



ARREST, DISCIPLINE, USE OF FORCE, FIELD DATA CAPTURE AND AUDIT STATISTICS

Covering Period Of

July 1, 2004 – December 31, 2004

***Consent Decree
Arrest, Discipline, Use of Force,
Field Data Capture, and Audit Statistics***

July 1, 2004 – December 31, 2004

This semiannual public report has been prepared pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 156. That paragraph states:

The LAPD shall prepare and publish on its website semiannual public reports by this paragraph. Such reports shall include aggregate statistics broken down by each LAPD geographic area and for the Operations Headquarters Bureau, and broken down by race/ethnicity/national origin of citizens involved, for arrests, information required to be maintained pursuant to paragraphs 104 and 105, and uses of force. Such reports shall include a brief description of each of the following that was completed during that period: (i) report of a specified audit completed, audits completed pursuant to paragraphs 111, 113, 125, 126, 130, 133, and 134, and any significant actions taken as a result of such audits or reports, (ii) a summary of all discipline imposed during the period reported by type of misconduct, broken down by type of discipline, bureau and rank, and (iii) any new policies or changes in policies made by the Department to address the requirements of this Agreement. Such reports shall also include the reports prepared pursuant to paragraph 173 and 175.

Section I

Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stop Data

Section II

Statistics

Section III

Audit Summaries

Section IV

New Policies / Changes In Policies

Section V

City Report

Consent Decree
Arrest, Discipline, Use of Force,
Field Data Capture, and Audit Statistics

July 1, 2004 – December 31, 2004

This semiannual public report has been prepared pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 156. That paragraph states:

The LAPD shall prepare and publish on its website semiannual public reports by this paragraph. Such reports shall include aggregate statistics broken down by each LAPD geographic area and for the Operations Headquarters Bureau, and broken down by race/ethnicity/national origin of citizens involved, for arrests, information required to be maintained pursuant to paragraphs 104 and 105, and uses of force. Such reports shall include a brief description of each of the following that was completed during that period: (i) report of a specified audit completed, audits completed pursuant to paragraphs 111, 113, 125, 126, 130, 133, and 134, and any significant actions taken as a result of such audits or reports, (ii) a summary of all discipline imposed during the period reported by type of misconduct, broken down by type of discipline, bureau and rank, and (iii) any new policies or changes in policies made by the Department to address the requirements of this Agreement. Such reports shall also include the reports prepared pursuant to paragraph 173 and 175.

Section I

Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stop Data

Section II

Statistics

Section III

Audit Summaries

Section IV

New Policies / Changes In Policies

Section V

City Report

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
CITYWIDE**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS							
	2,023	5,575	8,473	244	18	108	16,441
GENDER							
Male	71,670	42,648	90,191	16,189	465	4,133	225,296
Female	39,729	20,416	26,819	8,894	142	1,269	97,269
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	1,440	899	2,325	167	3	95	4,929
18 - 25	23,633	16,684	39,999	6,202	126	1,361	88,005
26 - 35	30,356	19,370	38,189	7,553	176	1,456	97,100
36 - 45	25,964	14,443	22,988	5,210	173	1,188	69,966
46 - 55	17,594	7,885	9,957	3,708	88	881	40,113
56+	12,413	3,782	3,553	2,243	41	421	22,453
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	70,253	30,672	64,831	14,742	388	3,536	184,422
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	123	82	158	35	3	7	408
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	36,682	29,470	45,725	9,227	187	1,629	122,920
Municipal Code Violation	2,443	718	1,316	799	17	84	5,377
Suspect Flight	23	50	87	3		3	166
Consensual	145	116	169	8		4	442
Call For Service	834	550	1,834	134	7	57	3,416
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	92	185	300	17		13	607
Penal Code Violation	427	728	1,482	67	3	39	2,746
Health & Safety Code Violation	136	179	231	10		6	562
Other	244	314	882	43	2	23	1,508
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	15,155	19,996	39,023	3,004	88	1,055	78,321
No	96,240	43,064	77,979	22,079	519	4,346	244,227
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	7,616	14,635	30,482	1,340	45	514	54,632
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	4,251	10,735	18,509	527	26	296	34,344
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	2,236	5,494	8,711	260	23	171	16,895
GRANTED?							
Yes	2,143	5,378	8,518	243	22	167	16,471
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	5,551	11,843	25,721	795	32	357	44,299
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	481	1,964	1,281	24	1	26	3,777
Odor of Contraband	88	237	228	16	1	5	575
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	623	1,659	3,087	78	3	51	5,501
Incident to Arrest	1,918	2,297	6,085	250	5	98	10,653
Impound Authority	2,163	4,190	14,388	382	13	126	21,262
Visible Contraband	128	192	281	11		12	624
Consent	1,995	5,030	7,949	222	20	152	15,368
Other	68	156	182	20	1	7	434
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	4,058	8,959	20,685	588	26	253	34,569
Person	3,667	7,819	13,762	438	22	239	25,947
Container	169	162	251	14		8	604
Other	20	31	59	1		2	113
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	3,096	5,506	17,108	465	18	176	26,369
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	76	145	265	8		6	500
Money	77	171	284	8		7	547
Drugs	526	805	1,100	46	4	23	2,504
Alcohol	65	96	333	5	1		500
Other Contraband	160	161	232	15		9	577
Other Evidence of Crime	123	169	445	9		8	754
Other Property	394	474	1,364	31	1	19	2,283
Vehicle	2,029	3,908	14,003	374	12	116	20,442
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	22,764	14,505	20,940	6,075	110	848	65,242
Citation	85,737	44,749	88,753	18,631	480	4,392	242,742
Arrest - Total	3,163	3,904	8,932	465	16	163	16,643
Booking - Yes	1,976	2,254	5,385	247	8	100	9,970
Booking - No	1,226	1,668	3,619	230	8	63	6,814
Release From Custody	132	131	213	17	1	18	512
Field Interview Completed	2,776	6,264	8,386	372	21	180	17,999
None	605	785	1,256	121	5	28	2,800

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
CITYWIDE**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	2,023	5,575	8,473	244	18	108	16,441
GENDER							
Male	1,309	4,225	6,855	173	11	85	12,658
Female	714	1,350	1,618	71	7	23	3,783
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	213	523	1,596	34	1	15	2,382
18 - 25	755	2,486	4,455	125	9	61	7,891
26 - 35	473	1,315	1,600	41	3	15	3,447
36 - 45	388	843	576	21	3	7	1,838
46 - 55	149	332	200	16	2	5	704
56+	45	76	46	7		5	179
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	727	1,860	3,402	134	9	44	6,176
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	25	47	85	3			160
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	520	2,265	2,726	46	4	24	5,585
Municipal Code Violation	100	140	295	9		8	552
Suspect Flight	10	28	48	1			87
Consensual	103	146	158	6		3	416
Call For Service	183	232	405	18	1	9	848
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	37	108	208	4		5	362
Penal Code Violation	179	483	748	14	2	11	1,437
Health & Safety Code Violation	85	169	209	5		2	470
Other	54	96	189	5	2	2	348
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	988	3,775	5,712	102	6	64	10,647
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	517	1,638	2,602	51	1	33	4,842
GRANTED?							
Yes	506	1,614	2,565	51	1	33	4,770
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	964	2,956	4,627	94	6	54	8,701
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	160	668	630	5	2	1	1,466
Odor of Contraband	23	118	142	6		4	293
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	180	635	1,014	21	2	14	1,866
Incident to Arrest	312	653	1,090	24	3	13	2,095
Impound Authority	56	112	318	9		3	498
Visible Contraband	50	81	175	2		4	312
Consent	493	1,493	2,441	48	1	30	4,506
Other	12	40	54	3			109
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	254	674	1,070	26		13	2,037
Person	894	2,791	4,335	85	6	53	8,164
Container	83	100	94	5		3	285
Other	18	21	31	1		1	72
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	308	674	1,405	34		19	2,440
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	11	72	160	2		3	248
Money	13	62	72			1	148
Drugs	144	294	401	18		4	861
Alcohol	22	51	154	1			228
Other Contraband	69	77	117	1		5	269
Other Evidence of Crime	37	49	158	2		6	252
Other Property	65	112	293	10		2	482
Vehicle	37	101	285	5		2	430
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	380	1,037	1,140	47		19	2,623
Citation	608	1,000	2,360	98	8	29	4,103
Arrest - Total	473	1,010	1,696	39	3	22	3,243
Booking - Yes	346	819	1,169	26	3	12	2,375
Booking - No	125	195	529	13		10	872
Release From Custody	64	105	140	4		8	321
Field Interview Completed	747	2,979	3,660	68	7	42	7,503
None	291	799	1,387	34	3	19	2,533

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
CITYWIDE**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	23,758	51,557	56,573	2,348	268	831	135,335
GENDER							
Male	17,692	41,671	48,624	1,590	193	662	110,432
Female	6,065	9,886	7,947	758	75	169	24,900
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	1,620	4,961	12,792	315	7	110	19,805
18 - 25	3,966	10,600	17,828	531	38	189	33,152
26 - 35	5,573	9,944	12,352	555	48	185	28,657
36 - 45	6,716	14,250	8,600	424	97	187	30,274
46 - 55	4,310	9,514	3,827	314	63	115	18,143
56+	1,572	2,287	1,173	209	15	45	5,301
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	997	2,628	2,162	100	6	29	5,922
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	4558	8817	9243	716	29	219	23,582
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	448	2,619	2,028	28	2	14	5,139
Municipal Code Violation	5,376	12,423	15,060	406	92	111	33,468
Suspect Flight	43	580	512	6	1	2	1,144
Consensual	2,189	5,564	5,242	71	18	37	13,121
Call For Service	5,830	6,805	10,291	609	66	288	23,889
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	359	1,223	1,182	18	5	7	2,794
Penal Code Violation	2,194	5,566	6,575	257	23	77	14,692
Health & Safety Code Violation	943	4123	2566	54	13	16	7,715
Other	827	1,213	1,723	83	13	31	3,890
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	10,673	32,502	35,722	961	112	400	80,370
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	5,030	13,500	14,900	323	52	141	33,946
GRANTED?							
Yes	4,919	13,196	14,628	317	50	136	33,246
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	10,128	27,235	29,668	890	115	364	68,400
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	1,297	5,486	3,401	40	13	25	10,262
Odor of Contraband	70	279	352	3	2	2	708
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	1,736	5,206	5,857	142	18	64	13,023
Incident to Arrest	4,872	10,830	12,586	587	74	231	29,180
Impound Authority	42	47	120	6	1	4	220
Visible Contraband	288	855	845	20	6	7	2,021
Consent	4,643	12,239	13,821	266	46	122	31,137
Other	201	261	262	21	1	8	754
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	361	488	762	36	3	25	1,675
Person	9,681	26,675	28,979	831	110	348	66,624
Container	1,143	1,496	1,730	94	17	27	4,507
Other	469	589	713	68	2	19	1,860
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	2,767	6,429	7,723	275	35	107	17,336
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	207	473	598	15	3	10	1,306
Money	179	867	674	63	3	10	1,796
Drugs	982	2,757	2,220	47	11	23	6,040
Alcohol	337	579	1,358	33	6	5	2,318
Other Contraband	519	1,308	1,093	31	9	13	2,973
Other Evidence of Crime	315	653	1,188	61	5	21	2,243
Other Property	809	1,286	1,900	63	9	45	4,112
Vehicle	33	51	113	5		5	207
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	4,305	11,464	10,154	292	29	97	26,341
Citation	5,468	10,519	15,828	938	40	279	33,072
Arrest - Total	9,445	18,403	21,488	858	171	329	50,694
Booking - Yes	4,992	11,360	11,412	509	74	220	28,567
Booking - No	4,472	7,056	10,087	348	97	108	22,168
Release From Custody	3,805	5,783	6,425	240	95	84	16,432
Field Interview Completed	9,776	26,609	24,786	742	118	331	62,362
None	1,514	2,876	3,211	106	4	36	7,747

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	OCB						
	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	12,394	8,396	33,604	5,745	80	932	61,151
GENDER							
Male	8,312	5,838	26,674	3,887	65	727	45,503
Female	4,082	2,558	6,930	1,858	15	205	15,648
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	88	102	689	22		13	914
18 - 25	2,403	1,926	11,351	1,229	11	211	17,131
26 - 35	3,537	2,476	10,881	1,648	26	254	18,822
36 - 45	2,993	2,085	6,541	1,256	26	201	13,102
46 - 55	2,026	1,228	2,943	983	13	168	7,361
56+	1,347	578	1,199	607	4	85	3,820
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	6,749	3,831	18,626	3,424	34	577	33,241
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	19	14	68	11		2	114
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	4,989	4,124	13,104	2,032	41	317	24,607
Municipal Code Violation	447	135	343	184	5	16	1,130
Suspect Flight		4	27	2		1	34
Consensual	5	11	31	1			48
Call For Service	99	81	640	52		10	882
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	4	20	82	5		5	116
Penal Code Violation	45	110	431	22		2	610
Health & Safety Code Violation	16	18	55	1		1	91
Other	21	47	198	11		1	278
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	1,651	2,888	12,468	853	8	181	18,049
No	10,743	5,506	21,131	4,892	72	751	43,095
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	743	2,068	9,743	348	3	78	12,983
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	389	1,476	5,851	161	2	45	7,924
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	161	707	2,660	73	2	21	3,624
GRANTED?							
Yes	152	692	2,608	65	1	20	3,538
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	537	1,753	8,420	215	1	54	10,980
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	37	251	403	7		4	702
Odor of Contraband	7	27	46	4		1	85
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	59	233	1,066	29		8	1,395
Incident to Arrest	168	351	1,700	72		7	2,298
Impound Authority	268	737	4,995	106	1	24	6,131
Visible Contraband	15	26	88	5		1	135
Consent	149	642	2,415	56		18	3,280
Other	13	7	40	4		2	66
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	416	1,322	6,858	160	1	42	8,799
Person	305	1,115	4,200	126		29	5,775
Container	9	21	68	2			100
Other		2	22	1			25
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	349	948	5,780	129	1	30	7,237
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	6	25	84	2			117
Money	8	26	64	2		1	101
Drugs	39	114	293	12		3	461
Alcohol	8	9	81	3			101
Other Contraband	17	27	67	4		2	117
Other Evidence of Crime	17	22	131	4		1	175
Other Property	32	70	245	6		3	356
Vehicle	252	714	5,050	105	1	22	6,144
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	4,399	2,297	6,086	1,515	33	174	14,504
Citation	7,730	5,582	25,477	4,121	45	739	43,694
Arrest - Total	265	514	2,552	111	3	15	3,460
Booking - Yes	165	359	1,520	71	2	5	2,122
Booking - No	99	156	1,036	39	1	10	1,341
Release From Custody	18	25	44	6		2	95
Field Interview Completed	238	750	2,430	83	1	23	3,525
None	63	90	296	32		5	486

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS**

OCB

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	233	750	2,602	41	4	21	3,651
GENDER							
Male	135	566	2,117	33	2	16	2,869
Female	98	184	485	8	2	5	782
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	24	63	506	4	1	5	603
18 - 25	79	269	1,318	18	2	11	1,697
26 - 35	56	198	499	6		1	760
36 - 45	44	153	187	8	1	1	394
46 - 55	22	54	71	2		1	150
56+	8	13	21	3		2	47
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	65	234	935	22	2	7	1,265
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	7	13	29	1			50
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	61	299	938	10	1	4	1,313
Municipal Code Violation	14	24	71			4	113
Suspect Flight			7				7
Consensual	4	17	35	1		1	58
Call For Service	31	29	177	4		4	245
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	6	15	67	1			89
Penal Code Violation	28	80	244		1	1	354
Health & Safety Code Violation	12	18	53				83
Other	5	20	46	2			73
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	122	529	1,899	22	2	8	2,582
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	48	208	858	11		5	1,130
GRANTED?							
Yes	48	204	843	11		5	1,111
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	108	428	1,592	21	2	7	2,158
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	11	102	204		1		318
Odor of Contraband	4	15	39			3	61
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	20	87	404	7	2		520
Incident to Arrest	41	103	355	3			502
Impound Authority	9	29	124	4		1	167
Visible Contraband	2	12	54			2	70
Consent	48	191	806	11		5	1,061
Other	4	7	29	1			41
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	24	97	308	5		6	440
Person	101	401	1,481	19	2	7	2,011
Container	8	11	21				40
Other	1	1	9				11
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	34	124	425	5		4	592
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	3	14	48				65
Money	1	14	22				37
Drugs	19	43	112	1		3	178
Alcohol	2	10	52				64
Other Contraband	8	5	39			2	54
Other Evidence of Crime	3	6	35				44
Other Property	2	21	62	2			87
Vehicle	8	28	112	2		1	151
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	43	96	334	6		1	480
Citation	68	133	687	14	2	7	911
Arrest - Total	61	156	555	3		5	780
Booking - Yes	43	120	371	2			536
Booking - No	18	38	182	1		5	244
Release From Custody	11	23	40	1		4	79
Field Interview Completed	105	378	1,208	15	2	7	1,715
None	23	137	422	6		3	591

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	4,785	14,979	22,401	911	90	206	43,372
GENDER							
Male	3,297	12,274	19,161	596	52	165	35,545
Female	1,488	2,705	3,240	315	38	41	7,827
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	137	537	3,765	58	3	16	4,516
18 - 25	599	1,778	6,394	152	6	37	8,966
26 - 35	1,151	2,862	5,328	228	15	44	9,628
36 - 45	1,483	5,042	4,219	200	32	58	11,034
46 - 55	1,014	3,788	2,017	152	28	35	7,034
56+	401	971	678	121	6	16	2,193
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	174	517	732	28	3	6	1,460
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1,632	3,173	5,230	436	16	100	10,587
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	58	598	620	7	1	2	1,286
Municipal Code Violation	989	4,693	5,910	125	32	21	11,770
Suspect Flight	3	60	168	3	1	1	236
Consensual	241	1,398	1,579	13	8	8	3,247
Call For Service	994	1,687	3,774	188	14	43	6,700
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	37	226	399	3		4	669
Penal Code Violation	355	1,026	2,447	60	6	9	3,903
Health & Safety Code Violation	220	1,301	1,014	17	6	5	2,563
Other	83	303	536	31	3	6	962
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1,733	8,308	12,914	274	32	63	23,324
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	644	3,096	5,146	84	12	16	8,998
GRANTED?							
Yes	620	3,045	5,046	82	12	15	8,820
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1,649	7,375	10,763	227	36	55	20,105
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	135	1,333	1,204	20	9	2	2,703
Odor of Contraband	3	27	72				102
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	263	975	2,264	41	3	8	3,554
Incident to Arrest	953	3,742	4,827	135	21	36	9,714
Impound Authority	10	10	39	1		1	61
Visible Contraband	77	233	328	6	2	3	649
Consent	588	2,885	4,757	72	11	14	8,327
Other	52	83	99	7	1	3	245
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	24	66	222	9		4	325
Person	1,568	7,256	10,522	219	33	52	19,650
Container	169	385	572	12	6	6	1,150
Other	54	132	244	12	1	1	444
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	484	2,321	2,975	63	13	20	5,876
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	15	101	187	6		3	312
Money	22	485	350	3	1	3	864
Drugs	166	914	841	12	5	8	1,946
Alcohol	107	208	724	13	2		1,054
Other Contraband	108	447	453	7	4	3	1,022
Other Evidence of Crime	40	223	474	10		5	752
Other Property	100	577	418	19	1	3	1,118
Vehicle	6	12	35	1		2	56
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	879	2,614	3,721	140	8	22	7,384
Citation	1,645	3,715	7,501	461	20	106	13,448
Arrest - Total	1,567	6,461	8,054	207	53	58	16,400
Booking - Yes	886	3,348	4,202	116	18	37	8,607
Booking - No	678	3,100	3,850	90	35	21	7,774
Release From Custody	611	2,905	2,801	66	33	15	6,431
Field Interview Completed	1,810	6,850	8,961	234	33	62	17,950
None	164	635	906	33		5	1,743

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Central Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	985	1,102	2,606	729	15	134	5,571
GENDER							
Male	683	804	1,963	503	12	109	4,074
Female	302	298	643	226	3	25	1,497
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	8	4	17	2			31
18 - 25	186	192	654	135		23	1,190
26 - 35	265	334	881	181	5	36	1,702
36 - 45	261	314	662	175	7	36	1,455
46 - 55	153	206	307	160	2	29	857
56+	112	52	85	76	1	10	336
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	486	421	1,176	365	9	65	2,522
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	3	4	4	1			12
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	456	609	1,295	347	6	65	2,778
Municipal Code Violation	9	10	29	3			51
Suspect Flight			1				1
Consensual	2	6	4	1			13
Call For Service	9	6	27	3			45
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	2	1	1		3	8
Penal Code Violation	12	31	50	5			98
Health & Safety Code Violation	4	2	5			1	12
Other	3	11	14	3			31
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	195	388	838	117	1	23	1,562
No	790	714	1,768	612	14	111	4,009
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	112	300	649	40	1	8	1,110
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	64	199	321	11		7	602
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	27	104	137	5		6	279
GRANTED?							
Yes	26	101	134	4		6	271
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	78	253	456	14		7	808
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	7	53	16				76
Odor of Contraband		3	3	1			7
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	5	14	30	2		1	52
Incident to Arrest	25	76	122	4			227
Impound Authority	30	75	262	6			373
Visible Contraband	3	5	2	1			11
Consent	27	95	121	4		6	253
Other	4		3				7
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	63	187	375	11		5	641
Person	48	196	227	9		4	484
Container	3	11	10				24
Other			2				2
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	55	145	329	9			538
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1	2	7	1			11
Money	5	15	7	1			28
Drugs	9	25	16	1			51
Alcohol	2	1	6	1			10
Other Contraband	2	9	3	1			15
Other Evidence of Crime	5	5	8				18
Other Property	14	32	50	2			98
Vehicle	28	78	258	5			369
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	142	218	317	70	2	6	755
Citation	793	775	2,135	646	12	122	4,483
Arrest - Total	42	101	163	9	2	1	318
Booking - Yes	30	76	113	3	1		223
Booking - No	11	25	51	6	1	1	95
Release From Custody	3	5	2	2			12
Field Interview Completed	55	134	215	11		4	419
None	13	27	36	8		2	86

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Central Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	50	151	150	3			354
GENDER							
Male	27	112	119	1			259
Female	23	39	31	2			95
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	6	3	22				31
18 - 25	18	46	54	1			119
26 - 35	11	45	36				92
36 - 45	6	40	27	1			74
46 - 55	7	16	9				32
56+	2	1	2	1			6
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	18	36	47	1			102
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	2	6	8				16
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	7	53	41	1			102
Municipal Code Violation	1	3	3				7
Suspect Flight			1				1
Consensual	1	9	3				13
Call For Service	5	4	12	1			22
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2	3	1				6
Penal Code Violation	9	26	21				56
Health & Safety Code Violation	2	5	5				12
Other	3	6	8				17
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	27	113	103				243
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	5	49	34				88
GRANTED?							
Yes	5	49	34				88
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	23	103	86				212
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	5	25	14				44
Odor of Contraband		2	4				6
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	1	12	9				22
Incident to Arrest	10	28	32				70
Impound Authority	3	5	4				12
Visible Contraband		6	6				12
Consent	5	51	31				87
Other	4	2	6				12
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	10	22	21				53
Person	21	99	81				201
Container	3	5	6				14
Other		1					1
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	9	37	31				77
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		3	3				6
Money		10	3				13
Drugs	4	14	10				28
Alcohol	1	2	5				8
Other Contraband			2				2
Other Evidence of Crime	1	2	5				8
Other Property	1	10	10				21
Vehicle	3	2	4				9
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	14	23	23	1			61
Citation	10	17	26				53
Arrest - Total	13	43	39				95
Booking - Yes	12	36	25				73
Booking - No	1	7	14				22
Release From Custody	1	5	1				7
Field Interview Completed	29	82	88	2			201
None	3	32	15				50

