

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

May 19, 2016
14.2

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT (AD NO. 15-036)

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. The Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached 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 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'CB', written over a white background.

CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Attachment

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

*NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL COMMAND
ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT*

(AD No. 15-036)



Conducted by
AUDIT DIVISION

CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

May 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Narcotics Enforcement Detail Command Accountability Performance Audit

	Page No.
Executive Summary	i
Purpose	1
Background	1
Prior Audits	1
Methodology	1
Summary of Findings	2
Detailed Findings	3
Objective No. 1 Evaluation of Arrest Reports	3
Objective No. 1(a) Articulation of Reasonable Suspicion and Probable Cause to Arrest	3
Objective No. 1(b) Articulation of Search and Seizure	3
Objective No. 1(c) Admonition of Miranda Rights	4
Objective No. 1(d) Evaluation of Confidential Informants	5
Objective No. 2 Consistency of Arrest Report Packages	5
Objective No. 3 Timely and Accurate Completion of Standards Based Assessments	8
Objective No. 4 Evaluation of NEDs' Documentation of Investigative Activities	11
Objective No. 4(a) Officers' Thorough and Accurate Completion of DALs	11
Objective No. 4(b) Supervisors' Thorough and Accurate Completion of SDRs	13
Objective No. 5 Adherence to Confidential Financial Disclosure Requirements	15
Other Related Matters	15
Recommendations	18
Actions Taken/Management's Response	18

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT
Conducted by
Audit Division
Fourth Quarter, Fiscal Year 2014/15**

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Annual Audit Plan for fiscal year 2014/15, Audit Division (AD) conducted the Narcotics Enforcement Detail (NED) Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA). The CAPAs are performed to determine if the internal controls within each geographic 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 first Department-wide NED CAPA performed. The audit included an evaluation of NED Units' operating procedures and work product: Arrest Reports, Form 05.02.00, Standards Based Assessments, Lieutenant and Below (SBAs), Form 01.87.00, Sergeant's Daily Report (SDR), Form 15.48.00, Detective's Activity Logs, and Confidential Financial Disclosure Reports, Form 01.74.01. The aforementioned documents were examined for accuracy, completeness, timely submission, articulation of reasonable suspicion/probable cause and supervisory oversight.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The audit consisted of five objectives and sub objectives which addressed nine specific areas. The Department had 100 percent compliance in four of the nine areas;

- Objective No. 1(a), Articulation of Reasonable Suspicion and Probable Cause to Arrest
- Objective No. 1(b), Articulation of Search and Seizure
- Objective No. 1 (d), Evaluation of Confidential Informants
- Objective No. 5, Adherence to Confidential Financial Disclosure Requirements

In one area the Department obtained a 96 percent compliance rate.

- Objective 1(c), Admonition of Miranda Rights

In four areas there were compliance rates of 75 to 79 percent.

- Objective No. 2, Consistency of Arrest Report Packages: 77 percent
- Objective No. 3, Timely and Accurate Completion of Standards Based Assessments: 78 percent
- Objective No. 4(a), Officers' Thorough and Accurate Completion of DALs: 79 percent
- Objective No. 4(b), Supervisors' Thorough and Accurate Completion of SDRs: 75 percent

CONCLUSION

The aforementioned administrative findings pertain to the accurate and thorough completion of Department forms. It appears that with additional supervisory scrutiny these administrative omissions and/or discrepancies would likely be resolved.

RECOMMENDATIONS

None.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Audit Division presented the audit report to the Director, Office of Operations, who was in general agreement with the findings.

**NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT
Conducted by
Audit Division
Fourth Quarter, Fiscal Year 2014/15**

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Annual Audit and Inspection Plan for fiscal year 2014/15, Audit Division (AD) conducted the Narcotics Enforcement Detail (NED) Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA). The new CAPAs are performed to determine if the internal controls within each geographic 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 audit under the guidance of Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards,¹ 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 is the first Department-wide NED CAPA performed.

METHODOLOGY

Scope

The audit included an evaluation of Arrest Reports, Form 05.02.00, and associated documents, Standards Based Assessment, Lieutenant and Below (SBAs), Form 01.87.00, NED investigations, Sergeant's Daily Reports (SDRs), Form 15.48.00, Detective's Activity Logs (DALs), and Confidential Financial Disclosure Reports, Form 01.74.01.

The period reviewed was October 1, 2014, to March 30, 2015. The audit steps employed are further delineated under each audit objective.²

¹U.S. Government Accountability Office, Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, December 2011 Revision.

²Audit Division personnel recently conducted a Department-wide Search Warrant Audit. The audit included a review of search warrants completed by NED personnel; therefore, no search warrants were reviewed during this audit.

