

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

March 14, 2014
14.2

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT
(IAID NO. 13-054)

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. That the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Operations - South Bureau Gang Enforcement Detail Command Accountability Performance Audit.
2. That the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Executive Summary thereto.

DISCUSSION

The Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Command Accountability Performance Audits (CAPAs) are intended to be used as a management tool to provide useful feedback to commanding officers related to an Area/bureau GED/Community Law Enforcement Recovery work products and supervision. Internal Audits and Inspections Division has previously completed four GED CAPAs for each of the geographic Areas within Operations - South Bureau.

If there are any questions regarding this matter, please contact Arif Alikhan, Special Assistant for Constitutional Policing, at (213) 486-8730.

Respectfully,



CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Attachments

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
OPERATIONS – SOUTH BUREAU
GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT
(IAID NO. 13-054)



Conducted by
INTERNAL AUDITS & INSPECTIONS DIVISION

CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Fiscal Year 2013/2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPERATIONS – SOUTH BUREAU GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT

Page
No.

<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	i
<u>PURPOSE</u>	1
<u>BACKGROUND</u>	1
<u>PRIOR AUDITS</u>	1
<u>SUMMARY OF FINDINGS</u>	2
<u>METHODOLOGY</u>	2
SCOPE	2
AUDIT OBJECTIVES	3
FIELDWORK	3
REPORTING VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE COMMAND	3
SOURCE DOCUMENTATION	3
OBJECTIVE No. 1 – EVALUATION OF ARREST REPORT PACKAGES	3
OBJECTIVE No. 2 – EVALUATION OF SEARCH / RAMEY WARRANT PACKAGES	5
OBJECTIVE No. 3 – EVALUATION OF SUPERVISORY ROLES	6
OBJECTIVE No. 4 – EVALUATION OF THE CONFIDENTIAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FILINGS	7
<u>ACTIONS TAKEN</u>	8
<u>ADDENDA A - DETAILED FINDINGS LISTED BY OBJECTIVE</u>	
<u>ADDENDA B - OPERATIONS – SOUTH BUREAU CAPA RESPONSE</u>	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT
Conducted by
Internal Audits and Inspections Division
Fiscal Year 2013/2014

PRIOR AUDITS

The Operations - South Bureau (OSB) Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA) is the second Bureau CAPA to be conducted by Internal Audits and Inspections Division (IAID) for OSB. Previous CAPAs were performed individually for each Area and a report was issued to each respective commanding officer (C/O). While the testing process was conducted concurrently for each of the four Areas within OSB for this CAPA, IAID has issued one report to the OSB C/O summarizing the findings for each of the four Areas; Southwest, Harbor, 77th Street and Southeast for their individual response.

Beginning in 2013, IAID changed the reporting methodology for GED CAPAs based on operational exposure/risk; therefore, a performance comparison summarizing prior years with the current year audit findings will not be noted in this report. The Bureau GED CAPAs will be conducted in those Bureaus that have a field-deployed Area gang unit and will have four objectives, as follows:

- Objective No. 1 – Evaluation of Arrest Report Packages;
- Objective No. 2 – Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages;
- Objective No. 3 – Evaluation of Supervisory Roles; and,
- Objective No. 4 – Evaluation of the Confidential Financial Disclosure Filings.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Bureau should be commended for the following:

Each (100%) of the four Areas met the standard for Objective No. 4 – Evaluation of the Confidential Financial Disclosure Filings. For Objective No. 3 – Evaluation of Supervisory Roles, a total of 152 (99%) of the 154 documents reviewed met the standard for the objective.

The two areas of concern that accounted for the majority of the findings are:

Objective No. 1 – Evaluation of Arrest Packages, 50 (86%) of the 58 arrest report packages met the standard for the objective and Objective No. 2 – Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages, 14 (88%) of the 16 warrant packages met the standard for the objective. The findings for these objectives are reflected in the following tables. Detailed findings are also documented in Addenda Item A.

THIS SECTION INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Objective No. 1 – Evaluation of Arrest Report Packages

Table No. 1 depicts a summary of findings for Objective No. 1 – Evaluation of Arrest Report Packages.

