred and fifty-two Black suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents in 2015, which represented 34 percent of the 1,894 total suspects. There was a decrease of 57 suspects, or eight percent, when compared to the 2014 total of 709 Black suspects. In addition, the 2015 total was five suspects, or one percent, below the annual average of 657 involved Black suspects during the period of 2011 through 2014.

Two hundred and seventy-eight White suspects were involved in NCUOF incidents in 2015, which represented 15 percent of the 1,894 total suspects. There was a decrease of 30 suspects, or 10 percent, when compared to the 2014 total of 308 White suspects. In addition, the 2015 total was five suspects, or one percent, below the annual average of 300 involved White suspects during the period of 2011 through 2014.

A combined total of 94 suspects, or five percent, with American Indian, Asian, other, or unknown ethnic designations comprised of the remaining sum for 2015.

OFFICER INJURIES

Six hundred and fifty employees sustained injuries as a result of NCUOF incident in 2015. This was an increase of 17 employees, or three percent, compared to the 2014 total of 633 injured officers.

The highest number of Department personnel injured during NCUOF incidents during the period of 2011 through 2015 occurred in 2012, with 670 for the year. The 2015 total remained consistent with the four year average of 650.5 officers injured during the period of 2011 through 2014.
In 2015, 1,598 out of 1,894 suspects, or 84 percent, were male. In comparison to 2014, the male suspect category decreased by 59 suspects, or four percent, in 2015 from 1,657 suspects the preceding year. Additionally, the 2015 total fell below the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 1,613 male suspects involved in NCUOF incidents by 15 individuals, or one percent.

In 2015, 291 out of 1,894 suspects, or 15 percent, were female. In comparison to 2014, the female suspect category increased by 17 suspects, or six percent, in 2015 from 274 suspects the preceding year. Additionally, the 2015 total exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 248 female suspects involved in NCUOF incidents by 43 individuals, or 17 percent.
Out of the 1,894 suspects involved in NCUOF incidents in 2015, the highest total were within the 23-37 age group; comprising of 414 individuals, or 22 percent. The following number of suspect totals and percentage changes occurred between 2014 and 2015 for each age group:

- 0-17 – 2014: 121, 2015: 91; 25 percent decrease;
- 18-22 – 2014: 381, 2015: 360; eight percent decrease;
- 23-27 – 2014: 400, 2015: 414; four percent increase;
- 33-37 – 2014: 203, 2015: 217; seven percent increase;
- 43-47 – 2014: 95, 2015: 91; four percent decrease;
- 53-57 – 2014: 51, 2015: 60; 18 percent increase; and,
- Unknown – 2014: eight, 2015: 16; 100 percent increase.

The following details the 2015 suspect totals by age group compared to their respective annual average for the period of 2011 through 2014:

- 0-17 – Average: 127, 2015: 91; 28 percent decrease;
- 18-22 – Average: 391, 2015: 360; eight percent decrease;
- 23-27 – Average: 361, 2015: 414; 15 percent increase;
- 28-32 – Average: 281, 2015: 301; seven percent increase;
- 33-37 – Average: 197, 2015: 217; 10 percent increase;
- 38-42 – Average: 153, 2015: 150; two percent decrease;
- 43-47 – Average: 131, 2015: 136; four percent increase;
- 48-52 – Average: 100, 2015: 91; nine percent decrease;
- 53-57 – Average: 71, 2015: 58; 18 percent decrease;
- 58 and Above – Average: 44, 2015: 60; 36 percent increase; and,
- Unknown – Average: 15, 2015: 16; seven percent increase.

From 2011 through 2015, the 18 to 22 age group represented the highest annual average of suspects involved in NCUOF incidents with 384 out of 1,875 individuals, or 20 percent. The 23-27 age group was the second highest with 372 individuals, or 20 percent. The 28-32 age group consisted of the third highest with 285 individuals, or 15 percent.
NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE

SUSPECT PERCEIVED UNDER THE INFLUENCE

In 2015, 841 suspects of the 1,894 total, or 44 percent, were perceived to be impaired by drugs and/or alcohol. Additionally, 901 suspects, or 48 percent, did not display signs or symptoms of alcohol or drug impairment. It is unknown if 152 suspects, or eight percent, were impaired by drugs and/or alcohol. The 2015 percentage of suspects who were perceived to be impaired by drugs and/or alcohol experienced a year-over-year increase of two percentage points when compared to 42 percent in 2014. Additionally, the 2015 percentage exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 43 percent by one percentage point.

SUSPECT PERCEIVED HOMELESS

In 2015, 427 of the 1,894 suspects involved in the NCUOF incidents, or 23 percent, were perceived to be homeless. For the same year, 1,467 suspects, or 77 percent, were not perceived to be, or unknown, if homeless. The 2015 percentage of suspects who were perceived to be homeless experienced a year-over-year increase of five percentage points when compared to 18 percent in 2014. Additionally, the 2015 percentage exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 15 percent by eight percentage points.
In 2015, 455 suspects of the 1,894 total, or 24 percent, were perceived to have a mental illness. The 2015 percentage was an increase of three percentage points compared to 21 percent of all NCUOF suspects who were perceived to be mentally ill in 2014. Additionally, the 2015 percentage exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 19 percent by five percentage points.

In 2015, 1,633 suspects sustained injuries during or as a result of NCUOF incidents, which was a decrease by 68 individuals, or four percent, compared to the 2014 total of 1,701. The 2015 total exceeded the 2011 through 2014 annual average of 1,615 injured suspects by 18, or one percent.
In 2015, 1,435 findings of Administrative Approval for Tactics out of 1,452 total adjudicated Tactics findings, or 99 percent, were established. Seventeen findings, or one percent, were Administrative Disapproval findings in Tactics. The 2015 adjudicated finding percentages were consisted with the 2014 percentages of 99 percent Administrative Approval and one percent Administrative Disapproval regarding Tactics. In addition, the 2015 percentage measurement was consistent with the 2013 through 2014 annual percentage average 99 percent Administrative Approval findings in Tactics and one percent Administrative Disapproval findings in Tactics.

In 2015, 4,121 findings of Administrative Approval for Force out of 4,123 total adjudicated Force findings, or 99.9 percent, were established. Two findings, or less than one percent, were Administrative Disapproval findings in Force. The 2015 adjudicated finding percentages were consistent with the 2014 percentages of 99.9 percent Administrative Approval and less than one percent Administrative Disapproval regarding Force. In addition, the 2015 percentage was consistent with the 2013 through 2014 annual percentage average 99.9 percent Administrative Approval findings in Force and less than one percent Administrative Disapproval findings in Force.
The department experienced a 35 percent decrease in 2015 ncuof incidents, in which strikes, kicks, and punches were utilized, compared to the period of 2011 through 2014.
F001-11: JANUARY 2, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a home invasion robbery. Officers received information that multiple victims were inside the residence with the suspects. As officers entered the residence, a suspect exited through the side door, holding a handgun. The suspect failed to comply with officers’ commands and raised the handgun at officers, resulting in an OIS.

F003-11: JANUARY 14, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a theft suspect there now. While responding, an additional radio call went out for a naked man in the same area. Upon their arrival, the officers were notified that the suspect had fled the location on foot. While searching the area, the officers encountered the suspect and a physical altercation ensued. During the altercation, the suspect attacked the officers and repeatedly punched both officers in the face and head. The suspect attempted to gain control of one of the officer’s handguns resulting in an OIS.

F004-11: JANUARY 16, 2011

Uniformed officers were flagged down by an individual who advised them that a male suspect pointed a handgun at him and entered a nearby apartment complex. The suspect’s apartment was identified and officers deployed on it. The suspect exited his apartment and refused to comply with directed verbal commands from the officers. When the suspect walked toward his apartment door, officers observed the suspect reaching inside his jacket despite continued verbal commands resulting in an OIS.

F005-11: JANUARY 18, 2011

Uniformed officers heard a radio broadcast of a robbery that had just occurred. Officers observed a male pedestrian who matched the suspect’s description and attempted to detain the suspect. The suspect failed to comply with officers’ commands and a foot pursuit ensued. During the foot pursuit, the suspect removed a handgun from his waistband, pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F007-11: JANUARY 24, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a male with a mental illness. Upon their arrival at the location, officers were confronted by the suspect inside the residence. The officers attempted to detain the suspect, at which time a physical altercation ensued. The officers utilized less-lethal force options on the suspect, which had no effect. The altercation continued outside the residence where the suspect attempted to disarm one of the officers resulting in an OIS.

F011-11: FEBRUARY 14, 2011

An off-duty officer was leaving his residence when he observed a suspect running towards him holding a pistol. The suspect pointed the pistol at the officer, resulting in an OIS.

F013-11: FEBRUARY 19, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a trespass suspect. Upon their arrival, the officers observed a male who matched the suspect’s description near the location. The officers attempted to detain the suspect, but he refused to comply with the officers’ commands and fled on foot. A foot pursuit ensued and officers caught up with the suspect in their patrol vehicle. While alongside the suspect, the additional officers gave verbal commands to the suspect to show his hands. The suspect refused to comply with their commands and removed a handgun from his jacket pointing it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F017-11: MARCH 2, 2011

Plainclothes officers were monitoring possible narcotics activity. The officers observed two suspects, one armed with a revolver. The suspect fired the gun at a second story apartment. Both suspects ran into an alley and the officers followed. The armed suspect turned at the officers resulting in an OIS.
F019-11: MARCH 3, 2011

Uniformed officers observed a pedestrian in the roadway and attempted to make contact. A vehicle came to a stop behind officers, honking the horn. The driver of the vehicle pointed a handgun at the officers resulting in an OIS.

F022-11: MARCH 10, 2011

An off-duty officer was driving home on a freeway in his personal vehicle. Another vehicle pulled up behind the officer and flashed his high beams. The officer attempted to exit the freeway, but the suspect prevented him from doing so. The suspect pulled ahead of the officer’s vehicle. The officer observed the suspect’s vehicle window open, followed by a loud bang and a flash of light resulting an OIS.

F024-11: MARCH 15, 2011

Uniformed officers observed a disturbance between several individuals and drove into a parking lot to monitor the group. Once inside the parking lot, the officers heard a gunshot originating from the group. Officers observed two suspects armed with handguns resulting in an OIS.

F025-11: MARCH 17, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of domestic violence/assault with a deadly weapon. A sergeant was the first to arrive and observed the suspect with two young girls and an adult female. The sergeant exited his vehicle and approached the suspect, who moved behind the female victim, placed his arm around her neck and chest area, and drew a handgun. The suspect and the victim fell to the ground, at which point the suspect discharged his weapon. Believing the victim was shot, the sergeant advanced towards the suspect resulting in an OIS. Additional officers arrived at the scene and observed the suspect point a handgun at the sergeant, resulting in a second OIS.
F026-11: MARCH 18, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a gang fight. As officers exited their vehicle and approached the location, they heard gunshots coming from the direction of a restaurant. Officers advanced in the direction of the gunshots and encountered three males, one of whom was holding a handgun. The suspect turned and pointed the handgun at the officers resulting in an OIS.

F028-11: MARCH 23, 2011

Uniformed officers conducted a traffic stop. Immediately after the vehicle stopped, a suspect exited the front passenger seat and dropped a handgun on the ground. The suspect picked up the handgun and fled the location on foot. The officers returned to their vehicle and followed the suspect. The suspect jumped over a wrought iron fence and pointed the handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F029-11: MARCH 24, 2011

Uniformed officers attempted to initiate a consensual encounter with two male pedestrians. When officers approached, both men ran in different directions and a foot pursuit ensued. One of the officers ran after one of the suspects while the other followed in their police vehicle. During the foot pursuit, the suspect refused to comply with commands and pointed a handgun at the officers resulting in an OIS.

F031-11: APRIL 4, 2011

A uniformed K-9 officer was searching for a domestic violence suspect and entered the suspect’s residence. The suspect shot the officer, critically wounding him. SWAT officers responded to the barricaded suspect and attempted to have the suspect submit to arrest, which resulted in no success. The suspect fired at SWAT officers resulting in an OIS.
F032-11: APRIL 6, 2011
Two sergeants were working off-duty as security officers in plain clothes. A suspect threatened two female employees with a knife and the sergeants were directed to the suspect’s location. The suspect fled the location on foot and a brief foot pursuit ensued. One of the sergeants pushed the suspect from behind, causing him to fall to the ground. The suspect extended his knife toward the second sergeant, resulting in an OIS.

F037-11: APRIL 27, 2011
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of shots fired. Upon their arrival, officers spoke with the suspect’s sister-in-law, who directed them to the rear of the residence. The sister-in-law encountered the suspect and an argument ensued. The officers observed the suspect holding a shotgun and a brief struggle between the sister-in-law and the suspect over the weapon ensued. The suspect failed to comply with officers’ commands and struggled with the officers resulting in an OIS.

F038-11: APRIL 27, 2011
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a shooting in progress. Upon their arrival, officers observed the suspect holding a handgun. The suspect raised the weapon and pointed it at a victim and then pointed it at officers, resulting in an OIS.

F039-11: APRIL 27, 2011
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of shots fired at a known gang location. Unable to find the source of the shots fired, they remained inside the apartment complex. The officers observed two gang members exit the complex, one of whom was carrying a pistol. The officers ordered the suspect to drop the weapon, but he raised his pistol at the officers resulting in an OIS.
F041-11: MAY 9, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an assault with a deadly weapon. Upon their arrival, officers were met by a female who stated that her grandson stabbed his mother, who was still inside the residence. The officers entered the house, located the victim, and removed her from the house. The suspect was later discovered in the garage, and when he failed to comply with officers’ commands and charged at the officers, an OIS ensued.

F042-11: MAY 10, 2011

Plainclothes detectives were conducting a narcotics investigation. The suspect approached one of the detectives and an agreement was made for a narcotics transaction. After the transaction, the suspect began walking away and noticed that the detectives were still following him. The suspect produced a knife and pointed it at one of the detectives, resulting in an OIS.

F043-11: MAY 14, 2011

Officers observed a group fighting in the middle of the street. The officers drove towards the group of individuals fighting. A suspect in a vehicle, reversed and accelerated, striking the front of the police vehicle, before fleeing. An officer approached on foot with his service pistol drawn and ordered the suspect to stop. Failing to comply, the suspect grabbed the officer’s wrist and began to drive his vehicle forward. While turning his vehicle onto the street, the suspect’s vehicle made contact with the officer, resulting in an OIS.

