

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

June 16, 2015
14.2

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: OPERATIONS – WEST BUREAU NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT
(AD NO. 14-037)

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. The Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Operations – West Bureau (OWB) Narcotics Enforcement Detail (NED) Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA).
2. The Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Executive Summary thereto.

DISCUSSION

Audit Division conducted the OWB NED CAPA to evaluate adherence with related Department directives.

If additional information regarding this audit is required, please contact Arif Alikhan, Director, Office of Constitutional Policing and Policy, at (213) 486-8730.

Respectfully,



CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Attachment

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
*OPERATIONS-WEST BUREAU
NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE
AUDIT*

(AD No. 14-037)



Conducted by
AUDIT DIVISION

CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

June 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPERATIONS-WEST BUREAU NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT

	PAGE No.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
PURPOSE	1
BACKGROUND	1
PRIOR AUDITS	1
METHODOLOGY	1
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	3
DETAILED FINDINGS	4
OBJECTIVE No. 1 EVALUATION OF ARREST REPORTS	4
OBJECTIVE No. 1(a) ARTICULATION OF REASONABLE SUSPICION AND PROBABLE CAUSE TO ARREST	4
OBJECTIVE No. 1(b) ARTICULATION OF SEARCH AND SEIZURE	4
OBJECTIVE No. 1(c) ADMONITION OF MIRANDA RIGHTS	5
OBJECTIVE No. 2 EVALUATION OF SEARCH/RAMEY WARRANT PACKAGES	6
OBJECTIVE No. 2(a) MAGISTRATE APPROVED THE SEARCH/RAMEY WARRANT	6
OBJECTIVE No. 2(b) COMPLETENESS OF THE WARRANT TRACKING LOG	7
OBJECTIVE No. 2(c) SUPERVISOR APPROVAL OF SEARCH/RAMEY WARRANT PACKAGES	8
OBJECTIVE No. 2(d) COMPLETION OF REQUIRED EMPLOYEE COMMENT SHEETS	10
OBJECTIVE No. 2(e) ADHERENCE TO OTHER SIGNIFICANT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	11
OBJECTIVE No. 2(f) EVALUATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANTS	12
OBJECTIVE No. 3 CONSISTENCY OF ARREST REPORT AND SEARCH/RAMEY WARRANT PACKAGES	13
OBJECTIVE No. 4 COMPLETION OF STANDARDS BASED ASSESSMENTS	15
OBJECTIVE No. 5 EVALUATION OF NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL INVESTIGATIONS	16
OBJECTIVE No. 5(a) NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL OFFICER ROLES	16
OBJECTIVE No. 5(b) NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL SUPERVISORY ROLES	18
OBJECTIVE No. 6 ADHERENCE TO CONFIDENTIAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS	19
OTHER RELATED MATTERS	20
ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE	20
ADDENDUM – RESPONSE TO OPERATIONS-WEST BUREAU NED CAPA	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
OPERATIONS-WEST BUREAU NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT

Conducted by
Audit Division
Third Quarter, Fiscal Year 2013/14

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Annual Audit Plan for fiscal year 2013/14, Audit Division (AD) conducted the Operations–West Bureau (OWB) Narcotics Enforcement Detail (NED) Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA). The NED CAPAs are performed to determine if the internal controls within each Area are effective to ensure they are operating within Department policies and procedures, as well as other established criteria set forth by State and federal guidelines.

BACKGROUND

This is the second OWB NED CAPA conducted by AD. The first OWB NED CAPA had no recommendations.

SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS

The audit consisted of 14 objectives/sub-objectives. The Department had 100 percent compliance in five of the 14 objectives; Evaluation of Arrest Reports (two objectives), specific to the articulation of reasonable suspicion and probable cause and the articulation of search and seizure, Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages (two objectives), specific to the magistrate approval of search/Ramey warrants and the Evaluation of Confidential Informants, and Evaluation of Confidential Financial Disclosure Filings (one objective), specific to the adherence to Confidential Financial Disclosure requirements.

An 80 percent or higher compliance was achieved in five of the nine remaining objectives, which are detailed below:

- Objective 1(c) - Admonition of Miranda Rights: 94 percent compliance;
- Objective 2(e) - Adherence to other Significant Policies and Procedures: 85 percent compliance;
- Objective 3 - Consistency of Arrest Report and Search/Ramey Packages: 87 percent compliance;
- Objective 4 – Completion of Standards Based Assessments: 81 percent compliance; and,
- Objective 5(b) – Narcotics Enforcement Detail Supervisory Roles: 85 percent compliance.

In the remaining four objectives the Department received 77 percent or below compliance. These findings were administrative in nature and would not impact the successful prosecution of the case:

- Objective 2(b) - Completeness of Warrant Tracking Logs: 50 percent compliance;
- Objective 2(c) – Supervisor Approval of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages;

- Objective 2(d) - Completion of Required Employee Comment Sheets: 54 percent compliance; and,
- Objective 5(a) – Narcotics Enforcement Detail Officer Roles: 54 percent compliance

CONCLUSION

This is the second OWB NED CAPA that has been conducted. The first OWB NED CAPA was conducted in 2012. A review of the findings from the previous audit indicated that the Department has made marginal improvements in areas pertaining to the timely and accurate completion of SBAs and Employee Comment Sheets. The Department's compliance rate pertaining to the Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages-Adherence to Significant Policies and Procedures improved significantly.

The Department's compliance rates decreased in three areas: Completeness of the Warrant Tracking Logs, Supervisor Approval of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages and Consistency of Information in the Arrest Report Package. Based on the current audit findings, improvement is still warranted in areas directly related to supervisory oversight and the review of Search Warrant Packages including, Warrant Service/Tactical Plan Reports and Arrests Reports and associated documents. Additionally, it is suggested that NED supervisors review the protocols outlined in Special Order No. 33, June 30, 2009, Sergeant's Daily Report Field Notebook Divider, Form 18.49.00, and Operations Order No. 1, January 10, 2012, Check-In Procedures for Specialized Units.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Audit Division presented the CAPA report to the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations, and Commanding Officer, OWB, both whom were in general agreement with the findings.

**OPERATIONS-WEST BUREAU NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT**

**Conducted by
Internal Audits and Inspections Division
Third Quarter, Fiscal Year 2013/14**

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Annual Audit Plan for fiscal year 2013/14, Audit Division (AD) conducted the Operations–West Bureau (OWB) Narcotics Enforcement Detail (NED) Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA). The NED CAPAs are performed to determine if the internal controls within each Area are effective to ensure they are operating within Department policies and procedures, as well as other established criteria set forth by State and federal guidelines.

Audit Division conducted this performance 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. Audit Division has determined that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for the findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives.