Fieldwork

The fieldwork was performed between May 11, 2015, and June 30, 2015.

Audit Division provided the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations, with an Intradepartmental Correspondence, Form 15.02.00, explaining the audit's methodology and requested input regarding additional areas requiring evaluation.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Table No. 1 – Summary of the Audit Findings

Objective No.	Description of Audit Objective	Total Meeting Standards	Total Reviewed	Percentage Meeting Standards
1	Evaluation of Arrest Reports			
1(a)	Articulation of Reasonable Suspicion and Probable Cause to Arrest	69	69	100%
1(b)	Articulation of Search and Seizure	69	69	100%
1(c)	Admonition of Miranda Rights	66	69	96%
1(d)	Evaluation of Confidential Informants	7	7	100%
2	Consistency of Arrest Report Packages			
2	Consistency of Arrest Report Packages	53	69	77%
3	Completion of Standards Based Assessments			
3	Timely and Accurate Completion of Standards Based Assessments	129	165	78%
4	Evaluation of Narcotics Enforcement Details' Documentation of Investigative Activities			
4(a)	Officers' Thorough and Accurate Completion of DALs	53	67	79%
4(b)	Supervisors' Thorough and Accurate Completion of SDRs	50	67	75%
5	Adherence to Confidential Financial Disclosure Requirements			
5	Adherence to Confidential Financial Disclosure Requirements	165	165	100%

DETAILED FINDINGS

Objective No. 1 – Evaluation of Arrest Reports

This objective included the review of arrest reports and associated documents completed by personnel assigned to 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 deviation from Department policies and procedures.

Audit Division identified 69 arrest reports. A copy of each arrest report was obtained directly from the Areas' Records Units.

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 69 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 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 69 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 Rights Admonition violations met the standards for this objective.

Findings

Sixty-six (96%) of the 69 arrest reports met the standards for this objective. The three arrest reports that did not meet the standards are detailed below:

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

Mission Area

- Divisional Record Nos. 14-19-22314, 14-17-16322 and 14-19-20232 – The Miranda Rights Admonition responses were not documented in the arrest reports.

Objective No. 1(d) – 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. 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 was reviewed to determine if a confidential informant (CI) was used. When it was determined that a CI was used, AD reviewed the corresponding CI package maintained at Gang and Narcotics Division to verify that an active package existed, and the contact with the CI was appropriately documented.

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

Findings

Of the 69 arrest reports reviewed, seven 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. 2 – Consistency of Arrest Report 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 package was reviewed for inconsistent information. Inconsistent information was defined as inconsistencies that would impact investigation or question the associated documents. Documents reviewed included, but were not limited to, the Arrest Report, Form 05.02.00, Property Report, Form 10.01.00, Receipt for Property Taken into Custody, Form 10.10.00, Booking Approval, Form 12.31.00, and Adult Detention Log, Form 06.19.00. Arrest report packages that did not contain inconsistent information met the standards for this objective.

Findings

Fifty-three (77%) of the 69 arrest reports reviewed met the standards for this objective. The 16 arrest report packages below did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

Central Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-01-23827 – The identity of the source of information was not properly documented in the arrest report, as required.
- Divisional Record No. 14-01-28200 – The arrest report documented that the suspect stated he had a syringe in his pocket; however, there was no documentation of its existence, recovery or booking.

Rampart Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-02-22324 – The identity of the source of information was not properly documented in the arrest report, as required.

Northeast Area

- Divisional Record Nos. 14-11-20794, 15-11-04135, and 14-11-21194 – The property reports indicated a cell phone was booked; however, the recovery of the cell phone was not documented in the Arrest Reports.
- Divisional Record No. 15-11-04376 – The recovery of property report item No. 3, green prescription bottle with marijuana, was not documented.

Newton Area

- Divisional Record No. 15-13-05792 – The identity of the source of information was not properly documented in the arrest report, as required.

77th Street Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-12-23091 – A Receipt for Property Taken into Custody was not issued for property report Item No. 8, marijuana (9.43gg), and Item Nos. 13 and 14, plastic wrap.

Southeast Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-18-21817 – The Scientific Investigation Division (SID) Control No. was not referenced on the property report. In addition, a Receipt for Property Taken into Custody was issued for a currency bag; however, it was not documented on the property report.

Hollywood Area

- Divisional Record No. 15-06-09466 – Item No. 1 on the property report is not consistent with the arrest report narrative. The arrest report narrative states, “2 off white solids” were recovered; however, the property report states, “1...off white solids.”