TABLE NO. 1 – OBJECTIVE NO. 1 - Evaluation of Arrest Report Packages
SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS – OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU

GED AREA	2013 Total Number of Documents Reviewed	2013 Total Number of Documents That Met the Standards	2013 Percentage (%) That Met the Standards
Southwest	17	15	88%
Harbor	17	17	100%
77 th Street	16	12	75%
Southeast	8	6	75%
Bureau Total	58	50	86%

Objective No. 2 – Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages

Table No. 2 depicts the findings for Objective No. 2 - Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages.

TABLE NO. 2 – OBJECTIVE NO. 2 - Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages
SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS – OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU

GED AREA	2013 Total Number of Documents Reviewed	2013 Total Number of Documents That Met the Standards	2013 Percentage (%) That Met the Standards
Southwest	1	1	100%
Harbor	8	7	88%
77 th Street	2	1	50%
Southeast	5	5	100%
Bureau Total	16	14	88%

THIS SECTION INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Objective No. 3 – Evaluation of Supervisory Roles

The results of this evaluation are depicted in a comprehensive summary of Supervisory Roles in Table No. 3A. A detailed description of the documents reviewed is reflected in Table No. 3B.

TABLE NO. 3A – OBJECTIVE NO. 3 - Evaluation of Supervisory Roles
SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS – OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU

GED AREA	2013 Total Number of Documents Reviewed	2013 Total Number of Documents That Met the Standards	2013 Percentage (%) That Met the Standards
Southeast	46	45	98%
Harbor	36	36	100%
77 th Street	46	45	98%
Southeast	26	26	100%
Bureau Total	154	152	99%

TABLE NO. 3B – OBJECTIVE NO. 3 – Evaluation of Supervisory Roles
SUMMARY OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED – OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU

Supervisory Roles	Documents/Reports	Total Documents Reviewed	Number of Documents That Met the Standards	Percentage That Met the Standards (%)
Supervisory <i>Approval</i>	Daily Field Activity Reports	50	50	100%
	GED Supervisor's Daily Reports	51	49	96%
Supervisory <i>Feedback</i>	Standards Based Assessments	53	53	100%
Bureau	Total	154	152	99%

THIS SECTION INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Objective No. 4 – Evaluation of the Confidential Financial Disclosure Filings

Table No. 4 depicts the findings for Objective No. 4 - Evaluation of the Confidential Financial Disclosure Filings.

TABLE NO. 4 – OBJECTIVE NO. 4 – Evaluation of the Confidential Disclosure Filings
SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS – OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU

GED AREA	2013 Total Number of Personnel assigned to GED	2013 Total Number of Financial Disclosures Completed and on File	2013 Percentage (%) That Met the Standards
Southwest	28	28	100%
Harbor	21	21	100%
77 th Street	28	28	100%
Southeast	32	32	100%
Bureau Total	109	109	100%

ACTIONS TAKEN

On November 26, 2013, IAID met with the Bureau C/O and provided him with a copy of the draft audit report. The draft audit report contained a detailed explanation of findings for each Area.

Internal Audits and Inspections Division received a response to the findings from the Bureau C/O on December 19, 2013 (attached as Addenda Item B) via an Intradepartmental Correspondence, Form 15.02.00. The response included a detailed plan of action that addressed those deficiencies identified in the CAPA report. Internal Audits and Inspections Division believes the implementation of this plan and the specific corrective actions of each Area GED within OSB will have an overall positive outcome on the daily GED operations.

In addition, the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations, reviewed this report and was in general agreement.

**OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT**

**Conducted by
Internal Audits and Inspections Division
Fiscal Year 2013/2014**

PURPOSE

The Bureau Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Command Accountability Performance Audits (CAPAs) are intended to provide useful information to Department management related to an Area GED's work product (WP) and supervisory oversight. They are also designed to assess significant risk management issues associated with GED operations.