BACKGROUND

Audit Division developed CAPAs to address risk management issues, assess operations, and provide timely information to Department management pertaining to NED units.

PRIOR AUDITS

This was the second NED CAPA performed for OWB. Audit Division conducted the previous OWB NED CAPA in June 2012, which had no recommendations.

METHODOLOGY

Scope

The audit included the review of Arrest Reports, Form 05.02.00, and associated documents, Search/Ramey Warrant packages, Standards Based Assessments (SBAs), Form 01.87.00, NED investigations, supervisory roles, officer roles, and Confidential Financial Disclosure Filings, Form 01.74.01.

The period reviewed was January 1, 2014, to March 31, 2014. The audit steps employed are further delineated under each audit objective.

A random stratified sample of 48 OWB NED related arrest reports was identified for this audit. All 13 search warrants initiated by OWB NEDs during the audit time-period were used for this audit. The audit steps employed are further delineated under each audit objective.

Fieldwork

The fieldwork was performed between May 13, 2014, and June 13, 2014. Audit Division provided the Commanding Officer (C/O), OWB, with an Intradepartmental Correspondence, Form 15.02.00, explaining the audit's methodology and requested input regarding additional areas requiring evaluation.

This area intentionally left blank

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Table No. 1 – Summary of the Audit Findings for Each Objective

Objective No.	Description of Audit Objective	2011/12 Operations-West Bureau Totals	2013/14 Operations-West Bureau Totals
1	Evaluation of Arrest Reports		
1(a)	Articulation of Reasonable Suspicion and Probable Cause to Arrest	45/45 (100%)	48/48 (100%)
1(b)	Articulation of Search and Seizure	45/45 (100%)	48/48 (100%)
1(c)	Admonition of Miranda Rights	45/45 (100%)	45/48 (94%)
2	Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages		
2(a)	Magistrate Approved the Search/Ramey Warrant	7/7 (100%)	13/13 (100%)
2(b)	Completeness of the Warrant Tracking Log	3/4 (75%)	4/8 (50%)
2(c)	Supervisor Approval of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages	6/7 (86%)	10/13 (77%)
2(d)	Completion of Required Employee Comment Sheets	1/7 (14%)	7/13 (54%)
2(e)	Adherence to other Significant Policies and Procedures	4/7 (57%)	11/13 (85%)
2(f)	Evaluation of Confidential Informants ¹	3/3 (100%)	7/7 (100%)
3	Consistency of Arrest Reports and Search/Ramey Warrant Packages		
3	Consistency of Arrest Report and Search/Ramey Warrant Packages	44/49 (90%)	53/61 (87%)
4	Completion of Standards Based Assessments		
4	Completion of Standards Based Assessments	24/34 (71%)	29/36 (81%)
5	Evaluation of Narcotics Enforcement Detail Investigations²		
5(a)	Narcotics Enforcement Detail Officer Roles	N/A	26/48 (54%)
5(b)	Narcotics Enforcement Detail Supervisory Roles	N/A	40/47 (85%)
6	Adherence to Confidential Financial Disclosure Requirements		
6	Adherence to Confidential Financial Disclosure Requirements	34/34 (100%)	36/36 (100%)

¹Arrest reports that indicated a confidential informant was used were also included in sub-objective No. 2(f).

²Objective No. 5 was not measured in the prior 2011/12 audit; therefore, no comparison could be made.

DETAILED FINDINGS

Objective No. 1 – Evaluation of Arrest Reports

This objective included the review of arrest reports and associated documents completed by all personnel assigned to OWB NED units during the audit period. The arrest reports were evaluated to determine whether they included articulation of legal sufficiency for actions taken, and whether they contained evidence of significant deviations from Department policies and procedures.

Objective No. 1(a) – Articulation of Reasonable Suspicion and Probable Cause to Arrest

Criteria

Department Manual Section 1/508, Police Action Based on Legal Justification, states, *“What is reasonable in terms of appropriate police action or what constitutes probable cause varies with each situation, and different facts may justify either an investigation, a detention, a search, an arrest, or no action at all. The requirement that legal justification be present imposes a limitation on an officer's action. In every case, officers must act reasonably within the limits of their authority as defined by statute and judicial interpretation, thereby ensuring that the rights of both the individual and the public are protected.”*

Audit Procedures

Each arrest report was reviewed to determine whether it sufficiently articulated the legal basis for all actions taken (e.g., detentions, arrests, and searches). Arrest reports that articulated the aforementioned criteria and procedures met the standards for this objective.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 48 arrest reports met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 1(b) – Articulation of Search and Seizure

Criteria

Department Manual Section 4/217, Searches of Suspects and Arrestees, states, *“Searches of Arrestees. When the rules of search and seizure permit, an arrestee shall be thoroughly searched as soon as practicable.”*

The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution protects the people against unreasonable searches and seizures. As such, Department personnel are required to document the legal basis for conducting searches, which includes the following: search warrants, probable cause, incident to arrest, consent, or exigent circumstances.

Audit Procedures

Each of the 48 arrest report was reviewed to evaluate the legality of each search, including booking searches involving strip and visual body cavity searches. Arrest reports that articulated the search authority met the standards for this objective.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 48 arrest reports met the standards for this objective.³

Objective No. 1(c) – Admonition of Miranda Rights

Criteria

Department Manual Section 4/202.10, Interrogation of Suspects – Admonition of Miranda Rights, states, *“Interrogating Officers – Responsibilities. When officers are conducting a custodial interrogation, the following procedures shall be followed:*

- *Officers shall read the Miranda admonition verbatim as delineated in the Officer’s Notebook, Form 15.03.00;”*
- *“Officers shall document the suspect’s responses to the Miranda admonition in the appropriate report.”*

Audit Procedures

Each arrest report was reviewed for the overall chronology of arrest events, specifically examining whether a detainee was interrogated regarding his/her participation in criminal activity. Arrest reports were also reviewed for evidence of Miranda Rights adherence. Arrest reports that contained no evidence of Miranda admonition violations met the standards for this objective.

Findings

Forty-five (94%) of the 48 arrest reports met the standards for this objective. The three arrest reports that did not meet the standards are detailed below:

Hollywood Area

- Divisional Record Nos. 14-06-00727 and 14-06-07204 – The Miranda admonition responses were not documented in the arrest reports.

³Searches incident to arrest were not considered for this objective.

