

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

July 18, 2014
14.2

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE PROCESS AUDIT (IAID NO. 13-060)

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Categorical Use of Force Process Audit.
2. It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Executive Summary thereto.

DISCUSSION

Internal Audits and Inspections Division conducted the Categorical Use of Force Process Audit to evaluate compliance with related Department directives. The audit included a review of the various processes pertaining to categorical use of force incidents and related adherence to Department policies and procedures.

If additional information regarding this audit is required, please contact Arif Alikhan, Special Assistant for Constitutional Policing, at (213) 486-8730.

Respectfully,



CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Attachment

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE PROCESS
AUDIT
(IAID No. 13-060)



CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

June 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE PROCESS AUDIT

PAGE
NO.

<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>		i
<u>PURPOSE</u>		1
<u>BACKGROUND/PRIOR AUDITS</u>		1
<u>METHODOLOGY</u>		2
<u>SUMMARY OF FINDINGS</u>		4
<u>DETAILED FINDINGS</u>		
OBJECTIVE NO. 1 -	Review of Force Investigation Division Investigator's Complaint History	5
OBJECTIVE NO. 2 -	Force Investigation Division Investigator's Completion of Required Training	6
OBJECTIVE NO. 3 -	Area Watch Commander's Notification to Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response Division	6
OBJECTIVE NO. 4 -	Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response Division Notifications to Force Investigation Division, Chief of Police, Chief of Staff, and Office of the Inspector General	7
OBJECTIVE NO. 5 -	Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response Division Notifications to the Commanding Officer, Professional Standards Bureau, Involved Employee's Commanding Officer, Department Risk Manager, and District Los Angeles County Attorney's Office	12
OBJECTIVE NO. 6(A) -	Completion of Use of Force Review Board Correspondence	14
OBJECTIVE NO. 6(B) -	Timeliness of the Use of Force Review Board Correspondence	15
OBJECTIVE NO. 7(A) -	Disciplinary Categorical Use of Force - Completion of Required Training Update	16
OBJECTIVE NO. 7(B) -	Disciplinary Categorical Use of Force - Completion of Required Tactical Debrief Training	17
OBJECTIVE NO. 7(C) -	Disciplinary Categorical Use of Force - Completion and/or Initiation of Administrative Disapproval Remedial Actions	18
OBJECTIVE NO. 7(D) -	Disciplinary Categorical Use of Force - Completion of the Use of Force Review Board Report	19
OBJECTIVE NO. 8(A) -	Non-Disciplinary Categorical Use of Force - Completion of Required Update Training	20
OBJECTIVE NO. 8(B) -	Non-Disciplinary Categorical Use of Force - Completion of Required Tactical Debrief Training	22

OBJECTIVE NO. 9 -	Timely Categorical Use of Force Reports to the Board of Police Commissioners	22
<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>		23
<u>ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE</u>		23

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE PROCESS AUDIT

Conducted by
Internal Audits and Inspections Division

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Audit and Inspection Plan for Fiscal Year 2013/2014, Internal Audits and Inspections Division (IAID) conducted the Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) Process Audit to evaluate adherence with Department policies and procedures. The audit included a review of the procedures, timeliness of notifications, completeness of documents, as well as subsequent training as it pertains to CUOF.

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 the 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.

BACKGROUND/PRIOR AUDITS

Internal Audits and Inspections Division reviewed the CUOF process biennially.¹ The last CUOF Process Audit that was reviewed was completed during the Third Quarter, FY 2010/1011. As with the prior audit, the Department standards were met in the areas of Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response (RACR) Division CUOF notifications to the Commanding Officer (C/O) Professional Standards Bureau, and the Involved Employee's C/O notification. However, areas for improvement were identified regarding Watch Commander Notifications to RACR Division regarding CUOF incidents, RACR notifications to the Chief of Police (COP), Chief of Staff (COS), and Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The Department has used the information produced in these audits in conjunction with the Office of the Inspector General's review of the audit as an internal management tool.

Table No. 1 on the following page provides a summary of audit findings for each objective.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended Planning and Research Division examine Department Manual sections 3/794.35 Categorical Use of Force – Notifications Real Time Analysis and Critical Response Division, and 4/204.80 Animal Shootings and Non-Tactical Unintentional Discharges of Firearms; to determine which of these two sections is correct, thus providing clarification for affected Department personnel.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

1. The audit findings were validated with the respective Area and division C/Os, who expressed general agreement.
2. The audit report was presented to the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations and the Director, Office of Administrative Services; both of which expressed general agreement with the audit findings and the recommendation.

¹The Categorical Use of Force *Systems* Audit has been renamed to Categorical Use of Force *Process* Audit; the term 'systems' is typically analogous to Information Technology systems audits.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Table No. 1 below is a summary of findings for the current audit along with the results from the prior year's inspection.

TABLE NO. 1 - SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

OBJECTIVE NO.	DESCRIPTION/OBJECTIVES	RESULTS	
		2010/2011	2012/2013
1	Review of Force Investigation Division (FID) Investigator's Complaint History	N/A ²	N/A
2	FID Investigator's Completion of Required Training	N/A	100% (12/12)
3	Area Watch Commander's Notification to RACR Division	100% (14/14)	72% (38/53)
4	RACR Notifications to FID, COP, Chief of Staff, and OIG	98% (41/42) ³	See Detailed Findings
5	RACR Notifications to the C/O PSB, Involved Employee's C/O, Department Risk Manager, and Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office (LADA)	100% (8/8) ⁴	96% (166/173) ⁵
6(a)	Completion of the Use of Force Review Board Correspondence	100% (14/14)	87% (20/23) ⁶
6(b)	Timeliness of the Use of Force Review Board Correspondence	N/A	74% (17/23)
7(a)	Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Training Update	100% (3/3)	100% (35/35) ⁷
7(b)	Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Tactical Debrief Training	100% (4/4)	100% (31/31) ⁸
7(c)	Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion and/or Initiation of Administrative Disapproval Remedial Actions	100% (3/3)	100% (34/34)
7(d)	Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of the Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB) Report	N/A	37% (13/35)
8(a)	Non-Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Training Update	100% (7/7)	100% (248/248)
8(b)	Non-Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Tactical Debrief Training	100% (1/1)	99% (242/244)
9	Timely CUOF Reports to the Board of Police Commissioners	100% (18/18)	99% (81/82)

² None of the investigators in FID has sustained complaints for allegations set forth in Department Manual Section 3/763.70.