The GED CAPAs are performed to determine if internal controls within each Area are effective to ensure they are operating within Department policies and procedures as well as other established criteria as set forth by state and federal guidelines. Specifically, the information contained in this audit is intended to be used as a management tool to provide useful feedback to the Operations-South Bureau (OSB) commanding officer (C/O) and responsive Area C/Os related to an Area's GED WP and supervision.

BACKGROUND

Internal Audits and Inspections Division (IAID) developed CAPAs to address risk management issues, assess operations, and provide timely information to Department management pertaining to GED. Beginning in 2011, the CAPAs were performed bureau-wide and audit results were reported for each Area in the final report as an attached Addendum.

Internal Audits and Inspections Division conducted this audit under the guidance of generally accepted government auditing standards, specifically pertaining to performing the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives. Internal Audits and Inspections Division has determined that the evidence obtained, provides a reasonable basis for the findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

PRIOR AUDITS

The OSB GED CAPA is the second Bureau CAPA to be conducted by IAID for OSB. Previous CAPAs were performed individually for each Area and a report was issued to each respective C/O. While the testing process was conducted concurrently for each of the four Areas within OSB for this CAPA, IAID has issued one report to the OSB C/O summarizing the findings for each of the four Areas; Southwest, Harbor, 77th Street, and Southeast for their individual responses.

Beginning in 2013, IAID changed the reporting methodology for GED CAPAs based on operational exposure/risk; therefore, a performance comparison summarizing prior years with the current year audit findings will not be noted in this report.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Bureau should be commended for the following:

Each of the four Areas (100%) met the standard for Objective No. 4 – Evaluation of the Confidential Financial Disclosure Filings. For Objective No. 3 – Evaluation of Supervisory Roles, a total of 152 (99%) of the 154 documents reviewed met the standard for the objective.

The two areas of concern that accounted for the majority of the findings are:

Objective No. 1 – Evaluation of Arrest Packages, 50 (86%) of the 58 arrest packages met the standard for the objective and Objective No. 2 – Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages, 14 (88%) of the 16 warrant packages met the standard for the objective. Detailed findings are included in Addenda Item A.

METHODOLOGY

Scope

The audit included the review of Arrest Reports, Search/Ramey Warrants, GED Supervisor's Daily Reports (SDRs), Form 15.49.00, Daily Field Activity Reports (DFARs), Form 15.52.00, Adult Detention Logs, Form 06.19.00 and Juvenile Detention Logs; Secure, Form 09.05.00 and Non-Secure, Form 09.06.00, Standards Based Assessments (SBAs), Form 01.87.00 and Confidential Financial Disclosure filing documents, which included the Confidential Financial Disclosure Face Sheet, Form 01.74.00 and the Confidential Financial Disclosure Report, Form 01.74.01.

The audit encompassed the Area's GED WP, supervisory oversight, as well as an assessment of significant risk management issues associated with GED operations. Deployment Periods (DPs) No. 5 and No. 6, 2013 (April 21, 2013 through June 15, 2013) was the time period that documents were reviewed and the audit steps employed are further delineated under each audit objective.

The population for this CAPA identified 142 arrests performed by GED/CLEAR or Gang Impact Team (GIT) personnel for the period under review. From this, a stratified random sample of 58 arrest reports was identified.¹

The testing process was conducted concurrently for each of the four Areas within OSB. Each Area C/O is responsible for providing the bureau C/O with written comments as a form of response to the findings contained in the draft audit report. The bureau C/O then formulates a written response to IAID outlining a plan of action that includes corrective action for all of the identified deficiencies.

¹ The sample size was obtained by using a one-tail test with a 95 percent confidence level with a precision of +4 percent.

Audit Objectives

The audit was comprised of four objectives, as follows:

Objective No. 1 - Evaluation of Arrest Report Packages;

Objective No. 2 - Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages;

Objective No. 3 - Evaluation of Supervisory Roles; and,

Objective No. 4 - Evaluation of the Confidential Financial Disclosure Filings.

Fieldwork

The fieldwork was performed between August 14, 2013 and October 4, 2013.