Wilshire Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-07-05538 – The Miranda admonition responses were not documented in the arrest report.⁴

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

This objective included the review of search/Ramey warrant packages completed by NED personnel during the audit period. A review of OWB Area Warrant Tracking Logs (WTLs), Form 08.17.05, indicated there were 13 search/Ramey Warrants served during the audit period that involved a NED officer as the affiant. The search warrant packages 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 WTL;
- The search warrant was served within the required ten-day period;
- The Warrant Service/Tactical Plan (Tac Plan) Report, Form 12.25.00, and Return to Search Warrant were completed;
- The C/O or designee initialed page one of the Tac Plan;
- The information documented on the “Return to Search Warrant” (location, vehicle, person(s) and description, etc.) was consistent with the information documented in the affidavit;
- The Employee Comment Sheet(s), Form 01.77.00, adequately addressed, at a minimum, the six items listed in Manual Section 4/742.10, Search Warrant And Probable Cause Arrest Warrant Procedures;
- The Warrant Affidavit contains a description of the person, places and vehicles to be searched;
- The Warrant Affidavit contains a description of the property to be seized and/or the person to be arrested;
- Proper use of confidential informants (CI) (if applicable); and,
- There was consistency between the evidence seized and the description of the property to be seized as documented in the search warrant.

Objective No. 2(a) – Magistrate Approved the Search/Ramey Warrant

Criteria

Department Manual Section 4/742.10, Search Warrant and Probable Cause Arrest Warrant Procedures, states, *“All Department personnel involved in the service (including the planning and debriefing) of a search or Ramey warrant shall comply with the instructions set forth in the Search Warrant Service Procedures Guide, prepared by Investigative Analysis Section, Detective Bureau. Each commanding officer shall be responsible for maintaining the Search Warrant*

⁴This arrest report was for a multi-four arrest. It should be noted, that this finding applies to each of the four arrestees in this arrest report.

Service Procedures Guide and ensuring that such procedures are made available to Department personnel. Department personnel shall follow these guidelines when preparing, obtaining, serving, and returning a search warrant."

Audit Procedures

Search warrant packages were reviewed to determine if they were properly approved by a magistrate prior to the service of the search warrant. Packages that contained evidence of a signature by the magistrate prior to the service of the warrant met the standards for this objective.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 13 search warrant packages met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 2(b) – Completeness of the Warrant Tracking Log

Criteria

Department Manual Section 4/742.10, Search Warrant and Probable Cause Arrest Warrant Procedures, states, "*Officer's Responsibility. An officer obtaining a search or Ramey warrant shall;*"

"Upon obtaining a search or Ramey warrant issued by a magistrate, the officer obtaining the warrant shall complete all the required information on the Warrant Tracking Log."

"Commanding Officer's Responsibilities. The commanding officer of each Area/specialized division (or designated Area detective's CO at the rank of lieutenant or above) shall ensure that his or her command is in compliance with Department policy and procedure as it relates to search and Ramey warrant service and:"

- *"Ensure that the warrant number and return date are entered on the Warrant Tracking Log no later than ten business days from the date of service, with the exception of third-party records warrants;*
- *Ensure that the warrant number is recorded on both the Warrant Tracking Log and the first page of the Tactical Plan Report;*
- *Sign and date the bottom of the final printout of the Warrant Tracking Log, at the completion of each month."*

Search Warrant Service Procedures Guide Chapter II, page 8, states, "*After approval by a supervisor, and before submission to a magistrate, the officer shall record the appropriate information on the Warrant Tracking Log, Form 08.17.05, maintained by the Area or detective division commanding officer."*

Audit Procedures

Audit Division identified eight WTLs that were applicable for this objective. The WTLs were reviewed to determine if they were completed and were maintained as required. Warrant Tracking Logs that documented search warrants, and were approved by the C/O by the end of the month, met the standards for this objective.

Findings

Four (50%) of the eight WTLs met the standards for this objective. The four WTLs below did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

Hollywood Area

- Warrant Tracking Log dated January 2014 – Did not contain the search warrant number and return date for Search Warrant No. 67403.

West Los Angeles Area

- Warrant Tracking Log dated January 2014 – The “Approving Supervisor” documented for search warrants Nos. 14014 and 012114002, is not the supervisor who approved the Warrant Affidavits.
- Warrant Tracking Log dated February 2014 – The “Approving Supervisor” documented for search warrant No. 02241400, and Ramey warrant No. 020414001, is not the supervisor who approved the Warrant Affidavits. Additionally, the WTL did not contain the return date for Ramey warrant No. 020414001.

Olympic Area

- Warrant Tracking Log dated January 2014 – The “Approving Supervisor” documented for search warrant No. 67284, is not the supervisor who approved the Warrant Affidavit.

Objective No. 2(c) – Supervisor Approval of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages

Criteria

Department Manual Section 4/742.10, Search Warrant and Probable Cause Arrest Warrant Procedures, states *“Supervisor Review Of Affidavit. The concerned supervisor shall place his/her initials and serial number on the lower right hand corner of each page of the original copy of the affidavit, indicating that he or she has thoroughly reviewed the document. Supervisors are reminded that every page must be reviewed and initialed in order to document a thorough review.”*

“Tactical Plan Report. Prior to the warrant service, the designated supervisor shall review and determine if a Tactical Plan Report is required. If the Tactical Plan Report is required, the supervisor shall follow the guidelines established in Manual Section 5/12.25.00.”

Department Manual Section 5/12.25.00 Warrant Service/Tactical Plan Report, Form 12.25.00, states, *“The Tactical Plan Report Shall be completed prior to the service of a search or Ramey warrant.*

12.25.00-01 Use of Form. The seven-page form shall be used to document information that will serve as the basis of the warrant service tactical plan. No other reporting formats are authorized.

12.25.00-10 Completion. The Tactical Plan Report shall be completed as follows:

“Supervisor. The designated supervisor shall review the Tactical Plan Report and, if approving, sign page one. Following service of the warrant, a supervisor that was at the scene of the service shall conduct a debriefing and document the debriefing and the debriefing location in the “Debriefing Location” and “Debriefing Summary” sections...”

“Commanding Officer. Prior to the service, the commanding officer or designee shall review and approve the Tactical Plan Report by placing his or her initials on the bottom right hand corner of the first page. Following service of the warrant, the commanding officer shall review the Tactical Plan Report for completeness and sign page seven.”

Audit Procedures

The search warrant packages were reviewed to determine if the warrant service conditions were documented, and a C/O evaluated the execution and supervisory oversight of the service. Search warrant packages that showed evidence of the above criteria met the standards for this objective.

Findings

Ten (77%) of the 13 search warrant packages met the standards for this objective. The three search warrant packages below did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

West Los Angeles Area

- Search Warrant No. 020414001 – The approving supervisor did not initial the first page of the warrant affidavit.

Olympic Area

- Search Warrant No. 67529 – The approving supervisor did not document his/her serial number on each page of the warrant affidavit as required.