F049-11: MAY 25, 2011

Plainclothes officers observed two males crossing the street in front of their vehicle. While driving past the two males, one of the individuals yelled out their gang affiliation. The officers continued driving and observed another male pointing a handgun in the direction of the officers’ vehicle and heard several gunshots impact their vehicle, resulting in an OIS.
F052-11: JUNE 1, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an assault with a deadly weapon/man armed with a gun. Officers arrived and met the PR, who informed them that the suspect was down the street. The officers attempted to detain the suspect, but he fled from them toward the rear of the residence. As the suspect ran from officers, they observed him drop a handgun. The suspect retrieved the handgun from the ground and pointed it at the officer, resulting in an OIS. The suspect continued running through the rear yard and attempted to jump over a fence, where he once again pointed the handgun at the officer, resulting in a second OIS.

F055-11: JUNE 13, 2011

Uniformed officers were working a burglary suppression detail, driving an unmarked vehicle. As the officers were driving, a black SUV with multiple occupants drove up next to them. One of the occupants asked the officers where they were from and then drove away. The officers followed the suspects and a passenger suspect extended a pistol out of the passenger window of the vehicle and fired at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F057-11: JUNE 21, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a battery/domestic violence. Officers initiated contact with the occupants of the residence while other officers established containment at the rear of the location. Officers entered the residence and heard noises and movement behind a closed bedroom door. The officers in the backyard observed an unknown person briefly protrude his head out of a window. One officer inside the residence kicked open the bedroom door and observed the suspect turn in his direction holding an unknown cylindrical object that he believed to be a gun, resulting in an OIS.

F058-11: JUNE 22, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an assault with a deadly weapon. Officers were directed to a female who was attempting to jump out a second story window. Officers instructed her not to jump and kicked open the door to the apartment. Upon kicking open the door, a male stood in the doorway while holding a knife in each hand. The suspect refused to comply with officers’ commands and advanced towards the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F063-11: JULY 15, 2011

Plainclothes officers were working undercover and monitoring a known gang area. The officers observed a group of five males standing in front of a residence. Officers heard someone from the group ask where they were from. A suspect approached the officers’ vehicle while holding his waistband. Officers, believing that the suspect was in possession of a handgun, drew their service pistols, exited their vehicle and pursued the suspect, who fled from them. The suspect ran into the rear of the residence and exited the rear door with a handgun pointed at an officer’s chest, resulting in an OIS.

F064-11: JULY 18, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an assault with a deadly weapon. While nearing the location, officers observed the suspect and the victim, his estranged wife, seated on a fence. The officers gave several commands to the suspect. As officers got closer, the suspect placed his arm around his estranged wife and produced a semi-automatic handgun and pointed it back and forth at her head and his own head. The suspect moved the gun toward his estranged wife resulting in an OIS.

F065-11: JULY 20, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a robbery. As officers made entry into the building, they heard a female victim screaming from a locked room. Officers determined that the suspect was also in the room and began giving him commands, which he failed to comply with. Fearing for the victim’s safety, officers gained entry inside the room and observed the suspect holding a knife to the victim’s throat. The suspect released his grip on the victim and charged at the officers with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

F067-11: JULY 22, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a violent female with a mental illness. The radio call was upgraded when LAFD requested help for a female who was armed with a knife. Upon their arrival, officers were advised by LAFD personnel that the female suspect was inside the residence armed with a knife. Officers made entry into the residence and made verbal contact with the suspect. The suspect opened the door holding a knife and advanced forward with the knife pointed at the officers resulting in an OIS.
**F070-11: JULY 30, 2011**

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call to meet ambulance personnel for an escaped patient. Upon arriving, the officers determined that the patient had jumped out of the ambulance and ran away. The ambulance followed the subject to a nearby church and officers located him attempting to hide within the premises. The suspect was located behind a locked door. Officers forced entry and were met by the suspect who had armed himself with a large knife. The suspect charged the officers and stabbed one of them, resulting in an OIS.

**F073-11: AUGUST 19, 2011**

Uniformed officers were on patrol when they observed three males standing in an apartment entrance. Believing the three males were gang members, the officers approached them. One of the men walked away and the officers made contact with the two remaining males. Officers followed the male who left the location. The fleeing suspect fired one round from a semi-automatic handgun at the officers. One officer pursued him and observed the suspect turn and point the gun at him, resulting in an OIS.

**F074-11: AUGUST 22, 2011**

SWAT and K-9 personnel responded to assist in a search for a double homicide suspect. The suspect stood on the rooftop of a residence, and pointed a handgun at officers, resulting in an OIS.

**F076-11: AUGUST 25, 2011**

Uniformed officers were driving an unmarked vehicle when they observed three males involved in a verbal argument. The officers observed one of the males holding his waistband and believed he was possibly armed. The officers negotiated a U-turn and observed one of the suspects point a handgun directly at them and gunfire began to strike the officers' windshield, resulting in an OIS.
F077-11: AUGUST 25, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a screaming man. Officers were directed to an apartment where they heard glass breaking inside. Moments later, the suspect ran out of the apartment and charged directly towards the officers holding a broken cane with a jagged edge in one hand and an aluminum window screen in the other hand. The officers ordered the suspect to drop the weapons but he refused to comply resulting in an OIS.

F079-11: SEPTEMBER 6, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an assault with a deadly weapon. Upon arrival, the officers were met by family members of the suspect and were directed to the rear portion of the property where he was located. Officers entered the structure and observed the suspect lying on a couch holding a handgun. The suspect failed to comply with verbal commands and pointed the handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F080-11: SEPTEMBER 8, 2011

Uniformed officers were conducting gang suppression and observed a man on a bicycle remove a handgun and fire three to five rounds at a vehicle. The officers ordered the suspect to drop the gun. The suspect lowered his arm while still holding the gun, but quickly turned and raised his gun at officers, resulting in an OIS.

F084-11: SEPTEMBER 16, 2011

Uniformed officers were driving and heard gunfire emanating from a residential area. The officers continued driving to determine the source of the sound and heard yelling coming from the driveway of an apartment complex. As officers approached the location on foot, they observed a suspect firing a handgun at two victims resulting in an OIS.
F085-11: SEPTEMBER 18, 2011
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of suspects trespassing at a vacant house. Upon arrival, the officers observed a male who they believed was one of the suspects and attempted to make contact with him. The male suspect stepped away from the officers and immediately began running while repeatedly reaching inside his pockets and waistband. The officers pursued the suspect on foot and observed him produce a semi-automatic handgun. The suspect pointed the handgun at the officers resulting in an OIS.

F086-11: SEPTEMBER 24, 2011
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an ambulance shooting, wherein multiple victims were shot. The officers received information regarding the suspect and issued a crime broadcast. A LAPD helicopter arrived and advised that a possible suspect was observed in the rear of a nearby residence. The officers verbally ordered the suspect to raise his hands and get on the ground. The suspect did not comply and produced a revolver and a semi-automatic pistol in each hand. The suspect pointed both guns at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F087-11: SEPTEMBER 27, 2011
Plainclothes officers were driving an unmarked car and observed four males standing on the front porch of a residence displaying gang signs. The officers stopped at a nearby intersection and observed two of the suspects walking at a fast pace towards their vehicle while one of them was holding a handgun at his side. The suspects then started running in the direction of the officer’s vehicle. The officers accelerated their vehicle in an effort to create distance between themselves and the suspects. The officers observed a vehicle travel westbound and stop. The two pedestrian suspects entered the vehicle, which accelerated in the direction of the officers. The suspects pulled near the officers’ vehicle and the front passenger began shooting at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F088-11: OCTOBER 1, 2011
Plainclothes officers were working a surveillance detail. Officers observed three individuals exit an apartment building and begin walking towards the officers' vehicle. At that time, a separate vehicle occupied with three individuals double parked the vehicle near the rear of the officers’ vehicle and all three exited. The vehicle’s occupants became involved in a verbal argument with the three individuals who had exited the apartment. Officers observed an additional male holding a shotgun near a tree. The officers observed two of the individuals standing to the rear of the vehicle, one who was armed with a weapon in his waistband area resulting in an OIS.
F090-11: OCTOBER 9, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of shots fired and a man armed with a gun. Upon arrival, the officers were confronted by the suspect, who was armed with a rifle, and took cover. The officers ordered the suspect to drop the rifle. The suspect pointed the rifle at the officers resulting in an OIS.

F091-11: OCTOBER 11, 2011

Uniformed officers conducted a traffic stop on a vehicle. During the detention, the officers believed that the driver was under the influence of a controlled substance and asked him to step out of the vehicle pending a field sobriety test. As the suspect exited the vehicle, officers observed him armed with a knife. The suspect refused to comply with the officers’ commands to drop the knife resulting in an OIS.

F094-11: OCTOBER 22, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an assault with a deadly weapon. Upon their arrival, officers were directed by a witness to the suspect, who was located inside a catering truck that had crashed into another vehicle. As officers approached the truck, they heard and observed a struggle emanating from within the truck. The suspect, who was armed with a machete, ignored officers’ commands to drop the weapon. Officers utilized less-lethal force options, but when the suspect began stabbing a victim in the chest, an OIS occurred.

F095-11: OCTOBER 23, 2011

Uniformed officers observed a group of people causing a disturbance inside a restaurant. The officers monitored the disturbance and observed several patrons fleeing from the location. The officers observed an unknown object in one of the suspects’ hands and decided to approach the business. As one of the officers approached the parking lot, he observed the suspect pointing a handgun at two men, resulting in an OIS.
**F096-11: OCTOBER 23, 2011**

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a shooting in progress. The suspect arrived at the home of the victim, armed with a handgun, and began shooting into the residence. The suspect then entered the home through a rear door and a physical altercation with the victim ensued. The officers arrived at the scene and entered the location. The suspect exited a bedroom and pointed his gun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

---

**F097-11: OCTOBER 26, 2011**

While conducting extra patrol at a business on foot, uniformed officers heard several gunshots originating from parking lot area. The officers observed a vehicle accelerate through the parking lot and two females jump out of the way to avoid being struck. The officers, believing that a shooting had just occurred and that the driver of the Pontiac was involved, heard additional gunshots and believed the suspect was shooting at them resulting in an OIS.

---

**F099-11: OCTOBER 31, 2011**

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a shooting with a victim down. As the officers approached the location, the PR directed the officer to the suspect. The suspect fled on foot, pointed a handgun at the officers, and an OIS occurred.

---

**F101-11: NOVEMBER 13, 2011**

Uniformed officers were flagged down by a female who informed them that a suspect was walking up and down the street with a large knife in his hand. The officers located the suspect standing in front of a business with his back turned towards them. The officers observed a large knife protruding from the suspect’s right rear pants pocket and requested additional units. The officers gave the suspect verbal commands and deployed less-lethal force options, all of which had no effect. The suspect suddenly grabbed the knife from his rear pocket and spun around to face the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F103-11: NOVEMBER 19, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a violent female with a mental illness. Upon arrival, the officers were directed to the suspect and a violent physical altercation ensued. The suspect grabbed both officers’ testicles and also bit one officer on his left shoulder/neck area. During the struggle, the suspect retrieved a three foot long plastic conduit with screws protruding from it and assumed a two-hand grip, holding it like a baseball bat, resulting in an OIS.

F106-11: NOVEMBER 25, 2011

Uniformed officers observed a male riding his bicycle in violation of a California Vehicle Code section. The officers conducted a traffic stop and ordered the suspect to place his hands on his head. The suspect grabbed his waistband, dropped his bicycle, and ran from the officers. The officers initiated a foot pursuit and observed the suspect remove a handgun from his waistband. The suspect turned his body towards the officers and pointed the weapon at them, which resulted in an OIS.

F107-11: NOVEMBER 27, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of shots fired. Upon their arrival, the officers observed a vehicle approach and, suddenly, the occupants in the vehicle fire multiple rounds at a residence and at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F110-11: DECEMBER 09, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man with a gun, shooting at vehicles and pedestrians. Upon their arrival, the officers heard shots being fired and observed a suspect standing in the middle of the street armed with a knife. The suspect yelled incoherently at the officers as they ordered him to drop his weapon. The officers observed the handle of a handgun protruding from the suspect’s waistband. The suspect reached into his waistband, removed his pistol, and pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F111-11: DECEMBER 12, 2011

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man armed with a knife. Upon arrival, officers located the suspect and gave him commands to drop the knife, which he refused to do. Officers utilized less-lethal force options, which had no effect on the suspect. The suspect lunged at the officers with the weapon and an OIS occurred.

F112-11: DECEMBER 16, 2011

Off-duty officers were attending an event when they became involved in a physical altercation with an individual. The altercation occurred in the bathroom after the suspect swung at one of the officers. The second officer approached and attempted to separate the officer and the suspect. The suspect exited the bathroom and walked away. After the physical altercation, the suspect advised a group of individuals of what had happened inside the bathroom, and the suspect along with the group began to charge and physically attack the officers. One of the officers was knocked to the ground during the attack and repeatedly hit and kicked in his head and body. The second officer was unable to immediately assist because of other males assaulting him. As a result, an OIS occurred.

F113-11: DECEMBER 20, 2011

Plainclothes officers were conducting surveillance in an unmarked vehicle regarding ongoing narcotics activity. During their surveillance, the officers observed two males conduct a narcotics transaction and took enforcement action to detain the suspects. One of the suspects attempted to flee from the location but was stopped by officers. The second suspect ran from officers and, at one point, produced a handgun, resulting in an OIS.

F114-13: DECEMBER 21, 2011

Plainclothes officers were conducting surveillance in an unmarked vehicle regarding ongoing narcotics activity. During their investigation, the officers observed a male sitting on the porch of the target location. The suspect entered the driver’s seat of stolen vehicle and began driving away from the location. The suspect suddenly jumped out of the moving vehicle and rolled onto the ground. The vehicle continued moving and collided into another vehicle. The suspect stood and fired numerous rounds at the officers with a handgun, resulting in an OIS.
**F117-11: DECEMBER 30, 2011**

Uniformed officers, driving a dual purpose police vehicle, were conducting follow-up investigations. As they were driving, the officers observed a male standing on a sidewalk pointing a handgun at them, resulting in an OIS. The suspect fled the location on foot and officers followed him in their vehicle. The officers observed the suspect stop, turn and point his handgun at them, resulting in a second OIS. The officers continued to follow the suspect, who again stopped and pointed his handgun at them, resulting in a third OIS.