³ Chief of Staff notifications were not assessed during the FY 2010/2011 audit.

⁴ Commanding Officer, PSB, involved employee's C/O, and Department Risk Manager notifications were not assessed during the FY 2010/2011 audit.

⁵ Fifty-two notifications were made to each of three entities while 17 qualified notifications were made to the LADA resulting in a total of 173 notifications.

⁶ It was determined that 23 of the 53 CUOF incidents required an Intradepartmental Correspondence, Form 15.02.00 (15.02), to be submitted to the UOFRB.

⁷ A total of 16 disciplinary CUOFs involving 35 officers were reviewed for this objective.

⁸ Initially, a total of 35 officers were to be assessed. Four officers were deselected from this population for justified reasons.

CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE PROCESS AUDIT

Conducted by
Internal Audits and Inspections Division
First Quarter FY 2013/14

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Audit and Inspection Plan for Fiscal Year 2013/2014, Internal Audits and Inspections Division (IAID) conducted the Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) Process Audit to evaluate adherence with Department policies and procedures. The audit included a review of the procedures, timeliness of notifications, completeness of documents, as well as subsequent training as it pertains to CUOF.

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 the 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.

BACKGROUND/PRIOR AUDITS

Internal Audits and Inspections Division reviewed the CUOF process biennially.¹ The last CUOF Process Audit was completed during the Third Quarter, FY 2010/2011. As with the prior audit, the Department standards were met in the areas of Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response (RACR) Division CUOF notifications to the Commanding Officer (C/O) Professional Standards Bureau (PSB), and the Involved Employee's C/O notification. However, areas for improvement were identified regarding Watch Commander Notifications to RACR Division regarding CUOF incidents, and RACR notifications to the Chief of Police (COP), Chief of Staff (COS), and Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The Department has used the information produced in these audits in conjunction with the OIG's review of the audit as an internal management tool.

The following recommendations were made in the last audit:

- 1. It is recommended that Planning and Research Division (PRD) review and consider incorporating the following procedure into Manual Section 3/794.35 – Area Watch Commander/Incident Commander. Due to the Department's current unwritten expectation of timely phone calls to RACR from the time the incident occurs, it is further recommended that phone calls to the respective entities be made as soon as possible, and wherein such instances the notifications are beyond the 20-minutes, that justification/reasons for the delay be articulated.*

Status on Recommendation No. 1: Implemented. The recommendation was implemented with the publication of Special Order No. 5, March 1, 2012, and included under Department Manual Section 3/794.35.

¹ The Categorical Use of Force *Systems* Audit has been renamed to Categorical Use of Force *Process* Audit; the term 'systems' is typically analogous to Information Technology systems audits.

2. *It is recommended that PRD revisit Department Manual Sections 3/796.35 – Procedures for Coordinating Directed Training and 3/792.2 – Administrative Disapproval, to incorporate the requirements for the completion of “Extensive Re-training” as it relates to CUOF. Additionally, ambiguous terminologies, “Extensive Re-training” and “Directed Training” should be resolved with input from UOFRD.*

Status on Recommendation No. 2: Implemented. The recommendation was implemented with the publication of Administrative Order No. 12, dated October 12, 2012, and included under Department Manual Section 3/792.05.

3. *It is recommended that PRD update the UOFRB Report, Form 1.67 (1/07), and provide documented procedures of completion with input from UOFRD.*

Status on Recommendation No 3: Implemented. The recommendation was implemented with the publication of Administrative Order No. 12, dated October 12, 2012. The updated Form 1.67, version 10/12, is included on the Department’s E-Forms.

METHODOLOGY

The time period and population utilized for the audit varied for accurate testing of each respective objective (refer to each objective for their specific time period and population). The methodology encompassed within this audit is different from that of the previous, which is attributable to an expanded time period, combined objectives, and an assessment of individual results pertaining to personnel, rather than results of cases; this led to an increased number of results for this audit.

The Department’s definition of a Categorical Use of Force is as follows:

Department Manual Section 3/792.05, Definitions-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 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;*

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.*
-
- *All other unintentional head strikes shall be investigated as Level I NCUOF incidents;*
 - *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.*

THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

TABLE NO. 1 – SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

OBJECTIVE No.	DESCRIPTION/OBJECTIVES	RESULTS	
		2010/2011	2012/2013
1	Review of Force Investigation Division (FID) Investigator's Complaint History	N/A ²	N/A
2	FID Investigator's Completion of Required Training	N/A	100% (12/12)
3	Area Watch Commander's Notification to RACR Division	100% (14/14)	72% (38/53)
4	RACR Notifications to FID, COP, Chief of Staff, and OIG	98% (41/42) ³	See Detailed Findings
5	RACR Notifications to the C/O PSB, Involved Employee's C/O, Department Risk Manager, and Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office (LADA)	100% (8/8) ⁴	96% (166/173) ⁵
6(a)	Completion of the Use of Force Review Board Correspondence	100% (14/14)	87% (20/23) ⁶
6(b)	Timeliness of the Use of Force Review Board Correspondence	N/A	74% (17/23)
7(a)	Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Training Update	100% (3/3)	100% (35/35) ⁷
7(b)	Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Tactical Debrief Training	100% (4/4)	100% (31/31) ⁸
7(c)	Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion and/or Initiation of Administrative Disapproval Remedial Actions	100% (3/3)	100% (34/34)
7(d)	Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of the Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB) Report	N/A	37% (13/35)
8(a)	Non-Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Training Update	100% (7/7)	100% (248/248)
8(b)	Non-Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Tactical Debrief Training	100% (1/1)	99% (242/244)
9	Timely CUOF Reports to the Board of Police Commissioners	100% (18/18)	99% (81/82)

² None of the investigators in FID had sustained complaints for allegations set forth in Department Manual Section 3/763.70.

³ Chief of Staff notifications were not assessed during the FY 2010/2011 audit.

⁴ Commanding Officer, PSB, involved employee's C/O, and Department Risk Manager notifications were not assessed during the FY 2010/2011 audit.