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Central Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,694	7,471	4,501	335	29	87	14,117
GENDER							
Male	1,088	6,016	3,556	198	18	67	10,943
Female	606	1,455	945	137	11	20	3,174
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	13	117	189	9			328
18 - 25	216	819	1,108	43	2	15	2,203
26 - 35	455	1,430	1,323	83	3	22	3,316
36 - 45	504	2,624	1,132	82	15	32	4,389
46 - 55	367	1,935	550	65	8	14	2,939
56+	139	546	199	53	1	4	942
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	50	186	105	8		1	350
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	709	1,403	1,784	228	10	55	4,189
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	20	209	134	4		1	368
Municipal Code Violation	303	2,638	692	18	6	4	3,661
Suspect Flight	3	36	9		1		49
Consensual	64	790	375	1	2	4	1,236
Call For Service	281	749	618	51	4	12	1,715
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	7	59	23	1		2	92
Penal Code Violation	104	463	399	16	2	2	986
Health & Safety Code Violation	128	821	274	4	4	3	1,234
Other	26	118	88	4		3	239
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	540	4,039	1,820	57	10	17	6,483
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	147	1,379	614	14	3	1	2,158
GRANTED?							
Yes	144	1,353	604	13	3	1	2,118
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	489	3,832	1,653	47	13	16	6,050
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	28	610	160	4	1	2	805
Odor of Contraband	1	12	6				19
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	65	263	140	4	1	1	474
Incident to Arrest	302	2,130	947	35	9	12	3,435
Impound Authority		6	1				7
Visible Contraband	21	118	63		1	1	204
Consent	136	1,292	559	10	3	1	2,001
Other	30	60	27	2		1	120
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	1	22	25				48
Person	482	3,771	1,591	47	13	15	5,919
Container	42	240	171	1	2	3	459
Other	9	53	43				105
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	156	1,441	627	12	6	6	2,248
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	3	49	25	1		2	80
Money	17	424	175	2	1	2	621
Drugs	62	584	198	3	3	2	852
Alcohol		38	12				50
Other Contraband	39	234	110	1	1	1	386
Other Evidence of Crime	6	139	157			1	303
Other Property	70	483	176	7	1	1	738
Vehicle	1	4					5
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	248	1,405	617	20	2	5	2,297
Citation	735	1,653	1,966	235	9	54	4,652
Arrest - Total	461	3,476	1,306	44	12	16	5,315
Booking - Yes	295	1,950	894	31	8	13	3,191
Booking - No	166	1,523	412	12	4	3	2,120
Release From Custody	152	1,438	374	9	4	3	1,980
Field Interview Completed	716	3,891	1,802	66	15	24	6,514
None	43	302	123	9		3	480

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Central Traffic Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	8,264	4,284	15,188	3,571	43	417	31,767
GENDER							
Male	5,367	2,658	11,508	2,385	37	335	22,290
Female	2,897	1,626	3,680	1,186	6	82	9,477
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	36	39	198	9		2	284
18 - 25	1,501	844	4,218	693	6	79	7,341
26 - 35	2,291	1,194	5,014	1,038	15	113	9,665
36 - 45	2,004	1,107	3,319	806	10	93	7,339
46 - 55	1,432	698	1,658	613	9	84	4,494
56+	1,000	402	781	412	3	46	2,644
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	4,465	2,303	10,019	2,093	15	263	19,158
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	12	8	26	3		1	50
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	3,322	1,825	4,561	1,268	23	133	11,132
Municipal Code Violation	416	113	227	175	5	12	948
Suspect Flight			2	1			3
Consensual			4				4
Call For Service	38	30	315	27		8	418
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	1	1				3
Penal Code Violation	3	1	9	2			15
Health & Safety Code Violation	2		2	1			5
Other	5	3	22	1			31
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	787	874	3,799	427	5	75	5,967
No	7,477	3,410	11,389	3,144	38	342	25,800
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	240	504	2,685	120	1	22	3,572
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	53	138	663	30		1	885
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	23	90	265	9		1	388
GRANTED?							
Yes	19	87	259	5		1	371
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	159	449	2,681	82	1	18	3,390
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		12	12				24
Odor of Contraband	1	10	2				13
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	5	15	106	7		1	134
Incident to Arrest	42	80	486	23			631
Impound Authority	121	375	2314	57	1	16	2,884
Visible Contraband	1	3	4				8
Consent	18	75	175	3			271
Other	2	1	2	3		1	9
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	134	393	2,380	62	1	17	2,987
Person	44	130	592	29		1	796
Container	1		2				3
Other			2	1			3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	124	394	2,379	59	1	16	2,973
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		1	6				7
Money	1		9	1			11
Drugs	2	21	20	2			45
Alcohol		3	8				11
Other Contraband	1		2				3
Other Evidence of Crime			2	1			3
Other Property	3	2	26	1			32
Vehicle	122	369	2,336	57	1	16	2,901
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	3,855	1,389	3,396	1,282	25	131	10,078
Citation	4,352	2,823	11,296	2,252	18	285	21,026
Arrest - Total	49	94	538	31		1	713
Booking - Yes	44	79	488	25			636
Booking - No	5	14	50	5		1	75
Release From Custody		1	1	1			3
Field Interview Completed	9	26	97	3		1	136
None	13	8	18	11			50

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Central Traffic Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	22	70	150	5	1	2	250
GENDER							
Male	8	49	99	4		2	162
Female	14	21	51	1	1		88
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17		6	14				20
18 - 25	6	21	62	1	1	1	92
26 - 35	8	24	46	1			79
36 - 45	2	13	17	1			33
46 - 55	3	3	6	1			13
56+	3	3	5	1		1	13
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	11	43	98	3	1	2	158
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	3	3	4				10
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	4	18	42	2			66
Municipal Code Violation	2	3	1				6
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual							0
Call For Service	2						2
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)							0
Penal Code Violation			3				3
Health & Safety Code Violation		1	1				2
Other		2	1				3
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1	20	33	1		1	56
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes		9	12			1	22
GRANTED?							
Yes		9	11			1	21
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1	23	44	1		1	70
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		4	3				7
Odor of Contraband		3	1			1	5
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk		7	14	1			22
Incident to Arrest	1	5	6				12
Impound Authority		6	17	1			24
Visible Contraband		3					3
Consent		9	8			1	18
Other		1					1
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	1	14	21	1			37
Person	1	18	29	1		1	50
Container							0
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	1	15	26	1		1	44
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		2	3				5
Money							0
Drugs		5	5			1	11
Alcohol		3	2				5
Other Contraband		1					1
Other Evidence of Crime							0
Other Property							0
Vehicle	1	6	17	1			25
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	7	9	8	1			25
Citation	13	46	106	3	1	1	170
Arrest - Total	1	10	11			1	23
Booking - Yes	1	8	9				18
Booking - No		2	1			1	4
Release From Custody		3	2			1	6
Field Interview Completed	1	10	13	1			25
None			17				17

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Central Traffic Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	849	1,167	1,618	207	4	42	3,887
GENDER							
Male	655	949	1,324	133	3	35	3,099
Female	194	218	294	74	1	7	788
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	10	16	67	1			94
18 - 25	104	87	379	29		6	605
26 - 35	198	206	434	51	1	7	897
36 - 45	228	363	423	60	3	15	1,092
46 - 55	204	369	214	36		11	834
56+	105	126	101	30		3	365
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	69	68	97	9		1	244
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	702	959	1,334	162	4	40	3,201
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	3	15	20	1			39
Municipal Code Violation	56	96	93	33		1	279
Suspect Flight		1	1				2
Consensual	4	3	3				10
Call For Service	12	10	48	2			72
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)							0
Penal Code Violation	2	7	12				21
Health & Safety Code Violation	2	4					6
Other	1	6	6				13
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	11	66	107	3			187
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	2	39	35	1			77
GRANTED?							
Yes	1	39	34	1			75
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	8	70	90	2			170
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		3	4				7
Odor of Contraband			1				1
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	3	23	30				56
Incident to Arrest	5	37	53	2			97
Impound Authority	1		4				5
Visible Contraband			1				1
Consent	1	27	27				55
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	2	2	9				13
Person	7	70	87	2			166
Container			2				2
Other			1				1
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	1	24	19				44
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons							0
Money							0
Drugs		6	4				10
Alcohol		9	6				15
Other Contraband		9					9
Other Evidence of Crime							0
Other Property			2				2
Vehicle	1	1	8				10
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	207	118	144	60		6	535
Citation	622	958	1,382	146	4	36	3,148
Arrest - Total	8	85	77	2			172
Booking - Yes	5	16	32	1			54
Booking - No	1	57	37	1			96
Release From Custody	3	64	43				110
Field Interview Completed	8	16	18				42
None	9	7	9				25

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Hollenbeck Area

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS							
	213	162	4,729	250	5	16	5,375
GENDER							
Male	147	119	3,821	169	2	13	4,271
Female	66	43	908	81	3	3	1,104
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	2	3	141	3		2	151
18 - 25	48	44	1,846	74	1	2	2,015
26 - 35	59	49	1,513	70	2	6	1,699
36 - 45	61	45	746	38	2	4	896
46 - 55	29	14	335	44		1	423
56+	14	7	148	21		1	191
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	147	76	2,615	194	2	13	3,047
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	2		9	3			14
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	59	79	1,806	50	3	3	2,000
Municipal Code Violation		2	25				27
Suspect Flight			14				14
Consensual			9				9
Call For Service	1	1	68	1			71
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)		1	32	2			35
Penal Code Violation	2	1	99				102
Health & Safety Code Violation	1		19				20
Other	1	2	33				36
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	54	69	2,134	51		6	2,314
No	159	93	2,595	199	5	10	3,061
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	33	55	1,789	25		3	1,905
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	20	42	1,218	13		4	1,297
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	9	26	682	6			723
GRANTED?							
Yes	7	26	674	5			712
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	24	48	1,568	16		3	1,659
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	3	7	141	5			156
Odor of Contraband			17	1			18
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	5	12	291	1			309
Incident to Arrest	5	13	302	4		2	326
Impound Authority	6	18	721	7		1	753
Visible Contraband	3	1	27				31
Consent	7	26	660	5			698
Other	1	1	7				9
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	15	39	1,252	15		2	1,323
Person	17	32	977	11		1	1,038
Container		1	18	1			20
Other			4				4
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	9	27	984	11		1	1,032
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		5	25				30
Money			13				13
Drugs	3	3	91	3			100
Alcohol			23				23
Other Contraband	1	2	20	1			24
Other Evidence of Crime	1		28	1			30
Other Property		1	24				25
Vehicle	5	18	802	8		1	834
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	34	38	687	25	3	3	790
Citation	172	107	3,644	219	2	11	4,155
Arrest - Total	17	18	529	11		4	579
Booking - Yes	6	12	272	6		2	298
Booking - No	11	6	256	5		2	280
Release From Custody	1		5				6
Field Interview Completed	11	14	493	9		1	528
None	2	6	61	3			72

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Hollenbeck Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	9	30	631	2		1	673
GENDER							
Male	5	26	535	2		1	569
Female	4	4	96				104
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	1	7	128	1			137
18 - 25	2	6	317				325
26 - 35	4	6	116				126
36 - 45	1	6	44	1			52
46 - 55		4	20				24
56+	1	1	6			1	9
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	1	9	233	1			244
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation			5				5
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	4	9	208	1			222
Municipal Code Violation		1	13				14
Suspect Flight			2				2
Consensual	1		14				15
Call For Service	1	1	41				43
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)		3	28				31
Penal Code Violation	1	2	49			1	53
Health & Safety Code Violation	1		21				22
Other		5	17				22
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	5	23	516				544
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	2	13	294				309
GRANTED?							
Yes	2	13	291				306
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	2	17	470				489
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		4	78				82
Odor of Contraband			10				10
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	2	2	151				155
Incident to Arrest		3	82				85
Impound Authority		1	10				11
Visible Contraband			21				21
Consent	2	12	285				299
Other		1	3				4
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle		2	75				77
Person	2	17	451				470
Container		1	4				5
Other			3				3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes		4	97				101
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons			20				20
Money			6				6
Drugs		3	36				39
Alcohol			10				10
Other Contraband			7				7
Other Evidence of Crime			9				9
Other Property			11				11
Vehicle		1	13				14
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	4	8	79	1			92
Citation		1	120	1			122
Arrest - Total		7	162			1	170
Booking - Yes		6	111				117
Booking - No		1	50			1	52
Release From Custody			5			1	6
Field Interview Completed	5	15	297				317
None	1	4	112				117

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Hollenbeck Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	167	181	3,990	39	6	11	4,394
GENDER							
Male	127	162	3,469	24	5	9	3,796
Female	40	19	521	15	1	2	598
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	10	18	812	2	2	4	848
18 - 25	22	20	1,113	5		2	1,162
26 - 35	33	33	789	8	1	2	866
36 - 45	60	54	740	9	3	2	868
46 - 55	32	52	397	6			487
56+	10	4	139	9		1	163
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	3	6	163	3	1		176
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	19	26	447	11		1	504
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	1	4	76				81
Municipal Code Violation	55	66	1,045	3	1	2	1,172
Suspect Flight			46				46
Consensual	10	10	364			1	385
Call For Service	43	23	600	12	3	1	682
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	5	6	165			1	177
Penal Code Violation	19	28	662	6	1	3	719
Health & Safety Code Violation	7	8	266	1			282
Other	5	4	156	3		2	170
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	90	115	2,556	13	4	5	2,783
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	40	53	1,290	5	1	1	1,390
GRANTED?							
Yes	37	53	1,267	5	1	1	1,364
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	85	112	2,411	13	3	5	2,629
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	23	19	387	1			430
Odor of Contraband	1		20				21
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	17	25	767	6		2	817
Incident to Arrest	41	46	774	7	2	2	872
Impound Authority			10				10
Visible Contraband	3	3	62			1	69
Consent	37	51	1,239	5	1	1	1,334
Other	2	1	13		1		17
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	1	5	51	1			58
Person	83	112	2,393	13	3	5	2,609
Container	5	3	107	1			116
Other	1	1	40				42
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	16	22	550	4		2	594
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		1	55	2			58
Money			21			1	22
Drugs	9	1	158	1		1	170
Alcohol	3	5	161	1			170
Other Contraband	6	5	78				89
Other Evidence of Crime	1	4	75	1		1	82
Other Property	2	6	61				69
Vehicle			6				6
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	54	51	889	3	1	3	1,001
Citation	16	20	822	14	1	1	874
Arrest - Total	68	75	1,565	14	3	6	1,731
Booking - Yes	41	46	814	7	2	3	913
Booking - No	26	28	752	7	1	3	817
Release From Custody	18	21	469	7		2	517
Field Interview Completed	81	71	1,854	7	3	4	2,020
None	14	15	209	4			242

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - NEWTON AREA**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	154	1,815	3,917	80	4	29	5,999
GENDER							
Male	129	1,466	3,460	60	4	25	5,144
Female	25	349	457	20		4	855
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	3	46	165	2			216
18 - 25	34	579	1,763	19	1	8	2,404
26 - 35	45	532	1,195	25	1	10	1,808
36 - 45	38	387	587	20	1	4	1,037
46 - 55	24	190	178	10	1	5	408
56+	10	80	29	4		2	125
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	85	601	1,614	55	3	17	2,375
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		2	7	1			10
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	57	1,080	2,029	22	1	10	3,199
Municipal Code Violation	1	6	11			1	19
Suspect Flight		1	4				5
Consensual	2	3	5				10
Call For Service	1	17	60	2			80
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	14	21				36
Penal Code Violation	4	57	118			1	180
Health & Safety Code Violation	2	14	10				26
Other	1	19	39				59
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	59	1,126	2,269	12		12	3,478
No	95	687	1,645	68	4	17	2,516
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	45	871	1,885	9		9	2,819
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	33	837	1,632	5		7	2,514
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	12	381	750	1		2	1,146
GRANTED?							
Yes	12	375	732	1		2	1,122
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	30	742	1,564	4		3	2,343
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	4	127	103			1	235
Odor of Contraband	2	10	15				27
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	4	159	336	1		1	501
Incident to Arrest	11	123	264	1		1	400
Impound Authority	9	167	616	1			793
Visible Contraband	1	13	18				32
Consent	11	349	686	1		1	1,048
Other		2	9				11
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	24	500	1,121	2		2	1,649
Person	20	584	1,101	3		3	1,711
Container	1	5	12				18
Other		1	5				6
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	15	248	755	1		1,019	2,038
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		13	16				29
Money	1	7	9				17
Drugs	4	46	52				102
Alcohol		5	13				18
Other Contraband		7	13				20
Other Evidence of Crime	1	9	35				45
Other Property	1	23	48				72
Vehicle	9	160	611	1			781
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	20	435	573	6	1	4	1,039
Citation	118	1,153	2,986	72	3	24	4,356
Arrest - Total	16	205	444	2		1	668
Booking - Yes	7	135	223	1			366
Booking - No	9	72	223	1		1	306
Release From Custody	3	12	14			1	30
Field Interview Completed	23	466	753	8		6	1,256
None	1	29	60				90

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Newton Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	18	381	657	3	3	3	1,065
GENDER							
Male	6	301	574	2	2	3	888
Female	12	80	83	1	1		177
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17		37	148		1	1	187
18 - 25	3	152	366	2	1	1	525
26 - 35	5	89	95			1	190
36 - 45	8	70	37		1		116
46 - 55	2	25	9	1			37
56+		8	2				10
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	3	111	224	2	1	2	343
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		4	7	1			12
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	5	181	285		1	1	473
Municipal Code Violation		10	13				23
Suspect Flight			2				2
Consensual		6	7				13
Call For Service	1	12	27				40
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	7	16				24
Penal Code Violation	7	34	56		1		98
Health & Safety Code Violation	1	9	14				24
Other		6	6				12
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	7	290	516	2	2	2	819
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	2	104	218	1			325
GRANTED?							
Yes	2	102	210	1			315
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	8	222	395	1	2		628
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		56	41		1		98
Odor of Contraband		8	10				18
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	2	55	107		2		166
Incident to Arrest	6	52	70				128
Impound Authority	1	10	33				44
Visible Contraband		3	11				14
Consent	2	91	198	1			292
Other			3				3
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	1	48	73				122
Person	7	211	376	1	2		597
Container	1	3	2				6
Other	1		1				2
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	3	53	98				154
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		8	6				14
Money	1	3	5				9
Drugs	2	17	14				33
Alcohol		4	10				14
Other Contraband	2	3	8				13
Other Evidence of Crime		1	9				10
Other Property		8	16				24
Vehicle		16	37				53
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	2	49	88				139
Citation	6	55	169	2	1	1	234
Arrest - Total	8	66	90				164
Booking - Yes	3	49	68				120
Booking - No	5	19	23				47
Release From Custody	5	9	5				19
Field Interview Completed	8	214	352	1	2	2	579
None		74	110				184

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Newton Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	308	3,799	3,822	35	5	6	7,975
GENDER							
Male	198	3,216	3,448	27	1	6	6,896
Female	110	583	374	8	4	1,079	2,158
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	3	282	946	5		1,236	2,472
18 - 25	25	577	1,095	7	2	1,706	3,412
26 - 35	79	743	868	7		3	1,700
36 - 45	119	1,193	593	4	1	1,910	3,820
46 - 55	60	818	250	8	2	2	1,140
56+	22	186	70	4		1	283
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	9	187	132			1	329
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	33	523	505	5		1	1,067
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	6	341	193				540
Municipal Code Violation	125	1,138	1,495	11	2	2,771	5,542
Suspect Flight		17	31	1			49
Consensual	12	274	254	1	1		542
Call For Service	41	411	447	6			905
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	5	133	78				216
Penal Code Violation	42	332	417	6	1	1	799
Health & Safety Code Violation	25	333	201	3	1	1	564
Other	10	112	75	2		1	200
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	161	2,620	2,611	22	2	4	5,420
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	85	1,148	1,225	11	1	1	2,471
GRANTED?							
Yes	85	1,131	1,211	11	1	1	2,440
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	139	2,026	2,094	17	3	3	4,282
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	11	427	201	3			642
Odor of Contraband	1	11	18				30
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	36	509	525	5	1	1,076	2,152
Incident to Arrest	81	779	848	5	1	2	1,716
Impound Authority	2	2	7				11
Visible Contraband	4	51	63				118
Consent	81	1,079	1,165	11	1	1	2,338
Other	2	10	12				24
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	3	18	45			1	67
Person	133	2,007	2,081	17	2	3	4,243
Container	6	33	28		1		68
Other	2	43	41	1			87
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	43	446	556	4	2	1	1,052
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		41	38				79
Money		44	29				73
Drugs	5	171	123		1	1	301
Alcohol	21	82	200	1			304
Other Contraband	5	69	56		1		131
Other Evidence of Crime	7	41	80	1			129
Other Property	4	71	70	2			147
Vehicle	2	4	9				15
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	44	651	514	7		1,216	2,432
Citation	38	800	1,147	5		2	1,992
Arrest - Total	172	1,532	1,564	11	4	4	3,287
Booking - Yes	62	665	547	2	2	3	1,281
Booking - No	109	868	1,014	9	2	1	2,003
Release From Custody	109	802	743	8	2	1	1,665
Field Interview Completed	152	1,982	1,675	20	3	2	3,834
None	9	183	184				376

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Northeast Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	2,276	451	4,101	523	7	280	7,638
GENDER							
Male	1,621	349	3,272	364	7	199	5,812
Female	655	102	829	159		81	1,826
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	34	6	110	3		8	161
18 - 25	529	107	1,637	161	2	87	2,523
26 - 35	707	184	1,250	148	2	73	2,364
36 - 45	514	92	696	92	2	47	1,443
46 - 55	308	41	304	72	1	43	769
56+	184	21	104	47		22	378
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	1,255	179	1,609	293	3	182	3,521
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1		7				8
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	945	243	2,192	202	4	89	3,675
Municipal Code Violation	20	3	34	3		3	63
Suspect Flight			2				2
Consensual			5				5
Call For Service	34	14	90	10		2	150
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	2	12	2		2	19
Penal Code Violation	9	5	79	6		1	100
Health & Safety Code Violation	3		10				13
Other	8	5	61	7		1	82
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	412	134	1,664	109		50	2,369
No	1,864	317	2,437	414	7	230	5,269
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	206	87	1,280	64		25	1,662
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	141	68	855	47		14	1,125
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	63	31	426	29		5	554
GRANTED?							
Yes	62	31	417	27		5	542
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	161	76	1,017	53		12	1,319
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	11	13	61	1		1	87
Odor of Contraband	3	2	7			1	13
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	33	15	179	11		2	240
Incident to Arrest	49	17	228	19		3	316
Impound Authority	71	28	514	20		4	637
Visible Contraband	2	1	26	2		1	32
Consent	60	30	402	25		5	522
Other	4	1	12				17
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	116	52	828	37		9	1,042
Person	115	54	663	40		10	882
Container	4	2	12	1			19
Other		1	4				5
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	97	40	652	27		8	824
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	3	1	17	1			22
Money	1	1	13				15
Drugs	12	6	71	3		2	94
Alcohol	5		20				25
Other Contraband	8	2	17	1		2	30
Other Evidence of Crime	6	3	39	2		1	51
Other Property	9	4	42	1		1	57
Vehicle	64	26	497	19		3	609
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	256	75	570	60	1	20	982
Citation	1,930	343	3,211	432	6	251	6,173
Arrest - Total	86	31	410	26		5	558
Booking - Yes	47	18	202	16		2	285
Booking - No	39	13	208	10		3	273
Release From Custody	8	4	15	3		1	31
Field Interview Completed	97	45	522	27		8	699
None	24	9	61	7		3	104