Pacific Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-14-30714 – The SID Control No. was not referenced on the property report, and the random sampling of the seized narcotics was not documented in the property report as required. In addition, the recovery of property report Item Nos. 26 and 73 was not documented.
- Divisional Record No. 15-14-08963 – The officer did not document that he notified, or attempted to notify, the juvenile’s parent, guardian or responsible relative, on the Juvenile Arrest Supplemental Report, Form 05.02.06.

Olympic Area

- Divisional Record No. 15-20-04729 – The arrest report and property report both indicate that \$1885 was recovered and booked; however, the itemized currency on the property report totals \$1965. In addition, two different items, Live Ammo and Certificate of Title, were both listed as Item No. 15 on the property report.

Van Nuys Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-09-17459 – Property report Item No. 9, Samsung cellphone, was listed on two Receipt for Property Taken into Custody reports. In addition, a Receipt for Property Taken into Custody was not issued for property report Item No. 11, Samsung cellphone.

North Hollywood Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-15-18446 – The SID Control No. is not referenced on the property report.

Objective No. 3 – 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 Training Evaluation and Management System (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 commanding officer (CO).⁴

Audit Procedures

Audit Division reviewed the Watch Assignment and Timekeeping Sheets for NED personnel employed during the audit period and determined there were 165 personnel. The corresponding Division Employee Folders were reviewed to determine if the following Department policies 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 CO; and,
- The Performance Evaluation Report Action Item (PERAI) was closed within 90 calendar days of the date issued.

⁴See Standards Based Assessment, Lieutenant and Below, Guidelines for Completing the Report, Form 01.87.02, (09/11).

Findings

One hundred and twenty-nine (78%) of the 165 SBAs met the standards for this objective. The 36 SBAs below did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

Rampart Area

- Two SBAs and respective PERAIs were closed beyond 90 calendar days of the date issued.⁵
- One SBA and PERAI was closed beyond 90 calendar days of the date issued and did not contain the employee's signature.

Northeast Area

- Three SBAs and respective PERAIs were closed beyond 90 calendar days of the date issued.
- One SBA and PERAI was closed beyond 90 calendar days of the date issued and did not contain the employee's signature.
- One SBA did not contain the date the employee signed it.

Newton Area

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

Southwest Area

- One Division Employee Folder did not contain a current SBA.

Harbor Area

- One SBA was signed by the employee prior to being signed by the CO.

77th Street Area

- One Division Employee Folder did not contain a current SBA.
- One Division Employee Folder did not contain the signature page of the current SBA.
- Two SBAs were signed by the employee prior to being signed by the CO.
- One SBA did not contain the employee's signature.

⁵When one SBA had multiple findings it was only counted once.

Southeast Area

- Three Division Employee Folders did not contain a current SBA.

Hollywood Area

- One SBA and PERAI was closed beyond 90 calendar days of the date issued.

Wilshire Area

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

West Los Angeles Area

- One Division Employee Folder did not contain a current SBA, and the SBA and PERAI was closed beyond 90 calendar days of the date issued.
- One SBA was signed by the employee prior to being signed by the CO.

Pacific Area

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

Olympic Area

- Two SBAs were signed by the employee prior to being signed by the CO.

North Hollywood Area

- Two SBAs were signed by the employee prior to being signed by the CO.

Foothill Area

- One SBA and PERAI was closed beyond 90 calendar days of the date issued.

Devonshire Area

- One SBA was signed by the employee prior to being signed by the CO.

Mission Area

- One SBA and PERAI was closed beyond 90 calendar days of the date issued and did not contain the employee and CO signatures.

- One SBA did not contain the employee's signature.

Topanga Area

- One SBA and PERAI was closed beyond 90 calendar days of the date issued.

Objective No. 4–Evaluation of NEDs' documentation of Investigative Activities

This objective included the review of the DALs and SDRs completed by personnel assigned to NED units during the audit period. The DALs and SDRs were evaluated to determine if they were completed according to Department policies and procedures.

Objective No. 4(a)–Officers' Thorough and Accurate Completion of DALs

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.⁶

Findings

Of the DALs reviewed, 53 (79%) of the 67 met the standards for this objective. The 14 DALs below did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

Central Area

- 10/21/14 – Overtime hours worked were not documented.

Rampart Area

- 12/15/14 and 03/13/15 – The DALs indicated the partner's DAL should be referenced for additional details.

Southwest Area

- 02/19/15 – Overtime hours worked were not documented.

Harbor Area

- 12/04/14 – Overtime hours worked were not documented.

77th Street Area

- 10/21/14 – The DAL indicated that the partner's DAL should be referenced for additional details.
- 01/06/15 – The DAL indicated that the partner's DAL should be referenced for additional details.

Hollywood Area

- 01/08/15 and 01/09/15 – Overtime hours worked were not documented and the DALs indicated that the partner's DAL should be referenced for additional details.