⁵ Fifty-two notifications were made to each of three entities while 17 applicable notifications were made to the LADA resulting in a total of 173 notifications.

⁶ It was determined that 23 of the 53 CUOF incidents required an Intradepartmental Correspondence, Form 15.02.00 (15.02), to be submitted to the UOFRB.

⁷ A total of 16 CUOFs resulting in disciplinary findings, involving 35 officers were reviewed for this objective.

⁸ Initially, a total of 35 officers were to be assessed. Four officers were deselected from this population because they did not fit the testing criterion for this particular objective.

Objective No. 1 – Review of FID Investigator’s Complaint History

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/763.70, Evaluation of Findings - states, “*Supervisors and managers shall be required to document their consideration of any sustained complaint, adverse judicial finding, or discipline against an officer on a TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04, for each of the following:*

- *Excessive use of force;*
- *False arrest or charge;*
- *Improper search or seizure;*
- *Sexual harassment;*
- *Discrimination; or,*
- *Dishonesty.*

The Commanding Officer, FID, may decide to select or retain an officer with a sustained complaint or adverse judicial finding in one or more of these categories. However, that decision must be justified in writing on a TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04, and retained in the selection package.”

Audit Procedures

A current FID personnel roster obtained from FID, identified 50 detective investigators as of Deployment Period No. 8 (July 14, 2013 through August 10, 2013). All 50 detective investigators were reviewed for their complaint histories.

The complaint histories were reviewed to determine if any complaints involving unauthorized force, false imprisonment, unlawful search, sexual misconduct, discrimination, or dishonesty occurred. If a complaint for the aforementioned categories existed, IAID reviewed the supervisor’s documentation of consideration and/or retention of the detective investigator on the TEAMS Evaluation Report (TER) addressing the above categories.

Findings

The FID detective investigators did not have any sustained complaints or adverse judicial findings related to the identified allegations that would require consideration for the selection or retention of the investigators. Accordingly, this objective was unable to be tested.

Objective No. 2 – FID Investigator’s Completion of Required Training

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/763.70, Qualifications and Requirements - states, *“Unless they have already attended, selected employees shall attend and successfully complete the first available Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) certified Homicide School following selection. In the event a selected candidate has not attended Supervisory School, managers and supervisors shall ensure the candidate is scheduled as soon as practicable.”*

Audit Procedures

A current list of 50 FID detective investigators as of Deployment Period No. 8 (July 14, 2013 through August 10, 2013) was obtained. All new detective investigators assigned to FID subsequent to the prior FY 2010-2011 CUOF Audit were reviewed for their completion of the Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) certified Homicide School.⁹ Further, IAID personnel determined that one FID detective was not assigned any regular investigative duties and was therefore, removed from the population, resulting in the review of 12 FID detective investigator’s TEAMS II reports.

The Department met the standard if the FID detective investigator’s respective TEAMS II report indicated he/she attended the POST certified Homicide School.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 12 FID detective investigators completed the required training.

Objective No. 3 – Area Watch Commander’s Notification to RACR Division

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/794.35 Categorical Use of Force - Notifications Area Watch Commander/Incident Commander - states, *“The Area watch commander/Incident Commander is responsible for making the following notifications within 30 minutes of learning that a CUOF incident has occurred:*

- *Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response Division (RACR);*
- *Area commanding officer of the Area of occurrence; and,*
- *Bureau commanding officer of the Area of occurrence.*

Note: *In such instances where the notification is beyond the 30 minutes, the justification must be documented in the Watch Commanders Daily Report, Form 15.80.00”*

⁹ The remaining 37 FID detective investigators were determined to have completed the POST Homicide School during the prior CUOF audit and, therefore, did not require additional review.

Audit Procedures

A list of 53 CUOF incidents was identified that occurred from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013, that required notification to RACR. Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response Division Incident Notification logs and Watch Commander Daily Reports (WCDRs) were reviewed.

The Department met the standard if the WCDR and/or the RACR Division, Incident Notification log contained documentation that RACR was notified by the Area watch commander/Incident Commander within 30 minutes upon learning that a CUOF incident had occurred.

Findings

Notifications were made in each (100%) of the CUOF incidents. However, thirty-eight (72%) of the 53 CUOF incidents that required notification to RACR met the standard for this objective.¹⁰ Of the remaining 15 CUOF incidents, notifications were made beyond the 30 minute requirement, and there were no justifications documented within the watch commander logs or the RACR Notification Logs.

Table No. 2 below illustrates the elapsed notification times to RACR from time of occurrence.

TABLE NO. 2 – ELAPSED TIME OF NOTIFICATIONS TO RACR FROM TIME OF OCCURRENCE

Elapsed Notification Time by WC	No. of CUOF Notifications to RACR
Within 30 Minutes	38 (5 ICD / 1 Carotid Restraint / 2 LERI / 9 OIS Hit / 3 OIS Non-Hit / 6 Non-Tactical AD / 9 OIS Animal / 2 K9 Contact/ 1 Head Strike)
Between 31 and 60 Minutes	10 (1 Non-Tactical AD / 7 OIS Hits / 1 OIS Animal / 1 Tactical AD)
Over 60 minutes	5 (1 LERI / 2 OIS Animal / 1 ICD / 1 OIS Hit)
Total CUOFs	53

Objective No. 4 – RACR Notifications to FID, COP, COS, and OIG

During the course of this audit, the initial criterion utilized to assess the indicated notifications was Department Manual Section 3/794.35. However, upon validating the finding results with RACR Division, Department Manual Section 4/204.80 (Animal Shooting and Non-Tactical Unintentional Discharges of Firearms) was brought to the attention of IAID. In reviewing both policies, there seems to be differing criteria specifically relating to the manner in which RACR Division makes notifications pertaining to Animal Shootings and Non-Tactical Unintentional Discharges of Firearms.

¹⁰ The RACR Division, Incident Notification log for the CUOF incident, F045-12/77th Street Area, could not be located by RACR personnel.