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Northeast Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	94	28	492	19		13	646
GENDER							
Male	68	20	366	17		10	481
Female	26	8	126	2		3	165
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	15	7	112	1		4	139
18 - 25	44	12	247	12		8	323
26 - 35	13	5	84	2			104
36 - 45	12	2	28	4			46
46 - 55	8	2	18			1	29
56+	2		3				5
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	24	11	135	9		3	182
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	2						2
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	29	5	180	3		2	219
Municipal Code Violation	8	1	26			3	38
Suspect Flight			1				1
Consensual	1		6	1		1	9
Call For Service	14	10	59	3		4	90
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2		13	1			16
Penal Code Violation	5	1	60				66
Health & Safety Code Violation	7		3				10
Other	2		9	2			13
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	58	20	341	15		5	439
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	31	10	162	9		4	216
GRANTED?							
Yes	31	10	160	9		4	214
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	54	15	311	15		6	401
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	3	2	42				47
Odor of Contraband	4	1	9			2	16
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	11	3	81	6			101
Incident to Arrest	17	5	79	2			103
Impound Authority	3	1	24	1		1	30
Visible Contraband	1		12			2	15
Consent	31	8	157	9		4	209
Other			13	1			14
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	8	3	62	2		6	81
Person	53	14	292	15		6	380
Container	3		6				9
Other			4				4
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	14	4	88	2		3	111
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	2		8				10
Money		1	1				2
Drugs	8	1	24	1		2	36
Alcohol			14				14
Other Contraband	4		17			2	23
Other Evidence of Crime	2	3	8				13
Other Property			3				3
Vehicle	3	1	25	1		1	31
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	10	1	63	2		1	77
Citation	36	4	123	3		5	171
Arrest - Total	25	9	135	2		2	173
Booking - Yes	18	7	70	1			96
Booking - No	7	2	65	1		2	77
Release From Custody	3		18	1		1	23
Field Interview Completed	48	17	292	11		5	373
None	6	3	51	3		2	65

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Northeast Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	906	498	3,315	122	6	38	4,885
GENDER							
Male	720	414	2,750	89	4	31	4,008
Female	186	84	565	33	2	7	877
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	91	62	1,026	33	1	9	1,222
18 - 25	130	82	830	26	1	10	1,079
26 - 35	187	85	615	23	1	5	916
36 - 45	252	130	538	17	2	5	944
46 - 55	170	113	243	13	1	2	542
56+	76	26	63	10		7	182
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	23	29	74	2		2	130
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	37	56	125	6			224
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	20	9	88		1	1	119
Municipal Code Violation	213	142	1,337	32	2	10	1,736
Suspect Flight		2	32	2			36
Consensual	45	24	124	1		1	195
Call For Service	434	156	1,027	55	3	20	1,695
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	16	4	48			1	69
Penal Code Violation	86	44	297	15		3	445
Health & Safety Code Violation	11	10	79	1			101
Other	21	22	84	8			135
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	483	289	1,985	71	3	24	2,855
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	213	108	824	19	3	10	1,177
GRANTED?							
Yes	202	107	797	19	3	9	1,137
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	492	270	1,810	61	4	21	2,658
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	18	29	136	3			186
Odor of Contraband			11				11
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	96	54	383	17		3	553
Incident to Arrest	265	145	898	33	1	13	1,355
Impound Authority	5		8			1	14
Visible Contraband	39	21	86	3			149
Consent	186	95	734	17	3	8	1,043
Other	14	3	36	2		2	57
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	13	2	37	5		3	60
Person	441	247	1,702	57	3	19	2,469
Container	67	30	161	7	2	3	270
Other	18	11	63	2		1	95
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	153	88	587	16	1	9	854
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	7	1	31	3		1	43
Money	1	3	13				17
Drugs	34	11	129	1		2	177
Alcohol	71	28	257	4	1		361
Other Contraband	26	21	91	1		1	140
Other Evidence of Crime	18	23	57	5		3	106
Other Property	11	8	40	2		2	63
Vehicle	2		6			2	10
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	164	59	498	17	1	3	742
Citation	116	108	881	29	1	10	1,145
Arrest - Total	400	228	1,496	59	3	21	2,207
Booking - Yes	226	122	690	30		12	1,080
Booking - No	174	106	806	29	3	9	1,127
Release From Custody	152	97	540	16	2	6	813
Field Interview Completed	553	253	1,698	62	3	25	2,594
None	43	26	138	8			215

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Rampart Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS							
	498	575	3,058	591	6	56	4,784
GENDER							
Male	362	438	2,646	405	3	46	3,900
Female	136	137	412	186	3	10	884
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	5	4	58	3		1	71
18 - 25	104	159	1,231	147	1	12	1,654
26 - 35	168	179	1,027	185	1	16	1,576
36 - 45	115	138	531	125	4	17	930
46 - 55	79	79	159	84		6	407
56+	27	16	52	47		4	146
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	307	245	1,591	423	2	37	2,605
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1		15	3		1	20
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	150	287	1,218	143	4	17	1,819
Municipal Code Violation	1	1	17	3			22
Suspect Flight		3	4	1		1	9
Consensual	1	2	4				7
Call For Service	16	13	80	9			118
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)			15				15
Penal Code Violation	15	15	76	9			115
Health & Safety Code Violation	4	2	9				15
Other	3	7	29				39
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	143	294	1,764	137	2	15	2,355
No	355	281	1,292	454	4	41	2,427
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	106	248	1,455	90	1	11	1,911
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	78	191	1,162	55	2	12	1,500
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	27	74	400	23	2	7	533
GRANTED?							
Yes	26	71	392	23	1	6	519
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	85	183	1,134	46		11	11
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	12	39	70	1		2	124
Odor of Contraband	1	2	2	2			7
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	7	18	124	7		3	159
Incident to Arrest	36	42	298	21		1	398
Impound Authority	31	73	568	15		3	690
Visible Contraband	5	3	11	2			21
Consent	26	66	371	18		6	487
Other	2	2	7	1		1	13
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	64	149	902	33		7	1,155
Person	61	118	640	34		10	863
Container		2	14				16
Other			5				5
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	49	92	681	22		5	849
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	2	2	13				17
Money		3	13			1	17
Drugs	9	13	43	3		1	69
Alcohol	1		11	2			14
Other Contraband	5	7	12	1			25
Other Evidence of Crime	4	4	19				27
Other Property	5	8	55	2		2	72
Vehicle	24	62	546	15		2	649
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	90	142	542	72	1	10	857
Citation	363	375	2,201	499	4	46	3,488
Arrest - Total	55	64	468	32	1	3	623
Booking - Yes	31	38	222	20	1	1	313
Booking - No	24	26	248	12		2	312
Release From Custody	3	3	7				13
Field Interview Completed	43	64	350	25	1	3	486
None	10	11	60	3			84

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Rampart Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	40	90	522	9		2	663
GENDER							
Male	21	58	424	7			510
Female	19	32	98	2		2	153
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	2	3	82	2			89
18 - 25	6	32	272	2		1	313
26 - 35	15	29	122	3			169
36 - 45	15	22	34	1		1	73
46 - 55	2	4	9				15
56+			3	1			4
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	8	24	198	6			236
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation			5				5
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	12	33	182	3		1	231
Municipal Code Violation	3	6	15			1	25
Suspect Flight			1				1
Consensual	1	2	5				8
Call For Service	8	2	38				48
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	2	9				12
Penal Code Violation	6	17	55				78
Health & Safety Code Violation	1	3	9				13
Other		1	5				6
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	24	63	390	4			481
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	8	23	138	1			170
GRANTED?							
Yes	8	21	137	1			167
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	20	48	286	4			358
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	3	11	26				40
Odor of Contraband		1	5				6
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	4	8	42				54
Incident to Arrest	7	10	86	1			104
Impound Authority	2	6	36	2			46
Visible Contraband	1		4				5
Consent	8	20	127	1			156
Other		3	4				7
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	4	8	56	2			70
Person	17	42	252	2			313
Container	1	2	3				6
Other			1				1
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	7	11	85	2			105
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1	1	8				10
Money			7				7
Drugs	5	3	23				31
Alcohol	1	1	11				13
Other Contraband	2	1	5				8
Other Evidence of Crime			4				4
Other Property	1	3	22	2			28
Vehicle	1	2	16				19
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	6	6	73	1			86
Citation	3	10	143	5			161
Arrest - Total	14	21	118	1		1	155
Booking - Yes	9	14	88	1			112
Booking - No	5	7	29			1	42
Release From Custody	2	6	9			1	18
Field Interview Completed	14	40	166				220
None	13	24	117	3		1	158

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OCB - Rampart Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	861	1,860	5,153	173	40	22	8,109
GENDER							
Male	509	1,516	4,612	125	21	17	6,800
Female	352	344	541	48	19	5	1,309
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	10	42	725	8		3	788
18 - 25	102	193	1,869	42	1	4	2,211
26 - 35	199	364	1,298	56	9	5	1,931
36 - 45	320	678	792	28	8	4	1,830
46 - 55	181	499	363	24	17	6	1,090
56+	49	83	106	15	5		258
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	20	41	161	6	2	1	231
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	132	203	1,034	24	2	3	1,398
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	8	20	109	2			139
Municipal Code Violation	237	613	1,248	28	21	4	2,151
Suspect Flight		4	49			1	54
Consensual	106	297	459	10	5	2	879
Call For Service	183	338	1,033	62	4	10	1,630
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	4	24	85	2			115
Penal Code Violation	102	152	660	17	2		933
Health & Safety Code Violation	49	127	190	8	1	1	376
Other	20	41	127	14	3		205
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	448	1,179	3,833	108	13	13	5,594
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	157	369	1,157	34	4	3	1,724
GRANTED?							
Yes	151	362	1,132	33	4	3	1,685
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	436	1,065	2,704	87	13	10	4,315
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	55	245	316	9	8		633
Odor of Contraband		4	16				20
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	46	101	419	9	1	2	578
Incident to Arrest	259	605	1,306	53	8	7	2,238
Impound Authority	2	2	9	1			14
Visible Contraband	10	40	53	3	1		107
Consent	147	341	1,033	29	3	3	1,556
Other	4	9	11	3			27
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	4	17	55	3			79
Person	422	1,049	2,667	83	12	10	4,243
Container	49	79	103	3	1		235
Other	24	24	56	9	1		114
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	115	300	636	27	4	2	1,084
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	5	9	38				52
Money	4	14	112	1			131
Drugs	56	141	229	7	1	2	436
Alcohol	12	46	88	7	1		154
Other Contraband	32	109	118	5	2	1	267
Other Evidence of Crime	8	16	105	3			132
Other Property	13	9	69	8			99
Vehicle		3	6	1			10
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	162	330	1,059	33	4	5	1,593
Citation	118	173	1,303	32	5	3	1,634
Arrest - Total	458	1,065	2,044	77	31	11	3,686
Booking - Yes	257	549	1,223	45	6	6	2,086
Booking - No	202	518	829	32	25	5	1,611
Release From Custody	177	483	632	26	25	3	1,346
Field Interview Completed	300	637	1,914	79	9	7	2,946
None	46	102	243	12		2	405

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	OHB DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,346	2,326	2,184	372	4	95	6,327
GENDER							
Male	981	1,957	1,903	271	3	82	5,197
Female	364	369	280	101	1	13	1,128
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	15	40	68	2		1	126
18 - 25	295	760	888	88		30	2,061
26 - 35	391	775	614	98	2	21	1,901
36 - 45	323	441	372	88	2	15	1,241
46 - 55	215	231	189	71		23	729
56+	107	79	52	25		5	268
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	372	791	746	93	1	41	2,044
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	2	3	4				9
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	923	1,424	1,322	274	3	47	3,993
Municipal Code Violation	17	16	21	4		3	61
Suspect Flight		4					4
Consensual	6	11	10				27
Call For Service	1	2	4				7
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	6	9	17	1		1	34
Penal Code Violation	5	27	32				64
Health & Safety Code Violation	9	31	17			2	59
Other	5	8	11			1	25
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	398	1,434	1,200	83		44	3,159
No	948	891	984	289	4	51	3,167
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	220	1,224	959	31		33	2,467
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	140	1,151	762	8		23	2,084
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	98	693	435	6		14	1,246
GRANTED?							
Yes	96	682	434	6		14	1,232
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	140	920	625	8		16	1,709
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	17	177	47				241
Odor of Contraband	3	14	12				29
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	17	132	134	1		2	286
Incident to Arrest	21	60	52			1	134
Impound Authority	19	32	78	2		1	132
Visible Contraband	6	26	20			2	54
Consent	91	654	419	6		12	1,182
Other	2	9	2			1	14
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	98	602	370	4		8	1,082
Person	113	767	525	6		16	1,427
Container	7	9	9				25
Other		2	3				5
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	36	119	113	2		3	273
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1	12	9				22
Money		12	7				19
Drugs	23	63	38			2	126
Alcohol	1	8	18				27
Other Contraband	5	11	3				19
Other Evidence of Crime	2	6	14				22
Other Property	3	15	7				25
Vehicle	7	26	38	2		1	74
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	596	871	793	162	1	42	2,465
Citation	678	1,186	1,183	207	3	48	3,305
Arrest - Total	39	117	90	1		3	250
Booking - Yes	30	93	59	1		1	184
Booking - No	9	25	31			2	67
Release From Custody	1	7	7				15
Field Interview Completed	257	1,209	920	30	1	34	2,451
None	3	17	16			1	37

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS**

OHB

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	83	551	448	6		5	1,093
GENDER							
Male	56	441	383	2		4	886
Female	27	110	65	4		1	207
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	4	42	85			1	132
18 - 25	29	235	254	5		3	526
26 - 35	23	152	76	1		1	253
36 - 45	16	91	27				134
46 - 55	9	26	6				41
56+	2	5					7
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	21	211	173	4		2	411
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		7	6				13
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	32	245	175	2		3	457
Municipal Code Violation	5	12	12				29
Suspect Flight	1						1
Consensual	8	22	9				39
Call For Service		1	3				4
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2	3	17				22
Penal Code Violation	5	17	27				49
Health & Safety Code Violation	9	28	23				60
Other		5	3				8
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	48	419	337	1		5	810
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	35	199	156	1		1	392
GRANTED?							
Yes	35	199	155	1		1	391
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	50	282	235	2		1	570
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	3	61	15				79
Odor of Contraband		5	11				16
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	9	56	59			1	125
Incident to Arrest	12	33	29				74
Impound Authority	2	1	6	1			10
Visible Contraband	2	10	13				25
Consent	34	180	148	1			363
Other	1	2					3
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	8	53	30	1			92
Person	44	269	227	1		1	542
Container	5	7	9				21
Other	1	2					3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	9	39	48				96
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		8	6				14
Money		5	2				7
Drugs	8	21	22				51
Alcohol		4	9				13
Other Contraband	4	10	4				18
Other Evidence of Crime	2	1	12				15
Other Property	4	2	4				10
Vehicle		1	1				2
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	18	127	97	1		1	244
Citation	11	58	44	5			118
Arrest - Total	15	56	46				117
Booking - Yes	14	50	31				95
Booking - No	1	7	15				23
Release From Custody	1	4	11				16
Field Interview Completed	65	444	343	1		5	858
None	3	40	42				85

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS**

OHB

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	758	3,801	2,225	37	12	23	6,856
GENDER							
Male	570	3,292	2,010	30	9	21	5,932
Female	188	509	215	7	3	2	924
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	30	275	598	4		4	911
18 - 25	112	653	754	5	2	13	1,539
26 - 35	200	736	453	11	1	2	1,403
36 - 45	261	1,230	286	6	2	2	1,787
46 - 55	122	739	110	8	7	1	987
56+	33	168	24	3		1	229
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	44	263	120	4		2	433
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	133	652	228	7		3	1,023
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	13	226	91	1			331
Municipal Code Violation	185	827	525	6	4	8	1,555
Suspect Flight	3	21	21	1			46
Consensual	161	474	392	6	1	9	1,043
Call For Service	5	23	27				55
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	17	96	48		2		163
Penal Code Violation	55	252	224	5	1		537
Health & Safety Code Violation	127	898	503	7	4	1	1,540
Other	15	69	46				130
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	517	2,999	1,733	14	7	21	5,291
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	384	1,721	1,058	14	5	9	3,191
GRANTED?							
Yes	383	1,676	1,052	14	5	9	3,139
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	502	2,471	1,584	20	8	10	4,595
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	85	574	136	4			799
Odor of Contraband	12	67	97		2		178
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	54	421	223	2	2	2	704
Incident to Arrest	122	491	341	5	5		964
Impound Authority		1	3	1			5
Visible Contraband	18	209	142	3	1		373
Consent	368	1,575	989	13	5	9	2,959
Other	2	9	5				16
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	7	35	30	1			73
Person	473	2,397	1,538	18	8	10	4,444
Container	98	210	167	8	1	1	485
Other	16	30	27				73
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	110	677	355	7	3		1,152
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	8	19	21				48
Money	5	45	20	1			71
Drugs	67	455	202	3	1		728
Alcohol	3	46	34				83
Other Contraband	49	204	74	2	2		331
Other Evidence of Crime	9	26	50	2			87
Other Property	5	42	19				66
Vehicle		1					1
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	269	1,351	729	6	2	8	2,365
Citation	51	366	278	6		3	704
Arrest - Total	192	940	526	16	8		1,682
Booking - Yes	167	835	399	9	6		1,416
Booking - No	30	108	131	7	2		278
Release From Custody	23	86	75	7	2		193
Field Interview Completed	665	3,277	1,753	22	9	20	5,746
None	15	102	52	3		1	173

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OHB - Criminal Intelligence Group**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS							
	1	9	5				15
GENDER							
Male	1	8	3				12
Female		1	1				2
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17							0
18 - 25		1					1
26 - 35		2	1				3
36 - 45		4	2				6
46 - 55	1		1				2
56+		2					2
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	1	1	1				3
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation							0
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation		1	1				2
Municipal Code Violation							0
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual		3	1				4
Call For Service							0
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)							0
Penal Code Violation		2					2
Health & Safety Code Violation		2	2				4
Other							0
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes		9	5				14
No	1						1
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes		4	4				8
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes		6	3				9
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes		4	3				7
GRANTED?							
Yes		4	3				7
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes		6	4				10
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		1					1
Odor of Contraband							0
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk							0
Incident to Arrest		2					2
Impound Authority			1				1
Visible Contraband							0
Consent		4	3				7
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle		6	4				10
Person		5	3				8
Container							0
Other		1	1				2
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes		3					3
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		2					2
Money		1					1
Drugs		1					1
Alcohol							0
Other Contraband							0
Other Evidence of Crime							0
Other Property							0
Vehicle							0
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning		2	1				3
Citation	1	3	2				6
Arrest - Total		4					4
Booking - Yes		4					4
Booking - No		1					1
Release From Custody							0
Field Interview Completed		5	3				8
None							0

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OHB - Criminal Intelligence Group**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	2	2					4
GENDER							
Male	1	1					2
Female	1	1					2
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17							0
18 - 25							0
26 - 35							0
36 - 45	1	2					3
46 - 55	1						1
56+							0
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation							0
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation							0
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation							0
Municipal Code Violation							0
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual	2	2					4
Call For Service							0
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)							0
Penal Code Violation							0
Health & Safety Code Violation							0
Other							0
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1	1					2
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	1						1
GRANTED?							
Yes	1						1
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1	1					2
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		1					1
Odor of Contraband							0
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk							0
Incident to Arrest							0
Impound Authority							0
Visible Contraband							0
Consent	1						1
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle							0
Person	1	1					2
Container							0
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons							0
Money							0
Drugs							0
Alcohol							0
Other Contraband							0
Other Evidence of Crime							0
Other Property							0
Vehicle							0
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning							0
Citation							0
Arrest - Total							0
Booking - Yes							0
Booking - No		1					1
Release From Custody							0
Field Interview Completed	2	1					3
None		1					1

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OHB - Criminal Intelligence Group**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	13	63	55	8	3	1	143
GENDER							
Male	10	54	47	8	2	1	122
Female	3	9	8		1		21
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17			1				1
18 - 25	2	15	20	1	1	1	40
26 - 35	4	25	21	1			51
36 - 45	5	14	7		2		28
46 - 55	1	6	5	3			15
56+	1	3	1	3			8
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation			1				1
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation							0
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation		1					1
Municipal Code Violation		2	3	5			10
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual	12	38	23	1		1	75
Call For Service							0
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)		1			2		3
Penal Code Violation		1	8	2			11
Health & Safety Code Violation	1	20	20		1		42
Other							0
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	4	27	33		1		65
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	10	41	24	1		1	77
GRANTED?							
Yes	10	38	24	1		1	74
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	11	54	45	1	1	1	113
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation			3				3
Odor of Contraband			4				4
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk			5				5
Incident to Arrest	1	16	15		1		33
Impound Authority							0
Visible Contraband		1	4				5
Consent	10	38	28	1		1	78
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle		1	10				11
Person	8	43	38	1	1	1	92
Container	6	29	14	1		1	51
Other		3	8				11
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	3	26	19	1			49
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons			3				3
Money	3	12	8	1			24
Drugs		16	11				27
Alcohol							0
Other Contraband		1	1				2
Other Evidence of Crime			6				6
Other Property			2				2
Vehicle							0
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	1	2	8				11
Citation							0
Arrest - Total	1	25	21	7	3		57
Booking - Yes	1	19	13		1		34
Booking - No	4	6	8	7	2		27
Release From Custody		5	3	7	2		17
Field Interview Completed	8	30	29		1		68
None	5	25	12	1		1	44

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OHB - Detective Services Group**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	26	6	28	6		1	67
GENDER							
Male	20	4	22	3			49
Female	6	2	6	3		1	18
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17							0
18 - 25	2	1	9	2			14
26 - 35	7	3	11	1		1	23
36 - 45	7	1	4	2			14
46 - 55	7	1	4				12
56+	3			1			4
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	16	5	14	2		1	38
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation							0
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	9	1	8	4			22
Municipal Code Violation							0
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual							0
Call For Service	1						1
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)							0
Penal Code Violation			6				6
Health & Safety Code Violation							0
Other							0
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	6	1	14	1			22
No	20	5	14	5		1	45
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	2	1	9				12
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1	1	12				14
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	1		1				2
GRANTED?							
Yes	1		1				2
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1	1	11				13
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation							0
Odor of Contraband							0
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk		1	1				2
Incident to Arrest	1		8				9
Impound Authority	1		6				7
Visible Contraband			1				1
Consent							0
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	1		9				10
Person	1	1	8				10
Container			1				1
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	1		8				9
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons							0
Money							0
Drugs							0
Alcohol							0
Other Contraband			1				1
Other Evidence of Crime			6				6
Other Property			1				1
Vehicle	1		1				2
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	9	4	10	2			25
Citation	16	2	8	4		1	31
Arrest - Total	1		8				9
Booking - Yes	1		8				9
Booking - No							0
Release From Custody							0
Field Interview Completed	1		4				5
None			1				1

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OHB - Detective Services Group**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS							
	1	2	9				12
GENDER							
Male	1	2	4				7
Female			5				5
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17							0
18 - 25		1	2				3
26 - 35	1	1	5				7
36 - 45			2				2
46 - 55							0
56+							0
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation			1				1
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation							0
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation			1				1
Municipal Code Violation							0
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual							0
Call For Service							0
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)							0
Penal Code Violation	1	2	7				10
Health & Safety Code Violation							0
Other							0
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1	2	9				12
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes							0
GRANTED?							
Yes							0
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1	2	8				11
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation							0
Odor of Contraband							0
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk			3				3
Incident to Arrest	1	2	8				11
Impound Authority		1	1				2
Visible Contraband							0
Consent							0
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle		1	1				2
Person	1	2	8				11
Container			3				3
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes		1	5				6
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons							0
Money							0
Drugs							0
Alcohol							0
Other Contraband							0
Other Evidence of Crime		1	5				6
Other Property							0
Vehicle		1					1
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning							0
Citation							0
Arrest - Total	1	2	8				11
Booking - Yes	1	2	8				11
Booking - No							0
Release From Custody							0
Field Interview Completed		1	2				3
None							0