⁶Of the 69 arrest reports reviewed, two arrests occurred on the same date; therefore, 67 arrest dates were applicable for this objective.

Foothill Area

- 10/15/14 – Partner information was not documented, and the DAL does not indicate a time of day for the daily activities documented.
- 11/14/14 – The DALs did not indicate a time of day for the daily activities documented.

Mission Area

- 10/08/14 and 10/16/14 – Arrestee information was not thoroughly documented in the DALs.
- 11/30/14 – Partner information was not documented, and the DAL did not indicate a time of day for the daily activities documented.

Objective No. 4(b) – Supervisors’ Thorough and Accurate Completion of SDRs

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, Form 14.48.08.*”

“*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 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.⁷

Findings

Fifty (75%) of the 67 SDRs reviewed met the standards for this objective. The 17 SDRs below did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

Northeast Area

- 11/13/14 – The duty status of subordinates was not documented and the SDR was not signed by the lieutenant.
- 12/09/14, 12/18/14, 01/03/15, 01/08/15, and 02/18/15 – The duty status of subordinates was not documented.

Harbor Area

- 12/04/14 – The SDR could not be located.

77th Street Area

- 01/06/15 – The SDR was not signed by the lieutenant.
- 02/13/15 – The SDR could not be located.

Hollywood Area

- 03/25/15 – The overtime hours worked by the employees were not documented. In addition, the watch commander (WC) notified at the end of watch was not documented.

West Valley Area

- 11/03/14 – The WC notified at start of watch and end of watch was not documented.

Devonshire Area

- 11/06/14 and 11/13/14 – The duty status of subordinates was not documented.

⁷Of the 69 arrest reports reviewed, two arrests occurred on the same date; therefore, 67 SDRs were applicable for this objective.

Mission Area

- 10/08/14, 10/16/14, 11/15/14 and 11/30/14 – The SDRs were not signed by the lieutenant.

Objective No. 5 – 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 165 NED officers assigned during the audit period.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 165 NED officers assigned during the audit period had completed the required Confidential Financial Disclosure Report.

OTHER RELATED MATTERS

Although the below issues were not deemed findings, they constitute omissions or inconsistencies and were subsequently brought to the attention of the Office of Operations.

Central Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-01-23827 and 14-01-27914 – The serial number of the WC who approved booking was incorrect in the arrest report.

- Divisional Record No. 14-01-27350 – The Detention Log indicated the need for medical treatment (MT); however, MT was not documented in the arrest report.
- Divisional Record No. 14-01-28200 – The Inspection and Interview was conducted by a supervisor other than the documented WC.

Rampart Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-02-20690 – The Detention Log indicated the need for MT; however, MT was not documented in the arrest report.

Hollenbeck Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-04-15003 – The property report was not signed by the WC.

Northeast Area

- Divisional Record No. 15-11-04135 – The Detention Log indicated the need for MT; however, MT was not documented in the arrest report.
- Divisional Record No. 15-11-04376 – The Inspection and Interview was conducted by a supervisor other than the documented WC.

Southwest Area

- Detective's Activity Log dated 01/03/15 – The vehicle information was not documented.

77th Street Area

- Detective's Activity Log dated 01/06/15 – The vehicle information was not documented.

Southeast Area

- Divisional Record No. 15-18-04574 – The Detention Log could not be located.
- Detective's Activity Log dated 02/18/15 – The vehicle information was not documented.

Hollywood Area

- Divisional Record No. 15-06-09466 – The serial number of the WC who approved booking is not documented in the arrest report.

- Divisional Record No. 15-06-05151 – The Inspection and Interview was conducted by a supervisor other than the documented WC. In addition, the Booking Approval was signed by a supervisor other than the documented WC.
- Detective’s Activity Log dated 03/25/15 – The vehicle information was not documented.

West LA Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-08-16086 – The Detention Log did not contain the “Date and Time of Inspection/Interview.”

Olympic Area

- Divisional Record No. 15-20-04729 – The serial number of the WC who approved booking was incorrect in the arrest report.

Van Nuys Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-09-17459 – The narcotics weight was not listed as “gg” for Item Nos. 1 and 2 on the property report. In Addition, the Detention Log indicated the need for MT; however, MT was not documented in the arrest report, and the WC serial number was not documented.

West Valley Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-10-01026 – The Inspection and Interview was conducted by a supervisor other than the documented WC.

N. Hollywood Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-15-19742 – The Inspection and Interview was conducted by a supervisor other than the documented WC.

Mission Area

- Divisional Record No. 14-19-23072 – The Inspection and Interview was conducted by a supervisor other than the documented WC.

RECOMMENDATIONS

None.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Audit Division presented the CAPA report to the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations, who was in general agreement with the findings.