Presented below are two sets of criteria and detailed findings according to each respective policy, followed by a summary of the differing requirements by each of the policies.¹¹

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/794.35 Categorical Use of Force – Notifications Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response Division - states, *"Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response Division 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 (or the designated on-call FID team during non-business hours);*
- *Office of the Chief of Police (COP) or his designee;*
- *Chief of Staff (COS); and,*
- *Office of the Inspector General (OIG) on behalf of the Board of Police Commissioners."*

Audit Procedures

A list of 53 CUOF incidents that occurred from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013, were identified that required notifications to FID, COP, COS, and OIG from RACR. The RACR Incident Notification logs were reviewed to determine if RACR notified FID, COP, COS, and OIG of the CUOF incidents within 20 minutes. Fifty-three RACR Division, Incident Notification logs were identified, that corresponded to the 53 CUOF incidents.

During the gathering of documents, the RACR Division, Incident Notification log for CUOF incident F045-12/77th Street Area, could not be located by RACR personnel. Therefore, the required timely notifications for this CUOF incident could not be determined and was removed from the total, resulting in 52 CUOF incidents and 208 total notifications.

The Department met the standard if the RACR Division, Incident Notification logs contained documentation that FID, COP, COS, and the OIG were notified by RACR Division within the 20 minute requirement.

THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

¹¹ See Recommendations No. 1

Findings

If evaluated according to the above policy, the results yield one-hundred and fifty-nine (76%) of the 208 CUOF notifications would meet the standard for this objective. The remaining 49 would not meet the standard, and the following is a breakdown of notifications by entity.

Notwithstanding, there was documentation in each (100%) of the incidents that a notification was made to at least one entity within this objective.

Force Investigation Division

Forty-eight (92%) of the 52 CUOF required notifications met the standard for this objective.

- Four CUOF incidents - FID was notified beyond the 20-minute requirement;
 - F084-12/OIS Animal/77th Street Area
 - F041-13/OIS Hit/Topanga Area
 - F013-13/Non-Tactical AD/Outside the City of Los Angeles
 - F002-13/OIS Hit/Southwest Area

Chief of Police

Forty (77%) of the 52 CUOF incidents met the standard for this objective.

- Four CUOF incidents - COP was not notified
 - F079-12/OIS Hit/Hollenbeck Area
 - F081-12/OIS Animal/Southeast Area
 - F087-12/Non-Tactical AD/Wilshire Area
 - F005-13/Head Strike/77th Street Area
- Eight CUOF incidents - COP was notified beyond the 20-minute requirement
 - F047-12/Non-Tactical AD/Van Nuys Area
 - F052-12/OIS Animal/Southwest Area
 - F059-12/OIS Animal/Southeast Area
 - F074-12/Non-Tactical AD/West Valley Area
 - F084-12/OIS Animal/77th Street Area
 - F003-13/OIS Animal/Southeast Area
 - F014-13/Non-Tactical AD/Newton Area
 - F032-13/Non-Tactical AD/Rampart Area

Chief of Staff

Thirty (58%) of the 52 CUOF incidents met the standard for this objective.

- Eight CUOF incidents - COS was not notified
 - F047-12/Non-Tactical AD/Outside the City of Los Angeles
 - F081-12/OIS Animal/Southeast Area
 - F087-12/Non-Tactical AD/Wilshire Area
 - F013-13/Non-Tactical AD/outside the City of Los Angeles

- F014-13/Non-Tactical AD/Newton Area
- F032-13/Non-Tactical AD/Rampart Area
- F048-13/ICD/Hollenbeck Area
- F049-13/Tactical AD/Devonshire Area
- Fourteen CUOF incidents - COS was notified beyond the 20-minute requirement;
 - F002-13/OIS Hit/Southwest Area
 - F003-13/OIS Animal/Southeast Area
 - F004-13/OIS Hit/Southwest Area
 - F005-13/Head Strike/77th Street Area
 - F019-13/ICD/Harbor Area
 - F039-13/OIS Hit/Central Area
 - F041-13/OIS Hit/Topanga Area
 - F048-12/ICD/Southeast Area
 - F052-12/OIS Animal/Southwest Area
 - F059-12/OIS Animal/Outside the City of Los Angeles
 - F069-12/OIS Hit/Newton Area
 - F074-12/Non-Tactical AD/West Valley Area
 - F079-12/OIS Hit/Hollenbeck Area
 - F084-12/OIS Animal/77th Street Area

Office of the Inspector General

Forty-one (79%) of the 52 CUOF incidents met the standard for this objective.

- Two CUOF incidents – There was no documentation to show notification was made to the OIG.
 - F087-12/Non-Tactical AD/Wilshire Area
 - F013-13/Non-Tactical AD/outside the City of Los Angeles
- Nine CUOF incidents - The OIG was notified beyond the 20 minute requirement
 - F003-13/OIS Animal/Southeast Area
 - F014-13/Non-Tactical AD/Newton Area
 - F015-13/OIS Animal/Southeast Area
 - F032-13/Non-Tactical AD/Rampart Area
 - F047-12/LERI/outside the City of Los Angeles
 - F052-12/OIS Animal/Southwest Area
 - F059-12/OIS Animal/outside the City of Los Angeles
 - F074-12/Non-Tactical AD/West Valley Area
 - F084-12/OIS Animal/77th Street Area

Table No. 3 below illustrates the notification times by RACR to the different entities.

TABLE NO. 3 – ELAPSED TIME OF NOTIFICATIONS BY RACR FROM TIME OF OCCURRENCE

Elapsed Notification Time by RACR	No. of CUOF Notifications to FID	No. of CUOF Notifications to COP	No. of CUOF Notifications to COS	No. of CUOF Notifications to OIG
Results	92% (48/52)	77% (40/52)	58% (30/52)	79% (41/52)
Within 20 minutes	48	40	30	41
Between 21-60 Minutes	4	8	12	8
Over 60 Minutes	0	0	2	1
No Notification	0	4	8	2
Total CUOFs	52	52	52	52

Criteria

Department Manual Section 4/204.80 Animal Shootings and Non-Tactical Unintentional Discharges of Firearms states, “...*Real-Time Analysis Crisis Response Division - (sic) Responsibility. When notified of an animal shooting or non-tactical unintentional discharge of a firearm involving an employee, 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:*

- *Notify Force Investigation Division (or the designated on-call FID team during non-business hours);*
- *Office of the Chief of Police or his designee;*
- *Office of the Inspector General (OIG) on behalf of the Board of Police Commissioners...*”

Audit Procedures

The same Objective No. 4 audit steps applied here, with the exception of the COS notification and the requirement for calls to be made within 20 minutes.