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OHB - Detective Services Group**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	11	14	43	2			70
GENDER							
Male	9	11	38	1			59
Female	2	3	5	1			11
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17							0
18 - 25	1	2	11				14
26 - 35			16	1			17
36 - 45	5	9	11				25
46 - 55	4	1	3	1			9
56+	1	2	2				5
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	1			1			2
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1	1					2
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation			2				2
Municipal Code Violation			1				1
Suspect Flight	1						1
Consensual	1		5				6
Call For Service							0
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)							0
Penal Code Violation	7	12	30	1			50
Health & Safety Code Violation							0
Other		1	5				6
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	7	11	30	1			49
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	3	2	8				13
GRANTED?							
Yes	3	2	8				13
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	8	12	34	1			55
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation			1				1
Odor of Contraband							0
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	2	5	8				15
Incident to Arrest	5	6	25	1			37
Impound Authority			2	1			3
Visible Contraband							0
Consent	1	1	2				4
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	1		5	1			7
Person	7	11	34	1			53
Container							0
Other	1	1	3				5
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	2	1	15	1			19
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1						1
Money			4				4
Drugs			2				2
Alcohol							0
Other Contraband			1				1
Other Evidence of Crime	1	1	9	1			12
Other Property			3				3
Vehicle							0
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	1						1
Citation	1	1		1			3
Arrest - Total	7	6	27	1			41
Booking - Yes	7	6	25	1			39
Booking - No	1	1	6				8
Release From Custody			2				2
Field Interview Completed	2	7	20				29
None	1	1	1				3

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OHB - Juvenile Services Group**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	4	2	18	1			25
GENDER							
Male	3	2	18	1			24
Female	1						1
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	2	1	7				10
18 - 25	1	1	7				9
26 - 35	1		2				3
36 - 45			1				1
46 - 55			1				1
56+				1			1
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation			7	1			8
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation							0
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	2		4				6
Municipal Code Violation			1				1
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual			1				1
Call For Service			1				1
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)							0
Penal Code Violation							0
Health & Safety Code Violation	2	2	3				7
Other			1				1
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	2	2	15	1			20
No	2		3				5
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	2	2	11				15
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	2	2	12				16
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes		1	7				8
GRANTED?							
Yes		1	7				8
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	2	2	14				18
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation							0
Odor of Contraband			1				1
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk							0
Incident to Arrest	2		7				9
Impound Authority							0
Visible Contraband		2	1				3
Consent		1	6				7
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	2	2	13				17
Person	2	2	12				16
Container			4				4
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	2		10				12
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons			2				2
Money							0
Drugs	2		6				8
Alcohol			1				1
Other Contraband			1				1
Other Evidence of Crime	1		1				2
Other Property							0
Vehicle			1				1
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning		2	1				3
Citation	2		9	1			12
Arrest - Total	2		11				13
Booking - Yes	2		7				9
Booking - No			4				4
Release From Custody			1				1
Field Interview Completed		1	1				2
None							0

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OHB - Juvenile Services Group**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS							
	2	4	17				23
GENDER							
Male	2	3	14				19
Female		1	3				4
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	1	4	14				19
18 - 25	1		1				2
26 - 35							0
36 - 45			2				2
46 - 55							0
56+							0
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation			5				5
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation							0
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation			3				3
Municipal Code Violation							0
Suspect Flight			2				2
Consensual							0
Call For Service							0
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)							0
Penal Code Violation							0
Health & Safety Code Violation	2	4	6				12
Other			1				1
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	2	2	14				18
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes		2	10				12
GRANTED?							
Yes		2	10				12
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	2	3	17				22
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation							0
Odor of Contraband			4				4
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk							0
Incident to Arrest	2	1	4				7
Impound Authority							0
Visible Contraband		2	4				6
Consent		1	10				11
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle			1				1
Person	2	3	15				20
Container			4				4
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	1		6				7
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons			1				1
Money							0
Drugs			4				4
Alcohol							0
Other Contraband			2				2
Other Evidence of Crime			1				1
Other Property	1						1
Vehicle							0
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning		1	2				3
Citation			4				4
Arrest - Total	2	2	8				12
Booking - Yes	1	1	5				7
Booking - No	1	1	3				5
Release From Custody	1	1	1				3
Field Interview Completed		4	2				6
None			5				5

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OHB - Juvenile Services Group**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	26	139	420	4			589
GENDER							
Male	24	125	356	4			509
Female	2	14	64				80
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	19	118	386	3			526
18 - 25	3	17	26				46
26 - 35	1	2	4	1			8
36 - 45	1	1	1				3
46 - 55	2	1	2				5
56+			1				1
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation							0
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation							0
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation							0
Municipal Code Violation	2	28	113				143
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual	2	5	14				21
Call For Service							0
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)							0
Penal Code Violation	2	10	56	1			69
Health & Safety Code Violation	15	95	229	3			342
Other	5	1	8				14
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	24	98	295	1			418
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	10	69	175	2			256
GRANTED?							
Yes	9	68	174	2			253
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	25	123	367	4			519
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		1					1
Odor of Contraband	4	21	71				96
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk		1					1
Incident to Arrest	19	46	176	3			244
Impound Authority			1				1
Visible Contraband	2	40	89	2			133
Consent	8	49	128	2			187
Other		1					1
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle			2				2
Person	25	118	351	4			498
Container	14	29	101	3			147
Other	2	1					3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	16	37	136	2			191
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1		4				5
Money							0
Drugs	12	35	93	1			141
Alcohol	1	1	3				5
Other Contraband	4	1	28				33
Other Evidence of Crime	4	3	24	1			32
Other Property	1		1				2
Vehicle							0
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	3	24	93				120
Citation	2	24	130				156
Arrest - Total	20	72	236	3			331
Booking - Yes	18	56	168	3			245
Booking - No	2	16	68				86
Release From Custody	2	16	28				46
Field Interview Completed	4	55	136	3			198
None	1	12	18	1			32

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OHB - Uniformed Services Group**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,315	2,309	2,132	365	4	94	6,219
GENDER							
Male	957	1,943	1,860	267	3	82	5,112
Female	357	366	272	98	1	12	1,106
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	13	39	61	2		1	116
18 - 25	292	757	872	86		30	2,037
26 - 35	383	770	600	97	2	20	1,872
36 - 45	316	436	365	86	2	15	1,220
46 - 55	207	230	182	71		23	713
56+	104	77	52	23		5	261
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	355	785	723	90	1	40	1,994
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	2	3	4				9
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	912	1,422	1,309	270	3	47	3,963
Municipal Code Violation	17	16	20	4		3	60
Suspect Flight		4					4
Consensual	6	8	8				22
Call For Service		2	3				5
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	6	9	17	1		1	34
Penal Code Violation	5	25	26				56
Health & Safety Code Violation	7	27	12			2	48
Other	5	8	10			1	24
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	390	1,422	1,166	81		44	3,103
No	925	886	966	284	4	50	3,115
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	216	1,217	935	31		33	2,432
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	137	1,142	735	8		23	2,045
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	97	688	424	6		14	1,229
GRANTED?							
Yes	95	677	423	6		14	1,215
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	137	911	596	8		16	1,668
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	17	176	47				240
Odor of Contraband	3	14	11				28
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	17	131	133	1		2	284
Incident to Arrest	18	58	37			1	114
Impound Authority	18	32	71	2		1	124
Visible Contraband	6	24	18			2	50
Consent	91	649	410	6		12	1,168
Other	2	9	2			1	14
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	95	594	344	4		8	1,045
Person	110	759	502	6		16	1,393
Container	7	9	4				20
Other		1	2				3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	33	116	95	2		3	249
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1	10	7				18
Money		11	7				18
Drugs	21	62	32			2	117
Alcohol	1	8	17				26
Other Contraband	5	11	1				17
Other Evidence of Crime	1	6	7				14
Other Property	3	15	6				24
Vehicle	6	26	36	2		1	71
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	587	863	781	160	1	42	2,434
Citation	659	1,181	1,163	202	3	47	3,255
Arrest - Total	36	113	71	1		3	224
Booking - Yes	27	89	44	1		1	162
Booking - No	9	24	27			2	62
Release From Custody	1	7	6				14
Field Interview Completed	256	1,203	912	30	1	34	2,436
None	3	17	15			1	36

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

FIELD DATA STATISTICS

OHB - Uniformed Services Group

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	77	543	422	6		5	1,053
GENDER							
Male	51	435	365	2		4	857
Female	26	108	57	4		1	196
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	3	38	71			1	113
18 - 25	27	234	251	5		3	520
26 - 35	22	151	71	1		1	246
36 - 45	15	89	23				127
46 - 55	8	26	6				40
56+	2	5					7
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	21	211	167	4		2	405
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		7	6				13
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	31	245	174	2		3	455
Municipal Code Violation	5	12	9				26
Suspect Flight	1						1
Consensual	6	20	7				33
Call For Service		1	3				4
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2	3	17				22
Penal Code Violation	4	15	20				39
Health & Safety Code Violation	7	24	17				48
Other		5	2				7
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	44	414	314	1		5	778
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	34	197	146	1		1	379
GRANTED?							
Yes	34	197	145	1		1	378
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	46	276	210	2		1	535
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	3	60	15				78
Odor of Contraband		5	7				12
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	9	56	56			1	122
Incident to Arrest	9	30	17				56
Impound Authority	2		5	1			8
Visible Contraband	2	8	9				19
Consent	33	179	138	1			351
Other	1	2					3
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	8	52	28	1			89
Person	40	263	204	1		1	509
Container	5	7	2				14
Other	1	2					3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	8	38	37				83
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		8	5				13
Money		5	2				7
Drugs	8	21	18				47
Alcohol		4	9				13
Other Contraband	4	10	2				16
Other Evidence of Crime	2		6				8
Other Property	3	2	4				9
Vehicle			1				1
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	18	126	95	1		1	241
Citation	10	58	40	5			113
Arrest - Total	12	52	30				94
Booking - Yes	12	47	18				77
Booking - No		5	12				17
Release From Custody		3	10				13
Field Interview Completed	63	438	339	1		5	846
None	3	39	37				79

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

FIELD DATA STATISTICS

OHB - Uniformed Services Group

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	708	3,585	1,707	23	9	22	6,054
GENDER							
Male	527	3,102	1,569	17	7	20	5,242
Female	181	483	138	6	2	2	812
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	11	157	211	1		4	384
18 - 25	106	619	697	4	1	12	1,439
26 - 35	195	709	412	8	1	2	1,327
36 - 45	250	1,206	267	6		2	1,731
46 - 55	115	731	100	4	7	1	958
56+	31	163	20			1	215
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	43	263	119	3		2	430
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	132	651	228	7		3	1,021
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	13	225	89	1			328
Municipal Code Violation	183	797	408	1	4	8	1,401
Suspect Flight	2	21	21	1			45
Consensual	146	431	350	5	1	8	941
Call For Service	5	23	27				55
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	17	95	48				160
Penal Code Violation	46	229	130	1	1		407
Health & Safety Code Violation	111	783	254	4	3	1	1,156
Other	10	67	33				110
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	482	2,863	1,375	12	6	21	4,759
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	361	1,609	851	11	5	8	2,845
GRANTED?							
Yes	361	1,568	846	11	5	8	2,799
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	458	2,282	1,138	14	7	9	3,908
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	85	573	132	4			794
Odor of Contraband	8	46	22		2		78
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	52	415	210	2	2	2	683
Incident to Arrest	97	423	125	1	4		650
Impound Authority		1					1
Visible Contraband	16	168	49	1	1		235
Consent	349	1,487	831	10	5	8	2,690
Other	2	8	5				15
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	6	34	13				53
Person	433	2,225	1,115	12	7	9	3,801
Container	78	152	52	4	1		287
Other	13	25	16				54
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	89	613	185	3	3		893
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	6	19	14				39
Money	2	33	8				43
Drugs	55	404	96	2	1		558
Alcohol	2	45	31				78
Other Contraband	45	202	44	2	2		295
Other Evidence of Crime	4	22	11				37
Other Property	4	42	13				59
Vehicle		1					1
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	264	1,325	628	6	2	8	2,233
Citation	48	341	148	5		3	545
Arrest - Total	164	837	242	5	5	1,253	2,506
Booking - Yes	141	754	193	5	5	1,098	2,196
Booking - No	23	85	49				157
Release From Custody	21	65	42				128
Field Interview Completed	651	3,185	1,568	19	8	20	5,451
None	8	64	21	1			94

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	OSB						
	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	6,957	30,304	21,208	2,090	71	291	60,921
GENDER							
Male	4,553	20,357	16,516	1,400	61	241	43,128
Female	2,404	9,947	4,692	690	10	50	17,793
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	68	506	513	7		5	1,099
18 - 25	1,645	8,622	7,732	593	23	69	18,684
26 - 35	1,807	8,941	6,578	592	18	96	18,032
36 - 45	1,597	6,646	4,157	414	18	59	12,891
46 - 55	1,150	3,704	1,708	303	9	44	6,918
56+	690	1,885	520	181	3	18	3,297
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	3,780	15,187	11,144	1,136	40	161	31,448
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	13	31	18	3			65
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	2,777	13,923	8,989	827	29	114	26,659
Municipal Code Violation	253	160	173	104	1	8	699
Suspect Flight	1	33	21				55
Consensual	14	48	16	1			79
Call For Service	43	237	266	5		2	553
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	18	106	81	2		1	208
Penal Code Violation	39	368	344	5		3	759
Health & Safety Code Violation	9	96	31	1		1	138
Other	10	115	128	7	1	1	262
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	993	10,480	7,468	200	17	73	19,231
No	5,964	19,824	13,740	1,890	54	218	41,690
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	573	7,822	6,013	100	8	42	14,558
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	359	5,758	3,786	44	8	22	9,977
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	186	2,765	1,543	22	7	12	4,535
GRANTED?							
Yes	183	2,711	1,502	22	7	12	4,437
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	432	6,233	4,685	53	6	29	11,438
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	62	1,094	330	1		5	1,492
Odor of Contraband	5	128	51	1		1	186
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	55	955	653	9		3	1,675
Incident to Arrest	110	1,094	960	12	1	5	2,182
Impound Authority	136	2,323	2,548	15	1	9	5,032
Visible Contraband	6	101	41			1	149
Consent	174	2,528	1,391	20	6	12	4,131
Other	20	113	78	8		2	221
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	322	4,721	3,673	43	5	25	8,789
Person	270	3,954	2,427	28	5	16	6,700
Container	4	67	39	2			112
Other	1	13	3				17
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	202	2,867	2,895	23	2	15	6,004
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	7	72	41				120
Money	7	81	51				139
Drugs	41	347	144	2	1	4	539
Alcohol	4	48	44				96
Other Contraband	4	71	27	1			103
Other Evidence of Crime	6	71	66				143
Other Property	9	192	163	3			367
Vehicle	140	2,171	2,459	17	1	11	4,799
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	2,606	5,772	3,792	848	13	90	13,121
Citation	4,137	22,685	16,143	1,215	54	193	44,427
Arrest - Total	215	2,026	1,601	35	3	13	3,893
Booking - Yes	115	1,059	876	12	1	6	2,069
Booking - No	105	977	736	24	2	7	1,851
Release From Custody	5	52	44	1			102
Field Interview Completed	192	3,170	1,714	31	5	5	5,117
None	50	375	233	12	2	2	674

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS**

OSB

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	163	2,910	1,770	23	6	9	4,881
GENDER							
Male	115	2,221	1,411	14	3	6	3,770
Female	48	689	359	9	3	3	1,111
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	15	301	321	5			642
18 - 25	63	1,365	916	10	1	5	2,360
26 - 35	35	640	357	3	1	2	1,038
36 - 45	38	395	121	4	2	2	562
46 - 55	9	174	39	1	2		225
56+	3	35	16				54
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	62	1,018	850	15	4	4	1,953
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	2	16	20				38
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	42	1,226	521	3		2	1,794
Municipal Code Violation	4	63	46	1		1	115
Suspect Flight	2	21	17				40
Consensual	3	62	9	1			75
Call For Service	17	106	48		1	2	174
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	12	62	50				124
Penal Code Violation	13	209	155	3			380
Health & Safety Code Violation	3	96	28				127
Other	3	31	26		1		61
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	101	1,987	1,087	6	2	6	3,189
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	40	811	364	5	1	4	1,225
GRANTED?							
Yes	39	798	361	5	1	4	1,208
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	81	1,484	739	8	2	5	2,319
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	25	359	127		1	1	513
Odor of Contraband	2	71	27	2			102
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	19	354	172			2	547
Incident to Arrest	18	282	171	1	1		473
Impound Authority	1	56	56			1	114
Visible Contraband	2	39	23				64
Consent	38	743	331	5	1	4	1,122
Other		25	9				34
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	24	359	179	4		1	567
Person	77	1,393	685	5	2	4	2,166
Container	1	42	11	2			56
Other	2	10	3			1	16
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	17	299	169	4		2	491
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		32	23				55
Money		24	3				27
Drugs	6	132	50	3			191
Alcohol	5	24	17				46
Other Contraband	5	32	11				48
Other Evidence of Crime	2	19	14				35
Other Property		42	16			1	59
Vehicle	1	56	58	1		1	117
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	36	573	198	7		1	815
Citation	27	556	659	7	2	1,251	2,502
Arrest - Total	26	450	272	4	1		753
Booking - Yes	21	380	209	2	1		613
Booking - No	6	71	63	2			142
Release From Custody	2	31	15				48
Field Interview Completed	74	1,604	786	8	2	6	2,480
None	27	360	174	2	2	2	567

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS**

OSB

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,969	20,956	9,481	189	14	57	32,666
GENDER							
Male	1,400	16,660	8,272	123	8	49	26,512
Female	569	4,296	1,209	66	6	8	6,154
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	216	2,902	2,918	22	1	5	6,064
18 - 25	541	5,703	3,303	78	2	13	9,640
26 - 35	369	3,682	1,712	39	2	20	5,824
36 - 45	476	5,067	1,034	20	5	10	6,612
46 - 55	293	2,983	414	19	3	6	3,718
56+	74	619	100	11	1	3	808
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	136	1,435	596	19		3	2,189
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	359	3,462	1,332	53	3	14	5,223
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	119	1,515	776	8		8	2,426
Municipal Code Violation	331	4,196	2,197	40	6	14	6,784
Suspect Flight	5	440	151				596
Consensual	180	2,190	905	4	1	1	3,281
Call For Service	394	2,443	1,376	35	2	10	4,260
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	111	681	345	5	1	1,143	2,286
Penal Code Violation	191	2,677	1,175	12	1	6	4,062
Health & Safety Code Violation	97	1,488	411	5		1	2,002
Other	46	430	217	8			701
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1,039	14,217	6,749	66	6	25	22,102
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	1,039	14,217	6,749	66	6	25	22,102
GRANTED?							
Yes	1,039	14,217	6,749	66	6	25	22,102
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	827	10,853	4,592	53	5	20	16,350
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	172	2,401	790	4		2	3,369
Odor of Contraband	4	133	70	1			208
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	160	2,577	1,078	9	1	5	3,830
Incident to Arrest	319	3,744	1,601	33	4	12	5,713
Impound Authority		20	16				36
Visible Contraband	12	294	79	1			386
Consent	377	4,775	2,064	21	2	4	7,243
Other	9	95	30	1		1	136
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	33	261	120	2			416
Person	797	10,642	4,499	52	5	18	16,013
Container	70	395	155	2		1	623
Other	29	210	118	2		2	361
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	168	1,898	897	9		4	2,976
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	27	260	130	2			419
Money	9	218	53				280
Drugs	66	842	325	2		1	1,236
Alcohol	16	209	105				330
Other Contraband	36	339	178	1		1	555
Other Evidence of Crime	21	174	126	4		2	327
Other Property	25	267	137				429
Vehicle	1	22	20				43
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	397	5,238	2,032	20		8	7,695
Citation	548	4,507	2,742	94	7	23	7,921
Arrest - Total	580	5,965	2,725	56	7	20	9,353
Booking - Yes	357	4,157	1,566	23	4	10	6,117
Booking - No	235	1,827	1,167	33	3	10	3,275
Release From Custody	143	1,238	569	24	3	7	1,984
Field Interview Completed	808	11,195	4,680	50	2	22	16,757
None	117	1,054	509	8			1,688

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - 77th Street Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	139	7,259	3,950	51	8	23	11,430
GENDER							
Male	109	5,482	3,351	40	7	22	9,011
Female	30	1,777	599	11	1	1	2,419
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	3	144	123				270
18 - 25	33	2,265	1,662	11	2	6	3,979
26 - 35	39	2,370	1,218	13	2	11	3,653
36 - 45	38	1,557	673	15	4	2	2,289
46 - 55	17	676	223	9		1	926
56+	9	247	51	3		3	313
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	78	3,359	1,981	37	6	16	5,477
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		13	7				20
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	51	3,499	1,695	11	1	6	5,263
Municipal Code Violation		26	16	1			43
Suspect Flight		13	11				24
Consensual	1	18	4				23
Call For Service	1	78	68				147
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	38	18				57
Penal Code Violation	4	136	107			1	248
Health & Safety Code Violation		38	8				46
Other	3	41	35	2	1		82
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	47	3,456	1,897	9	4	9	5,422
No	92	3,803	2,053	42	4	14	6,008
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	31	2,712	1,598	6	3	7	4,357
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	27	2,071	1,000	1	2	7	3,108
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	9	991	435	1	1	3	1,440
GRANTED?							
Yes	9	973	422	1	1	3	1,409
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	30	2,199	1,199	3	1	5	3,437
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	4	411	60			1	476
Odor of Contraband		47	12				59
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	8	416	242	1		1	668
Incident to Arrest	6	381	216			1	604
Impound Authority	7	766	648	1		1,422	2,844
Visible Contraband	2	32	6				40
Consent	9	896	385	1	1	3	1,295
Other	1	74	43				118
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	21	1,672	931	2		3	2,629
Person	22	1,472	663	1	1	5	2,164
Container		27	10	1			38
Other		3	2				5
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	9	968	724	2		1	1,704
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		23	9				32
Money		27	3				30
Drugs	1	116	23				140
Alcohol	2	14	16				32
Other Contraband		18	4				22
Other Evidence of Crime		30	18				48
Other Property		82	42	1			125
Vehicle	7	732	623	1		1	1,364
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	37	1,971	677	9		6	2,700
Citation	90	4,668	3,004	41	7	17	7,827
Arrest - Total	11	640	344	1	1	1	998
Booking - Yes	7	364	162			1	534
Booking - No	4	274	182	1	1		462
Release From Custody		9	3				12
Field Interview Completed	13	1,069	430	4	1	1	1,518
None	3	123	45	1	1		173