An Intradepartmental Correspondence, Form 15.2.00, was presented to the OSB C/O on August 21, 2013, to explain IAID's audit methodology and if there were any additional areas that should be audited for further evaluation.

Internal Audits and Inspections Division did not receive any concerns or requests from the OSB C/O prior to, or during the performance of the audit.

Reporting Views of Responsible Command

During the month of December 2013, IAID received a preliminary response from OSB. As a result of the response, further discussions were conducted and adjustments were made to the draft audit report.

On December 19, 2013, IAID received the response from OSB and each of the Areas audited in the GED CAPA. The final response from OSB was in general agreement with the findings and included a detailed plan of action to address the deficiencies as outlined in Addenda Item B.

Source Documentation

All authoritative source documents for the audit are contained within the CAPA Master Audit Plan.

Objective No. 1 – Evaluation of Arrest Report Packages

Audit Steps

This objective included the review of arrest reports completed by all GED personnel, including gang detectives, assigned to GED and GIT during DPs No. 5 and No. 6, 2013 (April 21, 2013 through June 15, 2013) respectively. Internal Audits and Inspections Division identified a

stratified random sample of 58 arrest reports as GED WP. A copy of each arrest report was obtained directly from each Area's Records Unit.

Internal Audits and Inspections Division reviewed the 58 arrest reports for evidence of at-risk patterns of conduct; to identify significant discrepancies or deviations from Department policies and procedures; to determine whether each report sufficiently articulated the legal basis for all actions taken (i.e., detentions, arrests, and searches) and, when applicable, determine whether the protocol for the admonition of Miranda Rights was followed.

Additionally, each arrest report was tested for the following:

- Proper supervisory approval signature on the arrest report and/or booking approval;
- Indication that the evidence/property seized from the arrestee(s) was properly booked or disposed of in a manner consistent with Department policy/procedure;
- Indication of the proper use of a confidential informant;
- Indication that a juvenile(s) was not detained longer than six hours, as documented on the Juvenile Detention Logs, when transported to an Area station; and,
- Indication that a juvenile(s) was advised of his/her right to make three telephone calls within three hours, two within one hour of the time he/she was taken into custody.

Arrest reports that indicated the above-mentioned criteria met the standard for this objective.

Summary of Findings

Of the 58 Arrest Report Packages reviewed, 50 (86%) met the standard for this objective. The detailed findings for the eight that did not meet the standard for this objective are documented in Addenda Item A. There were no patterns identified bureau-wide; however, of the eight Arrest Report Packages that did not meet the standard, four were from one specific Area.

Table No. 1 depicts a summary of audit findings for Objective No. 1 – Evaluation of Arrest Report Packages.

TABLE NO. 1 – OBJECTIVE NO. 1 – Evaluation of Arrest Report Packages
SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS – OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU

GED AREA	2013 Total Number of Documents Reviewed	2013 Total Number of Documents That Met the Standards	2013 Percentage (%) That Met the Standards
Southwest	17	15	88%
Harbor	17	17	100%
77 th Street	16	12	75%
Southeast	8	6	75%
Bureau Total	58	50	86%

Objective No. 2 – Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages

Audit Steps

The Warrant Tracking Log, Form 08.17.05, was reviewed for each Area within OSB to identify all search/Ramey warrants in which a GED officer or a gang detective was the affiant. If the number of search/Ramey warrants in a given Area exceeded five, a stratified sample of search/Ramey warrants was applied to the total number of search/Ramey warrants to determine the population for review. Internal Audits and Inspections Division identified a total of 16 search/Ramey warrants to evaluate for the period under review.

The search/Ramey warrants were reviewed to determine if the following Department policies and procedures were followed:

- The magistrate approved the search warrant and affidavit prior to service;
- The search warrant was properly documented on the Warrant Tracking Log;
- The search warrant was served within the required ten-day period;
- The Warrant Service/Tactical Plan Report, Form 12.25.00 and Return to Search Warrant were completed;
- There was a supervisor at the rank of Lieutenant or above present during the service of the search warrant;
- Proper use of confidential informants (if any);
- When required, a single copy of the sealed warrant affidavit (Hobbs portion) is properly maintained in a location within the Area C/O's office; and,
- There was consistency between the evidence seized and the description of the property to be seized as documented in the search warrant, when applicable.