Findings

If this objective was evaluated according to the above policy, the results would yield two hundred and two (97%) of the 208 CUOF notifications that met the standard for this objective.

Objective No. 5 – RACR Notifications to the Commanding Officer (C/O) PSB, Involved Employee's C/O, Department Risk Manager, and Los Angeles County District Attorney's (LADA's) Office

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/794.35 Categorical Use of Force - Notifications Additional Notifications Requirements - states, "*...As soon as possible after being notified of a CUOF incident, but not required within 20 minutes, RACR is responsible to make 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."*

Protocol For District Attorney Officer-Involved Shooting Response Program states, "*This protocol shall apply when either of the following incidents occur within Los Angeles County:*

1. *A peace officer, on or off duty, shoots and injures any person during the scope and course of employment.*
2. *An individual dies while in the custody or control of a law enforcement officer or agency and the use of force by a peace officer may be a proximate cause of the death."*

Audit Procedures

A list of 52 CUOF incidents that occurred from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013, were identified that required notifications to the C/O for PSB, involved employee's C/O, Department Risk Manager (DRM) and, when applicable, the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office (LADA) from RACR.¹²

As with Objective No. 4, due to the inability to locate the RACR Division, Incident Notification log for CUOF incident, F045-12/77th Street, it could not be assessed for the required notifications and was removed, resulting in 52 CUOF incidents. A total of 174 notifications were made to the four entities involving the 52 CUOFs.¹³

Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response Division Incident Notification logs were reviewed for this objective. The Department met the standards if the RACR Division, Incident Notification logs contained documentation that the C/O of PSB, the involved employee's C/O, the DRM, and the LADA were notified.

¹² Seventeen of the 52 CUOF incidents required notifications to the LADA.

¹³ Fifty-two notifications were made to each of three entities while 17 applicable notifications were made to the LADA, resulting in a total of 173 notifications.

Findings

One hundred and sixty-six (96%) of the 173 notifications met the standards for this objective. The remaining seven did not meet the standard and are detailed in a breakdown by entity.

Commanding Officer, Professional Standards Bureau

Forty-seven (90%) of the 52 CUOF incidents, that required notification to the C/O, PSB from RACR, met the standard for this objective.

- Five CUOF incidents – C/O, PSB was not notified
 - F081-12/OIS Animal/Southeast Area
 - F087-12/Non-Tactical AD/Wilshire Area
 - F035-13/K9 Contact/Northeast Area
 - F048-13/ICD/Hollenbeck Area
 - F049-13/Tactical AD/Devonshire Area

Involved Employee's Commanding Officer

Each (100%) of the 52 CUOF incidents, that required notification to the involved employee's C/O, met the standard for this objective.

Department Risk Manager

Fifty (96%) of the 52 CUOF incidents, that required notification to the DRM from RACR, met the standard for this objective.

- Two CUOF incidents - DRM was not notified
 - F046-12/OIS Hit/West Valley Area
 - F087-12/Non-Tactical AD/Wilshire Area

Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

Of the 52 CUOF incidents that occurred during the selected time period, 17 (ICDs and OIS Hits) required notifications to the LADA.¹⁴

Each (100%) of the 17 CUOF incidents met the standard for this objective.

¹⁴ According to policy, guidelines, and discussion with the Use of Force Review Division, ICDs and OIS Hits met the requirements for LADA's notifications.

Table No. 4 – Although the timeliness of the notifications is not a factor for the concerned entities in this objective, the below table provides a reference for information only.

TABLE NO. 4 – ELAPSED TIME OF NOTIFICATIONS BY RACR FROM TIME OF OCCURRENCE¹⁵

Elapsed Notification Times by RACR	No. of CUOF Notifications to C/O, PSB	No. of CUOF Notifications to Employee's C/O	No. of CUOF Notifications to DRM	No. of CUOF Notifications to LADA
Results	90% (47/52)	100% (52/52)	96% (50/52)	100% (17/17)
Within 20 Minutes	17	37	14	17
Between 21-60 Minutes	24	13	31	0
Over 60 Minutes	6	2	5	0
No Notification	5	0	2	0

Objective No. 6(a) – Completion of the Use of Force Review Board Correspondence

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/794.40, Return To Field Duty of Employees Involved in an Officer-Involved Shooting Resulting in Injury or a Categorical Use of Force Resulting in Death or the Substantial Possibility of Death – Notification of Use of Force Review Board, states, *“Within 30 calendar days of the incident, the commanding officer of the employee who is involved in an officer-involved shooting resulting in an injury to any person or a Categorical use of force resulting in the death or the substantial possibility of death shall submit a Form 15.02.00 via chain of command to the Chair of the Use of Force Review Board confirming compliance with these guidelines. The Form 15.02.00 shall include:*

- *The date of the incident;*
- *The date of the officer's BSS visit (if applicable);*
- *The date of the commanding officer's consultation with BSS (if applicable);*
- *The recommendation of BSS regarding the duty status of the involved employee (if applicable);*
- *The commanding officer's recommendation as to an employee's readiness and suitability to return or not return to field duty status shall be based on an employee interview, BSS recommendation, TEAMS II review, and Chief of Police approval;*
- *The dates that approval was obtained from the bureau commanding officer, assistant chief and Chief of Police to return the employee to field duty;*
- *The date the officer(s) was returned to field duty, if such a determination was made;*
- *The specific assignment(s) of the involved employee on each of the dates prior to the officer being returned to field duty; and,*

¹⁵ For informational purposes only; there is currently no mandate on time frame, other than as soon as possible.

Note: *If the involved employee has not returned to field duty within 30 calendar days of the incident due to the recommendation of BSS or non-approval by the Chief of Police, an additional Form 15.02.00 shall be submitted every 30 days thereafter indicating specific assignment(s) of the involved employee pending his/her return to field duty until approved for return to full duty.*

- *Any duty restrictions attached to the return to field duty determination."*

Audit Procedures

There were 53 CUOF incidents that occurred from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013, that met the above criteria for this objective. It was determined that 23 of the 53 CUOF incidents required an Intradepartmental Correspondence, Form 15.02.00 (15.02), to be submitted to the UOFRB. The 23 qualifying 15.02s were examined for completeness of the required information, as indicated in Department policy.