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - 77th Street Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	17	1,083	375	4	1	2	1,482
GENDER							
Male	8	779	313	2		1	1,103
Female	9	304	62	2	1	1	379
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	1	112	78	2			193
18 - 25	7	470	208	1		2	688
26 - 35	4	245	62	1			312
36 - 45	5	170	20				195
46 - 55		70	3		1		74
56+		16	4				20
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	8	396	164	3	1		572
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		5	4				9
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	5	431	111	1		1	549
Municipal Code Violation		21	4			1	26
Suspect Flight	1	8	8				17
Consensual		21	1				22
Call For Service		38	9				47
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	20	8				29
Penal Code Violation	2	89	50				141
Health & Safety Code Violation		40	10				50
Other		14	6				20
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	9	676	240				925
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	5	282	97	1			385
GRANTED?							
Yes	5	278	97	1			381
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	7	527	185	1			720
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	2	142	17				161
Odor of Contraband		28	7				35
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	1	128	53				182
Incident to Arrest	2	94	43				139
Impound Authority		22	8				30
Visible Contraband		14	4				18
Consent	5	250	90	1			346
Other		9	2				11
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	1	110	38				149
Person	7	505	175				687
Container		16	5	1			22
Other		6					6
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	2	83	37				122
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		8	5				13
Money		7					7
Drugs	1	37	3				41
Alcohol		3	8				11
Other Contraband	1	7	2	1	6	4	21
Other Evidence of Crime		21	7				28
Other Property							0
Vehicle		20	11				31
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	5	241	49				295
Citation	3	221	113		1		338
Arrest - Total	2	138	60				200
Booking - Yes	2	119	45				166
Booking - No		19	15				34
Release From Custody		3	2				5
Field Interview Completed	8	560	170	2		2	742
None	1	143	46	2			192

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - 77th Street Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	219	8,247	1,961	22	5	10	10,464
GENDER							
Male	105	6,192	1,654	14	2	9	7,976
Female	114	2,055	307	8	3	1	2,488
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	19	970	442	1			1,432
18 - 25	80	2,132	777	11			3,000
26 - 35	29	1,513	391	2		5	1,940
36 - 45	40	2,188	235	2	3	1	2,469
46 - 55	41	1,200	88	6	1	2	1,338
56+	10	244	28		1	2	285
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	20	755	169	2			946
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	68	1,643	383	4	2	2	2,102
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	5	437	112			1	555
Municipal Code Violation	30	1,446	373	8		4	1,861
Suspect Flight	1	195	48				244
Consensual	15	804	142		1		962
Call For Service	30	1,050	295	3	1	3	1,382
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	3	203	42	2	1		251
Penal Code Violation	36	915	274	2			1,227
Health & Safety Code Violation	7	649	86				742
Other	4	150	37	1			192
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	84	5,206	1,268	10	1	5	6,574
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	34	2,059	469	6	1		2,569
GRANTED?							
Yes	34	2,013	466	6	1		2,520
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	73	4,195	951	8	2	5	5,234
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	9	1,008	131	1			1,149
Odor of Contraband	1	90	25				116
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	12	962	249	1		2	1,226
Incident to Arrest	34	1,349	318	1	1	2	1,705
Impound Authority		5	2				7
Visible Contraband	1	129	18				148
Consent	29	1,757	430	6	1		2,223
Other	1	38	4			1	44
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	2	122	29				153
Person	71	4,114	931	8	2	4	5,130
Container	7	146	21				174
Other	2	74	18			1	95
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	20	785	167	1		1	974
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	4	100	39				143
Money	1	96	15				112
Drugs	9	330	54				393
Alcohol	1	82	9				92
Other Contraband	1	122	24	1			148
Other Evidence of Crime	2	73	17			1	93
Other Property	7	167	36				210
Vehicle		7	5				12
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	45	2,087	366	3		2	2,503
Citation	73	1,962	672	6	3	2	2,718
Arrest - Total	57	2,120	532	8	1	5	2,723
Booking - Yes	36	1,598	320		1	2	1,957
Booking - No	20	520	211	8		3	762
Release From Custody	14	347	122	6		3	492
Field Interview Completed	99	4,285	833	10	1	4	5,232
None	5	507	129				641

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - Harbor Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,604	883	3,577	249	9	44	6,366
GENDER							
Male	1,096	630	2,856	186	9	32	4,809
Female	508	253	721	63		12	1,557
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	33	20	110	1		2	166
18 - 25	318	224	1,369	61	3	12	1,987
26 - 35	427	243	1,195	66	2	9	1,942
36 - 45	433	242	597	46	2	7	1,327
46 - 55	252	108	245	42	2	12	661
56+	141	46	61	33		2	283
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	1,031	400	1,801	188	5	25	3,450
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	3	1	6				10
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	479	425	1,526	57	4	14	2,505
Municipal Code Violation	12	5	27	1			45
Suspect Flight	1		4				5
Consensual	4	3	4				11
Call For Service	25	12	54	1			92
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	16	12	41	1		1	71
Penal Code Violation	22	17	70			2	111
Health & Safety Code Violation	8	5	9			1	23
Other	3	3	35	1		1	43
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	475	330	1,640	41	5	17	2,508
No	1,129	553	1,937	208	4	27	3,858
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	335	249	1,312	29	3	14	1,942
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	245	195	1,056	21	4	8	1,529
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	138	104	461	13	4	4	724
GRANTED?							
Yes	137	101	451	13	4	4	710
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	267	216	1,135	18	4	12	1,652
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	49	47	163	1		2	262
Odor of Contraband	2	4	14			1	21
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	38	35	161	2		1	237
Incident to Arrest	55	43	239	4	1	3	345
Impound Authority	81	74	501	5	1	5	667
Visible Contraband	3	3	14			1	21
Consent	129	93	418	12	4	3	659
Other	6	2	6				14
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	206	169	914	15	4	11	1,319
Person	178	146	700	12	3	7	1,046
Container	4	5	14				23
Other	1	2	1				4
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	130	98	652	9	2	9	900
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	6	3	13				22
Money	4	2	8				14
Drugs	31	22	71	1	1	4	130
Alcohol	2	3	12				17
Other Contraband	3	5	15	1			24
Other Evidence of Crime	5	4	26				35
Other Property	5	1	34	1			41
Vehicle	86	69	501	6	1	5	668
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	343	216	804	59		8	1,430
Citation	1,134	583	2,431	184	7	31	4,370
Arrest - Total	108	67	361	9	2	5	552
Booking - Yes	62	39	227	4	1	4	337
Booking - No	51	32	141	6	1	1	232
Release From Custody	2	2	5				9
Field Interview Completed	146	85	467	10	2	2	712
None	24	27	72	2		1	126

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - Harbor Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	110	115	463	10	4	2	704
GENDER							
Male	82	81	376	7	3	1	550
Female	28	34	87	3	1	1	154
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	13	11	76	1			101
18 - 25	38	33	229	5	1	1	307
26 - 35	22	28	115	2	1		168
36 - 45	28	26	29	2	2	1	88
46 - 55	7	15	11				33
56+	2	2	3				7
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	40	33	182	6	2		263
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1		5				6
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	21	42	151			1	215
Municipal Code Violation	3	2	13	1			19
Suspect Flight	1	2	6				9
Consensual	2	4	4				10
Call For Service	16	9	21		1	1	48
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	11	8	30				49
Penal Code Violation	9	5	39	3			56
Health & Safety Code Violation	3	9	5				17
Other	3	1	7		1		12
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	81	91	377	6	2	1	558
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	29	52	127	4	1	1	214
GRANTED?							
Yes	28	52	127	4	1	1	213
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	65	76	272	7	2	1	423
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	22	28	69		1		120
Odor of Contraband	2	3	8	2			15
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	15	8	52				75
Incident to Arrest	14	11	69	1	1		96
Impound Authority	1		10				11
Visible Contraband	2	2	5				9
Consent	27	50	109	4	1	1	192
Other			4				4
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	19	21	55	4			99
Person	62	70	264	5	2	1	404
Container	1	4	3	1			9
Other	2		1			1	4
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	12	19	57	4			92
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		1	8				9
Money							0
Drugs	5	14	21	3			43
Alcohol	3		4				7
Other Contraband	4	5	6				15
Other Evidence of Crime		1	6				7
Other Property			9				9
Vehicle	1	2	15	1			19
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	23	23	57	4			107
Citation	10	14	95	3			122
Arrest - Total	21	32	103	4	1		161
Booking - Yes	17	26	81	2	1		127
Booking - No	5	6	22	2			35
Release From Custody	2	5	7				14
Field Interview Completed	58	60	247	4	2	1	372
None	19	12	62		2	1	96

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - Harbor Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,217	939	3,750	59	5	21	5,991
GENDER							
Male	927	769	3,312	37	2	20	5,067
Female	290	170	438	22	3	1	924
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	167	147	1,174	18		5	1,511
18 - 25	219	152	1,196	15		1,582	3,164
26 - 35	245	177	721	11	2	8	1,164
36 - 45	349	276	447	5	1	6	1,084
46 - 55	197	166	182	5	2	2	554
56+	40	21	30	5			96
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	58	51	226	1			336
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	80	72	325			2	479
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	70	50	356	1		1	478
Municipal Code Violation	216	164	834	21	4	5	1,244
Suspect Flight	3	7	33				43
Consensual	150	150	432	4		1	737
Call For Service	317	167	625	26		6	1,141
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	104	59	219	3			385
Penal Code Violation	116	111	423	1	1	5	657
Health & Safety Code Violation	67	80	164			1	312
Other	36	28	113	2			179
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	830	695	2,946	35	3	17	4,526
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	343	303	1,062	10		5	1,723
GRANTED?							
Yes	336	299	1,041	9		5	1,690
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	650	581	2,071	28	1	12	3,343
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	153	154	435	2		2	746
Odor of Contraband	3		22	1			26
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	129	106	462	5	1	3	706
Incident to Arrest	224	213	664	20	1	7	1,129
Impound Authority		2	5				7
Visible Contraband	9	10	28	1			48
Consent	307	270	960	9		4	1,550
Other	7	6	13				26
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	29	18	48	1			96
Person	631	565	2,042	28	1	12	3,279
Container	50	22	63	1		1	137
Other	23	21	59	2			105
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	118	132	429	2		2	683
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	20	9	51	1			81
Money	6	3	15				24
Drugs	52	56	181	1		1	291
Alcohol	9	3	41				53
Other Contraband	30	43	110			1	184
Other Evidence of Crime	11	18	59				88
Other Property	15	18	58				91
Vehicle	1	2	5				8
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	271	194	830	8		3	1,306
Citation	193	131	844	18	2	6	1,194
Arrest - Total	392	297	1,122	26	3	9	1,849
Booking - Yes	267	233	676	15	2	6	1,199
Booking - No	138	68	453	11	1	3	674
Release From Custody	58	31	200	4	1		294
Field Interview Completed	593	525	1,963	27	1	14	3,123
None	102	72	227	3			404

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - Southeast Area

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	128	3,867	2,077	58	3	15	6,148
GENDER							
Male	96	2,942	1,740	43	2	13	4,836
Female	32	925	337	15	1	2	1,312
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	2	85	77	1			165
18 - 25	29	1,259	926	21		1	2,236
26 - 35	36	1,225	609	16	1	8	1,895
36 - 45	29	771	332	9		3	1,144
46 - 55	17	406	104	9	1	3	540
56+	15	121	29	2	1		168
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	67	1,418	928	39		12	2,464
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		3	1				4
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	45	2,184	929	13	3	2	3,176
Municipal Code Violation	1	27	24				52
Suspect Flight		8	5				13
Consensual		5					5
Call For Service	4	44	43			1	92
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)		30	8				38
Penal Code Violation	8	113	113	3			237
Health & Safety Code Violation		15	4				19
Other	3	20	22	3			48
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	53	2,042	1,106	14	1	4	3,220
No	75	1,825	971	44	2	11	2,928
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	34	1,619	878	10		2	2,543
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	21	1,367	703	7		2	2,100
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	9	552	261	3	1	2	828
GRANTED?							
Yes	9	540	256	3	1	2	811
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	25	1,079	658	6		2	1,770
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	3	229	50			1	283
Odor of Contraband		20	8				28
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	3	143	79	3			228
Incident to Arrest	9	210	160	2			381
Impound Authority	6	269	293				568
Visible Contraband		22	10				32
Consent	9	498	237	3		2	749
Other		9	12	1			22
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	18	754	475	2		2	1,251
Person	15	710	377	5			1,107
Container		18	13	1			32
Other		3					3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	8	406	346				760
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		19	7				26
Money		10	3				13
Drugs	2	60	23				85
Alcohol		13	6				19
Other Contraband		12	3				15
Other Evidence of Crime		18	14				32
Other Property	1	47	22				70
Vehicle	5	256	276				537
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	36	944	390	10		2	1,382
Citation	75	2,546	1,446	40	2	12	4,121
Arrest - Total	11	359	248	4			622
Booking - Yes	7	221	162	2			392
Booking - No	4	143	87	2			236
Release From Custody	2	14	27	1			44
Field Interview Completed	12	644	335	9		1	1,001
None	3	88	51	3	1		146

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - Southeast Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	11	615	241	3		2	872
GENDER							
Male	8	485	198	1		1	693
Female	3	130	43	2		1	179
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17		59	48	2			109
18 - 25	6	282	137	1			426
26 - 35	1	149	39			1	190
36 - 45	3	96	14			1	114
46 - 55	1	27	3				31
56+		2					2
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	2	187	83	2		1	275
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		1	1				2
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	6	264	88	1			359
Municipal Code Violation		16	13				29
Suspect Flight		7					7
Consensual		7	1				8
Call For Service	1	24	6			1	32
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)		21	7				28
Penal Code Violation	2	69	34				105
Health & Safety Code Violation		15	2				17
Other		4	6				10
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	4	462	182			2	650
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	2	131	46				179
GRANTED?							
Yes	2	128	45				175
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	5	275	104			1	385
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	1	49	11				61
Odor of Contraband		12	3				15
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	1	58	23				82
Incident to Arrest	2	77	25				104
Impound Authority		15	12			1	28
Visible Contraband		7	5				12
Consent	2	117	44				163
Other		11	3				14
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	2	62	29			1	94
Person	4	249	89				342
Container		6					6
Other		4	1				5
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	2	70	24			1	97
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		3	3				6
Money		2					2
Drugs		25	6				31
Alcohol	1	6					7
Other Contraband		7	1				8
Other Evidence of Crime	1	6	2				9
Other Property		13					13
Vehicle		13	12			1	26
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning		106	40			1	147
Citation	2	91	39	1			133
Arrest - Total	3	109	44				156
Booking - Yes	2	93	33				128
Booking - No	1	17	11				29
Release From Custody		7	3				10
Field Interview Completed	3	336	135	2			476
None	4	103	36			1	144

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - Southeast Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	93	5,132	1,325	15	1	1	6,567
GENDER							
Male	54	4,240	1,167	12	1	1	5,475
Female	39	892	158	3			1,092
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	10	776	401	2			1,189
18 - 25	22	1,622	483	4	1		2,132
26 - 35	16	839	246	3			1,104
36 - 45	30	1,107	121	3			1,261
46 - 55	12	651	59	2			724
56+	3	137	15	1		1	157
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	4	245	44	1			294
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	9	685	129	2			825
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	7	409	109	1			526
Municipal Code Violation	19	1,120	336	3		1	1,479
Suspect Flight	1	178	43				222
Consensual	6	538	86				630
Call For Service	19	570	215	3	1		808
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2	181	33				216
Penal Code Violation	20	817	249	3			1,089
Health & Safety Code Violation	4	284	58	1			347
Other	2	105	23	1			131
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	45	3,687	920	8	1		4,661
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	11	1,090	271	1	1		1,374
GRANTED?							
Yes	11	1,072	264	1	1		1,349
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	40	2,405	590	6	1	1	3,043
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	5	468	78	1			552
Odor of Contraband		24	7				31
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	6	509	113	1			629
Incident to Arrest	26	972	277	3	1	1	1,280
Impound Authority		6	3				9
Visible Contraband	1	65	13				79
Consent	11	1,003	241	1	1		1,257
Other	1	26	7	1			35
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle		59	17				76
Person	34	2,342	565	5	1	2,947	5,894
Container	7	87	39	1			134
Other	2	49	14			1	66
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	14	428	125	1		1	569
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	2	89	19				110
Money	1	53	5				59
Drugs	2	171	34	1			208
Alcohol	5	75	34				114
Other Contraband	2	50	8				60
Other Evidence of Crime	1	35	24			1	61
Other Property	2	50	21				73
Vehicle		6	3				9
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	24	1,311	297	4			1,636
Citation	16	856	312	3			1,187
Arrest - Total	31	1,482	409	4	1	1	1,928
Booking - Yes	19	1,035	261	3	1		1,319
Booking - No	12	467	152	1		1	633
Release From Custody	10	273	80	1	1	1	366
Field Interview Completed	45	2,858	640	5			3,548
None	5	272	85	3			365

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - South Traffic Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	4,492	10,438	7,798	1,490	38	149	24,405
GENDER							
Male	2,843	5,754	5,529	961	31	122	15,240
Female	1,649	4,684	2,269	529	7	27	9,165
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	24	110	108	4		2	248
18 - 25	979	2,336	2,166	363	14	29	5,887
26 - 35	1,178	2,798	2,478	445	7	47	6,953
36 - 45	1,021	2,446	1,846	315	10	38	5,676
46 - 55	789	1,634	878	230	6	21	3,558
56+	501	1,114	322	133	1	12	2,083
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	2,327	7,588	5,056	751	22	82	15,826
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	10	12	2	3			27
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	1,893	2,689	2,558	628	15	59	7,842
Municipal Code Violation	239	57	88	100	1	7	492
Suspect Flight		1					1
Consensual	8	1	5	1			15
Call For Service	12	54	66	3		1	136
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	1	1	1			4
Penal Code Violation	1	22	13	2			38
Health & Safety Code Violation	1	3	1				5
Other		10	8	1			19
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	331	1,395	1,418	103	4	25	3,276
No	4,161	9,043	6,380	1,387	34	124	21,129
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	121	839	1,125	39		8	2,132
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	39	184	306	9		1	539
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	10	47	54	1		1	113
GRANTED?							
Yes	8	41	48	1		1	99
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	78	709	897	21		4	1,709
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	1	4	2				7
Odor of Contraband	2	8	2				12
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk		31	28	2			61
Incident to Arrest	34	148	223	6		1	412
Impound Authority	34	585	698	9		1	1,327
Visible Contraband		1	3				4
Consent	7	36	43			1	87
Other	13	12	10	7		2	44
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	50	619	727	21		4	1,421
Person	33	162	239	6		1	441
Container							0
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	39	617	741	10		2	1,409
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1	2	6				9
Money	2	16	35				53
Drugs		14	7				21
Alcohol			5				5
Other Contraband		2	2				4
Other Evidence of Crime	1	3	4				8
Other Property	2	34	55				91
Vehicle	35	568	674	10		2	1,289
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	2,072	819	1,272	739	10	69	4,981
Citation	2,380	9,468	6,294	742	28	79	18,991
Arrest - Total	36	181	244	7		1	469
Booking - Yes	32	149	226	6		1	414
Booking - No	4	34	20	1			59
Release From Custody		4	3				7
Field Interview Completed	3	43	41	1			88
None	9	17	13	2			41

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - South Traffic Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	11	74	326	5		1	417
GENDER							
Male	7	43	196	3		1	250
Female	4	31	130	2			167
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17		2	25				27
18 - 25	4	35	134	2			175
26 - 35	5	17	91			1	114
36 - 45	1	6	47	2			56
46 - 55	1	9	20	1			31
56+		5	9				14
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	8	56	297	4		1	366
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		1	7				8
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	1	13	18				32
Municipal Code Violation	1	2	1				4
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual	1			1			2
Call For Service			2				2
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)							0
Penal Code Violation		1	1				2
Health & Safety Code Violation		1					1
Other							0
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	9	7			1		17
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	2	1			1		4
GRANTED?							
Yes	2	1			1		4
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	13	12			1		26
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		1					1
Odor of Contraband							0
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk		4					4
Incident to Arrest		4	3				7
Impound Authority		6	8				14
Visible Contraband			3				3
Consent			1			1	2
Other		1					1
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	8	9					17
Person	8	5			1		14
Container							0
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	11	11			1		23
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		2					2
Money	3						3
Drugs	3	4					7
Alcohol	1						1
Other Contraband							0
Other Evidence of Crime	1	1					2
Other Property	4				1		5
Vehicle	5	7					12
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	4	5	4	3			16
Citation	7	61	318	2			388
Arrest - Total		7	6				13
Booking - Yes		6	3				9
Booking - No		1	3				4
Release From Custody		1					1
Field Interview Completed		5	1			1	7
None							0

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - South Traffic Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	190	308	277	46	1	7	829
GENDER							
Male	139	206	212	24	1	6	588
Female	51	102	65	22		1	241
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	10	43	33				86
18 - 25	74	59	89	22	1	2	247
26 - 35	42	57	63	10		4	176
36 - 45	23	53	51	5		1	133
46 - 55	25	63	24	6			118
56+	16	33	17	3			69
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	13	36	31	4		2	86
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	160	236	214	40	1	5	656
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	1	9	5				15
Municipal Code Violation	7	13	12				32
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual	4	1					5
Call For Service	2	6	3	1			12
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)		2					2
Penal Code Violation	2	5	7	1			15
Health & Safety Code Violation			3				3
Other	1		2				3
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	9	38	28				75
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	2	11	7				20
GRANTED?							
Yes	2	11	6				19
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	4	35	21				60
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		1	3				4
Odor of Contraband							0
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	1	11	4				16
Incident to Arrest	2	16	9				27
Impound Authority		1	2				3
Visible Contraband		1					1
Consent	2	11	6				19
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle		1	2				3
Person	4	34	21				59
Container	1						1
Other			1				1
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	1	11	10				22
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons			2				2
Money			3				3
Drugs		2	1				3
Alcohol		2	1				3
Other Contraband		3	2				5
Other Evidence of Crime		2					2
Other Property	1	1	4				6
Vehicle		1	2				3
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	36	18	16	4		1	75
Citation	149	262	242	41	1	6	701
Arrest - Total	5	21	15				41
Booking - Yes	2	13	7				22
Booking - No	3	8	8				19
Release From Custody	1	8	5				14
Field Interview Completed	2	11	12				25
None	2	2	1	1			6

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - Southwest Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	578	7,346	3,681	242	13	59	11,919
GENDER							
Male	398	5,080	2,925	170	12	51	8,636
Female	180	2,266	756	72	1	8	3,283
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	5	128	91	1		1	226
18 - 25	282	2,229	1,521	137	4	20	4,193
26 - 35	124	2,168	1,056	52	6	21	3,427
36 - 45	73	1,589	703	29	2	9	2,405
46 - 55	73	876	254	13		7	1,223
56+	21	356	56	10	1	1	445
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	273	2,194	1,317	121	7	25	3,937
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		2	2				4
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	297	4,859	2,223	118	6	33	7,536
Municipal Code Violation	1	45	16	2		1	65
Suspect Flight		10	1				11
Consensual	1	20	3				24
Call For Service	1	49	34	1			85
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)		19	11				30
Penal Code Violation	4	76	41				121
Health & Safety Code Violation		31	9	1			41
Other	1	41	27				69
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	86	2,913	1,339	33	3	17	4,391
No	492	4,433	2,342	209	10	42	7,528
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	52	2,096	1,040	16	2	10	3,216
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	27	1,617	663	6	2	3	2,318
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	20	819	293	4	1	1	1,138
GRANTED?							
Yes	20	804	287	4	1	1	1,117
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	32	1,722	749	5	1	5	2,514
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	5	328	45				378
Odor of Contraband	1	49	15	1			66
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	6	285	128	1			420
Incident to Arrest	6	300	121				427
Impound Authority	8	609	406			3	1,026
Visible Contraband	1	41	6				48
Consent	20	756	271	4	1	2	1,054
Other		15	7				22
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	27	1,304	598	3	1	4	1,937
Person	22	1,184	404	4	1	2	1,617
Container		16	2				18
Other		5					5
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	16	745	428	2		3	1,194
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		25	5				30
Money	1	22	2				25
Drugs	7	125	20	1			153
Alcohol		16	5				21
Other Contraband	1	31	3				35
Other Evidence of Crime		16	4				20
Other Property	1	28	9	1			39
Vehicle	7	527	383			3	920
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	106	1,588	600	31	3	4	2,332
Citation	454	5,229	2,908	208	10	54	8,863
Arrest - Total	49	754	396	14		6	1,219
Booking - Yes	7	265	92				364
Booking - No	42	490	305	14		6	857
Release From Custody	1	23	6				30
Field Interview Completed	18	985	371	7	2		1,383
None	11	119	52	4		1	187