Summary of Findings

Of the sixteen search/Ramey Warrant Packages reviewed, 14 (88%) met the standard for this objective. The detailed findings for the two that did not meet the standard for this objective are documented in Addenda Item A.

Table No. 2 depicts a summary of audit findings for Objective No. 2 – Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages.

TABLE NO. 2 – OBJECTIVE NO. 2 – Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages
SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS – OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU

GED AREA	2013 Total Number of Documents Reviewed	2013 Total Number of Documents That Met the Standards	2013 Percentage (%) That Met the Standards
Southwest	1	1	100%
Harbor	8	7	88%
77 th Street	2	1	50%
Southeast	5	5	100%
Bureau Total	16	14	88%

Objective No. 3 – Evaluation of Supervisory Roles

Audit Steps

This objective evaluated supervisory roles, which included an assessment of GED SDRs, DFARs, and SBAs for GED personnel. This objective consists of sub-categories; Supervisory Approval and timely Supervisory Feedback.

Supervisory Approval

Internal Audits and Inspections Division reviewed the GED DFARs to determine whether GED officers completed a DFAR for each work day selected in the audit time period and if the DFAR was properly approved by a GED supervisor. The GED SDRs were also reviewed to determine whether GED supervisors completed a SDR for each work day selected during the audit time period and if the SDR was properly approved by the C/O.

Supervisory Feedback

Internal Audits and Inspections Division also evaluated SBAs for selected GED personnel to ensure the most current SBA was completed and maintained in the officer's personnel package.

Summary of Findings

Of the 154 documents reviewed, 152 (99%) met the standard for this objective. The detailed findings for the two that did not meet the standard for this objective are documented in Addenda Item A.

The results of this evaluation are depicted in a comprehensive summary of Supervisory Roles in Table No. 3A. A detailed description of the documents reviewed is reflected in Table No. 3B.

TABLE NO. 3A – OBJECTIVE NO. 3 – Evaluation of Supervisory Roles
SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS – OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU

GED AREA	2013 Total Number of Documents Reviewed	2013 Total Number of Documents That Met the Standards	2013 Percentage (%) That Met the Standards
Southwest	46	45	98%
Harbor	36	36	100%
77 th Street	46	45	98%
Southeast	26	26	100%
Bureau Total	154	152	99%

TABLE NO. 3B – OBJECTIVE NO. 3 – Evaluation of Supervisory Roles
SUMMARY OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED – OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU

Supervisory Roles	Documents/Reports	Total Documents Reviewed	Number of Documents That Met the Standards	Percentage That Met the Standards (%)
Supervisory <i>Approval</i>	Daily Field Activity Reports	50	50	100%
	GED Supervisor's Daily Reports	51	49	96%
Supervisory <i>Feedback</i>	Standards Based Assessments	53	53	100%
	Bureau Total	154	152	99%

Objective No. 4 – Evaluation of the Confidential Financial Disclosure Filings

Audit Steps

The purpose of this objective is to determine whether the Confidential Financial Disclosures were completed as required per Special Order No. 20, 2008, entitled "Confidential Financial Disclosure Policy and Procedures for Gang Enforcement Detail and Narcotics Field Enforcement Section Units - Established." The Special Order requires all sworn officers at the rank of Lieutenant and below, assigned to the GIT, GED, and CLEAR units to complete a Confidential Financial Disclosure Face Sheet, Form 1.74.00 and Financial Disclosure Report, Form 01.74.01.

Summary of Findings

Each (100%) of the 109 officers assigned to Southwest, Harbor, 77th Street, and Southwest Area GED/CLEAR and GIT sworn personnel, had completed the Confidential Financial Disclosure filing documents as required.

Table No. 4 depicts the findings for Objective No. 4 - Evaluation of the Confidential Financial Disclosure Filings.