The Department met the standard if the 15.02 contained all of the required information.

Findings

Twenty (87%) of the 23 CUOF 15.02s reviewed met the standard for this objective. The remaining three did not meet the standard and are described as follows:

- F069-12/OIS Hit/Newton Area - The 15.02 indicated that the C/O only made recommendations for two of the four involved officers to return to field duty.
- F033-13/ICD/Central Area – The 15.02 indicated that the Deputy Chief - Operations Central Bureau approved the officers' return to field duty. However, the approval by the COP was not documented.
- F054-13/OIS Hit/Foothill Area – The 15.02 indicated that one officer was cleared to return to field duty by the COP two days prior to the officer's BSS visit.¹⁶

Objective No. 6(b) – Timeliness of the Use of Force Review Board Correspondence

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/794.40, Return to Field Duty of Employees Involved in an Officer-Involved Shooting Resulting in Injury or a Categorical Use of Force Resulting in Death or the Substantial Possibility of Death – Notification of Use of Force Review Board, states, *"Within 30 calendar days of the incident, the commanding officer of the employee who is involved in an officer-involved shooting resulting in an injury to any person or a Categorical use of force resulting in the death or the substantial possibility of death shall submit a Form 15.02.00 via chain of command to the Chair of the Use of Force Review Board confirming compliance with these guidelines."*

¹⁶ This officer visited BSS two days after the C/O gave approval to return to field duty; the officer *did not* return to field duty until after the BSS visit.

Audit Procedures

There were 53 CUOF incidents that occurred from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013, that met the above criteria for this objective. It was determined that 23 of the 53 CUOF incidents required a 15.02 to be submitted to the UOFRB. The 23 qualifying 15.02s were examined for the 30 calendar-day requirement.

The Department met the standard if the 15.02 indicated that it was submitted to the UOFRB within 30 calendar days of the CUOF incident confirming compliance with these guidelines.

Findings

Seventeen (74%) of the 23 CUOF 15.02s reviewed met the standard for this objective.

- F048-12/ICD/Southeast Area– 63 days after the CUOF incident.
- F069-12/OIS Hit/Newton Area – 39 days after the CUOF incident.
- F070-12/OIS Hit/Mission Area – 33 days after the CUOF incident.
- F079-12/OIS Hit/Hollenbeck Area – 34 days after the CUOF incident.
- F012-13/OIS Hit/Hollywood Area – 180 days after the CUOF incident.
- F033-13/ICD/Central Area – 41 days after the CUOF incident.

Objective No. 7(a) – Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Training Update

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/796.35 Procedures For Coordinating Directed Training - states, *“Mandatory Training Update. The Area/division commanding officer of any employee who substantially involved in a Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) incident, animal shooting, non-tactical/accidental or negligent discharge of a firearm shall:*

- *Identify those personnel who were substantially involved in the event;*
- *Attend the “Chief of Police 72-hour Briefing if convened. At the briefing, the commanding officer shall obtain concurrence from those present, including the Personnel and Training Bureau (PTB) representative, on the tactical and training issues of the Training Update, if any training shall be completed prior to the involved officer(s) return to field duty, and the entity responsible for providing the training;*
- *Coordinate with Use of Force Review Division (UOFRD) to ensure that the appropriate subject areas are covered;*
- *Ensure the substantially involved employee(s) receives a training update as directed within 90 days following the incident, or prior to the involved officer(s) return to field duties, if applicable;*
- *Ensure that Area/division staff does not conduct interviews of the officers to determine specific facts related to the incident but provides only a general Training Update on the identified subject matter;*
- *Ensure that any Training Update conducted within the Area/division subsequent to a CUOF is correctly entered into the identified employee’s Training Management System (TMS) within Training Evaluation and Management System II (TEAMS II), and that the*

entry states TRAINING UPDATE and includes the applicable Force Investigation Division (FID) Case Number or applicable tracking number; and,

- *Forward Intradepartmental Correspondence to UOFRD noting the Training Update was completed and a TEAMS II report entry was made for the concerned employee(s). A copy of the employee's TEAMS II report reflecting the Training Update should be attached."*

Audit Procedures

This objective involved CUOFs that were adjudicated from July 1, 2012 through July 16, 2013, with findings of Administrative Disapprovals. A total of 16 CUOFs resulting in disciplinary findings, involving 35 officers were reviewed for this objective. The Department met the standard if the officer's TEAMS II Report contained documentation that the Training Update course was received and completed within 90 days following the incident or prior to the involved officer(s) return to field duties.

Findings

Thirty-five (100%) of the 35 officers' TEAMS II Reports reviewed met the standard for this objective.

Objective No. 7(b) – Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Tactical Debrief Training

Criteria

Department Manual 3/792.15, Tactical Debrief – states, *"Tactical Debrief shall be conducted for all CUOF incidents within 90 days of the conclusion of the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC) review process... The Categorical Use of Force Debrief Facilitator shall conduct the Tactical Debrief with the personnel involved in the CUOF incident. The Categorical Use of Force Debrief Facilitator shall be responsible for presenting the fact pattern of the case and leading a facilitated discussion on the training, tactics, force, and leadership issues applicable to the incident. The Categorical Use of Force Debrief Facilitator will present those tactical practices identified by the adjudication process as "strengths" and "lessons learned" so that future practices, policies, or procedures can be enhanced. The Tactical Debrief shall provide training in the areas of drawing and exhibiting a firearm and use of force."*

Audit Procedures

This objective involved CUOF incidents that were adjudicated from July 1, 2012 through July 16, 2013, with findings of Administrative Disapprovals. This objective assessed 16 disciplinary CUOF incidents, which involved 31 officers.¹⁷ The Department met the standard if

¹⁷ Initially, a total of 35 officers were to be assessed. Four officers were removed from the population since it was learned that one officer was on "Injured on Duty" status (the training was immediately completed upon the officer's return from his "Injured on Duty" status); two officers were relieved of duty during the period the Tactical Debrief was to be received and completed; and, a fourth officer was ordered to a Board of Rights hearing. Therefore, these officers (F103-11/OIS Hit/SOW, F028-12/LERI/CENT [two officers] and F048-12/ICD/SOE) were removed from the population.

the officer's TEAMS II Report contained documentation that the Tactical Debrief was received and completed within 90 days of the conclusion of the BOPC review process.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 31 officers' TEAMS II Reports reviewed met the standard for this objective.