- Search Warrant No. 67648 – The approving supervisor did not initial the first page of the warrant affidavit as required.

Objective No. 2(d) – Completion of Required Employee Comment Sheets

Criteria

Department Manual Section 4/742.10, Search Warrant and Probable Cause Arrest Warrant Procedures, states, *“Commanding Officer’s Responsibilities. The commanding officer of each Area/specialized division (or designated Area detective’s CO at the rank of lieutenant or above) shall ensure that his or her command is in compliance with Department policy and procedure as it relates to search and Ramey warrant service and:”*

- *“Complete an analysis of the performance of the supervisor providing supervisory oversight (designated supervisor) at the service of a search warrant and document the results on an Employee Comment Sheet. The Employee Comment Sheet must be completed within seven business days of the warrants execution and include the following information:*

- *Identity of the designated supervisor assigned (e.g., name, rank, and serial number);*
- *Warrant location;*
- *Date and time of service;*
- *Whether the supervisor's actions during the service of the warrant were appropriate;*
- *Evaluation of the performance of the designated supervisor(s) at each warrant location; and,*
- *Any other information deemed by the commanding officer to be pertinent to the designated supervisor's performance.*

Note: As a reminder, commanding officers are required to sign and date the completed Employee Comment Sheet.”

Audit Procedures

Applicable Division Employee Folders and search warrant packages were reviewed to determine if an Employee Comment Sheet was given to the supervisor(s) who provided supervisory oversight at the search warrant location. The Employee Comment Sheet was then reviewed to determine if it was complete and met the above criteria.

Findings

Seven (54%) of the 13 search warrant packages met the standards for this objective. The six search warrant packages listed below did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

Wilshire Area

- Search Warrant No. 67452 – The C/O analysis was not completed on an Employee Comment Sheet, and the C/O did not date the Employee Comment Sheet as required.
- Search Warrant No. 67506 – The C/O analysis was not completed on Employee Comment Sheet, and the C/O did not date the Employee Comment Sheets as required; therefore, AD was not able to determine if they were completed within the required seven days. Additionally, the Employee Comment Sheets contained canned language and they were not specific to each supervisor's duties as required.

West Los Angeles Area

- Search Warrant No. 022414001 – The C/O did not sign the Employee Comment Sheet as required.

Olympic Area

- Search Warrant No. 67529 – The C/O did not date the Employee Comment Sheet as required; therefore, AD was not able to determine if it was completed within the required seven days. Additionally, the C/O did not complete an Employee Comment Sheet for all supervisors who provided supervisory oversight.
- Search Warrant No. 67648 – The C/O did not date the Employee Comment Sheet as required.
- Search Warrant No. 67598 – The C/O did not complete an Employee Comment Sheet for all supervisors who provided supervisory oversight.

Objective No. 2(e) – Adherence to other Significant Policies and Procedures

Criteria

Department Manual Section 4/742.10, Search Warrant and Probable Cause Arrest Warrant Procedures, states, "*Warrant Review Officer – Established. All Areas/specialized divisions responsible for the service of search and arrest warrants shall designate a WRO in accordance with the guidelines established in this section. The Warrant Review Officer shall be the rank of Sergeant I, Detective II, or higher and shall conduct a final quality assurance review for completeness and accuracy of all warrant documentation. This review shall include:*

- *The required notation is included in the Tactical Plan Report indicating that the concerned CO's review was performed within seven business days after the warrant service;*
- *The Warrant Tracking Log entry is complete and accurate;*

- *The Property Report and the Receipt for Property Taken Into Custody forms match; and,*
- *Any errors, inaccuracies, or omissions within the search warrant package are promptly corrected prior to proper storage.”*

Audit Procedures

Each search warrant package and all applicable documents and forms were reviewed for completeness (e.g., Arrest Report, Continuation Sheet, Form 15.09.00, Property Report, Form 10.01.00, Receipt for Property Taken into Custody, Form 10.10.00, etc.). These forms were selected for examination based on their relevance in evaluating the legality of the officers' actions.

Search warrant packages that contained the required documents and forms met the standards for this objective.⁵

Findings

Eleven (85%) of the 13 search warrant packages met the standards for this objective. The two search warrant packages below did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

West Los Angeles Area

- Search Warrant No. 012114002 – The Return to Search Warrant was not returned within ten calendar days of issuance as required.

Olympic Area

- Search Warrant No. 67648 – The “Search Warrant Info” boxes were not completed on the property report and the Tac Plan indicates that photos were taken; however, the photos were not included in the search warrant package.

Objective No. 2(f) – Evaluation of Confidential Informants

Criteria

Department Informant Manual Section 2/260, Guidelines to Manage Informants, states, *“The following procedures shall be followed when dealing with informants:
Informant Contact Form. Once an informant package has been approved by the C/O ND, all subsequent meetings and contacts with the informant shall be documented on an Informant Contact Form. The Informant Contact Form serves as a chronological log and follow-up report.*

⁵In accordance with Department Manual Sections 4/742.10 and 4/742.30, if a Search Warrant's Tac Plan indicated photos were taken, then the associated search warrant package was evaluated for the presence of photos (e.g., photocopies, disk, flash drive, etc.).

In addition, the Informant Contact Form may be utilized for administrative purposes to document information relevant to the informant's suitability, productivity history, or other miscellaneous information.

All Informant Contact Forms should be submitted, reviewed and approved by the C/O ND within 30 calendar days."

Audit Procedures

Each arrest report and search warrant package was reviewed to determine if a CI was used. When it was determined that a CI was used AD reviewed the corresponding CI package at Gang and Narcotics Division to verify that an active package existed, and that the contact with the CI was documented.

The CI packages that contained the required information met the standards for this objective.

Findings

Of the 61 arrest reports and search warrant packages reviewed, seven arrest reports and/or search warrants indicated that a CI was used, and were applicable for this objective.

Each (100%) of the seven CI packages reviewed met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 3 – Consistency of Arrest Reports and Search/Ramey Warrant Packages

Criteria

Department Manual Section 4/216.01, Advice/Approval on Felony Bookings, states, "*Arrest Reports. Consistent with current procedure, the watch commander or a supervisor designated by the watch commander shall review all reports related to the arrest for appropriateness, legality, and conformance with Department policy and procedure taking into account the booking recommendation. Additionally, the watch commander or supervisor shall examine the reports for authenticity by ensuring that the reports do not contain any "canned" language, inconsistent information, or fail to articulate the legal basis for the action, or any indication that the information in the report(s) is not authentic or correct. Subsequent to review, the watch commander or his/her designee shall indicate approval by signing (including serial number) the report(s).*"

Audit Procedures

Each arrest report, search warrant package, and the associated documents, were reviewed for consistent information. Inconsistent information was defined as inconsistencies that would have an impact on the investigation or question the associated documents. Documents reviewed included, but was not limited to, the Arrest Report and arrest narrative, Search Warrant and

Affidavit, Tac Plan, Property Report, Receipt for Property Taken into Custody, Booking Approval, Form 12.31.00, Employee Comment Sheet and the Adult Detention Log, Form 06.19.00. Arrest report/search warrant packages that did not contain inconsistent information within each report and associated documents met the standards for this objective.