TABLE NO. 4 – OBJECTIVE NO. 4 – Evaluation of the Confidential Disclosure Filings
SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS – OPERATIONS - SOUTH BUREAU

GED AREA	2013 Total Number of Personnel assigned to GED	2013 Total Number of Financial Disclosures Completed and on File	2013 Percentage (%) That Met the Standards
Southwest	28	28	100%
Harbor	21	21	100%
77 th Street	28	28	100%
Southeast	32	32	100%
Bureau Total	109	109	100%

ACTIONS TAKEN

On November 26, 2013, IAID met with the OSB C/O and provided him with a copy of the draft audit report. The draft audit report contained a detailed explanation of findings for each Area.

Internal Audits and Inspections Division received a response to the findings from the Bureau C/O on December 19, 2013 (attached as Addenda Item B) via an Intradepartmental Correspondence, Form 15.02.00. The response included a detailed plan of action that addressed those deficiencies identified in the CAPA report. Internal Audits and Inspections Division believes the implementation of this plan and the specific corrective actions of each Area GED within OSB will have an overall positive outcome on the daily GED operations.

In addition, the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations, reviewed this report and was in general agreement.

OBJECTIVE No. 1 – EVALUATION OF ARREST REPORT PACKAGES				
Booking/DR RFC No.	Control No.	Area/Division	Description of the Finding	Issue
130313137	SOW-AR-01	Southwest	Combined Crime/Evidence and Arrest Report for robbery, with multiple arrestees. The victim was riding his bicycle on the sidewalk when he was approached by four males who were on foot. The victim observed one of the males holding a knife, which he believed was for the purpose of intimidating him. The victim was then pushed off his bicycle by a second male, while a third male grabbed his bicycle and walked away with it. In the arrest report narrative, under the heading "Additional", it states that a property receipt was issued to one of the arrestee's for the knife; however, under the heading "Evidence", there is no documentation surrounding the circumstances as to how, where and from whom the knife was recovered from. Additionally the appropriate box on the face sheet indicating "evidence report" was not checked and the appropriate box for multiple arrestees, which documents who the evidence was booked to was also not completed.	Documentation of Evidence
130313157	SOW-AR-08	Southwest	Officers conducted a traffic stop for a cracked windshield violation. As officers approached the vehicle they smelled a strong odor of marijuana emitting from the vehicle. Officers obtained verbal consent from the driver to search the vehicle. Officers recovered narcotics from the vehicle and subsequently booked the items as evidence. The arrest report face sheet and narrative both indicate that a Property Receipt was issued to the arrestee, however, the Property Receipt was not located in the arrest package.	Receipt for Evidence
131214190	77-AR-03	77th Street	Officers received a radio call regarding possible gang members standing in front of the location, involved in possible narcotic activity, with an additional suspect inside a grey vehicle possibly armed with a gun. The officers then observed a vehicle matching that description commit a traffic violation. The officer's conducted a traffic stop on the vehicle. As the officers approached the vehicle they observed two occupants, a male (driver) and a female (passenger). The officers approached the driver and requested his driver's license. When the driver replied he did not have a driver's license, the officers asked him to exit the vehicle. At the same time, the passenger distracted the officers and the driver then ran from the location. A perimeter was established and the driver was taken into custody without incident and booked for resisting. The officers recovered a glass pipe and cell phone from the arrestee's front right shorts pocket and booked them as evidence. The arrest report does not articulate why the cell phone was seized and booked as evidence or how the cell phone was directly related to the crime.	Seizure of Evidence