**F118-11: DECEMBER 30, 2011**

Uniformed officers observed a known gang member walking on the sidewalk with another male. The suspect grabbed his waistband when officers stopped their police vehicle and fled on foot. Believing he was armed with a handgun, a foot pursuit ensued. During the foot pursuit, the suspect turned his body and attempted to aim a handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
**F001-12: JANUARY 1, 2012**

A uniformed sergeant observed the suspect standing next to a utility pole in an alley. As the sergeant drove closer, he observed the suspect raise his right hand and point it at him. The sergeant then heard a gunshot and observed muzzle flash emanating from the suspect. The sergeant exited his police vehicle and observed the suspect begin to walk rapidly away from him while holding a handgun. The sergeant ordered the suspect to drop the handgun, which he failed to do. The suspect pointed the gun at the sergeant, resulting in an OIS.

**F002-12: JANUARY 1, 2012**

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a screaming man. Upon arrival, the officers knocked on the location door and identified themselves as police officers. The suspect told the officers to go away and stated he was going to hurt somebody. The officers, in fear the suspect would harm himself or other individuals, forced entry into the apartment. The suspect pointed a handgun at the officers resulting in an OIS.

**F003-12: JANUARY 4, 2012**

Uniformed officers responded to an apartment in an attempt to locate an assault with a deadly weapon (ADW) suspect. Upon knocking at the location, the officers were met by a resident of the apartment. The officers asked the resident if the suspect was inside the residence. The resident told them that the suspect was inside and gave the officers permission to enter. The officers entered and observed the suspect standing against a corner wall in the living room. Officers ordered the suspect to place his hands behind his head; however, the suspect ignored the officer’s commands and produced a knife. The officers ordered him to drop the knife, but the suspect advanced toward the officers with the knife, resulting in OIS.

**F004-12: JANUARY 5, 2012**

Uniformed officers observed a vehicle traveling at a high rate of speed and attempted to conduct a traffic stop. While attempting to stop the vehicle, officers observed the suspect open the front passenger door and exit the vehicle armed with a shotgun. The suspect pointed the shotgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F005-12: JANUARY 7, 2012

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an assault with a deadly weapon investigation. Officers arrived at the location and approached the residence on foot. The officers observed the suspect exit the residence and begin walking through the front yard. Officers gave the suspect several commands but he refused to comply, removed a handgun from his waistband and fired two rounds at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F006-12: JANUARY 17, 2012

While conducting surveillance, plainclothes officers observed a vehicle pull along-side their vehicle and stop. The officers observed the suspect exit the vehicle, remove a handgun from his waistband and point it at them, resulting in an OIS.

F007-12: JANUARY 22, 2012

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a male with a possible mentally ill condition. The officers met with the PR, who told them that the suspect had assaulted her and directed the officers to the suspect, who was inside the residence in his bedroom. The officers contacted the suspect and ordered him to step out of the bedroom. The suspect ignored the officers’ commands, reached into a dresser, and retrieved a handgun. The officers redeployed to the front of the residence and the suspect followed them with the gun. Officers ordered the suspect to drop the gun; however, he refused and continued to walk toward the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F010-12: FEBRUARY 23, 2012

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a carjacking. Additional uniformed officers observed the stolen vehicle being driven by the suspect and a vehicle pursuit was initiated. The pursuit terminated at a gas station when the suspect stopped his vehicle alongside another uninvolved vehicle. The suspect pointed a handgun at a customer resulting in OIS.
F011-12: MARCH 1, 2012
Plainclothes officers were conducting a multi-agency surveillance of a residence to apprehend a murder suspect. The suspect became aware of the officers presence and fled from the rear of the residence. The suspect failed to comply with officers’ commands resulting in an OIS.

F012-12: MARCH 2, 2012
Uniformed officers observed the suspect commit traffic violations while riding a bicycle. The officers attempted to stop the suspect, but he ignored the officers’ commands to stop and fled on his bicycle. The officers followed in their vehicle and observed the suspect dismount the bike and begin to rapidly walk away from them. The suspect drew a semi-automatic pistol from his waistband and pointed it at the officers resulting in an OIS.

F017-12: MARCH 21, 2012
Plainclothes officers heard a crime broadcast of a robbery and had a clear view of the crime location from their position. The officers monitored the location and observed the suspect exit the business carrying a trash bag over his shoulder with one hand, while holding his other hand near his front waistband area. The suspect then ran toward the restaurant where officers were located. Both officers took cover behind a nearby door frame, identified themselves as police officers and ordered the suspect to stop. The suspect fled, which prompted a short foot pursuit. The officers broadcasted the information and a perimeter was established after the suspect temporarily evaded capture. The suspect emerged from the perimeter holding a handgun and pointed it at officers, resulting in an OIS.

F018-12: MARCH 24, 2012
Uniformed officers responded to a call regarding a “415 man with a knife” at a residence. The PR reported that his family member, later identified as the suspect, was armed with a knife and broke down the front door of the residence. The officers’ investigation determined that the suspect had threatened family members with the knife and had barricaded himself inside the residence with a handgun. A perimeter was established and notifications were made to Metropolitan Division. As officers at scene awaited the arrival of Metropolitan Division resources, the suspect exited the residence armed with a handgun and an OIS ensued.
F022-12: APRIL 11, 2012

Uniformed officers observed a vehicle fail to stop at a red phase tri-light signal. Officers pulled behind the vehicle and attempted to initiate a traffic stop. The suspect failed to yield and a vehicle pursuit was initiated, wherein multiple units responded to the back-up. As the pursuit terminated, the suspect exited from the front passenger door of his vehicle and fled on foot. While running from pursuing officers, the suspect turned, raised his arms into a shooting position and simulated a firearm at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F029-12: MAY 10, 2012

Plainclothes officers in an undercover vehicle were monitoring an area where they believed a robbery was about to occur. The officers heard gunshots emanating from behind them and observed two males, later identified as the suspects, armed with handguns and firing in an easterly direction at unknown targets. The suspects fled the location and entered a nearby apartment complex. The officers followed the suspects and both suspects pointed their firearms at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F030-12: MAY 11, 2012

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a “Woman yelling for help.” The officers approached the location on foot and heard shouting and a baby crying. They determined that the shouting was coming from a second floor apartment and attempted to make contact with the residents. The officers deployed adjacent to the doorway and attempted to verbally make contact with the residents. While directing the suspect to open the door, the officers observed the suspect holding a sword. The suspect, while maintaining a hold of the sword, reached inside his pants pocket and began to walk away from the sliding glass door. The officers then heard gunshots and believed the suspect was shooting at them. SWAT was requested and responded to the scene. While on containment, a SWAT officer observed the suspect point a handgun at officers, resulting in an OIS.

F035-12: MAY 23, 2012

Uniformed officers observed a known gang member, later identified as the suspect, walking with another male and a female. The suspect made eye contact with the officers and grabbed his waistband. Believing he was armed, the officers negotiated a U-turn and observed the butt of a handgun in the suspect’s waistband. As the officers exited their vehicle, the suspect removed the handgun from his waistband and pointed it at them, resulting in an OIS.
F037-12: JUNE 1, 2012

Uniformed officers responded to an Ambulance Shooting at a residence. While officers were at the location, the suspect fired his gun inside a back room. The suspect then emerged from the residence and pointed a revolver at the officers, resulting in OIS. As the officers approached the suspect, they observed him point his handgun at them, and a second OIS occurred.

F039-12: JUNE 6, 2012

Uniformed officers observed a vehicle occupied by two males, later identified as the suspect and an additional individual, negotiate a right turn without signaling then pull to the curb. The officers pulled behind the vehicle to conduct a traffic stop. The officers conducted a vehicle check, which revealed that the vehicle was reported stolen. The suspect, who was the driver, pulled away from the curb before the officers could take any action. The suspect then suddenly stopped the car and ran from the officers. One officer pursued the suspect while the other remained at the scene where the vehicle had stopped and took the other occupant into custody. During the foot pursuit, the suspect verbally threatened the pursuing officer that he was going to kill him and reached into his waistband, resulting in an OIS.

F040-12: JUNE 11, 2012

Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call regarding an attempted suicide. Upon the officers’ arrival, the suspect threatened to shoot himself. The suspect refused to comply with officers’ commands and, while out on the balcony, fired a handgun at a LAPD helicopter resulting in an OIS.

F042-12: JUNE 14, 2012

Uniformed patrol officers responded to a shots fired radio call. Upon the officers’ arrival, witnesses directed the officers to the suspect, who was seated in a parked vehicle. The suspect failed to comply with officers’ commands and drove away from the location. A pursuit was initiated and terminated when the suspect’s vehicle collided into a chain link fence. The suspect exited his vehicle and pointed a dark colored object in his right hand at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F043-12: JUNE 17, 2012

Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call at a residence wherein the parents of the suspect demanded that he be removed from the property. Upon their arrival, officers made contact with the suspect and observed that he was armed with multiple knives. The suspect then cut his wrists and throat and advanced toward one of the officers while still armed with the knives, resulting in an OIS.

F046-12: JULY 19, 2012

Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call regarding a battery investigation. The officers arrived and were directed to the suspect, who was located inside a locked bedroom. The officers attempted to make contact with the suspect, who opened the bedroom door but immediately closed it. The officers forced entry into the bedroom and observed the suspect produce a handgun and point it at them, resulting in an OIS.

F058-12: SEPTEMBER 3, 2012

Uniformed officers observed a large group of people running toward them. Moments later, the officers heard gunshots and observed a male suspect pointing a gun at an unknown victim, resulting in an OIS.

F060-12: SEPTEMBER 11, 2012

Uniformed patrol officers were in pursuit of a stolen vehicle driven by a suspect who was armed. During the pursuit, the suspect drove through a red phase tri-light signal and collided with another vehicle, bringing both vehicles to a stop. The suspect exited his vehicle armed with an AK-47 rifle and pointed it at officers, resulting in an OIS.
F062-12: SEPTEMBER 26, 2012

While off-duty and at his residence, an officer was awoken when the suspect entered the bedroom from a sliding glass door. In fear for his safety and the safety of his family, the officer attempted to detain the suspect pending the arrival of local law enforcement. The suspect fled on foot and the officer pursued him, resulting in an altercation. During the altercation, the officer was able to arm himself with his Department issued firearm. The suspect ignored the officer’s commands and attempted to disarm the officer, resulting in an OIS.

F067-12: OCTOBER 4, 2012

Uniformed officers observed four males in a parking lot drinking alcoholic beverages. The suspect, who was seated on a bicycle, began creating distance between him and the officers. When officers ordered him to dismount the bicycle, the suspect dropped it and ran in an attempt to evade capture. A foot pursuit ensued, during which the suspect pointed a handgun at one of the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F068-12: OCTOBER 6, 2012

Uniformed patrol officers responded to a LAFD help call for a man armed with a knife at a residence. The officers arrived and met with fire personnel inside the residence. Officers observed a female on the kitchen floor and a male suspect armed with a knife. The suspect failed to comply with the officers’ commands and advanced toward the female with the knife in his hand, resulting in an OIS.

F069-12: OCTOBER 12, 2012

Uniformed officers observed a known gang member spray painting gang graffiti on a wall. The gang member attempted to enter an awaiting vehicle, which was occupied by additional individuals, including the suspect. The officers detained all occupants of the vehicle and instructed them to take a position facing a wall. As officers were completing their search of the occupants, all fled on foot in separate directions, provoking a foot pursuit. Additional uniformed officers responded and observed the suspect attempting to conceal himself under a parked vehicle. One officer grabbed the suspect by his ankles and attempted to pull him from beneath the vehicle. In doing so, he and an additional officer observed what they believed was a handgun in the suspect’s hand, resulting in an OIS.
**F070-12: OCTOBER 17, 2012**

Uniformed officers attempted to initiate a traffic stop on a vehicle, which contained two suspects. In the process of stopping the vehicle, both suspects fired at the officers. A brief vehicle pursuit ensued and terminated when officers rammed their patrol vehicle into the suspect vehicle, causing it to crash into a tree. The suspects were ordered to exit the vehicle, which they failed to do. One of the suspects pointed a gun at the other suspect’s head, resulting in an OIS.

---

**F072-12: OCTOBER 18, 2012**

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a “415 man with a knife” at an apartment. Upon their arrival, officers observed the suspect in the apartment courtyard and ordered him to stop. The suspect turned toward one of the officers, reached inside his rear waistband area, and armed himself with a handgun. The suspect then pointed the handgun at the officer, resulting in an OIS.

---

**F075-12: OCTOBER 30, 2012**

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an attempted assault with a vehicle. Unbeknownst to the officers, the male suspect entered a market near the crime location and stole numerous items from the store. Upon their arrival, the officers observed the suspect running northbound in a parking lot being chased by two employees of the market. One officer observed the suspect manipulating his waistband as he was running and a foot pursuit ensued. During the foot pursuit, the suspect entered a vehicle and attempted to run over one of the officers resulting in an OIS.

---

**F079-12: NOVEMBER 15, 2012**

Uniformed officers observed a known gang member under the influence of a controlled substance. The officers initiated a pedestrian stop for further investigation. The suspect failed to comply with officers’ commands to put his hands up and fled on foot, provoking a foot pursuit. During the foot pursuit, the suspect produced a dark object from his waistband area and pointed it at one of the officers, resulting on an OIS.
F082-12: NOVEMBER 24, 2012

Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call regarding a burglary investigation. Upon arrival, officers observed the suspect and attempted to detain him. In the process of doing so, the suspect armed himself with a wooden board and approached the officers. The suspect failed to comply with the officers’ commands and swung the board at one of the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F083-12: DECEMBER 1, 2012

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an “ADW Suspect There Now.” Upon their arrival, the officers observed the suspect holding his girlfriend with a knife to her neck. Officers determined that the victim was in distress and ordered the suspect to drop the knife. The suspect refused and threatened to kill her, resulting in an OIS.