Findings

Fifty-three (87%) of the 61 arrest report and search warrant packages reviewed met the standards for this objective. The eight arrest report/search warrant packages below did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

Hollywood Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-06-05981 – Property report items Nos. 3 and 14 are not documented in the arrest report narrative. The arrest report narrative states that items Nos. 9 and 13 were recovered in the office area; however, the property report stated that item No. 9 was recovered on the living room table and item No. 13 was recovered from the defendant's wallet. Additionally, item No. 15 in the property report is not documented in the property receipt.
- Divisional Record No. 14-06-08548 – The arrest report stated that multiple hide-a-cans were recovered; however, the property report indicated that one was recovered. Item No. 3 in the arrest report is listed as item No. 5 in the property report.
- Search Warrant No. 14V0012 – A property receipt was not issued for items Nos. 41-44 in the property report.
- Search Warrant No. 67403 – A property receipt was not issued for items Nos. 9-41 in the property report.

Wilshire Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-07-05538 – The property report incorrectly indicates that the itemized total of currency is \$113. The correct itemized amount should be \$68.

West Los Angeles Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-08-00663 – A property receipt was not issued for items Nos. 4-19 in the property report.
- Search Warrant No. 012114002 – A property receipt was not issued for items Nos. 14-15 in the property report.

Olympic Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-20-04385 – Item No. 8 in the property receipt is listed twice, and items Nos. 47 and 48 in the property receipt do not match the property report.

Objective No. 4 – Completion of Standards Based Assessments

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/760.20, Standards Based Assessment – Lieutenants and Below, states, *“Supervisor’s Responsibilities. Supervisors who receive a PERAI shall:*

- *Review the concerned employee’s TEAMS report and all other available documents”;*
- *“Complete the Standards Based Assessment, Lieutenant and Below, Form 01.87.00; and,*
- *Serve the employee with the final paper copy of the SBA, and complete the PERAI no later than 90-calendar days after the date it was issued.”*

According to the Standards Based Assessment Lieutenant and Below Guidelines for Completing the Report a Risk Management Information System (RMIS) Action Item number, which corresponds with the TEAMS II Action Item number, is required in the Administrative Section of the report. The report must also contain signatures and dates of the employee, Department/unit assessor, reviewing supervisor, and C/O.⁶

Audit Procedures

Audit Division reviewed the Watch Assignment and Timekeeping Sheet for OWB NED personnel who worked during the audit period and determined there were a total of 36 personnel. The corresponding Division Employee Folders were reviewed to determine if the following Department policy and procedures were followed:

- The SBA was completed for the current rating period;
- The SBA was signed and dated by the employee, all supervisors, and the C/O; and,
- The PERAI was closed within 90 calendar days of the date issued.

Findings

Twenty-nine (81%) of the 36 SBAs met the standards for this objective. The seven SBAs below did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

⁶See Standards Based Assessment, Form 01.87.02, (09/11).

Wilshire Area

- One SBA was not signed by the employee.

West Los Angeles Area

- Two SBAs were closed beyond 90 calendar days of the date issued.

Pacific Area

- Two SBAs were closed beyond 90 calendar days of the date issued.

Olympic Area

- Two SBAs did not contain the RMIS Action Item number.

Objective No. 5 – Evaluation of Narcotics Enforcement Detail Investigations

This objective included the review of the Detective's Activity Logs (DALs) and Sergeant's Daily Reports (SDRs), Form 15.48.00, completed by personnel assigned to OWB NED units during the audit period. The DALs and SDRs were evaluated to determine if they were completed in accordance with current Department policies and procedures.

Objective No. 5(a) – Narcotics Enforcement Detail Officer Roles

Criteria

Gang and Narcotics Division Order No. 2, 2009, Detective's Activity Log - Revised, states, *"Procedures. All field personnel below the rank of Detective III shall complete a DAL, handwritten in ink only..."*

"Detective Activity Log (DAL) Entries. Detective's Activity Log entries shall include, but are not limited to the following:

- *All relevant times, including start of watch and end of watch times, overtime hours and significant activities.*
- *All locations of significant activities, including start of watch and end of watch locations, out of county locations, surveillance locations, etc.*
- *All mandatory appearances (court, administrative hearings, etc.).*
- *All expenditures, including gasoline purchases, out-of-town expenses, informant payments, credit card purchases, and all known expenditures to be reimbursed by other agencies.*
- *Vehicle information including shop number(s), repair and maintenance information and mileage at the time of gasoline purchase.*

- *Informant contacts (including GND personnel present).*
- *Partner information, if applicable.*
- *Any other information as directed by the concerned OIC.*
- *All field personnel below the rank of DIII shall complete their own DAL."*

Audit Procedures

On the dates when an arrest was made by a NED officer, the corresponding DALs were reviewed to determine if the required information was properly documented.

Findings

The corresponding DALs reviewed for 26 (54%) of the 48 arrest reports met the standards for this objective. The 22 DALs that did not meet the standards are detailed below:

Hollywood Area

- The DALs dated 01/01/14, 03/10/14, 03/11/14, 03/20/14, 03/23/14, and 03/30/14 – The shop number was not documented.
- The DALs dated 01/14/14, 02/19/14, 02/20/14, 02/27/14, 03/24/14, and 03/25/14 – The required information was not documented. The DAL indicated that a different DAL be referenced for additional details.

Wilshire Area

- The DALs dated 01/03/14, 01/15/14, 01/22/14, 01/26/14, 02/12/14, and 03/18/14 – The shop number was not documented.
- The DAL dated 03/25/14 – The shop number was not indicated and the required information was not documented. The DAL indicated that a different DAL be referenced for additional details.

Pacific Area

- The DAL dated 01/01/14 – The partner information was not documented.

Olympic Area

- The DALs dated 02/13/14 and 02/25/14 – The partner information was not documented.

Objective No. 5(b) – Narcotics Enforcement Detail Supervisory Roles

Criteria

Department Manual Section 5/18.49.00, Sergeant's Daily Report – Field Notebook Divider, Form 18.49.00, states, "*General Rules. The Sergeant's Daily Report (SDR) is used to capture oversight activities completed by a field supervisor on a daily basis.*"

Gang and Narcotics Division Order No. 2, 2009, Detective's Activity Log – Revised, states, "*Procedures. Detectives III shall complete a Sergeant's Daily Report...*"

"Additionally, supervising detectives (Detectives III and acting Detectives III) shall enter the duty status of their subordinates, all significant personnel and supervisory matters, critiques of incidents, matters of probable interest to GND and any other information as directed by the concerned Officer in Charge (OIC)."