Objective No. 7(c) – Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion and/or Initiation of Administrative Disapproval Remedial Actions

Criteria

Department Manual 3/792.20 Administrative Disapproval (Tactics, Drawing and Exhibiting or Use of Force) – states, *“When the UOFRB recommends or the COP finds that an employee’s actions (tactics, drawing and exhibiting, or use of force) should be classified as “Administrative Disapproval,” the UOFRB will specify in writing the specific recommended remedial actions and state why they expect that the remedial actions will reduce the risk of the officer repeating the disapproved behavior. Such remedial actions may include:*

- *Completion of Extensive Retraining;*
- *Notice to Correct Deficiencies; and/or,*
- *Personnel Complaint.*

When the BOPC concurs that a finding of Administrative Disapproval is appropriate, the matter will be referred back to the Department for the appropriate remedial action as delineated above.”

A review of the Department Manual did not indicate a specific time period for the remedial action to be initiated (Personnel Complaint) or completed (Extensive Training or Notice to Correct Deficiencies). However, since the recommendation for a Tactical Debrief is to be conducted within 90 days of the conclusion of the BOPC review process, it would be reasonable to conclude that both the Extensive Training and/or Notice to Correct Deficiencies are to be completed during the same time period.

Audit Procedures

This objective involved CUOFs that were adjudicated from July 1, 2012 through July 16, 2013, with findings of Administrative Disapprovals. This objective assessed the same 16 CUOFs involving 34 officers.¹⁸

TEAMS II reports were reviewed to verify that Extensive Retraining, Notice to Correct Deficiencies, and/or Personnel Complaints were completed or initiated. The Department met the

¹⁸ Initially, a total of 35 officers were to be assessed, however, it was learned that one officer was “Injured on Duty” during the time period the Extensive Retraining was to be received and completed. Therefore, this officer (F103-11/OIS Hit/SOW) was removed from this objective. The training was immediately completed upon the officer’s return.

standard for this objective if the remedial action was received and/or initiated within 90 days of the conclusion of the BOPC review process.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 34 officers TEAMS II Reports reviewed met the standard for this objective.

Objective No. 7(d) – Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of the Use of Force Review Board Report

Criteria

Administrative Order No. 12, dated October 12, 2012 – IV. Use of Force Review Board Report, Form 01.67.00 – Revised, B. Completion, states, *“The form will be completed by Use of Force Review Division (UOFRD) staff based on the adjudication recommendations made by the UOFRB, Chief of Police (COP), and the Police Commission.”*

Audit Procedures

The UOFRB reports were reviewed for 35 officers whose CUOF actions were adjudicated by the UOFRB to be Administrative Disapprovals. The Department met the standard if the officers' UOFRB report was completed.

Findings

Thirteen (37%) of the 35 officers' UOFRB reports met the standard for this objective. The remaining 22 did not have the “Final Adjudication for Out of Policy/Administrative Disapproval Finding” box/field completed.

- F073-11 (two officers)
- F095-11 (two officers)
- F097-11 (one officer)
- F118-11 (two officers)
- F007-12 (four officers)
- F028-12 (Only Police Commission Box Checked for three officers)
- F029-12 (two officers)
- F038-12 (one officer)
- F039-12 (one officer)
- F042-12 (three officers)
- F048-12 (one officer)

The remedial actions of Extensive Retraining, Notice to Correct Deficiencies, and/or Personnel Complaint could not be determined with certainty. A check of the officers' TEAMS II reports yielded the completion of the Extensive Retraining and/or the initiation of a Personnel

Complaint(s), however it is not known if these actions were at the direction of the UOFRB or at the discretion of command staff.¹⁹

Objective No. 8(a) – Non-Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Update Training

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/796.35 Procedures For Coordinating Directed Training - states, *"Mandatory Training Update. The Area/division commanding officer of any employee who substantially involved in a Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) incident, animal shooting, non-tactical/accidental or negligent discharge of a firearm shall:*

- *Identify those personnel who were substantially involved in the event;*
- *Attend the "Chief of Police 72-hour Briefing if convened. At the briefing, the commanding officer shall obtain concurrence from those present, including the Personnel and Training Bureau (PTB) representative, on the tactical and training issues of the Training Update, if any training shall be completed prior to the involved officer(s) return to field duty, and the entity responsible for providing the training;*
- *Coordinate with Use of Force Review Division (UOFRD) to ensure that the appropriate subject areas are covered;*
- *Ensure the substantially involved employee(s) receives a training update as directed within 90 days following the incident, or prior to the involved officer(s) return to field duties, if applicable;*
- *Ensure that Area/division staff does not conduct interviews of the officers to determine specific facts related to the incident but provides only a general Training Update on the identified subject matter;*
- *Ensure that any Training Update conducted within the Area/division subsequent to a CUOF is correctly entered into the identified employee's Training Management System (TMS) within Training Evaluation and Management System II (TEAMS II), and that the entry states TRAINING UPDATE and includes the applicable Force Investigation Division (FID) Case Number or applicable tracking number; and,*
- *Forward Intradepartmental Correspondence to UOFRD noting the Training Update was completed and a TEAMS II report entry was made for the concerned employee(s). A copy of the employee's TEAMS II report reflecting the Training Update should be attached."*

Audit Procedures

This objective assessed use of force incidents by officers that were adjudicated as non-disciplinary by the UOFRB. A total of 95 CUOFs were presented to the UOFRB from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013, that involved 290 officers, 255 of which were determined to be non-disciplinary.²⁰ The remaining 35 officers' actions were found to be administratively disapproved and were reviewed in Objective Nos. 7(a-d).