F085-12: DECEMBER 6, 2012

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a burglary in progress at an apartment. Upon their arrival, the officers met with the victim and observed that her right hand was bleeding. The victim stated that her ex-boyfriend, identified as the suspect, had cut her with a knife and was still in her apartment. The officers responded to the apartment and located the suspect inside. Officers observed the suspect holding the knife and ordered him to drop it. The suspect refused and lunged at one of the officers with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

F086-12: DECEMBER 13, 2012

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an assault with a deadly weapon suspect at a residence. Upon their arrival, the officers met with a female victim who had been assaulted by the suspect. The suspect subsequently barricaded himself in a bedroom and held two of his children hostage with a knife. SWAT was notified and responded to negotiate with the suspect. During the hostage rescue, SWAT officers made entry into the bedroom and confronted the suspect who was holding both children at knife-point, resulting in an OIS.
F090-12: DECEMBER 29, 2012

Uniformed officers were flagged down by a private security guard near an apartment complex. The security guard informed the officers that he had been threatened by the suspect, who was armed with a handgun. The suspect then fled the location on foot. A perimeter was established and the suspect’s location was identified and his movements were monitored. Officers observed the suspect attempt to enter a locked door, and a short foot pursuit ensued, resulting in an OIS.
**FID 001-13: JANUARY 1, 2013**

During a New Year’s Eve Gunfire Suppression Detail, uniformed officers heard the sound of gunfire. When they went to investigate, they observed the suspect shooting a rifle into the air. When ordered to drop the weapon, the suspect pointed the rifle at the officer, resulting in an OIS.

---

**FID 002-13: JANUARY 18, 2013**

Uniformed officers received a radio call of a man with a knife. Upon arriving at the location, they contacted the suspect and a struggle ensued. During the struggle, the suspect attempted to disarm an officer, resulting in an OIS.

---

**FID 004-13: JANUARY 25, 2013**

While off-duty, an officer became involved in a road rage incident. After believing he had evaded the suspect, the officer drove to his residence. The suspect appeared and struck the officer with his vehicle causing the officer to land on top of the vehicle. The suspect drove off with the officer on his vehicle, resulting in an OIS.

---

**FID 007-13: FEBRUARY 2, 2013**

Uniformed officers received a radio call of a man with a gun. Officers located the suspect who fled. A perimeter was set up. During a search, the suspect was located and given orders. The suspect pointed a handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers were assigned a protection detail outside the city of Los Angeles for a wanted 187 suspect. A citizen approached the officers and pointed out the suspect’s vehicle. The officers followed the vehicle onto a freeway. The suspect exited the freeway, stopped his vehicle and began shooting at the officers with a rifle, resulting in an OIS.

FID 012-13: FEBRUARY 8, 2013

Uniformed officers were assigned a protection detail outside the city of Los Angeles for a wanted 187 suspect. Officers observed a vehicle approach the location driving erratically. Officers heard a noise, which they believed to be a gunshot, come from the vehicle, resulting in an OIS.


Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an ADW suspect armed with a handgun. Officers located the suspect who had his hands concealed inside a bag. The suspect approached the officers and stated he was going to kill the officers. The suspect refused to stop and refused to show his hands, resulting in an OIS.

FID 023-13: MARCH 8, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man with a gun. Upon arrival, officers heard a victim yell that the suspect was armed and hurting her. Officers approached the residence and observed the suspect appear a window and point a handgun at them, resulting in an OIS.

Plainclothes officers were serving a search warrant and entered the residence. Upon identifying themselves, a suspect appeared holding a black object which was pointed at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

FID 026-13: MARCH 16, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a robbery in progress. Upon arrival, the officers located the suspect inside a restaurant holding a handgun. The suspect exited the restaurant with the handgun and pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS. A suicide note was found in the suspect’s possessions.

FID 029-13: MARCH 9, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an ADW. Upon arrival, they located the suspect who had an object concealed behind his back. The suspect yelled at the officers to kill him. The suspect fled, then turned around and pointed the silver object at the officers, resulting in an OIS. (Numerous MEU contacts)

FID 038-13: APRIL 29, 2013

Uniformed officers observed a vehicle driving erratically. Officers attempted to stop the vehicle and a pursuit ensued. The pursuit left the city and terminated when the suspect crashed his vehicle and fled into a residence. The residence was surrounded and SWAT responded. SWAT officers asked for the suspect to surrender which he refused. The suspect appeared with a handgun pointed at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
FID 039-13: MAY 1, 2013

Plainclothes officers in different vehicles were returning to Central Facilities. They were stopped in traffic when they each observed a suspect emerge from a business firing a handgun into a business, resulting in an OIS.

FID 040-13: MAY 1, 2013

Plainclothes officers working a task force observed a vehicle being driven erratically and requested that uniformed officers conduct a traffic stop. Officers conducted a traffic stop when the suspect emerged from the vehicle with an assault weapon and pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

FID 041-13: MAY 5, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a radio of a burglary suspect. Upon arrival, they observed the suspect on a second story balcony holding a handgun. The suspect pointed the handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

FID 043-13: MAY 16, 2013

Uniformed officers received a radio call of an attempt suicide. Upon arrival, they observed a suspect armed with two knives. Officers verbally contacted the suspect, when he charged the officers, resulting in an OIS.
**FID 044-13: MAY 17, 2013**

Uniformed officers attempted to conduct a Consensual Encounter on a pedestrian when the suspect began running with his hand on his waistband. The officers followed the suspect who removed a handgun from his waistband and pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

**FID 045-13: MAY 17, 2013**

Uniformed officers received a radio call of a violent male mental. Upon arrival, they located the suspect inside of his residence armed with two knives. Officers verbally contacted the suspect when he raised the knives and charged the officers, resulting in an OIS.

**FID 046-13: MAY 20, 2013**

Plainclothes officers observed a suspect on a bicycle commit several vehicle code violations and decided to conduct a traffic stop. When the officers attempted to stop the suspect he fled on the bicycle. The suspect then abandoned the bicycle and ran on foot. The suspect produced a handgun and pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

**FID 051-13: JUNE 25, 2013**

Plainclothes detectives were returning to their station and were stopped on the apron to the entrance of the station when a suspect approached their vehicle. The suspect began firing an unknown weapon at them, resulting in an OIS.
FID 052-13: JUNE 30, 2013

Uniformed officers, along with the Probation Department, conducted a Parole/Probation compliance check. As they were searching an attic, the suspect appeared and shot an officer in the face, resulting in an OIS.

FID 053-15: JUNE 30, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man with a gun. Upon arrival, they observed a man inside the residence to the rear of the location holding a pistol. The suspect exited the residence and pointed the pistol at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

FID 054-13: JUNE 30, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to an ADW Shots fired radio call. Upon arrival and after speaking to a victim of a gunshot wound, they observed the suspect armed with a handgun. The suspect pointed the handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

FID 057-13: JULY 8, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a robbery in progress at a marijuana dispensary. Upon arrival, they observed the suspect’s vehicle and attempted to stop the vehicle. A vehicle pursuit ensued and terminated a short distance away. The suspect exited the vehicle and began firing a handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
FID 058-13: JULY 18, 2013
A uniformed lieutenant had parked and exited his vehicle when a citizen informed him of an armed robbery suspect and pointed to the suspect. The suspect entered his vehicle and drove towards the lieutenant, resulting in an OIS.

FID 061-13: JULY 16, 2013
Plainclothes officers were monitoring a gang vigil at a church to obtain intelligence. The suspect walked away from the church and approached the officers. The suspect removed a handgun and fired at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

FID 067-13: JULY 26, 2013
SWAT officers responded to a radio call of a barricaded suspect armed with a handgun. Officers were attempting to persuade the suspect to exit the apartment without the handgun, when the suspect exited the apartment and pointed the handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

Uniformed officers were stopped in traffic when the suspect walked past them holding a shotgun. When the officers directed him to drop the weapon, the suspect turned, pointed the shotgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
FID 070-13: JULY 31, 2013

Uniformed officers observed a suspect dressed inappropriately for the weather and acting irrationally. Officers made contact with the suspect who assumed a shooting stance and pointed an unknown object at them, resulting in an OIS.


Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man with a gun. Upon arrival, they observed the suspect seated on a residential porch. They verbally ordered him to lay on the ground when he produced a handgun and fired at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

FID 078-13: AUGUST 20, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a shooting. Upon arrival, they located the suspect who was in possession of a handgun. When the officers ordered him to drop the handgun, he turned and pointed the handgun at them, resulting in an OIS.


Uniformed officers observed a known gang member standing on the sidewalk. They decided to make contact with him, when he ran from them, stopped and pointed a handgun at them, resulting in an OIS.
FID 083-13: SEPTEMBER 11, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a shooting just occurred radio call. Upon arrival at a laundromat, they observed the suspect pointing a revolver at a victim. The officers attempted to make contact with the suspect when the suspect pointed the revolver at them, resulting in an OIS.

FID 085-13: SEPTEMBER 13, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man with a gun. Upon arrival, they observed the suspect seated near a food truck holding a revolver. When they ordered him to drop the gun, he pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

FID 088-13: OCTOBER 11, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an ADW suspect who was inside a camper parked in the driveway. The officers attempted to persuade the suspect to exit the camper with negative results. The officers used a pry tool to breach the camper door when the suspect exited the camper armed with a hammer. The suspect raised the hammer towards the officers, resulting in an OIS.


Uniformed officers received a radio call of a woman armed with a knife. Officers arrived and were directed to her apartment. While attempting to verbalize with her, the suspect charged the officers with a knife, resulting in an OIS.
**FID 091-13: OCTOBER 26, 2013**

Uniformed officers were providing extra patrol in a housing project when they were flagged down by citizens. As they neared, the citizens pointed towards a group of men, one of who was in possession of a handgun. The suspect ran away, then turned towards the officers and pointed the handgun at them, resulting in an OIS.

---

**FID 093-13: NOVEMBER 3, 2013**

Uniformed officers observed a known gang member standing on a street corner and decided to initiate a consensual encounter. As they approached, the suspect fled while holding his waistband. As the officers pursued him, he removed a revolver from his waistband and pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

---

**FID 094-13: NOVEMBER 11, 2013**

Plainclothes officers received information regarding an ADW suspect. During a surveillance of the suspect’s residence, they observed him leave in a vehicle with two other persons. They followed the suspect vehicle and conducted a traffic stop when the suspect exited and ran from the officers. During the foot pursuit, the suspect pointed a handgun at them, resulting in an OIS.

---

**FID 095-13: NOVEMBER 17, 2013**

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an Assault with a Deadly Weapon. After speaking to the victim, the officers responded to the suspect’s residence, where they observed him on the balcony. The suspect pointed a shotgun at them, resulting in an OIS.
FID 097-13: NOVEMBER 22, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a radio of a man with a gun. Upon arrival, they observed the suspect and made contact with him. The suspect drew a handgun from his waistband and pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.


Uniformed officers received a radio call of shots fired. Upon arrival, they surrounded the residence and tried to convince the suspect to exit. The suspect refused and was seen in possession of a rifle. SWAT was notified. While waiting for the arrival of SWAT, the suspect pointed the rifle at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

FID 101-13: DECEMBER 13, 2013

Officers observed a vehicle driving a high rate of speed. When they attempted to stop the vehicle, a pursuit ensued. The suspect became involved in a traffic collision. The suspect exited his vehicle and walked towards the rear of his vehicle. A beanbag shotgun was deployed at the suspect and an OIS ensued.


Uniformed officers received a radio call of a robbery just occurred. After completing the report, they observed the suspect’s vehicle in the parking lot of a convenience store. They stopped and attempted to detain the occupants when the suspect pointed an unknown object at them, resulting in an OIS.
FID 104-13: DECEMBER 27, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of man with a gun. While searching the backyard of the residence, a suspect exited the detached garage with a handgun. The suspect pointed the handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

FID 105-13: DECEMBER 29, 2013

Uniformed officers responded to an Assault with a Deadly Weapon radio call. After entering the residence, the suspect appeared with a knife and charged at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F003-14: JANUARY 14, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a robbery investigation at a business. Utilizing the tracking feature on the victim’s cell phone, officers tracked the suspect’s movements and verified his whereabouts. A foot pursuit ensued and the suspect entered a residence at gunpoint, resulting in an extensive standoff with numerous Department resources. At one point, the suspect emerged from the residence and pointed a handgun at an officer, resulting in an OIS.

F004-14: JANUARY 15, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to an assault with a deadly weapon, domestic violence radio call at a residence. Upon their arrival, officers heard a single gunshot emanating from the residence. Officers located the suspect and a foot pursuit ensued. During the foot pursuit, an OIS occurred.

F008-14: MARCH 6, 2014

Plainclothes officers contacted a suspicious male and observed a handgun in his front waistband. The suspect failed to comply with officers’ commands and removed the handgun from his waistband, resulting in an OIS.

F009-14: MARCH 24, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a man armed with a knife and threatening to harm a female victim inside a residence. A LAPD helicopter arrived at scene before patrol officers and observed the suspect armed with a shotgun. Officers arrived at scene and began formulating a tactical plan and a perimeter. While on the perimeter, the suspect emerged from the residence and pointed the shotgun at officers, resulting in an OIS.
F014-14: APRIL 4, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a male attempting suicide which indicated that the suspect was armed with a knife. After using less-lethal force to effect the arrest of the suspect, which had no effect, he charged at the officers with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

F016-14: APRIL 7, 2014

Two uniformed officers assigned the front desk at a community police station observed a male, later identified as the suspect, enter the front lobby area. The suspect reached into his waistband, removed a handgun, and pointed it at the officers resulting in an OIS.

F017-14: APRIL 13, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an assault with a deadly weapon suspect armed with a knife inside a business. Officers arrived at the scene and observed the suspect walking away from the location. After ordering him to stop, the suspect removed a knife from a bag in his possession and charged at one of the officers with the knife raised above his head, resulting in an OIS.