Booking/DR RFC No.	Control No.	Area/Division	Description of the Finding	Issue
131213424	77-AR-10	77th Street	Officers responded to an ADW radio call, victim stabbed in the knee with an unknown object. When officers arrived on scene, the victim immediately identified the suspect. The suspect was detained pending further investigation and subsequently arrested. Officers recovered the screw driver used by the suspect and booked it as evidence. The arrest report face sheet indicates that a property receipt was issued; however, the Property Receipt was not located in the arrest package.	Receipt for Evidence
131212633	77-AR-14	77th Street	Officers received a radio call of a group brandishing a firearm. Officers observed three males walking who matched the description of the suspects. As the officers exited their vehicle and proceeded to approach the males, they observed two of the males take off running from the location. Officers initiated a foot pursuit, resulting in the detention and arrest of only one of the males. The detention log documents that the arrestee answered yes to being sick, ill or injured (abrasion on shoulder) during the watch commander's inspection/interview; however, the arrest report does not address the suspect's injury. Additionally, there is no indication that the arrestee's injury was, or was not related to the incident, particularly since the arrest report does document the fact that one of the involved officers was "seriously injured" while taking the suspect into custody.	Documentation of injury
131213420	77-AR-15	77th Street	While driving in their vehicle, officers observed three males (two seated inside a parked vehicle and one standing outside the vehicle driver's side door) in a high gang and narcotic activity area. As the officers approached the vehicle, they observed the male standing near the vehicle holding US currency in his right hand, extend his hand toward the passenger side window. The officers then observed a hand extend from the driver's side window, holding a yellow plastic baggie. The officers believed a narcotic transaction was about to occur, however, the male outside the vehicle, observed the officers and then retracted his hand from the vehicle and began to walk away. The officers detained all three males and as they approached the vehicle they could smell a strong odor of marijuana emitting from the vehicle. The officers ordered the two males to exit the vehicle and conducted a search of the vehicle. The officers recovered narcotics and related packaging paraphernalia from both the passenger and driver floorboard areas and the driver's side door. The officers formed the opinion that the driver was in possession of narcotics for sale and placed him into custody. The arrest report indicates that the other two males were detained; however, there is no documentation regarding any further investigation involving the other two males and what was the final disposition of that investigation.	Documentation of witnesses

Booking/DR RFC No.	Control No.	Area/Division	Description of the Finding	Issue
131809711	SOE-AR-02	Southeast	The watch commander documented in the arrest report as having approved booking is different from the watch commander who actually approved booking on the Booking Approval form.	Inconsistent information
131809487	SOE-AR-04	Southeast	Officers responded to a Home Invasion Robbery just occurred broadcast, to assist with the search of outstanding suspects. Officers observed three males in the area who possibly matched the suspects description and detained them. The three males were positively identified by the victims during the field show up. The arrest report documents the events that occurred during the home invasion robbery incident; however, it did not sufficiently articulate the specific actions of each suspect during the incident. The victim stated that one of the suspects had a cut on his arm and two of the suspects were armed with handguns. The arrest report did not identify which of the suspects in custody had the cut on his arm or which of the suspects in custody were armed with handguns during the incident.	Probable Cause to arrest

OBJECTIVE No. 2 – EVALUATION OF SEARCH/RAMEY WARRANT PACKAGES

Search Warrant No.	Control No.	Area/Division	Description of the Finding	Issue
F67422	HAR-SW-01	Harbor	The commanding officer's analysis on the performance of the supervisor providing supervisory oversight at the service of the search warrant was not completed by the commanding officer as required.	Employee Comment Sheet
79-2012-SW225	77-SW-01	77th Street	The search warrant information boxes on the bottom portion of the Property Report were not completed.	Property Report

OBJECTIVE No. 3 – EVALUATION OF SUPERVISORY ROLES

Document	Control No.	Area/Division	Description of the Finding	Issue
Daily Field Activities Report	SOW-SDR-13	Southwest	The GED SDR dated May 15, 2013, for unit 3G30 was not signed by the commanding officer.	Commanding Officer approval
	77-SDR-03	77th Street	The GED SDR dated June 1, 2013, for unit 12G40 was not signed by the commanding officer.	Commanding Officer approval

December 19, 2013

1. 5

TO: Commanding Officer, Internal Audits and Inspection Division

FROM: Commanding Officer, Operations-South Bureau

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO OPERATIONS-SOUTH BUREAU GANG ENFORCEMENT
DETAIL COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT IAID NO. 13-054

The fiscal year 2013/2014 Operations-South Bureau (OSB), Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA) was completed by Internal Audits and Inspection Division (IAID). There were four objectives examined for the audit, and OSB was found to be below the acceptable level of compliance in two of the objectives. The four objectives results were as follows:

Objective No. 1 Evaluation of Arrest Report Packages

A total of 58 Arrest Reports were reviewed in the audit, 50 of those reports met the standard of review. Eight (8) reports did not meet the standard, identifying an 86% compliance rate. This overall rate fell below the acceptable level of compliance. The issues identified were:

- Inconsistencies within Property Reports
- Lack of consistencies in arrest report narratives

Objective No. 2 Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrants Packages

A total of 16 Search Warrant Packages were reviewed in the audit, 14 of the packages met the standard of review. Two (2) packages did not meet the standard, identifying an 88% compliance rate. This overall rate fell below the acceptable level of compliance. The issues identified were:

- Employee comment sheet incomplete
- Property report incomplete

Objective No. 3 Evaluation of Supervisory Roles

A total of 154 Supervisor Daily Reports (SDR) were reviewed in the audit, 152 of the SDR's met the standard of review. Two (2) SDR's did not meet the standard, identifying a 99% compliance rate. This overall rate was an acceptable level of compliance.

Objective No. 4 Financial Disclosures

The audit of Financial Disclosures was found to be a 100% in compliance. The current systems in place will remain to ensure this level of compliance is maintained by OSB Commands.

Summary and Actions Taken

A comparison of these findings to the last OSB GED CAPA Audit showed a continual upward trend. Many proactive systems were put in place and the results indicate they are working.

Each OSB Command was directed to review and respond to the findings. A closer review of the core issues of the anomalies faulted inattention by the officers who wrote the reports and the reviewing supervisors. This involved only 8 Arrest Reports and 2 Search Warrant Packages. Based upon the anomalies found, there were no issues with the prosecution of any case identified with an anomaly. The OSB expectation is to ensure that an accurate, concise, and detailed report is completed every time; and that all Warrant Packages meet the standard. Each OSB Command was directed to enact proactive measures to address and rectify the identified anomalies and the cause to prevent future anomalies.

As a result of the findings, the Commanding Officer, OSB, directed to enact proactive measures to address and rectify the identified anomalies. Those measures are as follows:

- The OSB Bureau Gang Coordinator (BGC) has met with all Gang Impact Team Officers in Charge (GIT OIC) to provide insight and recommendations on addressing the identified issues. Training to all GED supervisors: emphasis was placed on review and correlation between arrest narratives, property receipts, property reports, and other attached reports (Objectives No. 1 and No. 2 CAPA evaluation topics).
- The Gang Assessment Detail, OSB will conduct a random "spot" check assessment of the Objective No. 1 and No. 2 CAPA evaluation topics. The Gang Assessment Detail has met with auditors from IAID to obtain additional insight and direction to ensure assessment criteria is uniform with that utilized by IAID.
- The OSB BGC has met with all Bureau Detective Commanding Officers to ensure that all Bureau Detective personnel receive training to cover the CAPA findings for Objective No. 2 (Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages). To ensure that each area has a Search Warrant Package Coordinator and a system in place to provide review of packages as they are completed and stored.
- On two separate training days held in Deployment Periods 12 and 13, 2013, the OSB C/O, Assistant C/O, and the OSB BGC provided training to all OSB Watch Commanders and Supervisors on items of the GED arrest report checklist, with an emphasis on inconsistencies found in the arrest reports
- There is an OSB GIT supervisor training day scheduled for January 22, 2014, to discuss progress of new measures and training of CAPA results.


Commanding Officer, Internal Audits and Inspection Division

Page 3 of 3

1.5

Operations-South Bureau will continue to utilize the aforementioned strategies, as well as seek additional methods to ensure and maintain acceptable levels of compliance in the areas identified.

Should you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact either myself, or Lieutenant Darrell Belthius, Bureau Gang Coordinator, Operations-South Bureau at 213.485.4251.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert F. Green". The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized manner with a large initial "R" and "F".

ROBERT F. GREEN, Deputy Chief
Commanding Officer
Operations-South Bureau