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - Southwest Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	14	824	324	1	1		1,164
GENDER							
Male	10	649	288	1			948
Female	4	175	36		1		216
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	1	84	86				171
18 - 25	8	409	177	1			595
26 - 35	3	175	48				226
36 - 45	1	93	11				105
46 - 55		53	2		1		56
56+	1	10					11
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	4	245	100		1		350
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1	5	3				9
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	9	390	138	1			538
Municipal Code Violation		21	15				36
Suspect Flight		4	3				7
Consensual		30	3				33
Call For Service		35	10				45
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)		10	3				13
Penal Code Violation		44	31				75
Health & Safety Code Violation		28	11				39
Other		12	7				19
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	7	582	245				834
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	4	245	74				323
GRANTED?							
Yes	4	239	72				315
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	4	472	145				621
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		112	27				139
Odor of Contraband		28	9				37
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	2	116	38				156
Incident to Arrest		91	31				122
Impound Authority		13	18				31
Visible Contraband		16	6				22
Consent	4	231	69				304
Other		4					4
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	2	133	47				182
Person	4	445	131				580
Container		15	3				18
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	1	111	39				151
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		18	5				23
Money		11	3				14
Drugs		52	15				67
Alcohol	1	13	5				19
Other Contraband		12	1				13
Other Evidence of Crime		5	1				6
Other Property		4					4
Vehicle		16	13				29
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	4	141	38				183
Citation	5	147	86	1	1		240
Arrest - Total		154	56				210
Booking - Yes		126	44				170
Booking - No		28	12				40
Release From Custody		15	3				18
Field Interview Completed	5	467	195				667
None	3	92	29				124

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OSB - Southwest Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	244	5,731	1,996	47	2	17	8,037
GENDER							
Male	170	4,667	1,758	36	2	12	6,645
Female	74	1,064	238	11		5	1,392
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	8	790	795	1	1		1,595
18 - 25	145	1,412	675	26		10	2,268
26 - 35	36	1,033	278	13		3	1,363
36 - 45	32	1,414	177	5	1	2	1,631
46 - 55	18	898	61			2	979
56+	5	184	10	2			201
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	41	272	106	11		1	431
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	41	717	239	7		4	1,008
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	35	540	173	6		6	760
Municipal Code Violation	58	1,326	608	8	2	4	2,006
Suspect Flight		44	21				65
Consensual	5	604	219				828
Call For Service	23	650	236	2		1	912
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2	213	50				265
Penal Code Violation	17	777	210	5		1	1,010
Health & Safety Code Violation	19	447	95	4			565
Other	3	142	39	4			188
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	66	4,048	1,429	13	1	2	5,559
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	30	1,625	375	6		1	2,037
GRANTED?							
Yes	27	1,582	364	6			1,979
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	56	3,269	853	11	1	2	4,192
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	5	693	133				831
Odor of Contraband		19	16				35
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	11	891	225	2			1,129
Incident to Arrest	31	1,171	320	9	1	2	1,534
Impound Authority		6	4				10
Visible Contraband	1	85	19				105
Consent	26	1,458	347	5			1,836
Other		25	6				31
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	2	56	23	1			82
Person	53	3,219	835	11	1	2	4,121
Container	5	137	31				173
Other	2	55	24				81
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	15	514	152	5			686
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1	56	16	1			74
Money	1	62	11				74
Drugs	3	266	50				319
Alcohol	1	47	20				68
Other Contraband	3	118	29				150
Other Evidence of Crime	7	41	24	4			76
Other Property		30	18				48
Vehicle		6	5				11
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	19	1,377	454	1		1	1,852
Citation	116	1,161	628	26	1	9	1,941
Arrest - Total	93	1,983	625	18	2	5	2,726
Booking - Yes	31	1,218	283	5		2	1,539
Booking - No	62	762	340	13	2	3	1,182
Release From Custody	60	577	160	13	1	3	814
Field Interview Completed	65	2,992	1,096	8		3	4,164
None	3	194	67	1			265

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

FIELD DATA STATISTICS

OVB

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	44,202	7,698	37,663	6,166	257	1,850	97,836
GENDER							
Male	28,039	5,091	28,200	3,800	203	1,387	66,720
Female	16,163	2,607	9,462	2,366	54	463	31,115
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	822	97	772	80	3	44	1,818
18 - 25	9,662	1,936	13,160	1,508	52	502	26,820
26 - 35	10,587	2,521	12,328	1,705	68	458	27,667
36 - 45	10,470	1,869	7,247	1,325	75	413	21,399
46 - 55	7,320	888	3,099	961	39	294	12,601
56+	5,341	387	1,057	587	20	139	7,531
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	33,225	4,700	23,969	4,343	183	1,365	67,785
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	21	10	37	7	2	3	80
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	9,516	2,585	11,551	1,580	57	417	25,706
Municipal Code Violation	448	101	311	165	8	18	1,051
Suspect Flight	15	5	26	1			47
Consensual	110	32	91	4		1	238
Call For Service	426	95	637	31	4	17	1,210
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	38	21	95	4		2	160
Penal Code Violation	198	81	468	16	2	15	780
Health & Safety Code Violation	75	17	107	6		2	207
Other	132	51	371	9	1	9	573
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	6,937	1,895	12,219	710	42	359	22,162
No	37,264	5,803	25,440	5,456	215	1,490	75,668
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	3,403	1,256	9,349	285	22	171	14,486
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	2,270	848	6,163	138	9	109	9,537
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	1,305	457	3,011	76	9	59	4,917
GRANTED?							
Yes	1,250	443	2,939	73	9	58	4,772
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	2,797	1,038	8,252	180	15	130	12,412
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	305	157	378	10	1	13	864
Odor of Contraband	47	20	86	4		2	159
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	293	112	920	22	1	16	1,364
Incident to Arrest	973	310	2,601	63	4	36	3,987
Impound Authority	1,006	422	4,363	75	7	53	5,926
Visible Contraband	79	18	103	3		5	208
Consent	1,149	414	2,764	72	9	52	4,460
Other	20	12	39	4	1		76
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	2,137	839	6,604	130	12	103	9,825
Person	1,986	702	5,012	117	10	85	7,912
Container	113	33	110	3		3	262
Other	14	9	21			1	45
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	1,615	630	5,689	106	9	74	8,123
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	44	11	106	3		5	169
Money	44	20	128	3		2	197
Drugs	319	116	505	17	1	6	964
Alcohol	34	15	153	1	1		204
Other Contraband	108	15	114	7		3	247
Other Evidence of Crime	86	31	193	2		2	314
Other Property	285	118	846	14		9	1,272
Vehicle	943	369	4,121	72	7	53	5,565
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	6,136	1,870	5,910	1,226	41	218	15,401
Citation	36,661	5,384	28,908	4,850	209	1,581	77,593
Arrest - Total	1,571	462	3,530	121	6	61	5,751
Booking - Yes	1,011	290	2,274	60	4	40	3,679
Booking - No	589	173	1,307	70	2	21	2,162
Release From Custody	38	16	76	2	1	2	135
Field Interview Completed	1,149	393	2,284	69	6	52	3,953
None	285	109	488	30	3	13	928

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS**

OVB

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,009	478	2,551	66	2	37	4,143
GENDER							
Male	638	349	2,039	48	2	29	3,105
Female	371	129	512	18		8	1,038
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	116	43	478	15		6	658
18 - 25	355	208	1,376	37	2	19	1,997
26 - 35	218	111	475	9		5	818
36 - 45	220	80	168	3		2	473
46 - 55	79	28	48	2		2	159
56+	21	8	6			3	38
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	323	138	952	24	2	15	1,454
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	13	5	19				37
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	262	164	798	14		10	1,248
Municipal Code Violation	49	13	128	6			196
Suspect Flight	6	3	15	1			25
Consensual	78	20	76	1		2	177
Call For Service	105	37	120	9		1	272
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	11	14	59	1			85
Penal Code Violation	80	57	215	4		7	363
Health & Safety Code Violation	43	14	91	4		2	154
Other	39	13	78	2			132
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	531	289	1,779	31		23	2,653
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	306	145	924	13		15	1,403
GRANTED?							
Yes	300	142	907	13		13	1,375
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	546	261	1,519	28		20	2,374
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	102	58	216	1			377
Odor of Contraband	10	5	41	2		1	59
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	94	38	254	7		3	396
Incident to Arrest	173	80	402	9		7	671
Impound Authority	31	7	86	3		1	128
Visible Contraband	34	8	62	1		2	107
Consent	292	134	873	13		13	1,325
Other	5	2	9	1			17
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	153	54	404	6		6	623
Person	512	252	1,447	27		20	2,258
Container	56	15	38	1		2	112
Other	13	6	16				35
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	189	88	612	15		7	911
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	6	2	65			2	75
Money	7	9	42				58
Drugs	95	37	178	6		1	317
Alcohol	6	4	54				64
Other Contraband	41	12	51	1		3	108
Other Evidence of Crime	19	10	70	1		2	102
Other Property	52	34	203	8			297
Vehicle	18	4	76	2			100
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	201	90	382	15		11	699
Citation	243	64	570	20	2	7	906
Arrest - Total	269	120	626	16		9	1,040
Booking - Yes	199	98	434	10		6	747
Booking - No	67	23	193	6		3	292
Release From Custody	28	10	56	1		2	97
Field Interview Completed	353	194	895	18		12	1,472
None	188	109	601	14		9	921

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVb**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	7,862	3,413	13,641	577	33	276	25,802
GENDER							
Male	5,745	2,508	11,441	374	27	210	20,305
Female	2,116	905	2,200	203	6	66	5,496
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	837	466	3,388	144	2	58	4,895
18 - 25	1,479	864	4,687	144	5	64	7,243
26 - 35	1,817	844	2,911	124	7	61	5,764
36 - 45	2,071	749	1,778	83	11	54	4,746
46 - 55	1,227	382	674	57	6	29	2,375
56+	430	108	202	25	2	10	777
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	300	109	431	18	2	3	863
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1,080	421	1,361	90	1	42	2,995
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	150	65	359	7		2	583
Municipal Code Violation	1,313	554	3,509	135	5	29	5,545
Suspect Flight	22	7	129	2			160
Consensual	1,069	470	1,556	23	3	10	3,131
Call For Service	2,425	905	3,446	175	17	135	7,103
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	115	81	247	3	1		447
Penal Code Violation	862	566	1,633	94	3	34	3,192
Health & Safety Code Violation	245	134	440	9		6	834
Other	283	101	534	21	1	16	956
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	4,097	2,215	9,203	293	19	155	15,982
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	2,154	1,124	4,184	93	13	56	7,624
GRANTED?							
Yes	2,114	1,094	4,106	92	13	54	7,473
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	4,065	2,133	8,318	302	20	152	14,990
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	535	387	913	6		12	1,853
Odor of Contraband	21	9	57			2	89
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	580	308	1,271	40	5	19	2,223
Incident to Arrest	1,906	940	3,886	225	11	103	7,071
Impound Authority	23	4	48	4		2	81
Visible Contraband	72	33	199	1	1	1	307
Consent	2,016	1,010	3,947	82	11	50	7,116
Other	67	24	84	4		4	183
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	249	58	305	14		12	638
Person	3,874	2,069	8,090	267	19	145	14,464
Container	450	206	598	58	2	10	1,324
Other	251	99	232	35		8	625
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	1,314	614	2,610	136	6	52	4,732
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	102	31	173	4	1	5	316
Money	91	51	201	55	1	2	401
Drugs	429	176	614	11	2	7	1,239
Alcohol	83	40	333	3		2	461
Other Contraband	179	80	278	11	2	5	555
Other Evidence of Crime	174	97	355	34	2	5	667
Other Property	535	258	1,175	38	2	31	2,039
Vehicle	21	4	40	4		2	71
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	1,452	674	2,306	66	7	33	4,538
Citation	1,467	540	3,026	177	2	66	5,278
Arrest - Total	3,163	1,390	6,113	305	19	140	11,130
Booking - Yes	2,057	958	3,533	180	13	100	6,841
Booking - No	1,106	433	2,582	125	6	40	4,292
Release From Custody	757	254	1,420	70	8	30	2,539
Field Interview Completed	3,241	1,548	5,634	209	18	115	10,765
None	740	330	1,191	23	2	21	2,307

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVB - Devonshire Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	4,046	1,016	5,309	727	32	238	11,368
GENDER							
Male	2,726	757	4,145	463	24	184	8,299
Female	1,320	259	1,164	264	8	54	3,069
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	98	18	123	14		4	257
18 - 25	1,076	349	2,112	252	6	73	3,868
26 - 35	973	312	1,764	142	9	59	3,259
36 - 45	933	208	881	150	9	57	2,238
46 - 55	610	90	320	112	7	30	1,169
56+	356	39	109	57	1	15	577
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	2,515	462	3,019	532	21	180	6,729
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	5	1	1	1			8
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	1,230	475	1,907	177	8	51	3,848
Municipal Code Violation	48	7	45	5	1	1	107
Suspect Flight	2	3	4				9
Consensual	42	7	16	1			66
Call For Service	71	22	76	2	1	2	174
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	14	2	19	3			38
Penal Code Violation	56	24	102	1		2	185
Health & Safety Code Violation	38	2	39	3			82
Other	25	11	81	2	1	2	122
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	1,122	375	2,049	110	6	57	3,719
No	2,924	641	3,260	617	26	181	7,649
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	791	269	1,673	71	2	36	2,842
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	614	206	1,169	44	1	21	2,055
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	349	103	545	22	1	17	1,037
GRANTED?							
Yes	341	100	533	22	1	17	1,014
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	649	219	1,424	47	1	24	2,364
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	90	29	70	3	1	1	194
Odor of Contraband	5	4	15	3		1	28
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	40	9	83	3			135
Incident to Arrest	197	82	462	11		4	756
Impound Authority	143	77	733	19		10	982
Visible Contraband	31	3	24	1		2	61
Consent	329	94	522	22	1	17	985
Other	4	6	11	1			22
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	509	172	1,194	37	1	21	1,934
Person	498	159	873	33	1	15	1,579
Container	28	6	28	1			63
Other	3		9			1	13
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	362	132	1,052	30		15	1,591
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	13	4	19			2	38
Money	18	4	34	3			59
Drugs	88	22	88	7		1	206
Alcohol	9	2	33	1			45
Other Contraband	33	3	15	2			53
Other Evidence of Crime	20	7	44			2	73
Other Property	114	39	218	8		1	380
Vehicle	138	64	703	16		10	931
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	879	306	886	107	6	31	2,215
Citation	2,816	597	3,929	593	22	200	8,157
Arrest - Total	339	116	688	31	1	10	1,185
Booking - Yes	211	68	350	12		5	646
Booking - No	128	48	339	19	1	5	540
Release From Custody	10	3	13		1		27
Field Interview Completed	444	141	593	32	1	11	1,222
None	63	29	133	8	2	2	237

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVB - Devonshire Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	258	126	499	26		8	917
GENDER							
Male	144	91	396	21		6	658
Female	114	35	103	5		2	259
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	41	11	117	7		3	179
18 - 25	80	66	249	16		3	414
26 - 35	48	29	93	3		1	174
36 - 45	62	15	33				110
46 - 55	22	5	7				34
56+	5					1	6
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	73	36	186	3		3	301
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1	1					2
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	65	37	135	7			244
Municipal Code Violation	25	8	30	4			67
Suspect Flight	1	1	3				5
Consensual	16	10	26			2	54
Call For Service	32	13	24	5			74
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	3	2	6	1			12
Penal Code Violation	22	13	47	1		3	86
Health & Safety Code Violation	15	3	28	3			49
Other	5	2	14	2			23
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	136	72	346	15		6	575
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	84	38	181	7		6	316
GRANTED?							
Yes	82	38	178	7		5	310
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	138	67	297	13		6	521
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	23	19	61	1			104
Odor of Contraband	4		7	2			13
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	12	6	25	1			44
Incident to Arrest	44	18	70	4		2	138
Impound Authority	3	4	22	1		1	31
Visible Contraband	15	2	12	1		1	31
Consent	81	36	178	7		5	307
Other	1		1	1			3
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	48	11	86	2		2	149
Person	129	64	279	13		6	491
Container	18	4	6	1		1	30
Other	2	1	7				10
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	57	21	131	6		3	218
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	3		9			1	13
Money	1	4	8				13
Drugs	25	4	33	2			64
Alcohol	4	2	10				16
Other Contraband	16	3	10	1		1	31
Other Evidence of Crime	2	4	12			2	20
Other Property	17	10	49	4			80
Vehicle	1	2	19				22
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	55	27	74	10		3	169
Citation	62	16	99	4		2	183
Arrest - Total	72	31	124	8		3	238
Booking - Yes	47	25	74	4		1	151
Booking - No	25	6	50	4		2	87
Release From Custody	6		11	1			18
Field Interview Completed	132	68	266	12		4	482
None	38	25	100	3		1	167

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVb - Devonshire Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	2,025	870	3,914	152	7	66	7,034
GENDER							
Male	1,478	611	3,153	108	7	42	5,399
Female	547	259	761	44		24	1,635
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	305	191	1,191	69	1	20	1,777
18 - 25	381	247	1,386	38	1	9	2,062
26 - 35	428	197	750	18		10	1,403
36 - 45	559	147	410	16	4	16	1,152
46 - 55	285	76	148	7	1	9	526
56+	67	12	29	4		2	114
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	80	32	128	4			244
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	106	78	273	4		4	465
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	54	13	110				177
Municipal Code Violation	279	97	1,002	39		5	1,422
Suspect Flight	4	2	17				23
Consensual	401	124	540	6	1	2	1,074
Call For Service	721	308	1,092	64	4	40	2,229
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	26	18	37				81
Penal Code Violation	243	147	462	33	1	9	895
Health & Safety Code Violation	70	30	175	2		1	278
Other	41	21	78		1	5	146
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1,157	578	2,637	84	4	34	4,494
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	636	281	1,158	20	1	11	2,107
GRANTED?							
Yes	629	276	1,144	20	1	11	2,081
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1,125	550	2,309	81	3	36	4,104
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	139	103	299			1	542
Odor of Contraband	3	4	11				18
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	76	47	182	5		5	315
Incident to Arrest	494	239	1,120	68	2	26	1,949
Impound Authority	2		4	1		1	8
Visible Contraband	15	2	36				53
Consent	613	266	1,112	20	1	11	2,023
Other	17	6	24				47
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	66	7	63	4		2	142
Person	1,085	543	2,282	78	3	35	4,026
Container	102	58	122	14	1	3	300
Other	32	9	41	4			86
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	386	185	813	28	2	17	1,431
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	27	6	37	1	1		72
Money	25	11	75	6	1	2	120
Drugs	95	32	162	3	2		294
Alcohol	17	2	58			1	78
Other Contraband	42	20	81	4	1	3	151
Other Evidence of Crime	41	29	100	15			185
Other Property	209	107	444	10	1	13	784
Vehicle	3		5			1	9
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	443	189	637	12	2	8	1,291
Citation	278	136	1,133	46		18	1,611
Arrest - Total	781	331	1,764	97	4	38	3,015
Booking - Yes	536	234	1,025	62	4	24	1,885
Booking - No	246	97	737	35		14	1,129
Release From Custody	73	29	160	5		7	274
Field Interview Completed	1,359	541	2,275	100	6	48	4,329
None	191	111	323	5		4	634

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVB - Foothill Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,870	606	5,468	213	18	139	8,314
GENDER							
Male	1,264	462	4,333	137	12	115	6,323
Female	606	144	1,134	76	6	24	1,990
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	34	9	181	5		5	234
18 - 25	533	154	2,434	67	5	51	3,244
26 - 35	438	189	1,632	48	7	34	2,348
36 - 45	466	144	824	51	4	25	1,514
46 - 55	272	77	312	32	2	16	711
56+	127	33	85	10		8	263
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	1,115	281	2,844	160	12	94	4,506
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation			7				7
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	615	278	2,156	47	4	38	3,138
Municipal Code Violation	8	3	49	2		1	63
Suspect Flight	4	1	10				15
Consensual	29	6	32				67
Call For Service	27	4	66	2	2	1	102
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	7	3	43			1	54
Penal Code Violation	41	14	163	2		4	224
Health & Safety Code Violation	6	3	17				26
Other	18	13	81				112
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	572	259	2,512	29	8	29	3,409
No	1,298	347	2,956	184	10	110	4,905
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	407	200	2,078	15	6	19	2,725
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	348	172	1,677	12	2	15	2,226
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	242	97	1,071	9	2	6	1,427
GRANTED?							
Yes	235	96	1,055	9	2	6	1,403
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	390	184	1,928	10	4	16	2,532
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	83	54	167	2		4	310
Odor of Contraband	6	4	32				42
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	31	14	197	1		2	245
Incident to Arrest	106	47	492	4	1	3	653
Impound Authority	71	44	691	4	1	3	814
Visible Contraband	11	5	32				48
Consent	228	94	1,042	9	2	6	1,381
Other	3		6	1	1		11
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	308	156	1,581	6	3	13	2,067
Person	331	144	1,400	9	4	12	1,900
Container	19	9	38				66
Other	2	2	5				9
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	205	107	1,261	7	2	9	1,591
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	8		47			1	56
Money	4	1	34				39
Drugs	49	22	144	1			216
Alcohol	7	7	43				57
Other Contraband	17	6	50	1			74
Other Evidence of Crime	11	5	51				67
Other Property	88	38	443	1		6	576
Vehicle	60	38	592	4	2	2	698
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	362	174	1,029	28	3	11	1,607
Citation	1,312	362	3,813	177	13	120	5,797
Arrest - Total	163	68	677	10	2	5	925
Booking - Yes	127	47	430	3	1	4	612
Booking - No	36	21	246	7	1	1	312
Release From Custody	6	5	24			1	36
Field Interview Completed	147	72	497	4	2	6	728
None	44	13	137	5	1		200

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVb - Foothill Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	195	112	994	10		1	1,312
GENDER							
Male	117	79	803	6			1,005
Female	78	33	191	4		1	307
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	15	7	171	3			196
18 - 25	65	31	565	3			664
26 - 35	48	28	170	3		1	250
36 - 45	47	27	70				144
46 - 55	19	15	16	1			51
56+	1	4	2				7
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	47	30	360	4			441
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	3	2	1				6
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	62	54	353	1			470
Municipal Code Violation	4		53	1			58
Suspect Flight	1	1	7				9
Consensual	32	2	28	1			63
Call For Service	14	4	32	2			52
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	3	2	28				33
Penal Code Violation	21	12	80			1	114
Health & Safety Code Violation	2		24			1	27
Other	6	5	28				39
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	130	78	757	5			970
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	79	37	419	2			537
GRANTED?							
Yes	79	34	411	2			526
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	130	71	644	3		1	849
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	30	23	85				138
Odor of Contraband	1	3	18				22
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	13	8	100				121
Incident to Arrest	29	18	153	1		1	202
Impound Authority	4	1	26				31
Visible Contraband	8	3	35				46
Consent	76	32	395	2			505
Other	1		4				5
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	25	14	166	1			206
Person	124	67	618	3		1	813
Container	10	5	18				33
Other	4	1	5				10
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	43	34	280	1		1	359
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		1	37				38
Money	3	2	18				23
Drugs	15	11	67				93
Alcohol		2	24				26
Other Contraband	10	5	20			1	36
Other Evidence of Crime	2		18	1			21
Other Property	25	17	127				169
Vehicle	2	1	27				30
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	42	17	160	1			220
Citation	25	13	165	4			207
Arrest - Total	48	24	225	3		1	301
Booking - Yes	39	20	154	1		1	215
Booking - No	9	4	71	2			86
Release From Custody	1	2	20				23
Field Interview Completed	78	46	322	1		1	448
None	55	34	315	4			408