Operations Order No. 1, 2012, Check-In Procedures for Area Specialized Units, states, "*Procedure: I. Area Specialized Unit Supervisor's Responsibilities. The supervisor of each Area specialized unit shall report to the on-duty patrol watch commander at the unit's start of watch (SOW) and end of watch (EOW).*"

"That supervisor shall document the time and the name of the on-duty watch commander that was provided the DPS printout and the SOW check-in briefing in his/her Sergeant's Daily Report, Form 15.48.00."

"The supervisor shall document the time and the name of the on-duty watch commander that was provided the EOW briefing in his/her Sergeant's Daily Report."

Audit Procedures

On the dates when an arrest was made by the NED unit, AD collected the corresponding SDRs. The SDRs were reviewed to determine if one was submitted to the lieutenant by the NED supervisor who had oversight of the NED unit on the arrest date, and that it sufficiently documented all required information, and was signed by the lieutenant. An SDR that contained evidence of the aforementioned met the standards for this objective.

Findings

Of the 48 arrest reports reviewed, two arrests occurred on the same date; therefore, 47 SDRs were applicable for this objective.

Forty (85%) of the 47 SDRs reviewed met the standards for this objective. The seven SDRs below did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

West Los Angeles Area

- The SDRs dated 01/03/14, 02/26/14, 03/03/14 and 03/16/14 – Did not contain the unit's duty status information.

Olympic Area

- The SDR dated 02/25/14 – Was not signed by the lieutenant.
- The SDRs dated 02/13/14 and 03/18/14 – The corresponding DALs were not initialed by a supervisor.

Objective No. 6 – Adherence to Confidential Financial Disclosure Requirements

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/381, Confidential Financial Disclosure Policy and Procedures for Gang Enforcement and Narcotics Enforcement Personnel, states, *"Sworn employees at the rank of lieutenant or below shall submit a completed Confidential Financial Disclosure Face Sheet, Form 01.74.00, and a Confidential Financial Disclosure Report, Form 01.74.01, to the Financial Disclosure Coordinator (FDC), Audit Division, within ten calendar days of being selected and prior to assignment to or for the retention of an existing position within any assignment or loan to:*

- *Gang Impact Team (GIT);*
- *Gang Enforcement Detail (GED);*
- *Narcotic Enforcement Detail (NED) positions;*
- *Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) Unit; or,*
- *Gang and Narcotics Division (GND). Any sworn personnel whose primary duty involves contact with or investigation of gang and/or narcotics."*

Audit Procedures

Audit Division met with the Financial Disclosure Coordinator to determine if a Confidential Financial Disclosure Report had been completed for the 36 NED officers assigned during the audit period.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 36 officers assigned had completed the required Confidential Financial Disclosure Report.

OTHER RELATED MATTERS

In the course of this audit, it was found information indicated that Hollywood, Wilshire, and Pacific Areas did not adequately document anonymous sources of information. The Department Informant Manual, Section 2/280, Procedures for Reporting and Documenting Information, requires when information is received from an anonymous source, as much detail as possible should be provided when documenting the identity of said source in the appropriate report (e.g., arrest report, DAL, SDR); in addition, the anonymous source's refusal to provide identifying information shall also be documented. Additionally, there was indication of instances, wherein the wrong SDR form was being used and the watch commander information was not being documented. Each Area was advised by AD of the aforementioned requirements and has taken the necessary actions to correctly document their use of anonymous sources of information, watch commander information and use the correct SDR form.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Audit Division presented the CAPA report to the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations, and C/O, OWB, both whom were in general agreement with the findings.

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

ADDENDUM

September 25, 2014

1.6

TO: Commanding Officer, Internal Audits and Inspections Division

FROM: Commanding Officer, Operations-West Bureau

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO OPERATIONS-WEST BUREAU NARCOTICS
ENFORCEMENT DETAIL COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY
PERFORMANCE AUDIT

A review of Operations-West Bureau (OWB) Narcotics Enforcement Detail (NED) Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA) for fiscal year 2013/2014 was conducted. The inspection was thoroughly reviewed and this correspondence was prepared in response to the findings that were identified in the inspection. In total, fourteen categories were reviewed for compliance with the Los Angeles Police Department's (LAPD) policy and procedures. Operations-West Bureau was 100% in compliance in five categories and the remaining nine categories indicated the need for improvement. The inspection identified the following anomalies. Included is the response and corrective action from OWB.

Objective No. 1(c) – Admonition of Miranda Rights

- Forty-Eight arrest reports were reviewed, forty-five were in compliance. Three arrest reports did not meet the standard. Hollywood Area had two and Wilshire Area had one. Hollywood's arrest report findings indicated that the Miranda admonition responses were not documented in the arrest report. Wilshire's arrest report was a multi-5 and the Miranda responses for four arrestees were not documented in the arrest report.
- Hollywood Area completed a Follow-Up Report (03.14) to correct the deficiencies. A review of Wilshire's arrest report indicated it was a multi-5. The Miranda responses for all five arrestees were included in pages 4 and 5 of the arrest report. Each of the arrestee's responses was documented in a separate paragraph including arrestee's 3-5 refusals to waive their rights. Training will be given to the officers and supervisors in the NED Units with an emphasis on attention to detail on arrest reports and in particular, documenting the Miranda responses on the arrest report face sheet as well as the narrative.

Objective No. 2(b) – Completeness of the Warrant Tracking Log

- Eight Warrant Tracking Logs (WTL) were reviewed and four were found to be in compliance. Four WTL's did not meet the standard. Hollywood Area had one, West Los Angeles Area had two and Olympic Area had one. Hollywood's did not contain a search warrant number and return date for SW No. 67403, West Los Angeles Area had the incorrect "Approving Supervisor" in the WTL and a return date was not indicated. Olympic Area had the incorrect "Approving Supervisor" in the WTL.

- Hollywood Warrant No. 67403 was entered into the WTL for January 2014. The search warrant was for 3rd party records with a requested 90 day timeframe for Return of Search Warrant. At the time of the audit, the return had not been submitted. Since then, the search warrant return was completed and the WTL updated. West Los Angeles and Olympic Area NED officers erroneously placed the operation supervisor's name in place of the "Approving Supervisor" for the warrant affidavit. Both NED units have received training on the importance of documenting on the WTL the correct name and serial numbers of the affiants, approving supervisors and supervisors at the scene of search warrant service. Also, the units were reminded to document the Return of Search Warrant dates on the WTL.