F018-14: APRIL 21, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a possible assault with a deadly weapon suspect at a parking structure. A police sergeant assisted the responding officers and was the first to arrive at the scene. The sergeant made contact the suspect, who emerged from behind a pillar holding a box cutter in his hand. After failing to comply with commands, the suspect began swinging the box cutter at the sergeant. The sergeant then utilized less-lethal force, which had no effect on the suspect and caused him to more aggressively and intently slash at the sergeant, resulting in an OIS.
F019-14: APRIL 24, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an assault with a deadly weapon suspect armed with a machete in front of a residence. A police helicopter arrived over the scene and observed the suspect running from the location and into a nearby business. Officers deployed into the business and made contact with the suspect, who they verified was armed with a sword. Officers utilized less-lethal force against the suspect, which had not effect. The suspect then charged at the officers with the sword, resulting in an OIS.

F024-14: MAY 12, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a group fighting at a major entertainment venue. As officers arrived at the location, they observed a large group of individuals fighting and then heard gunfire. Officers tactically deployed along a planter and observed a suspect crouched in a shooting position while holding a handgun. The suspect pointed the handgun in the direction of an on-coming crowd of people running, resulting in an OIS.

F027-14: MAY 17, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding an assault with a deadly weapon suspect at a residence. Officers arrived and made contact with the PR. As they continued talking to the PR, large rocks were thrown at their police vehicle. Officers requested back-up and additional resources arrived at the scene. A male suspect then emerged and ran at the officers holding a kitchen knife while slashing it towards them, resulting in an OIS.

F033-14: JUNE 25, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a shooting in progress at a business. A perimeter was established after officers verified the suspect’s last known location. While conducting a search of the area, a police K-9 located the suspect and commands were given to the suspect to surrender. Officers observed a handgun near the suspect, which he gained possession of, resulting in an OIS.
F038-14: JULY 13, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a burglary alarm activation at a business. As the officers were preparing to search the location, one officer observed a male suspect arm himself with a rifle and point it at him, resulting in an OIS.

F041-14: JULY 25, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a vandalism suspect at a residence. Upon their arrival, officers observed a male suspect holding two metal poles in his right hand and screaming. The officers gave the suspect numerous commands to drop the poles, which he failed to do. Officers then utilized less-lethal force against the suspect, which had no effect. The suspect advanced towards one of the officers with the metal poles, resulting in an OIS.

F042-14: JULY 30, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a shooting involving an off-duty law enforcement employee, which also involved a kidnapping. The suspect entered a vehicle and pointed a handgun at a female occupant, who was forced to remain inside the vehicle as the suspect fled the location. Officers located the vehicle and a vehicle pursuit ensued. At one point, the suspect stopped, exited his vehicle, and pointed a handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F047-14: AUGUST 11, 2014

Uniformed officers attempted to detain a male suspect regarding a narcotics investigation. As one officer approached the suspect, he immediately turned towards the officer and a physical altercation ensued. During the altercation, the suspect attempted to remove the officer’s service pistol from his holster, resulting in an OIS.
F049-14: AUGUST 12, 2014

While monitoring a location for narcotic activity, plainclothes officers observed a narcotic transaction. Officers attempted to detain the suspect who sold the item; however, he fled from the location. Officers searched the area and encountered the suspect, who again fled from the officers, provoking a foot pursuit. A physical altercation ensued with the suspect, resulting in an OIS.

F052-14: AUGUST 17, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a violent male with a mental condition at a residence. Upon arrival, officers observed the suspect in the rear of the location armed with a shotgun. Officers ordered the suspect numerous times to drop the shotgun; however, their efforts were ineffective. The suspect then charged at the officers with the shotgun, resulting in an OIS.

F053-14: AUGUST 18, 2014

Uniformed officers attempted to conduct a vehicle stop after observing the driver of a vehicle driving recklessly. The driver failed to yield to officers and a vehicle pursuit was initiated. At one point, the vehicle suddenly stopped and the front passenger exited the vehicle armed with an assault rifle and fired at officers, resulting in an OIS. The suspects continued fleeing, after which the vehicle collided into a building and the suspects fled on foot. As the suspects continued running, the front passenger again fired at officers with the rifle, resulting in a second OIS. Both suspects temporarily evaded capture and a perimeter was established. SWAT arrived at the scene and initiated a search of the area. The driver was subsequently located and taken into custody. While continuing with their search for the passenger, SWAT officers observed him emerge from behind a parked vehicle and begin firing at them with the rifle, resulting in a third OIS.

F054-14: SEPTEMBER 8, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a domestic violence radio call at a residence. Upon their arrival, officers heard arguing emanating from the porch area of the residence. As the officers approached, they heard gunshots and a woman screaming. Additionally, they observed muzzle flashes coming from a silhouette of the suspect standing on the front porch. The suspect again began shooting into the house and then pointed the handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F056-14: SEPTEMBER 17, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a man armed with a gun in front of a hospital. Upon their arrival, the officers observed the suspect pointing a handgun at motorists and followed him on foot while attempting to communicate with him. In the course of doing so, the suspect pointed his handgun at one of the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F066-14: NOVEMBER 9, 2014

Uniformed officers observed and identified a wanted male suspect from a Crime Bulletin who was driving a vehicle. Officers attempted to conduct a vehicle stop, which resulted in the initiation of a vehicle pursuit. During the pursuit, the suspect stopped his vehicle at multiple locations and pointed a sawed-off shotgun at officers, at one point resulting in an OIS. The suspect continued driving and was incidentally contained in an area by SWAT armored vehicles. During the containment, the suspect pointed his shotgun at a SWAT officer resulting in a 2nd OIS.

F067-14: NOVEMBER 9, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding shots fired at a residence. Upon their arrival, officers observed the suspect leaving the location on foot and then began running. Officers initiated a foot pursuit, during which the suspect removed a handgun from his waistband and an OIS ensued. The suspect was not struck by gunfire and fled into the neighborhood. A perimeter was established and Metropolitan Division K-9 and SWAT personnel arrived at scene. During a search of the area, officers located the suspect and gave him numerous commands to surrender. The suspect refused and a K-9 was released, which resulted in a K-9 contact with the suspect. As the K-9 continued biting onto the suspect, he removed the pistol from his front waistband area and shot himself in the head.

F068-14: NOVEMBER 9, 2014

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a male stabbing himself with a knife. Upon their arrival, officers observed the suspect walking on a nearby sidewalk and saw blood on his T-shirt, hands, and neck area. Officers also observed a black knife in his right hand. The officers ordered the suspect to drop the knife numerous times; however, he ignored their commands and continued cutting and stabbing himself. As officers continued following the suspect on foot, he suddenly turned towards the officers and began to advance toward them with the knife, resulting in an OIS.
**F074-14: NOVEMBER 30, 2014**

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a burglary from a motor vehicle investigation in front of a residence. Upon their arrival, officers observed the suspect sitting inside a vehicle parked on the street. The suspect looked in the direction of the officers, immediately exited the vehicle and began running from the location. Officers initiated a foot pursuit of the suspect. At one point during the foot pursuit, the suspect pointed a handgun at one of the officers, resulting in an OIS.

**F075-14: DECEMBER 2, 2014**

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a screaming woman at an apartment. Officers arrived at the scene and heard a female victim yell for help and indicated she was being stabbed. Additional officers arrived at scene and a tactical plan to gain entry into the residence was formulated. Upon making entry, officers observed the suspect stabbing the victim numerous times in the chest, resulting in an OIS.

**F076-14: DECEMBER 5, 2014**

Uniformed officers responded to an ambulance cutting at a major entertainment center. Comments of the call also indicated that the suspect was still at the location. Upon arrival, the officers were directed to the suspect, who was still armed with the knife. Officers ordered the suspect numerous times to drop the knife; however, he refused to comply. The suspect then charged at the officers with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

**F078-14: DECEMBER 26, 2014**

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a female suspect armed with a handgun and fist fighting other females at a major entertainment center. Upon their arrival, officers were redirected to an underground parking structure, where the suspect was located. While conducting their follow-up investigation, officers observed the suspect armed with a handgun and pointing it at her own head. The officers gave the suspect numerous commands to drop the gun; however, she refused to comply. The suspect then pointed the handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F079-14: DECEMBER 28, 2014

Uniformed officers were driving to a radio call and observed two males walking on the sidewalk. The officers then heard numerous gunshots, causing them to believe that they were being shot at. Both officers deployed out of the vehicle and took cover behind the engine block. Officers observed the suspect point a handgun at them, resulting in an OIS.
F002-15: JANUARY 5, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a “Kidnap Suspect There Now” radio call. The victim advised officers at scene that the suspect had held him overnight at gunpoint in the residence and had refused to let him leave. A perimeter was established and numerous attempts to have the suspect surrender failed. SWAT and K9 units responded as a result of the barricaded suspect and deployed on the residence. A citizen advised officers that the next door residence was abandoned and that there was a shed behind the house that should be checked. The officers responded to the back and subsequently observed the suspect armed with a pistol. After failed attempts to gain his cooperation, the suspect fired numerous rounds at officers through a window, resulting in an OIS.

F004-15: JANUARY 15, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a subject attempting suicide at a residence. Los Angeles City Fire Department personnel were the first to arrive at scene and discovered a combative patient who locked himself inside a room. Officers, who responded to a back-up request by the LAFD, formed a contact team and entered the residence. During officers’ attempts to contact the suspect and allow medical personnel to treat him, the suspect stood up with a kitchen knife in his hand and moved toward officers, resulting in an OIS.

F005-15: JANUARY 17, 2015

Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call of a suspect firing a gun in the air. Officers arrived at the location and saw the suspect holding a firearm in his hand. Officers gave him orders to drop the gun; however, the suspect pointed the firearm at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F006-15: JANUARY 20, 2015

While conducting crime suppression, uniformed officers observed a suspect whom they believed was attempting to conceal a weapon under his clothing. When the suspect saw the officers approaching, he began to walk away at a rapid pace. As the officers exited their vehicle, they directed the suspect to stop and show his hands. The suspect reached under his clothing, produced a shotgun, and fired a round, resulting in an OIS.
F007-15: JANUARY 21, 2015

Uniformed officers initiated a vehicle pursuit of a vehicle containing four armed suspects. During the pursuit, the suspect’s vehicle struck several parked vehicles and came to rest in the middle of the street. The driver and the front passenger of the vehicle exited and ran, followed by the officers. As the officers chased after the driver, the suspect pointed a handgun at one of the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F008-15: JANUARY 25, 2015

Off-duty detectives responded to the screams of a woman yelling for help at the end of the cul-de-sac outside the city. Following their 911 phone call to the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, the detectives approached the area of the screaming woman and observed a male straddling a woman on the ground. The suspect appeared to be strangling the woman with his hands. Both detectives approached, identified themselves as police officers, and ordered the suspect to stop his actions and raise his hands. The suspect did not comply and continued to strangle the woman, resulting in an OIS.

F011-15: FEBRUARY 9, 2015

While being pursued by uniformed patrol officers, the suspect (driver) drove erratically, struck several cars, and changed vehicles by carjacking a female victim at gunpoint. The pursuit eventually terminated and the suspect attempted a second carjacking; however, he was unsuccessful. The suspect then fled on foot carrying the firearm in his hand while being pursued by officers. Officers gave the suspect numerous verbal commands to drop his weapon and to get down on the ground; however, he refused. The suspect turned toward the officers with the gun in his hand, resulting in an OIS.

F012-15: FEBRUARY 10, 2015

While driving back to their respective police station, Criminal Gang Homicide Division uniformed officers passed an alley and observed a suspect pointing a firearm at a third party. Officers stopped, approached the suspect on foot, and ordered him to drop the gun. The suspect did not comply, resulting in an OIS.
F016-15: FEBRUARY 23, 2015

Plainclothes investigators were conducting surveillance for a named suspect in an attempted murder investigation. While parked west of the location, plainclothes detectives observed the suspect and a female exit the concerned residence and enter separate vehicles in the driveway. The female slowly drove toward the detective’s location while systematically looking inside all of the parked vehicles on the street. As she slowly drove by the detective, she noticed his presence and conducted a three-point turn, slowly driving by him a second time. The female then returned to the residence where she appeared to have a conversation with the suspect. The suspect immediately drove to the detective’s parked vehicle and confronted him with a semi-automatic handgun. The suspect then began shooting at the detective, resulting in an OIS.

F017-15: FEBRUARY 26, 2015

While conducting a narcotics investigation, plainclothes officers observed several suspects on the porch of a residence. As the officers drove past the residence, they heard a gunshot behind them. Both officers looked back toward the residence and observed additional muzzle flashes emanating from the corner of the property. Officers stopped their vehicle and an OIS ensued.

F018-15: MARCH 1, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a robbery in progress. Upon their arrival, the officers contacted the suspect and a violent altercation occurred. An officer deployed a TASER, which struck the suspect but had no effect. During the altercation, the suspect attempted to disarm an officer by pulling on his handgun from the holster, resulting in an OIS.

F019-15: MARCH 3, 2015

Uniformed officers initiated a vehicle pursuit of a van that was involved in prior shooting incidents. The pursuit travelled into an alley, where two passenger suspects exited the vehicle and fled on foot while the driver continued evading additional officers in the vehicle. As the passengers exited, officers pursued them on foot. During the foot pursuit, one of the suspects drew a pistol from his waistband and pointed it at the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F020-15: MARCH 5, 2015

Uniformed officers initiated a vehicle pursuit of a reckless driver. During the pursuit, the suspect’s vehicle and the officer’s vehicle collided. One officer was not able to exit the vehicle. As the suspect stood next to the door of the police vehicle, the officer was in fear of being ambushed, and an OIS ensued.

F022-15: MARCH 14, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an assault with a deadly weapon suspect at a residence. Upon their arrival, the suspect’s father, who had a shoulder injury, stated the suspect was throwing items out of the house and had attacked him with a knife. As officers approached the residence where the suspect lived, the suspect pointed a handgun out of the window at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F023-15: MARCH 15, 2015

As plainclothes officers were driving in an unmarked Department vehicle, their vehicle was struck by gunfire. The officers then observed two suspects shooting at them, resulting in an OIS.