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVB - Foothill Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	862	454	2,734	49	4	26	4,129
GENDER							
Male	628	342	2,328	43	4	24	3,369
Female	234	112	406	6		2	760
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	110	41	709	12		2	874
18 - 25	160	86	983	16		7	1,252
26 - 35	213	95	567	5		8	888
36 - 45	222	139	322	8	2	7	700
46 - 55	127	75	128	6	2	2	340
56+	30	18	25	2			75
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	27	21	86	2			136
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	50	50	203	1		3	307
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	12	16	93	1			122
Municipal Code Violation	150	105	722	8	1	2	988
Suspect Flight	4	2	71				77
Consensual	150	66	341	6		1	564
Call For Service	250	91	573	20	3	17	954
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	25	11	85	2			123
Penal Code Violation	114	66	342	4			526
Health & Safety Code Violation	19	10	69			1	99
Other	61	16	150	5		2	234
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	524	321	2,025	32	3	18	2,923
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	325	165	1,031	10	1	10	1,542
GRANTED?							
Yes	320	160	1,010	10	1	10	1,511
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	531	312	1,858	30	3	19	2,753
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	97	71	235	2		3	408
Odor of Contraband			15				15
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	72	19	249	9	2	1	352
Incident to Arrest	174	136	750	12	1	7	1,080
Impound Authority	1		10				11
Visible Contraband	5	8	32				45
Consent	312	151	975	10	1	9	1,458
Other	8	3	17	2		2	32
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	36	11	87			2	136
Person	505	303	1,790	29	3	17	2,647
Container	63	40	163	5		1	272
Other	46	7	54	1		2	110
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	258	124	768	15	1	12	1,178
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	16	4	49	2			71
Money	19	5	33	1			58
Drugs	59	21	120	2			202
Alcohol	19	21	92	1			133
Other Contraband	36	15	68	1			120
Other Evidence of Crime	27	7	75	1		1	111
Other Property	146	66	465	10	1	11	699
Vehicle	2		8				10
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	196	88	525	11	1	7	828
Citation	78	49	392	14		2	535
Arrest - Total	307	183	1,151	17	2	9	1,669
Booking - Yes	210	115	651	8	1	6	991
Booking - No	96	68	499	9	1	3	676
Release From Custody	79	49	322	3	1	3	457
Field Interview Completed	381	213	1,073	22	1	8	1,698
None	120	50	360	1		5	536

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVb - North Hollywood Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	2,999	577	3,356	279	13	128	7,352
GENDER							
Male	2,111	402	2,667	192	9	108	5,489
Female	888	175	689	87	4	20	1,863
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	45	4	101	2		3	155
18 - 25	765	150	1,251	85	4	40	2,295
26 - 35	907	241	1,139	79	5	41	2,412
36 - 45	655	126	536	50	1	22	1,390
46 - 55	392	40	261	44	3	18	758
56+	235	16	68	19		4	342
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	1,784	272	1,654	161	8	65	3,944
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	2	1	3				6
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	1,122	272	1,480	109	4	58	3,045
Municipal Code Violation	7		13			1	21
Suspect Flight			2	1			3
Consensual	10	3	4				17
Call For Service	36	8	56	4			104
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	3	3	11				17
Penal Code Violation	21	14	87	3	1	2	128
Health & Safety Code Violation	5	2	9			1	17
Other	9	2	37	1		1	50
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	616	173	1,280	40	4	39	2,152
No	2,383	404	2,075	239	9	89	5,199
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	342	120	1,004	19	1	19	1,505
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	201	68	671	12	1	12	965
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	107	31	287	8	2	6	441
GRANTED?							
Yes	99	30	278	7	2	6	422
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	242	89	834	16	2	15	1,198
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	21	10	21			2	54
Odor of Contraband	1	2	12	1		1	17
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	39	13	169	3		2	226
Incident to Arrest	83	28	255	7		3	376
Impound Authority	91	38	425	8	1	5	568
Visible Contraband	3		13	1		1	18
Consent	93	29	267	7	2	6	404
Other	1	2	7				10
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	174	63	635	11	1	12	896
Person	173	60	553	12	1	9	808
Container	5	2	12	2		1	22
Other	3	1	2				6
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	138	48	523	9	1	6	725
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	4	1	12				17
Money	7	2	9			1	19
Drugs	32	10	56	1			99
Alcohol	1		10				11
Other Contraband	9		18	1			28
Other Evidence of Crime	7	3	31				41
Other Property	7	2	16				25
Vehicle	90	33	414	8	1	5	551
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	385	120	496	30	3	14	1,048
Citation	2,493	404	2,571	236	10	109	5,823
Arrest - Total	184	44	351	13		6	598
Booking - Yes	82	23	216	7		3	331
Booking - No	102	21	135	6		3	267
Release From Custody	6	2	9				17
Field Interview Completed	80	25	175	6		3	289
None	38	23	56	7		3	127

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVB - N Hollywood Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	96	38	257	4		4	399
GENDER							
Male	64	28	207	4		3	306
Female	32	10	50			1	93
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	5	7	55				67
18 - 25	34	14	125	4		4	181
26 - 35	20	7	56				83
36 - 45	26	7	16				49
46 - 55	10	1	3				14
56+	1	2	2				5
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	19	8	70	1			98
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1		1				2
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	29	9	88	1		3	130
Municipal Code Violation	4	1	11	1			17
Suspect Flight	2	1	2	1			6
Consensual	12		3				15
Call For Service	11	5	24				40
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	1	7				9
Penal Code Violation	13	10	30				53
Health & Safety Code Violation	2	2	8			1	13
Other	2	1	13				16
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	51	21	193			2	267
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	30	8	96			1	135
GRANTED?							
Yes	30	8	92			1	131
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	59	19	179	1		2	260
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	7	1	16				24
Odor of Contraband		1	5			1	7
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	14	5	44			1	64
Incident to Arrest	28	10	63				101
Impound Authority	3		5	1			9
Visible Contraband	2		8	1			11
Consent	29	8	89			1	127
Other	1	1	1				3
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	12	6	34	1		1	54
Person	58	19	173			2	252
Container	7	1	4			1	13
Other			2				2
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	18	5	48	1			72
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons			6				6
Money			4				4
Drugs	10	2	21				33
Alcohol			5				5
Other Contraband	3	1	7				11
Other Evidence of Crime	5	2	14				21
Other Property	3	2	1				6
Vehicle	2		2	1			5
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	14	4	29	1		3	51
Citation	15	3	58	2			78
Arrest - Total	41	13	86				140
Booking - Yes	32	10	62				104
Booking - No	9	3	24				36
Release From Custody	3	1	8				12
Field Interview Completed	32	14	91	1		1	139
None	23	8	42	1		1	75

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVb - N Hollywood Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,326	447	2,046	53	1	43	3,916
GENDER							
Male	1,017	340	1,774	34	1	37	3,203
Female	309	107	272	19		6	713
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	64	40	384	6		5	499
18 - 25	190	107	619	20		12	948
26 - 35	336	96	506	14	1	12	965
36 - 45	359	109	326	9		7	810
46 - 55	276	70	155	4		5	510
56+	101	25	56			2	184
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	47	11	53	2		1	114
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	137	34	108	10		3	292
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	24	6	49	2		1	82
Municipal Code Violation	404	99	565	9		9	1,086
Suspect Flight	6	1	9				16
Consensual	124	37	165	3	1	2	332
Call For Service	330	142	611	12		13	1,108
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	11	12	32				55
Penal Code Violation	171	78	271	15		9	544
Health & Safety Code Violation	28	15	58			3	104
Other	44	12	125			3	184
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	552	248	1,269	15		29	2,113
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	284	109	535	7	1	8	944
GRANTED?							
Yes	276	104	526	7	1	8	922
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	587	250	1,286	22	1	20	2,166
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	48	30	73			3	154
Odor of Contraband			3			2	5
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	88	44	238	4		1	375
Incident to Arrest	324	127	666	16		13	1,146
Impound Authority	3		6	1			10
Visible Contraband	16	6	60			1	83
Consent	267	102	515	7	1	8	900
Other	9	6	10				25
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	26	4	28	2		1	61
Person	564	245	1,241	21	1	19	2,091
Container	61	24	103	4			192
Other	35	17	33			2	87
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	140	66	259	8		3	476
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	9	6	17			1	33
Money	11	5	19	3			38
Drugs	62	27	78			1	168
Alcohol	13	4	66			1	84
Other Contraband	31	10	26				67
Other Evidence of Crime	33	17	60	4			114
Other Property	18	7	33	1			59
Vehicle	1		4				5
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	151	57	200	2		3	413
Citation	185	50	306	15		5	561
Arrest - Total	719	248	1,174	29		19	2,189
Booking - Yes	343	142	588	21		13	1,107
Booking - No	375	106	586	8		6	1,081
Release From Custody	339	83	456	6		4	888
Field Interview Completed	329	132	620	13		17	1,111
None	125	33	135	2	1	3	299

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVB - Valley Traffic Division**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	28,068	4,049	17,381	4,255	172	741	54,666
GENDER							
Male	17,306	2,430	12,185	2,579	144	543	35,187
Female	10,762	1,619	5,196	1,676	28	198	19,479
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	457	42	234	45	2	15	795
18 - 25	5,590	888	4,951	897	32	168	12,526
26 - 35	6,581	1,240	5,795	1,255	40	195	15,106
36 - 45	6,793	1,073	3,937	942	55	174	12,974
46 - 55	4,875	548	1,798	680	25	127	8,053
56+	3,772	258	666	436	18	62	5,212
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	23,536	3,116	13,585	3,033	135	640	44,045
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	10	5	16	6	2		39
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	3,932	804	3,244	1,039	28	74	9,121
Municipal Code Violation	362	86	164	156	6	14	788
Suspect Flight			2				2
Consensual	3	1	7	1			12
Call For Service	198	22	325	17	1	10	573
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	2		1			4
Penal Code Violation	8	3	7				18
Health & Safety Code Violation	1	1	3				5
Other	19	9	28	2		2	60
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	2,726	503	3,473	377	16	88	7,183
No	25,342	3,546	13,907	3,878	156	653	47,482
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	786	223	2,304	98	7	26	3,444
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	342	74	977	21	2	13	1,429
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	133	26	281	10	1	4	455
GRANTED?							
Yes	120	23	270	10	1	4	428
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	587	154	1,979	49	5	25	2,799
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	4	2	8				14
Odor of Contraband	10	2	10				22
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	52	17	112	7		2	190
Incident to Arrest	276	47	832	17	2	10	1,184
Impound Authority	349	115	1,297	25	4	16	1,806
Visible Contraband	4	2	8				14
Consent	58	12	163	9	1	1	244
Other	2	1	1	1			5
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	414	130	1,439	32	5	19	2,039
Person	326	60	914	21	2	13	1,336
Container	12		6				18
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	384	123	1,385	27	5	18	1,942
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	2		5			1	8
Money	1		11				12
Drugs	24	8	58			1	91
Alcohol	7	2	40		1		50
Other Contraband	13		8				21
Other Evidence of Crime	6	4	12				22
Other Property	12	1	28	1		1	43
Vehicle	350	113	1,285	26	4	17	1,795
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	3,449	879	2,418	956	27	101	7,830
Citation	24,325	3,124	14,103	3,280	145	632	45,609
Arrest - Total	311	53	921	19	2	12	1,318
Booking - Yes	276	45	847	16	2	12	1,198
Booking - No	63	10	126	12			211
Release From Custody	4		8				12
Field Interview Completed	231	34	608	12	2	12	899
None	27	5	14	5		1	52

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVB - Valley Traffic Division**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	137	40	202	13	1	5	398
GENDER							
Male	91	34	146	7	1	4	283
Female	46	6	56	6		1	115
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	25	5	43	3			76
18 - 25	51	24	93	6	1	4	179
26 - 35	23	7	39	1			70
36 - 45	20	2	19	2		1	44
46 - 55	11	2	7	1			21
56+	7		1				8
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	111	32	147	9	1	4	304
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	2						2
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	6	3	35	4		1	49
Municipal Code Violation	4		2				6
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual	2		1				3
Call For Service	8		6				14
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)		4					4
Penal Code Violation			3				3
Health & Safety Code Violation	1	1	5				7
Other	3		3				6
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	15	10	47	3		4	79
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	7		12				19
GRANTED?							
Yes	7		12				19
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	19	8	49	3		1	80
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	2		3				5
Odor of Contraband	1		4				5
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	3	2	10	3			18
Incident to Arrest	8	6	16			1	31
Impound Authority	5		12				17
Visible Contraband	1		1				2
Consent	6		10				16
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	10		16				26
Person	14	8	39	3		1	65
Container			1				1
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	11	2	26	3			42
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons			1				1
Money							0
Drugs	6	2	9				17
Alcohol			1				1
Other Contraband	1		3				4
Other Evidence of Crime	1		1				2
Other Property	1			3			4
Vehicle	5		13				18
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	23	7	20	3			53
Citation	95	22	136	7	1	1	262
Arrest - Total	12	8	23			1	44
Booking - Yes	8	6	19			1	34
Booking - No	1	3	5				9
Release From Custody	4	2	4				10
Field Interview Completed	8	3	9			1	21
None	6	4	23	3		3	39

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVB - Valley Traffic Division**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	646	171	688	73	2	18	1,598
GENDER							
Male	476	129	521	50	2	13	1,191
Female	169	42	167	23		5	406
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	13	11	65	2			91
18 - 25	134	36	210	15	1	8	404
26 - 35	156	44	174	29	1	2	406
36 - 45	149	33	136	11		5	334
46 - 55	110	35	69	8		2	224
56+	83	12	34	8		1	138
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	47	9	52	9	1	1	119
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	533	128	479	59	1	16	1,216
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	2		6				8
Municipal Code Violation	11	9	40	2			62
Suspect Flight		1	2				3
Consensual	15	4	36	1			56
Call For Service	20	5	33	1		1	60
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2	4	6				12
Penal Code Violation	7	2	20				29
Health & Safety Code Violation	3	4	11				18
Other	5	5	3	1			14
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	39	31	120	1		1	192
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	13	9	43				65
GRANTED?							
Yes	13	9	43				65
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	39	29	120	1		1	190
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	2	2					4
Odor of Contraband			2				2
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	6	11	17			1	35
Incident to Arrest	26	19	99	1			145
Impound Authority	5	1	8				14
Visible Contraband		3	3				6
Consent	11	7	42				60
Other							0
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	7	2	11				20
Person	37	28	116	1		1	183
Container		1	3				4
Other	1		2				3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	14	10	42				66
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1		2				3
Money	2		3				5
Drugs	3	6	14				23
Alcohol	1	1	7				9
Other Contraband	1	3	10				14
Other Evidence of Crime	1		3				4
Other Property	1		5				6
Vehicle	6	2	10				18
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	98	22	49	19		2	190
Citation	501	122	510	52	2	16	1,203
Arrest - Total	31	22	114	1			168
Booking - Yes	24	20	91				135
Booking - No	7	3	25	1			36
Release From Custody	6	2	20				28
Field Interview Completed	15	17	39	1			72
None	16	3	17	1			37

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVb - Van Nuys Area

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	2,312	658	2,856	214	6	182	6,228
GENDER							
Male	1,530	477	2,293	128	4	128	4,560
Female	782	181	563	86	2	54	1,668
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	48	3	58	2		4	115
18 - 25	508	162	1,088	65	2	45	1,870
26 - 35	612	260	965	55	1	42	1,935
36 - 45	550	152	523	42	2	45	1,314
46 - 55	349	61	176	28		35	649
56+	245	20	46	22	1	11	345
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	1,387	244	1,258	135	1	122	3,147
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	3	1	6			1	11
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	813	337	1,328	72	4	52	2,606
Municipal Code Violation	8	4	16			1	29
Suspect Flight	4		4				8
Consensual	13	11	24				48
Call For Service	24	24	66	3		1	118
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	3	10	13			1	27
Penal Code Violation	33	16	62	2	1	4	118
Health & Safety Code Violation	5	5	17				27
Other	19	6	62	2			89
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	605	276	1,328	44	3	43	2,299
No	1,707	382	1,528	170	3	139	3,929
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	340	221	1,065	19	3	20	1,668
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	260	172	838	11	1	19	1,301
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	169	131	435	6	1	13	755
GRANTED?							
Yes	161	127	422	5	1	13	729
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	302	200	972	14	1	18	1,507
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	41	38	61	1		4	145
Odor of Contraband	4	3	9				16
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	37	23	149	3	1	4	217
Incident to Arrest	98	53	314	6		6	477
Impound Authority	100	49	466	5		4	624
Visible Contraband	4	5	9				18
Consent	149	121	393	5	1	11	680
Other	4	1	6				11
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	226	153	790	9		11	1,189
Person	229	156	663	10	1	16	1,075
Container	19	8	11				38
Other	3	4	2				9
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	159	93	627	8		4	891
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	6	4	14				24
Money	8	6	21			1	36
Drugs	33	30	73				136
Alcohol	1	1	17				19
Other Contraband	8	4	17				29
Other Evidence of Crime	12	7	33				52
Other Property	37	29	108	2		1	177
Vehicle	80	31	407	6		3	527
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	391	196	621	38		21	1,267
Citation	1,776	375	1,950	170	5	151	4,427
Arrest - Total	265	101	553	16		13	948
Booking - Yes	98	51	207	4		5	365
Booking - No	168	49	346	12		8	583
Release From Custody	4	3	15				22
Field Interview Completed	97	80	236	3	1	12	429
None	37	18	69	3		4	131

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVB - Van Nuys Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	113	95	339	2		13	562
GENDER							
Male	82	62	275	1		12	432
Female	31	33	64	1		1	130
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	6	4	44	1		2	57
18 - 25	35	36	208	1		6	286
26 - 35	36	27	66			2	131
36 - 45	30	23	14			1	68
46 - 55	4	5	7			1	17
56+	2					1	3
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	20	11	98	1		6	136
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	3	1	6				10
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	30	32	111			5	178
Municipal Code Violation	4	3	16				23
Suspect Flight	2						2
Consensual	6	7	11				24
Call For Service	17	11	22	1			51
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2	4	16				22
Penal Code Violation	9	17	31			1	58
Health & Safety Code Violation	7	6	18			1	32
Other	13	3	10				26
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	79	66	267	2		9	423
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	44	44	148	1		7	244
GRANTED?							
Yes	42	44	148	1		6	241
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	78	64	218	2		8	370
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	19	13	36				68
Odor of Contraband	3		4				7
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	21	6	37	2			66
Incident to Arrest	20	21	58			2	101
Impound Authority	7		5				12
Visible Contraband	2		4				6
Consent	41	40	136	1		6	224
Other	1	1	3				5
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	30	15	55			2	102
Person	72	64	213	2		8	359
Container	6	2	7				15
Other	3	4	2				9
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	21	16	70			2	109
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1	1	9			1	12
Money	3	3	9				15
Drugs	14	11	24				49
Alcohol			6				6
Other Contraband	4	3	8			1	16
Other Evidence of Crime	4	2	19				25
Other Property	3	4	21				28
Vehicle	4		1				5
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	26	27	61			4	118
Citation	10	5	54			3	72
Arrest - Total	33	32	100			2	167
Booking - Yes	25	29	72			1	127
Booking - No	8	3	28			1	40
Release From Custody	5	2	5			1	13
Field Interview Completed	49	47	121	2		3	222
None	17	12	66			3	98

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVb - Van Nuys Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,422	1,077	2,506	142	10	46	5,203
GENDER							
Male	986	789	2,141	60	8	32	4,016
Female	436	288	365	82	2	14	1,187
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	107	73	574	22		10	786
18 - 25	255	299	855	33	1	10	1,453
26 - 35	350	318	538	30	2	9	1,247
36 - 45	396	252	389	27	4	9	1,077
46 - 55	239	99	121	22	2	6	489
56+	75	36	29	8	1	2	151
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	52	30	64		1		147
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	127	101	165	10		4	407
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	28	26	65	1			120
Municipal Code Violation	238	169	693	57	3	4	1,164
Suspect Flight	7	1	16	1			25
Consensual	195	186	303	5	1	2	692
Call For Service	461	213	658	25	3	26	1,386
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	21	27	44				92
Penal Code Violation	192	229	342	30	2	8	803
Health & Safety Code Violation	50	64	74	4		1	193
Other	52	31	83	9		1	176
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	909	795	1,943	102	7	33	3,789
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	449	459	953	37	6	13	1,917
GRANTED?							
Yes	441	446	926	37	6	11	1,867
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	882	761	1,785	109	7	34	3,578
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	110	149	210	3		3	475
Odor of Contraband	7	5	21				33
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	160	129	373	11		3	676
Incident to Arrest	446	303	749	91	3	25	1,617
Impound Authority	5		10	2		1	18
Visible Contraband	15	13	43	1	1		73
Consent	390	390	875	28	4	9	1,696
Other	12	6	20				38
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	42	22	68	3		5	140
Person	828	735	1,726	86	6	32	3,413
Container	131	65	161	30	1	4	392
Other	71	50	59	25		2	207
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	263	175	498	63	2	11	1,012
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	9	8	44			2	63
Money	22	25	51	38			136
Drugs	87	73	143	4		5	312
Alcohol	25	9	85	1			120
Other Contraband	36	26	60	2			124
Other Evidence of Crime	29	29	66	9	2	2	137
Other Property	116	65	179	14		3	377
Vehicle	1		7	2		1	11
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	257	265	547	9	3	5	1,086
Citation	191	92	351	26		6	666
Arrest - Total	651	418	1,099	101	5	32	2,306
Booking - Yes	427	321	696	53	3	24	1,524
Booking - No	224	97	403	48	2	8	782
Release From Custody	146	70	246	40	2	8	512
Field Interview Completed	580	504	960	44	6	17	2,111
None	106	88	212	4	1	2	413

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVb - West Valley Area

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	4,880	788	3,272	471	15	419	9,845
GENDER							
Male	3,081	560	2,560	294	9	306	6,810
Female	1,799	228	712	177	6	113	3,035
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	140	21	74	12	1	13	261
18 - 25	1,184	232	1,315	139	3	124	2,997
26 - 35	1,068	277	1,028	126	5	86	2,590
36 - 45	1,064	166	542	88	4	89	1,953
46 - 55	818	71	230	64	2	68	1,253
56+	606	21	83	42		39	791
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	2,880	324	1,602	320	6	263	5,395
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1	2	4			2	9
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	1,798	417	1,428	133	8	144	3,928
Municipal Code Violation	15	1	24	2	1		43
Suspect Flight	5	1	4				10
Consensual	11	4	7	1		1	24
Call For Service	70	15	48	3		3	139
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	10	1	9				20
Penal Code Violation	32	9	44	7		2	94
Health & Safety Code Violation	18	4	21	3			46
Other	40	10	81	2		4	137
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	1,280	308	1,566	107	4	101	3,366
No	3,600	480	1,706	364	11	318	6,479
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	727	222	1,215	61	2	49	2,276
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	491	155	821	36	2	27	1,532
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	299	69	389	19	2	12	790
GRANTED?							
Yes	288	67	378	18	2	11	764
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	611	191	1,104	42	2	30	1,980
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	64	24	49	2		2	141
Odor of Contraband	21	5	8				34
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	93	36	210	5		6	350
Incident to Arrest	205	52	241	16	1	9	524
Impound Authority	249	99	747	13	1	15	1,124
Visible Contraband	25	3	17	1		2	48
Consent	288	64	374	18	2	10	756
Other	6	2	8	1			17
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	493	164	956	33	2	25	1,673
Person	416	122	600	30	1	19	1,188
Container	30	8	14			2	54
Other	1	2	3				6
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	356	126	834	23	1	20	1,360
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	11	2	9	3		1	26
Money	6	7	19				32
Drugs	87	23	82	6	1	2	201
Alcohol	9	3	10				22
Other Contraband	27	2	6	3		3	41
Other Evidence of Crime	26	5	20	1			52
Other Property	24	9	32	1			66
Vehicle	221	89	717	11		15	1,053
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	665	195	458	67	2	40	1,427
Citation	3,932	520	2,532	389	13	368	7,754
Arrest - Total	297	79	331	30	1	13	751
Booking - Yes	205	55	216	16	1	9	502
Booking - No	91	24	115	14		4	248
Release From Custody	8	3	7	2		1	21
Field Interview Completed	137	41	168	10		7	363
None	75	20	79	2		3	179