Objective No. 2(c) – Supervisor Approval of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages

- Of the thirteen search warrant packages reviewed, ten met the standards for this objective and three did not. West Los Angeles had one and Olympic Area had two packages. The three packages did not have the approving supervisor initials and/or serial number at the bottom of each page of the affidavit.
- On search warrant No. 010414001 for West Los Angeles, the supervisor did not initial the first page of the warrant affidavit. This was an oversight and has been brought to the attention of the West Los Angeles NED supervisors and Gang Impact Team (GIT) Lieutenant. Olympic Search Warrant No. 67529 was a "Hobbs" search warrant. The audited search warrant package did not contain the sealed portion of the Hobbs. The search warrant contained all the required initials and serial number of the approving supervisor. Search Warrant No. 67648 was missing the initials and serial number of the approving supervisor on the first page only. This was an oversight and Olympic Area NED supervisors and GIT Lieutenant, have been made aware of the issue. Training was provided to both West Los Angeles and Olympic on the importance of attention to detail and a more thorough review process of search warrant packages.

Objective No. 2(d) – Completion of Required Employee Comment Sheets

- Of the thirteen search warrant packages reviewed, seven packages met the standard for this objective and six packages did not. West Los Angeles Area had one package, Wilshire had two and Olympic had three packages. The identified issues were that Commanding Officers did not complete an Employee Comment Sheet for all supervisors that provided supervisory oversight and / or canned language was identified. On those packages in which a Comment Sheet was completed and signed by the Commanding Officer, a date was not written. The auditors were unable to determine if the Comment Sheets were signed within the required seven days.
- Wilshire reported that both Comment Sheets were completed and signed but the Commanding Officer did not date the form. West Los Angeles agreed that the Commanding Officer had not signed the Comment Sheet. Olympic Area agreed with the findings and concurred that dates were missing from the Comment Sheet and that indeed one had not been completed.

Operations-West Bureau, Acting Bureau Gang Coordinator provided training to each of OWB's NED Units and GIT Lieutenants on the importance of completing Comment Sheets, using the correct forms and having the Area Commanding Officer sign and date the Comment Sheets within the required 7 days.

Objective No. 2(e) – Adherence to Other Significant Policies and Procedures

- Of the thirteen search warrant packages reviewed, eleven packages met the standard for review and two packages did not. One from West Los Angeles Area and one from Olympic Area. West Los Angeles search warrant was not returned within the required ten calendar days and Olympics package did not contain the search warrant photographs and the "Search Warrant Info" boxes were not completed on the Property Report.
- West Los Angeles acknowledged that the date the warrant should have been returned was an oversight and the concerned investigating officer was counseled on the importance of returning search warrants within the required ten calendar day period. NED supervisors will also monitor return of search warrants for compliance. Olympic advised that pre and post search warrant photographs were taken but not included in the search warrant package at the time of package approval. NED supervisors have been counseled on this matter and will ensure that no search warrant packages are submitted for approval without first ensuring photographs (if any taken) are in the package. The "Search Warrant Info" box in the Property Report will also be reviewed by NED supervisors to ensure the proper documentation of the search warrant information. Both NED supervisors and officers have been counseled to complete the "Search Warrant Info" box when property is seized as a result of a search warrant.

Objective No. 3 – Consistency of Arrest Report and Search/Ramey Warrant Packages

- Sixty-One arrest report and search warrant packages were reviewed of which fifty-three met the standard. There were eight arrest / search warrant packages that did not meet the standard. Hollywood had two reports that showed inconsistencies between the property report and arrest report narrative as it pertains to recovered property. Hollywood also had two search warrant packages in which not all items were accounted for and issued a Property Receipt. Wilshire Area had one Property Report which incorrectly documented \$113 seized when in fact it was \$68. West Los Angeles Area had two reports in which a Property Receipt was not issued for all items. Olympic Area had one report in which items listed in the Property Report did not match the Property Receipt.
- Wilshire had one case in which there was a discrepancy in the amount of money that was seized. This was a typographical error and a Follow-Up report was completed to correct the mistake. In addition, Areas have taken the appropriate action by completing Follow-Up reports to correct any inconsistencies in the reports and have also located missing Property Receipts for items that had not been issued one. OWB will provide training to the officers in charge of the NED Units and an emphasis will be given to attention to detail on arrest reports, property reports, receipts for property taken into custody and other miscellaneous reports to ensure consistency of information.

Objective No. 4 – Completion of Standard Based Assessments

- Thirty-six Standard Based Assessments (SBA) were reviewed of which twenty-nine met the standard for this objective and seven did not. Wilshire Area had one SBA not meeting the standard with West Los Angeles, Pacific and Olympic Area each having two. The Wilshire SBA was not signed by the employee, West Los Angeles and Pacific Areas SBAs were closed beyond the 90 calendar date and both of Olympic Areas SBAs did not contain the Action Item number.
- The timely completion of SBAs for Area NED units and Area Commands will be discussed at OWB's weekly crime control meetings and at the next all Commanding Officers meeting for OWB, scheduled for September 24, 2014. This will also be a topic of inspection for the Bureau Gang Coordinator.

Objective No. 5(a) – Narcotics Enforcement Detail Officer Roles

- Forty-Eight arrests reports were reviewed and compared with the officer's Detective Activity Logs (DAS) for correct entries. Twenty-Six met the standard of this objective and twenty-two did not meet the standard. Hollywood Area had six dates in which the shop number was not referenced in the DAL and six dates in which the required information was not documented. The DALs also indicated that a different officer's DAL should be referenced. Wilshire Area had six dates in which the shop number was not referenced in the DAL and one date in which the shop number and required information was not added along with a notation to refer to a different officer's DAL.

Pacific Area had one date in which the officer completing the DAL did not document his/her partner information. Olympic Area had two dates in which the partner information was not documented.

- Training will be provided to NED supervisors and officers along with the GIT lieutenant. In addition, Gang and Narcotics Division Order No. 2, Detectives Activity Logs, dated April 23, 2009, will be provided to each officer and supervisor in each of the NED units. A weekly system of inspecting the officers DAL will be put in place for each OWB NED unit with the supervisor conducting such inspection documenting the results in his / her Sergeant Daily Report (SDR). Effective immediately, all references to "See (*officer name*) log" will stop. Each officer will be required to properly document his/her activities.