F025-15: MARCH 25, 2015

An off-duty officer was asleep in his residence and was awakened by noises and a flashlight illuminating the interior of the residence. The officer armed himself and exited the residence to further investigate. Upon exiting the front door, the officer observed an unfamiliar vehicle parked in his driveway. A male suspect suddenly appeared from a walkway to the rear yard that was adjacent to the driveway, and an OIS ensued.
F026-15: MARCH 26, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a male with a possible mental illness who was stabbing himself in the throat and had a belt around his neck. Upon their arrival, the suspect’s mother directed officers to the suspect, who was lying on the kitchen floor bleeding profusely. The officers attempted to render aid while awaiting the arrival of a Fire Department Rescue Ambulance and verbalized with the suspect to stay calm. When the rescue ambulance arrived, one officer exited the residence to escort LAFD personnel back into the kitchen. The suspect suddenly leapt to his feet, grabbed two kitchen knives off the counter, and began to advance toward the officer. The officer redeployed out the residence and alerted his partner and the paramedics that the suspect had armed himself. As the officers were attempting to gain distance from the residence, the suspect exited the front door armed with a knife in each hand and charged at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F027-15: MARCH 29, 2015

While off-duty and driving with a friend, an officer was driving behind a vehicle, driven by an unidentified male suspect. The suspect suddenly conducted a U-turn, causing the officer to brake to avoid a collision. The officer continued driving and was stopped to turn into a side street when he observed the suspect’s vehicle rapidly approaching the passenger side of his vehicle. As the suspect drove past the officer’s vehicle, the suspect pointed a handgun at them and fired two gunshots. The suspect fled the location in his vehicle, and the officer followed. The officer located the suspect, drew his service weapon, identified himself as a police officer, and gave the suspect commands to surrender. The suspect failed to comply, suddenly backed up, and again pointed a handgun at the officer, resulting in an OIS.

F029-15: APRIL 8, 2015

After hearing gunshots, uniformed officers observed a victim down in the middle of the street. The officers observed a suspect running away from the location and immediately requested additional resources, including an ambulance for the downed victim. A LAPD airship observed the suspect running northbound and directed uniformed officers to the suspect’s location. As the officers tactically approached on foot, the suspect began to shoot at them, resulting in an OIS.

F031-15: APRIL 21, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a male stabbing himself. Upon their arrival, the officers attempted to make contact with the male. The suspect appeared at the apartment door armed with a hunting knife in his right hand and approached the officers. Officers verbalized with the suspect to drop the knife but he refused to comply and advanced toward officers, resulting in an OIS.
**F032-15: APRIL 23, 2015**

Uniformed officers responded to numerous radio calls of a man with a gun. Upon arrival, officers located the suspect and observed him armed with a handgun, which he alternately pointed at passing motorists, the officers, and himself. The officers attempted to contain the suspect as he began walking, while repeatedly giving him commands to drop the weapon. The suspect refused to obey the officers’ commands and kept waving the gun and pointing it at himself as he continued walking. Suddenly, the suspect turned and pointed the handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

**F037-15: MAY 05, 2015**

While driving in an unmarked police vehicle, uniformed officers observed a suspect running away from them while holding his waistband area. Believing the suspect was armed, the officers exited their vehicle and pursued the suspect on foot. The suspect jumped over a gate into a driveway and jumped over a fence into the rear yard of another property. Officers contained the area where the suspect was last seen and began establishing a perimeter. Moments later, the suspect emerged from a parked vehicle holding a black handgun. One of the officers issued commands to the suspect to drop the gun; however, the suspect failed to comply and raised the handgun at the officer, resulting in an OIS.

**F038-15: MAY 5, 2015**

Uniformed officers received a radio call of a man harassing customers and refusing to leave a business. Upon their arrival, the officers encountered the suspect and engaged him in conversation. The suspect agreed to leave the area and began to walk away. Moments later, the suspect became engaged in a fight with a security officer. While attempting to assist the security officer, the officers became involved in a struggle with the suspect and an OIS ensued.

**F043-15: MAY 24, 2015**

Uniformed officers walked out of an LAPD Service Center and observed a group of three males standing in the parking lot across the street involved in a verbal dispute. Officers then observed the males begin walking away from the location and noted a fourth individual walk to the rear of a nearby parked vehicle, retrieve a handgun and begin walking toward the group of males. When the suspect pointed the handgun at the group, an OIS ensued.
F044-15: MAY 26, 2015

Uniformed officers were flagged down by two victims who advised them that two suspects had threatened them with a gun. The victims directed the officers to the suspects, who were walking away from the location. The officers gave the suspects numerous commands to stop and both failed to comply. One suspect continued walking while the other crouched behind a car with his hands in his waistband. The crouched suspect then advanced on one of the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F046-15: JUNE 10, 2015

Uniformed officers and supervisors responded to a radio call of a suicidal man armed with a knife. Two uniformed supervisors arrived and observed the suspect sitting on the sidewalk. The supervisors waited the arrival of the second unit, requested a bean bag and a TASER, and coordinated the deployment of the second unit. Two uniformed officers arrived and attempted to verbalize with the suspect from a distance. The suspect charged at one of the supervisors with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

F048-15: JUNE 19, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a domestic violence radio call. Comments of the radio call identified the suspect and advised he had battered his wife, was under the influence, and was possibly driving the victim’s van. Upon their arrival, the officers observed the suspect in the van and attempted to initiate a traffic stop. The suspect failed to yield to the officers and a pursuit ensued. During the pursuit, the suspect called the California Highway Patrol via 911 and advised he had a gun in his lap and was suicidal. After fleeing through Los Angeles and neighboring cities, the suspect stopped his vehicle and exited with a handgun. An officer deployed a beanbag shotgun, firing numerous rounds at the suspect, which had no effect. The suspect pointed the handgun at officers resulting in an OIS. The suspect appeared unaffected by both the beanbag rounds and the gunfire and re-entered the vehicle and continued fleeing from the officers. When the pursuit terminated, the suspect exited the van, pointed the handgun at officers again, resulting in a second OIS.

F049-15: JUNE 19, 2015

While on patrol in a marked black and white police vehicle, uniformed officers were stopped in traffic when they observed a suspect on a nearby sidewalk advancing toward them with his hands wrapped in a gray cloth in a shooting stance. Believing they were about to be fired upon, the officers exited their car, ordered the suspect to drop the gun, and an OIS ensued.
F054-15: JUNE 29, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a drive-by shooting. During the officers’ response, they heard gunfire emanating north of their location. The officers subsequently observed three to four suspects mid-block where additional shots were heard and observed muzzle flash from a firearm. One of the suspects then turned and pointed a handgun at the officers, resulting in an OIS.

F055-15: JULY 6, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of an assault with a deadly weapon. The comments of the call indicated a woman was screaming and a man covered in blood was armed with a knife at the location. Upon their arrival with a secondary unit, officers were met in the middle of the street by a male covered in blood while armed with a large kitchen knife. The officers deployed out of their vehicle and directed the suspect to drop the knife. The suspect refused to comply and advanced toward the officers armed with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

F057-15: JULY 9, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a vandalism suspect breaking business windows. Upon their arrival, the officers observed a smashed window and the suspect attempting to smash an additional window with a skateboard. When officers attempted to detain the suspect, the suspect fled on his skateboard and officers followed him in their patrol vehicle. Eventually, the suspect fell off his skateboard and the officers attempted to detain the suspect. A physical altercation ensued and one of the officers utilized the TASER on the suspect. The suspect was able to gain control of the TASER and used it on one officer who became incapacitated, resulting in an OIS by the partner officer.

F058-15: JULY 13, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a man armed with a knife. Upon their arrival, the officers observed the suspect was armed with a knife and began giving him commands to drop it. The suspect refused to comply, stood up and began to aggressively approach the officers. One officer utilized a TASER on the suspect, which had no effect. The suspect continued to advance on one of the officers while still armed with the knife, resulting in an OIS.
F062-15: JULY 24, 2015
Citizens observed a suspect firing what was perceived to be live rounds into the air, causing numerous “shots fired” and “man with a gun” radio calls to be generated. A uniformed sergeant and two uniformed officers responded and observed the suspect sitting on a brick wall with what officers believed was a handgun between his legs. The suspect ignored officers’ verbal commands to drop the gun, resulting in an OIS.

F065-15: AUGUST 6, 2015
Plainclothes officers were monitoring narcotic sales activity when they observed a suspect standing at the corner holding a handgun. The suspect ran from the location into a nearby alley while holding the handgun in plain view and the officers followed in their vehicle. The suspect attempted to scale a chain link fence, but his clothing became entangled and he became stuck on top of the fence. When the officers exited their vehicle, the suspect pointed his handgun at them, resulting in an OIS.

F067-15: AUGUST 12, 2015
Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a robbery suspect that had just left a business. The comments of the radio call also indicated that the suspect was armed with a large knife. The officers observed the suspect walking away from the location and exited their police vehicles in an attempt to detain her. A foot pursuit ensued and officers chased the suspect into an alley where she armed herself with a large knife. Officers gave the suspect commands to drop it; however, she refused to comply and continued to flee before she suddenly stopped and turned toward the officers with the knife in hand. One officer utilized his TASER on the suspect, which had no effect. She began to advance on one of the officers while still armed with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

F071-15: AUGUST 22, 2015
Uniformed patrol officers responded to a radio call regarding a violent male with a possible mental illness at a residence. Officers knocked on the apartment door and the subject of the radio call answered the door while in possession of knives. The suspect threw one of the knives at the officers and then fled on foot. Two additional units responded and observed the suspect running from the location. The officers exited their vehicles and observed the suspect running towards them in an aggressive manner while still in possession of a large knife, resulting in an OIS.
F072-15: AUGUST 22, 2015

While working crime suppression duties, uniformed officers observed a male walking in the street, obstructing vehicle traffic. The officers stopped the police vehicle in order to conduct a pedestrian stop for the observed violation. As the driver officer exited the vehicle, he observed the handle of a handgun protruding from the suspect’s jacket pocket and immediately voiced his observation to his partner. The suspect ran onto the adjacent sidewalk and the officers followed. The suspect turned in the direction of the officers with a handgun in his right hand, resulting in an OIS.

F075-15: AUGUST 27, 2015

Uniformed officers responded a radio call of a neighbor dispute. Upon arrival, the officers determined that one of the parties involved in the dispute was using utilities from the other’s address without permission. The officers responded to investigate and encountered the suspect. A physical altercation ensued, in which the suspect picked up a metal tool and struck both officers on the head and shoulder area, resulting in an OIS.

F080-15: SEPTEMBER 10, 2015

While conducting a follow-up investigation, detectives observed a wanted shooting suspect driving in the vehicle used in the commission of the crime. The detectives followed him and broadcasted their observations and location. The suspect suddenly negotiated a U-turn and drove southbound towards the detectives. The detectives drove into a driveway, exited their vehicle, and were confronted by the suspect, resulting in an OIS.

F081-15: SEPTEMBER 15, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call regarding a man armed with a gun. Upon their arrival, officers observed the suspect and attempted to detain him. As the suspect continued walking away, officers observed that he was armed with handgun in his right hand. As the officers tactically deployed, the suspect pointed the handgun at one of the officers, resulting in an OIS.
F082-15: SEPTEMBER 16, 2015
Numerous officers responded to a shots fired radio call. In addition to the call, two additional 911 calls were received, one of which was made by the shooting suspect. The responding personnel began to deploy on the residence when the suspect walked out the side door of the residence armed with a rifle. The suspect pointed the rifle at officers, resulting in an OIS.

F083-15: SEPTEMBER 27, 2015
Uniformed officers received a radio call of a woman with a knife. Upon their arrival, the officers were confronted by the suspect. The suspect failed to obey the officers’ commands and continued to approach the officers with the knife, resulting in an OIS.

F084-15: OCTOBER 3, 2015
Uniformed officers were stopped at a red tri-light signal waiting to negotiate a turn. The officers heard and saw their rear window explode. Believing they were being fired upon, the officers’ attention was drawn to a suspect who was standing to the rear of their vehicle. The officers exited their vehicle and an OIS ensued.

F087-15: OCTOBER 27, 2015
Uniformed officers attempted to detain the driver of a stolen vehicle, resulting in a physical altercation. The officers and suspect fell to the ground and fought over a knife that the suspect had armed himself with. During the physical altercation, the suspect attempted to remove an officer’s gun from the holster, resulting in an OIS.
F090-15: NOVEMBER 9, 2015

Uniformed officers responded to a radio call of a male in the middle of the street causing vehicles to swerve around him. Upon the officers’ arrival, the suspect reached into his waistband area, simulated drawing a handgun and ran toward the officers. The officers utilized a beanbag shotgun and TASER on the suspect, which had no effect. A physical altercation ensued and an officer was knocked to the ground. The suspect obtained control of the beanbag shotgun and stood over the officer with the beanbag shotgun, resulting in an OIS.

F095-15: DECEMBER 14, 2015

An off-duty officer was outside his private vehicle which was parked in front of his residence. The officer was confronted by a suspect armed with a handgun, resulting in an OIS.

F098-15: DECEMBER 19, 2015

Uniformed officers were monitoring a suspect receiving medical treatment after he was involved in a prior CUOF incident where he attempted to disarm an officer of his handgun. After medical treatment was provided and the suspect was cleared to be booked by the attending physician, the officers began handcuffing the suspect. In the process, the suspect attacked the officers with bodily force and a metal chair. Officers utilized TASERs to control him with no effect. The suspect attempted to remove an officer’s gun from the holster, resulting in an OIS.


Uniformed officers assisted in the service of a search and arrest warrant for a murder suspect. The suspect barricaded himself inside the residence and refused to surrender. After some time, the suspect fled the location and began climbing onto the roof of a storage shed in the rear yard of the property. While doing so, the suspect turned towards officers positioned nearby with an object that was believed to be a handgun in his hand, resulting in an OIS.
2015 SUMMARY OF FINDING
DEPARTMENT TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

Department training and development are evolutionary and adaptable to emerging issues in the community. Throughout the years, the Department has consistently tailored training methods and curriculum based on academic research and emerging societal trends. The expectation is for police officers to resolve situations safely and with the least amount of force possible.

Training implemented by the Department in 2015 expanded on the concepts of preservation of life and building public trust, which were identified as essential elements in the law enforcement community throughout the nation. Additionally, the augmented training on de-escalation of force and mental illness were significant avenues of success for the Department and its employees.