¹⁹ UOFRD staff immediately addressed the incomplete UOFRB reports, and the UOFRD commanding officer initiated a plan of action to address the issue.

²⁰ The three officers with the Administrative Disapprovals were not reviewed for Tactical Debrief or for Remedial

During a review of the documents, it was learned that four officers were terminated during the CUOF review process and three officers with Administrative Disapprovals that did not fall into the audit time period for Objective No.7; these seven officers were subsequently removed from this objective. As a result, a total of 248 officers TEAMS II reports were assessed in this objective.

The TEAMS II reports of 248 officers involving 79 CUOFs, were reviewed for this objective. The Department met the standard if the officers' TEAMS II report contained documentation that the Training Update was received and completed within 90 days following the CUOF incident.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 248 officers' TEAMS II reports that were reviewed, met the standard for this objective. The remaining five did not meet the standard and are described as follows:

- **Information Only:** Forty-three officers' TEAMS II reports did not have any documentation of the Training Update. However, the officers did receive the Training Update during the required Tactical Debrief Training after a UOF Review determined the officers to be significantly involved.
 - 1 officer - F093-11/OIS Animal/Foothill Area
 - 2 officers - F100-11/LERII/Hollywood Area
 - 1 officer - F105-11/OIS/Southeast Area
 - 1 officer - F107-11/OIS/Southeast Area
 - 1 officer - F115-11/OIS Animal/Newton Area
 - 6 officers - F117-11/OIS/Southeast Area
 - 4 officers - F119-11/LERII/Central Area
 - 1 officer - F016-12/OIS Animal/West Valley Area
 - 3 officers - F017-12/OIS/Foothill Area
 - 2 officers - F018-12/OIS/North Hollywood Area
 - 11 officers - F021-12/ICD/West Valley Area
 - 2 officers - F027-12/LERII/Hollywood Area
 - 1 officer - F033-12/OIS Animal/Southeast Area
 - 1 officer - F043-12/OIS/West Los Angeles Area
 - 1 officer - F054-12/Head Strike/Pacific Area
 - 1 officer - F056-12/K9 Contact/Wilshire Area
 - 3 officers - F060-12/OIS/Rampart Area
 - 1 officer - F063-12/OIS Animal/Hollenbeck Area

Actions. As of the writing of this report, the officers still had time remaining to comply with the training requirements. However, the officers' Training Update was assessed. Two of the three officers completed the Training Update; one officer (F060-12/OIS/RAMP) did not.

Objective No. 8(b) – Non-Disciplinary CUOFs - Completion of Required Tactical Debrief Training

Criteria

Department Manual 3/792.15, Tactical Debrief – states, “*Tactical Debrief shall be conducted for all CUOF incidents within 90 days of the conclusion of the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC) review process... The Categorical Use of Force Debrief Facilitator shall conduct the Tactical Debrief with the personnel involved in the CUOF incident. The Categorical Use of Force Debrief Facilitator shall be responsible for presenting the fact pattern of the case and leading a facilitated discussion on the training, tactics, force, and leadership issues applicable to the incident. The Categorical Use of Force Debrief Facilitator will present those tactical practices identified by the adjudication process as “strengths” and “lessons learned” so that future practices, policies, or procedures can be enhanced. The Tactical Debrief shall provide training in the areas of drawing and exhibiting a firearm and use of force.*”

Audit Procedures

This objective assessed the same 248 officers as in Objective No. 8(a). The Department met the standard if the officer’s TEAMS II report contained documentation that the Tactical Debrief was received and completed within 90 days of the conclusion of the BOPC review process. During the course of the audit, it was determined that FID’s CUOF investigation identified two officers were not significantly involved in the CUOF. Therefore, the officers were not required to complete the Tactical Debrief. The officers were removed from the population resulting in a total of 244 officers assessed for this objective.

Findings

Two hundred and forty-two (99%) of the 244 officers’ TEAMS II reports that were reviewed, met the standard for this objective. The remaining two did not meet the standard and are described as follows:

- Two officer’s TEAMS II reports indicated that the Tactical Debrief training was received and completed after the 90 days following the conclusion of the BOPC review process.
 - F101-11/OIS/Central Area– 181 days after the BOPC
 - F063-12/OIS Animal/Hollenbeck Area – 101 days after the BOPC

Objective No. 9 – Timely CUOF Reports to the BOPC

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/792.06, Categorical Use of Force Investigations Administrative Statute line - states, “*To ensure that a categorical use of force (CUOF) is properly reviewed and adjudicated in a timely manner, the Chief of Police shall submit all CUOF recommended administrative findings to the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC) by the administrative statute deadline, which is 60 calendar days prior to the administrative statute date. The statute date is either one year from the date the CUOF incident is reported to a Department supervisor*

or the amended statute date if the statute date is tolled. If the statute date is amended due to tolling, the Commanding Officer (C/O), Use of Force Review Division (UOFRB), shall provide the BOPC with ended statute date."

Audit Procedures

To test for this objective, IAID requested a list of CUOFs for which the statute date would be 60 days beyond the audit date.

The population consisted of 82 CUOF incidents that occurred from October 23, 2011 through October 23, 2012. The Department met the standard if the UOFRB Report was forwarded to the BOPC from the COP within 60 calendar days prior to the administrative statute date.

Findings

Eighty-one (99%) of the 82 CUOF reports met the standard for this objective. The remaining incident did not meet the standard and is described below:

- One CUOF report (F112-11/OIS/Outside the City of LA) - 1 day past compliance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that PRD examine Department Manual Sections 3/794.35 Categorical Use of Force – Notifications Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response Division, and 4/204.80 Animal Shootings and Non-Tactical Unintentional Discharges of Firearms; determine which of these two sections should be modified for consistency, thus providing clarification for affected Department personnel.
2. It is recommended that PRD review Department Manual Section 3/794.35 Categorical Use of Force - Notifications Area Watch Commander/Incident Commander; determine whether a need exists to either expand the time frame for watch commanders to make notifications, or provide a window of time for these notifications to be made.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

1. The audit findings were validated with the respective Area and division C/Os, who expressed general agreement.
2. The audit report was presented to the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations and the Director, Office of Administrative Services; both of which expressed general agreement with the audit findings and the recommendations.