Objective No. 5(b) – Narcotics Enforcement Detail Supervisory Roles


- Forty-Seven Sergeant Daily Reports (SDR) were reviewed for this objective. Of the forty-seven, forty met the standards for this objective and seven SDRs did not meet the standard. West Los Angeles Area had four SDRs that did not contain the unit's duty status. Olympic Area had one in which the lieutenant did not sign the SDR and two in which the supervisor did not initial the corresponding officers DAL.
- NED supervisors will be provided with training and a copy of Operations Order No. 1, Check-In Procedure for Area Specialized Units, dated January 10, 2012.

An emphasis will be placed on attention to detail. In addition, NED supervisors will be advised that the only acceptable SDR is downloadable from LAPD eForms, form number 15.48.00 dated 06/09. West Los Angeles NED was using the incorrect form.

Operations-West Bureau Commanding Officer and Assistant Commanding Officer have each reviewed the findings of this audit and will discuss the discrepancies identified with the OWB subordinate Commanding Officers, including Detective Commanding Officers and Gang Impact Team Officers in Charge at the OWB Commanding Officers meeting on October 22, 2014. In addition, OWB's Assistant Commanding Officer will meet with all OWB NED units during Deployment Period 11 to discuss the discrepancies of the audit and Bureau's expectation to correct the discrepancies and attain a 100% compliance rate in subsequent years CAPA audits.

In conclusion, as a result of this audit, all OWB commands have taken proactive steps and instituted systems to ensure there is improved attention to detail and proper supervisory review and oversight from the GIT lieutenant down the chain of command. Additionally, OWB will be adding a Bureau Gang Coordinator Lieutenant II during Deployment Period 12 and is hoping to add a Detective III Narcotics Detective Auditor in the very near future. One Police Officer II was also added during Deployment Period 10, 2014 to work specifically on NED inspections. With the addition of a BGC lieutenant and Police Officer II inspector, OWB will have a team to conduct Bureau inspections to ensure compliance with Department policy and procedures. It is anticipated that significant improvements will be made and will reflect in any subsequent CAPA NED audits.

Should you require any further information regarding this project, please contact my Bureau Detective Coordinator, Detective III Mario Mota, at (213) 473-0211.


TERRY S. HARA, Deputy Chief
Commanding Officer
Operations-West Bureau

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

ADDENDUM

September 25, 2014

J.E.

TO: Commanding Officer, Internal Audits and Inspections Division

FROM: Commanding Officer, Operations-West Bureau

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO OPERATIONS-WEST BUREAU NARCOTICS
ENFORCEMENT DETAIL COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY
PERFORMANCE AUDIT

A review of Operations-West Bureau (OWB) Narcotics Enforcement Detail (NED) Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA) for fiscal year 2013/2014 was conducted. The inspection was thoroughly reviewed and this correspondence was prepared in response to the findings that were identified in the inspection. In total, fourteen categories were reviewed for compliance with the Los Angeles Police Department's (LAPD) policy and procedures. Operations-West Bureau was 100% in compliance in five categories and the remaining nine categories indicated the need for improvement. The inspection identified the following deficiencies. Included is the response and corrective action from OWB.

Objective No. 1(c) – Admonition of Miranda Rights

- Forty-Eight arrest reports were reviewed, forty-five were in compliance. Three arrest reports did not meet the standard. Hollywood Area had two and Wilshire Area had one. Hollywood's arrest report findings indicated that the Miranda admonition responses were not documented in the arrest report. Wilshire's arrest report was a multi-5 and the Miranda responses for four arrestees were not documented in the arrest report.
- Hollywood Area completed a Follow-Up Report (03.14) to correct the deficiencies. A review of Wilshire's arrest report indicated it was a multi-5. The Miranda responses for all five arrestees were included in pages 4 and 5 of the arrest report. Each of the arrestee's responses was documented in a separate paragraph including arrestee's 3-5 refusals to waive their rights. Training will be given to the officers and supervisors in the NED Units with an emphasis on attention to detail on arrest reports and in particular, documenting the Miranda responses on the arrest report face sheet as well as the narrative.

Objective No. 2(b) – Completeness of the Warrant Tracking Log

- Eight Warrant Tracking Logs (WTL) were reviewed and four were found to be in compliance. Four WTL's did not meet the standard. Hollywood Area had one, West Los Angeles Area had two and Olympic Area had one. Hollywood's did not contain a search warrant number and return date for SW No. 67403, West Los Angeles Area had the incorrect "Approving Supervisor" in the WTL and a return date was not indicated. Olympic Area had the incorrect "Approving Supervisor" in the WTL.

OTHER RELATED MATTERS

In the course of this audit, it was found information indicated that Hollywood, Wilshire, and Pacific Areas did not adequately document anonymous sources of information. The Department Informant Manual, Section 2/280, Procedures for Reporting and Documenting Information, requires when information is received from an anonymous source, as much detail as possible should be provided when documenting the identity of said source in the appropriate report (e.g., arrest report, DAL, SDR); in addition, the anonymous source's refusal to provide identifying information shall also be documented. Additionally, there was indication of instances, wherein the wrong SDR form was being used and the watch commander information was not being documented. Each Area was advised by AD of the aforementioned requirements and has taken the necessary actions to correctly document their use of anonymous sources of information, watch commander information and use the correct SDR form.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Audit Division presented the CAPA report to the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations, and C/O, OWB, both whom were in general agreement with the findings.

West Los Angeles Area

- The SDRs dated 01/03/14, 02/26/14, 03/03/14 and 03/16/14 – Did not contain the unit's duty status information.

Olympic Area

- The SDR dated 02/25/14 – Was not signed by the lieutenant.
- The SDRs dated 02/13/14 and 03/18/14 – The corresponding DALs were not initialed by a supervisor.

Objective No. 6 – Adherence to Confidential Financial Disclosure Requirements

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/381, Confidential Financial Disclosure Policy and Procedures for Gang Enforcement and Narcotics Enforcement Personnel, states, *"Sworn employees at the rank of lieutenant or below shall submit a completed Confidential Financial Disclosure Face Sheet, Form 01.74.00, and a Confidential Financial Disclosure Report, Form 01.74.01, to the Financial Disclosure Coordinator (FDC), Audit Division, within ten calendar days of being selected and prior to assignment to or for the retention of an existing position within any assignment or loan to:*

- *Gang Impact Team (GIT);*
- *Gang Enforcement Detail (GED);*
- *Narcotic Enforcement Detail (NED) positions;*
- *Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) Unit; or,*
- *Gang and Narcotics Division (GND). Any sworn personnel whose primary duty involves contact with or investigation of gang and/or narcotics."*

Audit Procedures

Audit Division met with the Financial Disclosure Coordinator to determine if a Confidential Financial Disclosure Report had been completed for the 36 NED officers assigned during the audit period.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 36 officers assigned had completed the required Confidential Financial Disclosure Report.