Chief of Police Charlie Beck continued his model of Relationship-Based Policing, where he established the expectation for Department personnel to build one-on-one personal relationships with members of the community by breaking down barriers, improving communication, and providing everyone a better understanding of each other’s perspectives and needs.

The COP also re-established the Department’s continued pledge to the institutionalization of preservation of life, and introduced the Preservation of Life Award to recognize employees who heroically use exceptional tactics to safely resolve dangerous situations.

Lastly, the introduction of the Department’s Police Science Leadership course teaches newer officers the investigative and field operational skills necessary to solve long-term problems in the community while increasing public trust and police legitimacy.

LESS LETHAL DEPLOYMENT

In synchronization with the concept of preservation of life, the Department made tremendous progress in increasing the deployment of less lethal tools in the field, including additional TASER and beanbag shotgun units. Training for field personnel in the deployment and use of the TASER is currently being provided in the 10-hour Use of Force Update class. The Department is also conducting additional research in regards to new less lethal force options, including, but not limited to, a gel-based OC spray that directs a stream of gel as opposed to an aerosol spray, and a 40-millimeter impact launcher. The Department is committed to equipping each patrol vehicle’s cabin area with beanbag shotgun mounts to provide officers quick and more effective access to the beanbag shotgun.

2015 CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The following represent notable findings revealed during the statistical analysis of 2015 CUOF incidents, when compared to those from 2011 through 2014:

- OIS HIT
  - The 38 OIS Hit incidents in 2015 was an increase of 12 incidents from the preceding year and exceeded the four year annual average from 2011 through 2014 by four incidents.
  - Hispanic suspects represented the largest percentage of individuals involved in OIS Hit incidents, with 22 out of the 38 for the year, or 58 percent. Black suspects were the second highest concentration with eight, or 21 percent, followed by White suspects with five individuals, or 13 percent.
  - Thirty-six of the 38 suspects, or 95 percent, were male.
  - Twenty suspects, or 53 percent, were between the ages of 30 to 39, which was an increase of 16 individuals, or 400 percent, compared to the preceding year.
  - Thirteen suspects, or 34 percent, were armed with a firearm; 10 suspects, or 26 percent, were armed with an edged weapon; and five, or 13 percent, were armed with a pellet or replica firearm. The replica/pellet category experienced a 400 percent increase from the preceding year.
  - Metropolitan Division experienced a significant reduction of personnel involved in OIS Hit incidents from the preceding year, with two officers in 2015.
which were 15 fewer than in 2014, or an 88 percent decrease. Meanwhile, the patrol category experienced a significant increase in 2015 with 52 officers, which were 20 more than in 2014, or a 63 percent increase.

- The most OIS Hit incidents in 2015 occurred in Operations Central Bureau, which represented 12 of the 38 incidents, or 32 percent. Specifically, Hollenbeck Division had the most incidents on a geographical level, with five of the twelve incidents. All five incidents involved suspects armed with a firearm.
- Six incidents, or 16 percent, occurred outside the Department’s jurisdiction, which was an increase of four incidents, or 200 percent, from the preceding year.
- Twenty-four of the 38 OIS Hit incidents, or 63 percent, involved only one officer firing his/her weapon.
- Sixty-two officers were involved in OIS Hit incidents in 2015, which was 22 officers below the four year annual average from 2011 through 2014 of 84 officers, or 26 percent.
- Twenty-seven of the 38 OIS Hit incidents, or 71 percent, involved only one to five rounds being fired, which was an increase of 10 incidents, or 59 percent, from the preceding year.

OIS NO HIT
- The 10 OIS No Hit incidents in 2015 was an increase of six incidents from the preceding year and exceeded the four year annual average from 2011 through 2014 by less than one incident.
- Black suspects represented the largest percentage of individuals involved in OIS No Hit incidents, with four out of the 10 for the year, or 40 percent. White suspects were the second highest concentration with two, or 20 percent, followed by Hispanic suspects with one individual, or 10 percent. Two suspects were designated with an unknown ethnicity.
- All suspects involved in OIS No Hit incidents were male.
- Eight of the ten suspects, or 80 percent, were armed with a firearm, and one suspect, or 10 percent, was armed with a pellet or replica firearm.
- Personnel assigned to a specialized assignment represented the highest concentration of Department employees involved in OIS No Hit incidents with six out 14 individuals, or 43 percent. Meanwhile, the patrol category represented four personnel, or 29 percent.
- Seven of the 10 OIS No Hit incidents, or 70 percent, involved only one officer firing his/her weapon.
- Six of the 10 OIS Hit incidents, or 60 percent, involved only one to five rounds being fired, which was an increase of three incidents, or 100 percent, from the preceding year.

IN-CUSTODY DEATHS
In 2015, the Department experienced 12 ICD incidents, which was an increase of eight, or 200 percent, compared to four in 2014. In the four year period from 2011 through 2014, there were a total of 21 ICD incidents, resulting in an annual average of 5.25 incidents.

The following table depicts the decedents’ causes of death, whether force was used by Department personnel, and whether the suspects were under the influence of alcohol/narcotics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Cause of Death</th>
<th>Force Used?</th>
<th>Under the Influence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Toxicology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overdose</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Overdose</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Overdose</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pending from Coroner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Accidental</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pending from Coroner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pending from Coroner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pending from Coroner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pending from Coroner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pending from Coroner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pending from Coroner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pending from Coroner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pending from Coroner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
The following represent notable findings as revealed during the statistical analysis of 2015 NCUOF incidents when compared to those from 2011 through 2014:

- The 1,825 NCUOF incidents in 2015 was a decrease of 38 incidents from the preceding year, however exceeded the four year annual average from 2011 through 2014 by approximately 37 incidents.
- Hispanic suspects represented the largest percentage of individuals involved in NCUOF incidents, with 870 out of the 1,894 for the year, or 46 percent. Black suspects were the second highest concentration with 562, or 30 percent, followed by White suspects with 278 individuals, or 15 percent.
- Of the 1,894 suspects, 1,598 were male, representing 84 percent.
- The most NCUOF incidents in 2015 occurred in Operations Central Bureau, which represented 554 of the 1,825 incidents, or 30 percent.
- The most frequently used force option by Department personnel during NCUOF incidents in 2015 were firm grips and joint locks, which were utilized in 1,494 of the 1,825 incidents, or 82 percent. Body weight was the second most used force option, utilized in 1,295 incidents, or 71 percent.

---

19 The County of Los Angeles Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner defines accidental deaths as any death due to injury where there is no evidence of intent to harm.

20 Additional information was received subsequent to the printing of the 2015 Use of Force Year-End Review Executive Summary, which reclassified the cause/manner of death for one of the ICD incidents from an overdose to a homicide. The County of Los Angeles Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner indicated in the autopsy report that the decedent died as a result of being under the influence of narcotics (cocaine), pre-existing medical conditions, and from the use of a Department TASER.
Non-Categorical Use of Force incidents in which a TASER was used in 2015 increased by 100 incidents from the preceding year, representing a 24 percent increase. Additionally, TASER usage in 2015 increased by 35 percent when compared to the 2011 through 2014 period.

Non-Categorical Use of Force incidents in which a beanbag shotgun was used in 2015 increased by 17 incidents from the preceding year, representing a 31 percent increase.

2015 STATISTICAL SNAPSHOT

In 2015, 278,530 of the subjects stopped by LAPD personnel during field detentions were Hispanic, which represented 45 percent of all 617,934 subjects stopped during the year. During the same period, 160,412 subjects, or 26 percent, were Black. White subjects detained during field detentions comprised of 122,807 individuals, or 20 percent. Lastly, 56,185 subjects, or nine percent, had unknown ethnic designations.

In 2015, 14,875 suspects involved in violent crime incidents in the City of Los Angeles were of Hispanic descent, which represented 42 percent of all 35,277 suspects. During the same period, 14,633 suspects, or 41 percent, were Black. White suspects involved in violent crime incidents comprised of 2,745 individuals, or eight percent. Lastly, 3,024 suspects, or nine percent, had either unknown or other ethnic designations.

In 2015, 5,926 suspects arrested by the LAPD as a result of incidents involving violent crime were Hispanic, which represented 49 percent of all 12,082 suspects arrested for violent crime incidents during the year. During the same period, 3,980 suspects, or 33 percent, were Black. White suspects arrested for violent crime incidents comprised of 1,459 individuals, or 12 percent. Lastly, 717 suspects, or six percent, had either unknown or other ethnic designations.
DEFINITIONS

A. Adjudication: Tactics, drawing and exhibiting a firearm, and use of force shall be evaluated during the adjudication process. The adjudication process for Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) incidents differs slightly from Non-Categorical Use of Force (NCUOF) with respect to the chain of investigation, review, and analysis. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792 and 3/793)

B. Administrative Disapproval/Out of Policy – Drawing and Exhibiting and/or Use of Force: A finding, supported by a preponderance of the evidence that the actions of the employee relative to drawing and exhibiting a firearm or use of force were not within the Department’s policies. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

Administrative Disapproval – Negligent Discharge: A finding, where it was determined that the unintentional discharge of a firearm resulted from operator error, such as the violation of a firearm safety rule. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

Administrative Disapproval – Tactics: A finding, supported by a preponderance of the evidence that the tactics employed during a Categorical Use of Force incident unjustifiably and substantially deviated from approved Department tactical training. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

C. Animal Shooting: Officer-involved animal shootings. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

D. Canine (K9) Contacts (CUOF): An incident in which a member of the public has contact with a Department canine and hospitalization is required. If hospitalization is not required, the incident does not rise to the level of a use of force. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

E. Carotid Restraint Control Holds: An upper body control hold by a Department employee, including the modified carotid, full carotid, and locked carotid hold; all deaths while the arrestee or detainee is in the custodial care of the Department (also known as an In-Custody Death or ICD); a use of force incident resulting in death; a use of force incident resulting in an injury requiring hospitalization, commonly referred to as a Law Enforcement Related Injury or LERI; all intentional head strikes with an impact weapon or device (e.g., baton, flashlight, etc.) and all unintentional (inadvertent or accidental) head strikes that results in serious bodily injury, hospitalization or death; officer-involved animal shootings; non-tactical unintentional discharges; and an incident in which a member of the public has contact with a Department canine and hospitalization is required. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

F. Categorical Use of Force Incident: The use of deadly force (e.g., discharge of a firearm) by a Department employee; all uses of an upper body control hold by a Department employee, including the use of a modified carotid, full carotid or locked carotid hold; all deaths while the arrestee or detainee is in the custodial care of the Department (also known as an In-Custody Death or ICD); a use of force incident resulting in death; a use of force incident resulting in an injury requiring hospitalization, commonly referred to as a Law Enforcement Related Injury or LERI; all intentional head strikes with an impact weapon or device (e.g., baton, flashlight, etc.) and all unintentional (inadvertent or accidental) head strikes that results in serious bodily injury, hospitalization or death; officer-involved animal shootings; non-tactical unintentional discharges; and an incident in which a member of the public has contact with a Department canine and hospitalization is required. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

G. Force Options: All Department-approved physical force techniques (e.g. firm grip, strike, takedown) or devices (e.g. OC spray, baton, TASER) available to an officer. Force Options fall into the following three categories: Deadly Force; Less-Lethal (e.g. TASER, bean bag), and Non-Lethal (e.g. firm grip, takedown). (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

H. General Training Update: Standardized training provided by the employee’s command or Training Division personnel to personnel involved in a CUOF incident. The Training Update is not an inquiry into the specific details of the CUOF. The intent of the update is to provide involved personnel with standardized training material in tactical issues and actions readily identified in the CUOF incident as well as an update on the Use of Force policy. Training should be provided as soon as practicable before the involved officer(s) return to field duties, but within 90 days following the incident. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05 and 3/796.35)

I. Head Strikes: An intentional head strikes with an impact weapon or device (e.g., baton, flashlight) and all unintentional (inadvertent or accidental) head strikes that results in serious bodily injury, hospitalization, or death. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

J. In Custody Death: The death of an arrestee or detainee who is in the custodial care of the Department. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)
K. **Law Enforcement Related Injury Investigations:** A use of force incident resulting in an injury requiring hospitalization, commonly referred to as a law enforcement related injury or LERI. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

L. **Non-Categorical Use of Force:** An incident in which any on-duty Department employee, or off-duty employee whose occupation as a Department employee is a factor, uses a less-lethal control device or physical force to compel a person to comply with the employee’s direction; overcome resistance of a person during an arrest or a detention; or, defend any individual from an aggressive action by another person. (2015 LAPD Manual 4/245.05)


N. **Officer Involved Shooting:** An incident in which a Department employee discharges a firearm. These incidents can be categorized into Hits or Non-Hits. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/796)

O. **Serious Bodily Threat:** Serious bodily injury, as defined in California Penal Code Section 243(f)(4), includes, but is not limited to, the following: Loss of consciousness, concussion, bone fracture, protracted loss or impairment of function of any bodily member organ, a wound requiring extensive suturing, and serious disfigurement. (2015 LAPD Manual 1/556.10)

P. **Source of Activity:**
   i. **Radio Call:** Call for service directed by Communications Division.
   
   ii. **Observation:** Contact initiated by officers based on reasonable suspicion, probable cause, or as a consensual encounter.
   
   iii. **Private Person Call/Request:** Private person alert officers to a subject, an activity, or a location not otherwise observed by officers or reported to Communications Division.

   iv. **Pre-Planned:** Any type of activity that requires an operational plan (e.g. search/arrest warrant services, task forces).
   
   v. **Station Calls:** Non-coded or low priority incidents where officers are directed to a location by Department personnel, other than Communications Division.
   
   vi. **Ambush:** An act or an instance so as to attack by surprise or lure officers resulting in an officer involved shooting.
   
   vii. **Off-Duty:** Incident where officers are off-duty and not conducting official Department business.

Q. **Substantially Involved Personnel:** Employee(s) applying force or who had a significant tactical or decision making role in the incident. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

R. **Tactical Debrief:** The collective review of an incident to identify those areas where actions and decisions were effective and those areas where actions and decisions could have been improved. The intent of a Tactical Debrief is to enhance future performance. The Tactical Debrief is conducted by the Categorical Use of Force Debrief Facilitator. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

S. **Unintentional Discharge:** The unintentional discharge of a firearm regardless of cause. Unintentional discharges are evaluated and then determined to be either “Accidental Discharges” or “Negligent Discharges.” (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

T. **Use of Force-Tactics Directive:** A written directive that contains procedure and/or insight into use of force and tactics issues. Use of Force policy will continue to be expressed in the Department Manual but may be reiterated in Use of Force-Tactics Directives. Use of Force-Tactics Directives supersedes any Training Bulletins that have been published regarding the subject matter of the directives. (2015 LAPD Manual 1/240.12)
U. Use of Force: In a complex urban society, officers are confronted daily with situations where control must be exercised to effect arrests and to protect the public safety. Control may be exercised through advice, warnings, and persuasion, or by the use of physical force. Officers are permitted to use force that is objectively reasonable to defend themselves or others, to effect an arrest or detention, and/or to prevent escape or overcome resistance, consistent with the Department’s Policy on the Use of Force. (2015 LAPD Manual 1/556.10)

V. Use of Force Review Board: The Use of Force Review Board shall convene at the direction of the Chair of the Board and shall: Avail itself of any facilities of the Department necessary to conduct a complete examination of the circumstances involved in the incident under investigation, report its findings and recommendations to the Chief of Police and upon adjournment, forward the Use of Force Internal Process Report, and other related reports to the Chief of Police. (2015 LAPD Manual 2/092.50)

W. Use of Lethal Force (Other): An incident involving the use of deadly force by Department personnel. This type of force will encompass those forces that are not included in other CUOF classifications. (2015 LAPD Manual 3/792.05)

X. Warning Shots: Warning shots shall only be used in exceptional circumstances where it might reasonably be expected to avoid the need to use deadly force. Generally, warning shots shall be directed in a manner that minimizes the risk of injury to innocent persons, ricochet dangers and property damage. (2015 LAPD Manual 1/556.10)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AD</th>
<th>Administrative Disapproval</th>
<th>NCUOF</th>
<th>Non-Categorical Use of Force Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOPC</td>
<td>Board of Police Commissioners</td>
<td>NYPD</td>
<td>New York Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSS</td>
<td>Behavioral Science Services</td>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>Office of Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGHD</td>
<td>Criminal Gang and Homicide Division</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Oleoresin Capsicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>Operations Central Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>Chief of Staff</td>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>Office of the Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Chicago Police Department</td>
<td>OIS</td>
<td>Officer Involved Shooting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRCH</td>
<td>Carotid Restraint Control Hold</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>Office of Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTSOB</td>
<td>Counter Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>Operations South Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUOF</td>
<td>Categorical Use of Force Incident</td>
<td>OVB</td>
<td>Operations Valley Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/E</td>
<td>Drawing or Exhibiting</td>
<td>OWB</td>
<td>Operations West Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID</td>
<td>Force Investigation Division</td>
<td>PBL</td>
<td>Problem Based Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIP</td>
<td>Fair and Impartial Policing</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOS</td>
<td>Force Option Simulator</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>Peace Officer Standards and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSD</td>
<td>Forensic Sciences Division</td>
<td>PPD</td>
<td>Philadelphia Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTO</td>
<td>Field Training Officer</td>
<td>PSL</td>
<td>Police Science Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>Gang Enforcement Detail</td>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Public Safety Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIT</td>
<td>Gang Impact Team</td>
<td>PSTB</td>
<td>Police Sciences and Training Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTU</td>
<td>General Training Update</td>
<td>PTE</td>
<td>Police Training and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>Houston Police Department</td>
<td>RACR</td>
<td>Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Head Strike</td>
<td>RBP</td>
<td>Relationship Based Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD</td>
<td>In-Custody Death</td>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>Substantially Involved Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITD</td>
<td>Information Technology Division</td>
<td>SOB</td>
<td>Special Operations Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADA</td>
<td>Los Angeles District Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>TASER</td>
<td>Thomas A. Swift Electric Rifle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Fire Department</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Training Division or Tactical Debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Police Department</td>
<td>TEAM II</td>
<td>Training Evaluation and Management System II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASD</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department</td>
<td>TID</td>
<td>Technical Investigation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LERI</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Related Injury</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Unintentional Discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETAC</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Tactical Application</td>
<td>UOF</td>
<td>Use of Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEU</td>
<td>Mental Evaluation Unit</td>
<td>UOFRB</td>
<td>Use of Force Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>Museum of Tolerance</td>
<td>UOFRD</td>
<td>Use of Force Review Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTCD</td>
<td>Notice to Correct Deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Department maintains several data repositories on Department personnel, as well as details regarding CUOF incidents. Use of Force Review Division queried the data for the 2015 Use of Force Year-End Review from internal databases. In addition, FID was instrumental in providing any outstanding information from their records. However, FID was unable to provide some information due to the ongoing nature of various CUOF investigations.

The query period included all CUOF incidents from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2015.

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

An officer’s years of service was determined by comparing the Department employee’s hire date to the date of the incident.

An officer’s gender and ethnicity were provided by the employee to the Department when hired.

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

Suspect injuries include self-inflicted injuries, pre-existing medical conditions aggravated during the incident, accidental injuries, and those caused by Department personnel.

The cause and manner of death are determined by the Los Angeles County Department of Medical Examiner - Coroner.

The Department’s method of classifying CUOF incidents is based on the type of force used during the incident. The FID investigation may reveal that multiple force options were used during an incident, which could potentially be classified as different CUOF categories. For tracking purposes, and to avoid duplicate recordation of an incident, the Department classifies an incident based on the most significant force used by Department personnel. However, all CUOFs are fully investigated and adjudicated, including additional force options not captured under the primary classification.

For the purpose of this report, only Department personnel who received an adjudication finding, or has a pending finding, in the concerned force type for each respective CUOF incident are counted as involved employees.

Department personnel are often at scene as part of the tactical situation, but do not apply force. The officers who did not utilize the relevant force were not counted as “involved” in this report.

Any Department personnel discharging a firearm during an OIS Hit incident where the suspect was struck by a projectile, and who received a finding, or has a pending finding, for lethal use of force under the use of force adjudication category, was counted as involved for this report.

Any Department personnel discharging a firearm during an OIS No Hit incident where the suspect was not struck by a projectile, and who received a finding, or has a pending finding, for lethal use of force under the use of force adjudication category, was counted as involved for this report.
OIS ANIMAL
Any Department personnel discharging a firearm during an OIS Animal incident where an animal was the intended target, and who received a finding, or has a pending finding, for lethal use of force under the use of force adjudication category, was counted as involved for this report.

UNINTENTIONAL DISCHARGE
Any Department personnel who unintentionally discharged a firearm and received an unintentional discharge finding, or has a pending finding, was counted as involved.

CAROTID RESTRAINT CONTROL HOLD
Although a CRCH is designed to minimize injury by avoiding pressure to the front of the neck, it is also intended to cause the loss of consciousness. Any Department personnel who applied a CRCH and received a finding, or has a pending finding, for lethal use of force under the use of force adjudication category was counted as involved.

LAW ENFORCEMENT RELATED INJURY INVESTIGATION
A use of force incident is dynamic by nature and the cause of injury may be attributed to various factors or types of force options used. Any Department personnel who utilized force may have contributed to the suspect’s injury. Therefore, any Department personnel who received a finding, or has a pending finding, under the use of force adjudication category in a LERI incident was counted as involved.

HEAD STRIKE
Any Department personnel who received a finding, or has a pending finding, for lethal or less lethal use of force under the use of force adjudication category in a Head Strike incident was counted as involved.

IN-CUSTODY DEATH
The County of Los Angeles Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner, determines the cause and manner of death. A use of force may be ruled as the primary or contributing factor to the cause of death. Any Department personnel who received a finding, or has a pending finding, under the use of force adjudication category in an In-Custody Death incident was counted as involved.

CANINE CONTACT REQUIRING HOSPITALIZATION
Canine deployments do not receive conventional CUOF force findings, but receive separate findings relevant to the deployment of the canine, contact of the canine, and post canine contact procedures. Any Department personnel assigned as the canine handler and who received a finding, or has a pending canine finding, was counted as involved.

WARNING SHOT
A warning shot shall be directed in a manner that minimizes the risk of injury to innocent persons. For the purpose of this report, any Department personnel who received a finding, or has a pending finding, for lethal use of force under the use of force classification in a Warning Shot incident, was counted as involved.

OTHER LETHAL USE OF FORCE
The type of force involved encompasses those that are not specifically described in any other CUOF classifications, but still have the potential to cause serious bodily injury and/or death. For the purposes of this report, any Department personnel who received a finding, or has a pending finding, for lethal use of force under the other lethal use of force adjudication category, was counted as involved.

OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING - ROUNDS AND DISTANCE
Department personnel involved in an OIS incident often change positions during the incident in an effort to seek cover and/or concealment, maintain visual contact with the threat, or to decrease danger to the public. Therefore, the location of each round fired is often an approximation. To maintain a level of consistency for the purpose of this report, the distance of the shooting incident was determined by the distance of the initial firearm discharge.

SUSPECT UNDER THE INFLUENCE
Suspects were determined to be under the influence of alcohol and/or narcotics based on the County of Los Angeles Department of Medical Examiner – Coroner’s toxicology reports. It is uncommon for suspects to release their medical records to the Department. Therefore, under the influence could only be determined for deceased suspects involved in OIS Hit and ICD incidents.

SUSPECT PERCEIVED MENTAL ILLNESS
A suspect’s indication of mental illness was determined based on records with MEU and DMH.

SUSPECT GANG MEMBERSHIP
Gang membership of suspects involved in OIS incidents were provided by FID based on their investigation.
ADJUDICATION

OIS HIT
All Department personnel who were identified as discharging a firearm receive findings in Tactics, Drawing and/or Exhibiting, and Lethal Use of Force. Additionally, if personnel utilized other force options in addition to the discharge of the firearm, they receive findings for all applicable force type(s).

OIS NO HIT
All Department personnel who were identified as discharging a firearm receive findings in Tactics, Drawing and/or Exhibiting, and Lethal Use of Force. Additionally, if personnel utilized other force options in addition to the discharge of the firearm, they receive findings for all applicable force type(s).

OIS ANIMAL
All Department personnel who were identified as discharging a firearm receive findings in Tactics, Drawing and/or Exhibiting, and Lethal Use of Force. Additionally, if personnel utilized other force options in addition to the discharge of the firearm, they receive findings for all applicable force type(s).

UNINTENTIONAL DISCHARGE
All Department personnel who were identified as discharging a firearm receive findings in Tactics. Personnel do not receive a Drawing and/or Exhibiting finding unless the unintentional discharge occurred during a tactical situation. If determined that personnel unintentionally and negligently discharged their firearm, they receive unintentional discharge findings.

LAW ENFORCEMENT RELATED INJURY INVESTIGATION
All Department personnel identified as having utilized force receive findings in Tactics. Personnel may receive findings in all applicable force type(s), and Drawing and/or Exhibiting.

IN-CUSTODY DEATH
All Department personnel identified as having utilized force receive findings in Tactics. Personnel may receive findings in all applicable force type(s), and Drawing and/or Exhibiting.

CAROTID RESTRAINT CONTROL HOLD
All Department personnel identified as having utilized relevant force receive findings in Tactics. Personnel may receive findings in all applicable force type(s), and Drawing and/or Exhibiting.

HEAD STRIKE
All Department personnel identified as having utilized relevant force receive findings in Tactics. Personnel may receive findings in all applicable force type(s), and Drawing or Exhibiting.

OTHER LETHAL USE OF FORCE
All Department personnel identified as having utilized deadly force will receive findings in Tactics. Personnel may receive findings in all applicable force type(s), and Drawing and/or Exhibiting.

ADJUDICATION FINDINGS

ADMINISTRATIVE DISAPPROVAL
Each adjudication category in a use of force incident is evaluated independently. Department personnel may receive an In-Policy finding in one adjudication category, but receive an Administrative Disapproval finding in another, or receive findings of Administrative Disapproval under multiple adjudication categories for the same incident.

ADMINISTRATIVE DISAPPROVAL - OUTCOME
After the BOPC adopts or amends the recommendations as the final part of the CUOF administrative adjudication process, the matter is referred back to the Department for the suitable remedial action. The process allows the Department to use the appropriate means necessary to ensure future compliance with policies and/or procedures. The remedial action addresses all Administrative Disapproval findings in any adjudication category for each Department personnel, and may differ for each personnel involved in the same incident.

PERSONNEL COMPLAINT - OUTCOME
Information regarding the outcome of a personnel complaint is provided through Department databases utilized by Professional Standards Bureau, Internal Affairs Division. Disposition information for some personnel complaints generated from an adjudicated CUOF incident was not available at the time of publication as they were still pending adjudication.
NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE
All NCUOF data was queried by Application Development and Support Division from TEAMS II, as requested by UOFRD.

TOTAL INCIDENTS BY YEAR
The query period included all NCUOF incidents from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2015.

FORCE OPTIONS USED
Each force option was counted once per incident, regardless of the number of times the force option was applied by one or more Department personnel. However, the force options were not mutually exclusive, as multiple force options could have been utilized in an incident. In such cases, all force options used were counted once per incident.

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

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

INCIDENTS BY BUREAU AND AREA
Incident by Bureau and Area detailed where the NCUOF incident occurred, rather than where the involved officers were assigned.

OFFICER GENDER AND ETHNICITY
An officer’s gender and ethnicity were provided by the employee to the Department when hired.

OFFICER RANK AND UNIT ASSIGNED
Officer rank and unit of assignment indicated the employee’s status at the time of the incident.

OFFICER INJURIES
Officer injuries included all injuries sustained by a Department employee during the NCUOF incident.

SUSPECT MENTAL ILLNESS
A suspect’s perceived mental illness for NCUOF incidents was determined based on officers’ observations and was not verified by MEU or DMH.

SUSPECT UNDER THE INFLUENCE
Officers’ observations were used to determine if a suspect was under the influence of alcohol and/or narcotics for NCUOF incidents. The status was not verified through field sobriety tests.

SUSPECT HOMELESSNESS
Perceived homelessness for NCUOF incidents was determined based on officers’ observations and statements made by suspects.

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

ADJUDICATION
Non-Categorical Use of Force incidents were adjudicated on a line-item basis, as an incident could have multiple force applications. Therefore, each force application entry was adjudicated separately.
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