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVb - West Valley Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	203	66	257	10	1	6	543
GENDER							
Male	136	54	209	9	1	4	413
Female	67	12	48	1		2	130
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	24	9	48	1		1	83
18 - 25	86	37	136	6	1	2	268
26 - 35	41	12	50	2		1	106
36 - 45	35	6	14	1			56
46 - 55	12		8			1	21
56+	5	2	1			1	9
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	52	21	91	6	1	2	173
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	2	1	11				14
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	70	29	76	1		1	177
Municipal Code Violation	8	1	16				25
Suspect Flight			3				3
Consensual	9	1	6				16
Call For Service	23	4	12	1		1	41
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2	1	2				5
Penal Code Violation	11	4	22	2		2	41
Health & Safety Code Violation	16	2	8				26
Other	10	2	10				22
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	114	42	167	5		2	330
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	60	18	66	2		1	147
GRANTED?							
Yes	58	18	65	2		1	144
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	115	32	129	5		2	283
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	20	2	15				37
Odor of Contraband	1	1	3				5
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	31	11	38	1		2	83
Incident to Arrest	38	7	40	3		1	89
Impound Authority	8	2	15				25
Visible Contraband	6	3	2				11
Consent	57	18	64	2		1	142
Other	1						1
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	24	8	46	1		1	80
Person	108	30	122	5		2	267
Container	14	3	1				18
Other	3						3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	34	10	55	3		1	103
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	2		3				5
Money			3				3
Drugs	22	7	24	3		1	57
Alcohol	2		8				10
Other Contraband	7		2				9
Other Evidence of Crime	2	2	6				10
Other Property	2	1	4				7
Vehicle	3	1	14				18
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	41	8	38			1	88
Citation	35	5	58	3	1	1	103
Arrest - Total	57	12	65	4		2	140
Booking - Yes	42	8	50	4		2	106
Booking - No	15	4	15				34
Release From Custody	9	3	8			1	21
Field Interview Completed	48	15	84	1		2	150
None	49	26	55	3		1	134

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OVb - West Valley Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,519	373	1,683	105	9	75	3,764
GENDER							
Male	1,127	281	1,462	77	5	60	3,012
Female	392	92	221	28	4	15	752
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	238	109	452	33	1	21	854
18 - 25	345	84	600	21	2	17	1,069
26 - 35	309	86	367	28	3	19	812
36 - 45	365	63	185	10	1	10	634
46 - 55	188	26	51	10	1	5	281
56+	74	5	28	3	1	3	114
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	46	6	46	1		1	100
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	118	27	122	6		12	285
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	29	4	36	3		1	73
Municipal Code Violation	230	72	477	19	1	9	808
Suspect Flight	1		14	1			16
Consensual	179	50	163	2		3	397
Call For Service	643	145	478	52	7	38	1,363
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	30	9	43	1	1		84
Penal Code Violation	118	41	172	12		7	350
Health & Safety Code Violation	73	9	51	2			135
Other	54	10	82	6		4	156
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	869	230	1,157	58	5	38	2,357
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	424	96	431	18	4	13	986
GRANTED?							
Yes	413	94	424	17	4	13	965
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	848	218	908	57	6	40	2,077
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	119	28	87			2	236
Odor of Contraband	11		5				16
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	176	58	208	11	3	8	464
Incident to Arrest	411	108	473	36	5	30	1,063
Impound Authority	6	3	7				16
Visible Contraband	20	1	24				45
Consent	410	93	415	17	4	13	952
Other	19	3	12	2		2	38
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	66	11	39	5		2	123
Person	807	204	889	51	6	39	1,996
Container	92	17	44	5		2	160
Other	49	12	32	3		2	98
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	229	51	213	21	1	8	523
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	38	7	22	1		2	70
Money	11	5	18	6			40
Drugs	108	15	88	2		1	214
Alcohol	8	3	25	1			37
Other Contraband	29	5	32	4	1	2	73
Other Evidence of Crime	40	15	44	5		2	106
Other Property	43	12	44	3		3	105
Vehicle	6	2	3	2			13
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	305	53	347	13	1	8	727
Citation	234	91	332	24		19	700
Arrest - Total	631	173	764	59	8	40	1,675
Booking - Yes	478	114	439	36	5	31	1,103
Booking - No	153	59	324	23	3	9	571
Release From Custody	111	18	207	15	5	8	364
Field Interview Completed	539	128	628	27	5	24	1,351
None	180	45	142	10		7	384

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	46,496	14,337	22,344	10,710	195	2,234	96,316
GENDER							
Male	29,782	9,403	16,891	6,830	133	1,696	64,735
Female	16,714	4,934	5,453	3,879	62	538	31,580
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	447	154	283	56		32	972
18 - 25	9,628	3,438	6,864	2,784	40	549	23,303
26 - 35	14,034	4,657	7,787	3,509	62	627	30,676
36 - 45	10,580	3,401	4,669	2,127	52	500	21,329
46 - 55	6,880	1,834	2,016	1,390	27	352	12,499
56+	4,927	853	725	843	14	174	7,536
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	26,125	6,160	10,341	5,746	130	1,392	49,894
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	68	24	31	14	1	2	140
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	18,474	7,414	10,756	4,513	57	734	41,948
Municipal Code Violation	1,278	306	468	342	3	39	2,436
Suspect Flight	7	4	13			2	26
Consensual	10	14	21	2		3	50
Call For Service	265	135	287	46	3	28	764
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	26	29	25	5		4	89
Penal Code Violation	140	142	207	24	1	19	533
Health & Safety Code Violation	27	17	21	2			67
Other	76	93	173	16		11	369
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	5,175	3,298	5,665	1,158	21	398	15,715
No	41,317	11,038	16,678	9,551	174	1,836	80,594
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	2,676	2,265	4,415	576	12	190	10,134
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1,093	1,501	1,945	176	7	97	4,819
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	486	871	1,061	83	5	65	2,571
GRANTED?							
Yes	462	849	1,034	77	5	63	2,490
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1,645	1,898	3,736	339	10	128	7,756
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	60	285	123	6		4	478
Odor of Contraband	26	48	33	7	1	1	116
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	199	226	314	17	2	22	780
Incident to Arrest	646	482	770	103		49	2,050
Impound Authority	734	676	2,403	184	4	39	4,040
Visible Contraband	22	21	29	3		3	78
Consent	432	791	960	68	5	58	2,314
Other	13	15	23	4		2	57
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	1,085	1,475	3,178	251	8	75	6,072
Person	993	1,280	1,597	161	7	93	4,131
Container	36	32	25	7		5	105
Other	5	5	10			1	21
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	894	942	2,630	205	6	54	4,731
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	18	25	25	3		1	72
Money	18	32	34	3		4	91
Drugs	104	165	120	15	2	8	414
Alcohol	18	16	37	1			72
Other Contraband	26	37	21	3		4	91
Other Evidence of Crime	12	39	40	3		5	99
Other Property	65	79	103	8	1	7	263
Vehicle	687	628	2,335	178	3	29	3,860
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	9,027	3,694	4,358	2,324	22	324	19,749
Citation	36,526	9,910	17,036	8,237	169	1,831	73,709
Arrest - Total	1,073	785	1,157	197	4	71	3,287
Booking - Yes	655	453	654	103	1	48	1,914
Booking - No	424	337	509	97	3	23	1,393
Release From Custody	70	31	42	8		14	165
Field Interview Completed	940	742	1,037	159	8	66	2,952
None	204	194	223	47		7	675

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	535	886	1,102	108	6	36	2,673
GENDER							
Male	365	648	905	76	4	30	2,028
Female	170	238	197	32	2	6	645
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	54	74	206	10		3	347
18 - 25	229	409	591	55	4	23	1,311
26 - 35	141	214	193	22	2	6	578
36 - 45	70	124	73	6		2	275
46 - 55	30	50	36	11		2	129
56+	11	15	3	4			33
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	256	259	492	69	1	16	1,093
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	3	6	11	2			22
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	123	331	294	17	3	5	773
Municipal Code Violation	28	28	38	2		3	99
Suspect Flight	1	4	9				14
Consensual	10	25	29	3			67
Call For Service	30	59	57	5		2	153
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	6	14	15	2		5	42
Penal Code Violation	53	120	107	7	1	3	291
Health & Safety Code Violation	18	13	14	1			46
Other	7	27	36	1	1	2	74
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	186	551	610	42	2	22	1,413
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	88	275	300	21		8	692
GRANTED?							
Yes	84	271	299	21		8	683
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	179	501	542	35	2	21	1,280
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	19	88	68	4			179
Odor of Contraband	7	22	24	2			55
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	38	100	125	7		8	278
Incident to Arrest	68	155	133	11	2	6	375
Impound Authority	13	19	46	1			79
Visible Contraband	10	12	23	1			46
Consent	81	245	283	18		8	635
Other	2	4	7	1			14
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	45	111	149	10			315
Person	160	476	495	33	2	21	1,187
Container	13	25	15	2		1	56
Other	1	2	3	1			7
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	59	124	151	10		6	350
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	2	16	18	2		1	39
Money	5	10	3			1	19
Drugs	16	61	39	8			124
Alcohol	9	9	22	1			41
Other Contraband	11	18	12				41
Other Evidence of Crime	11	13	27	1		4	56
Other Property	7	13	8			1	29
Vehicle	10	12	38				60
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	82	151	129	18		5	385
Citation	259	189	400	52	2	15	917
Arrest - Total	102	228	197	16	2	8	553
Booking - Yes	69	171	124	12	2	6	384
Booking - No	33	56	76	4	2	171	342
Release From Custody	22	37	18	2		2	81
Field Interview Completed	150	359	428	26	3	12	978
None	50	153	148	12	1	5	369

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS**

OWB

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	8,377	8,405	8,811	628	119	267	26,607
GENDER							
Male	6,674	6,934	7,727	463	97	215	22,110
Female	1,703	1,471	1,082	165	22	52	4,495
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	400	780	2,123	87	1	27	3,418
18 - 25	1,235	1,600	2,689	152	23	62	5,761
26 - 35	2,032	1,820	1,945	152	23	58	6,030
36 - 45	2,425	2,162	1,276	115	47	62	6,087
46 - 55	1,652	1,622	610	75	19	43	4,021
56+	633	421	168	47	6	15	1,290
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	343	304	283	31	1	15	977
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1,353	1,109	1,092	130	9	60	3,753
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	108	215	182	5	1	2	513
Municipal Code Violation	2,552	2,153	2,907	94	45	37	7,788
Suspect Flight	10	52	43			1	106
Consensual	538	1,031	810	25	5	9	2,418
Call For Service	2,012	1,746	1,667	211	33	100	5,769
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	79	139	143	7	1	3	372
Penal Code Violation	730	1,045	1,095	86	12	28	2,996
Health & Safety Code Violation	254	301	198	16	3	3	775
Other	400	310	390	23	9	9	1,141
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	3,287	4,760	5,121	314	48	136	13,666
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	1,426	2,187	2,247	109	20	54	6,043
GRANTED?							
Yes	1,390	2,122	2,202	107	18	53	5,892
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	3,085	4,400	4,410	288	46	127	12,356
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	370	790	358	6	4	9	1,537
Odor of Contraband	30	43	56	2			131
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	679	925	1,020	50	7	30	2,711
Incident to Arrest	1,572	1,912	1,931	189	33	80	5,717
Impound Authority	9	12	14		1	1	37
Visible Contraband	109	86	97	9	2	3	306
Consent	1,294	1,993	2,064	78	17	45	5,491
Other	71	50	44	9			174
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	48	68	85	10	3	9	223
Person	2,969	4,308	4,329	275	45	123	12,049
Container	356	300	238	14	8	9	925
Other	119	118	92	19	1	8	357
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	691	919	886	60	13	31	2,600
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	55	62	87	3	2	2	211
Money	52	68	50	4	1	5	180
Drugs	254	370	238	19	3	7	891
Alcohol	128	76	162	17	4	3	390
Other Contraband	147	238	110	10	1	4	510
Other Evidence of Crime	71	133	183	11	3	9	410
Other Property	144	142	151	6	6	11	460
Vehicle	5	12	18			1	36
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	1,307	1,587	1,366	58	12	26	4,356
Citation	1,757	1,391	2,281	200	11	81	5,721
Arrest - Total	3,939	3,647	4,058	270	84	109	12,107
Booking - Yes	1,525	2,061	1,711	181	33	73	5,584
Booking - No	2,419	1,588	2,348	90	51	36	6,532
Release From Custody	2,265	1,300	1,548	69	49	30	5,261
Field Interview Completed	3,252	3,737	3,756	227	56	112	11,140
None	478	754	553	39	2	9	1,835

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - Hollywood Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	3,523	1,320	2,128	478	16	183	7,648
GENDER							
Male	2,589	1,043	1,780	332	13	161	5,918
Female	934	277	348	146	3	22	1,730
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	28	8	31	1		5	73
18 - 25	958	392	755	143	2	73	2,323
26 - 35	1,355	536	783	186	8	55	2,923
36 - 45	745	257	414	81	4	24	1,525
46 - 55	310	105	121	50	2	24	612
56+	127	22	24	17		2	192
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	1,590	457	887	229	10	96	3,269
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	5	6	3	2			16
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	1,766	745	1,053	233	4	65	3,866
Municipal Code Violation	29	10	22				61
Suspect Flight	2		1			2	5
Consensual	2	2	2			1	7
Call For Service	30	21	33	1	2	3	90
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	8	7	5	1		2	23
Penal Code Violation	76	50	81	10		12	229
Health & Safety Code Violation	2	5	4	1			12
Other	13	17	37	1		2	70
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	767	532	845	90	5	75	2,314
No	2,756	788	1,283	388	11	108	5,334
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	509	411	681	57	3	54	1,715
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	304	265	441	20	3	42	1,075
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	171	154	258	12	3	31	629
GRANTED?							
Yes	165	149	256	12	3	31	616
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	373	318	538	36	3	44	1,312
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	27	44	20	1		3	95
Odor of Contraband	8	7	6	2			23
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	73	65	115	5		12	270
Incident to Arrest	146	103	150	9		16	424
Impound Authority	140	114	224	19		6	503
Visible Contraband	7	7	8			1	23
Consent	164	149	255	12	3	31	614
Other	6	2	7			1	16
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	255	225	412	27	2	24	945
Person	275	252	393	19	3	40	982
Container	21	14	13	3		4	55
Other		2				1	3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	198	168	298	22	1	10	697
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	12	6	4	1		1	24
Money	5	10	10			1	26
Drugs	37	25	21	3		2	88
Alcohol	4	2	8	1			15
Other Contraband	13	16	7			2	38
Other Evidence of Crime	6	9	9	1		2	27
Other Property	26	21	25	3		1	76
Vehicle	122	100	233	16	1	3	475
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	557	279	348	51	1	36	1,272
Citation	2,772	908	1,597	417	14	125	5,833
Arrest - Total	215	152	222	16		20	625
Booking - Yes	149	106	134	11		17	417
Booking - No	66	46	88	5		3	208
Release From Custody	34	14	19			6	73
Field Interview Completed	374	225	327	47	3	34	1,010
None	52	28	52	5		1	138

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - Hollywood Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	218	254	259	22	1	16	770
GENDER							
Male	155	183	220	18		15	591
Female	63	71	39	4	1	1	179
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	12	15	46	3			76
18 - 25	109	148	154	12	1	11	435
26 - 35	64	66	43	6		4	183
36 - 45	20	17	10				47
46 - 55	10	4	6	1		1	22
56+	3	4					7
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	93	71	118	11		9	302
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1	1	3				5
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	69	80	57	4		4	214
Municipal Code Violation	8	4	11	1			24
Suspect Flight		1					1
Consensual	4	3	3				10
Call For Service	5	17	12	2			36
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2	7	3				12
Penal Code Violation	30	62	41	3	1	2	139
Health & Safety Code Violation	4	2	2	1			9
Other	2	6	9			1	18
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	80	146	164	9	1	10	410
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	32	56	79	3		1	171
GRANTED?							
Yes	32	56	79	3		1	171
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	80	144	157	8	1	10	400
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	10	8	17	1			36
Odor of Contraband	4	7	5	2			18
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	22	34	57	3		6	122
Incident to Arrest	30	73	29	3	1	3	139
Impound Authority	7	6	10	1			24
Visible Contraband	3	5	14				22
Consent	32	55	79	3		1	170
Other	1		2				3
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	20	29	39	1			89
Person	77	136	149	8	1	10	381
Container	7	12	6	1		1	27
Other	1	1	1				3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	31	41	45	3		2	122
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		6	7	1		1	15
Money	5	7	3			1	16
Drugs	8	15	11	2			36
Alcohol	5	2	4	1			12
Other Contraband	7	9	5				21
Other Evidence of Crime	6	4	12	1		1	24
Other Property	5	6	4				15
Vehicle	6	4	10				20
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	23	34	39			2	98
Citation	127	79	103	11		6	326
Arrest - Total	47	93	46	4	1	4	195
Booking - Yes	31	79	30	2	1	4	147
Booking - No	16	14	16	2			48
Release From Custody	14	12	5	2		1	34
Field Interview Completed	67	115	101	4	1	6	294
None	15	27	28	5		3	78

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - Hollywood Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	2,824	2,961	2,637	99	63	67	8,651
GENDER							
Male	2,307	2,439	2,374	77	51	57	7,305
Female	517	522	263	22	12	10	1,346
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	65	87	387	7		8	554
18 - 25	467	725	933	28	14	18	2,185
26 - 35	896	863	708	27	16	16	2,526
36 - 45	810	745	394	21	18	13	2,001
46 - 55	427	443	182	14	11	9	1,086
56+	159	98	33	2	4	3	299
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	71	68	53	3	1	2	198
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	437	431	295	20	6	9	1,198
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	39	48	38			1	126
Municipal Code Violation	895	849	986	16	30	16	2,792
Suspect Flight	5	5	12				22
Consensual	233	289	193	5	1	4	725
Call For Service	638	498	464	33	14	15	1,662
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	23	35	49	2		2	111
Penal Code Violation	325	545	400	18	8	14	1,310
Health & Safety Code Violation	120	98	80	2	2	1	303
Other	38	95	67		1	3	204
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1,423	1,730	1,620	53	28	45	4,899
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	642	726	791	17	13	21	2,210
GRANTED?							
Yes	630	711	781	17	12	21	2,172
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	1,372	1,682	1,512	50	25	45	4,686
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	224	358	120	3	3	7	715
Odor of Contraband	17	19	19	1			56
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	342	385	380	10	3	12	1,132
Incident to Arrest	700	855	638	36	18	29	2,276
Impound Authority	5	2	7		1		15
Visible Contraband	41	27	28		2	1	99
Consent	621	698	775	17	11	21	2,143
Other	25	14	20	1			60
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	20	16	33	2	2	3	76
Person	1,355	1,672	1,506	50	25	45	4,653
Container	146	118	78	7	3	2	354
Other	36	41	29	1	1	4	112
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	295	400	289	10	6	11	1,011
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	34	22	28			1	85
Money	28	31	16	1		1	77
Drugs	127	154	93	5	2	7	388
Alcohol	30	25	42		1		98
Other Contraband	80	117	37	1		3	238
Other Evidence of Crime	30	67	58	5	2	2	164
Other Property	57	84	53	2	3	5	204
Vehicle	2	2	9				13
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	516	543	437	7	10	6	1,519
Citation	474	425	424	24	6	16	1,369
Arrest - Total	1,421	1,544	1,404	49	45	37	4,500
Booking - Yes	726	929	642	40	21	23	2,381
Booking - No	693	615	762	9	24	14	2,117
Release From Custody	726	621	708	10	24	14	2,103
Field Interview Completed	1,588	1,682	1,446	61	41	37	4,855
None	196	232	163	6	1	2	600

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - Pacific Area

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	5,512	2,672	3,383	1,103	46	319	13,035
GENDER							
Male	3,630	1,747	2,536	723	36	260	8,932
Female	1,882	925	847	380	10	59	4,103
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	61	40	53	8		6	168
18 - 25	1,182	676	1,048	285	14	71	3,276
26 - 35	1,665	838	1,079	327	13	99	4,021
36 - 45	1,290	624	740	216	13	70	2,953
46 - 55	843	360	337	188	5	47	1,780
56+	471	134	126	79	1	26	837
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	2,960	1,019	1,568	669	33	184	6,433
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	6	6	1				13
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	2,363	1,517	1,646	398	13	123	6,060
Municipal Code Violation	58	24	30	24		6	142
Suspect Flight	3	1	4				8
Consensual	4	4	5				13
Call For Service	47	36	30	5		1	119
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	9	9	11	2			31
Penal Code Violation	31	33	43	3		3	113
Health & Safety Code Violation	15	4	6	1			26
Other	16	19	39	1		2	77
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	921	650	816	134	8	43	2,572
No	4,588	2,022	2,566	969	38	276	10,459
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	508	443	632	58	4	21	1,666
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	300	264	357	23	3	11	958
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	138	133	173	10	1	4	459
GRANTED?							
Yes	130	126	166	9	1	4	436
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	342	332	475	26	3	14	1,192
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	22	62	30	1			115
Odor of Contraband	11	10	10	2	1		34
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	61	55	69	2	2	2	191
Incident to Arrest	124	92	128	11		7	362
Impound Authority	128	137	254	8	1	5	533
Visible Contraband	5	2	4	1			12
Consent	122	108	157	6	1	3	397
Other		1	3	1			5
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	244	253	378	18	2	8	903
Person	231	210	261	17	3	10	732
Container	3	5	3	1			12
Other	2		4				6
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	175	182	306	12	2	6	683
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	5	6	4				15
Money	5	7	4	1		1	18
Drugs	31	25	28	2	2		88
Alcohol	4	4	8				16
Other Contraband	10	4	5	1			20
Other Evidence of Crime	4	10	7				21
Other Property	10	18	15	2		1	46
Vehicle	119	130	254	9		5	517
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	638	431	383	86	1	20	1,559
Citation	4,644	2,070	2,816	991	43	289	10,853
Arrest - Total	267	179	252	25	3	12	738
Booking - Yes	127	86	101	11	1	5	331
Booking - No	140	94	153	14	2	7	410
Release From Custody	13	8	6	3		1	31
Field Interview Completed	119	102	131	4	1	2	359
None	70	53	55	13		3	194

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - Pacific Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	142	159	305	15	4	3	628
GENDER							
Male	94	129	236	8	4	2	473
Female	48	30	69	7		1	155
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	26	23	55	1			105
18 - 25	52	63	162	4	2	2	285
26 - 35	37	33	51	7	2		130
36 - 45	18	28	25	2		1	74
46 - 55	7	11	11				29
56+	2	1	1	1			5
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	50	45	155	11	1	3	265
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		2	1				3
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	33	56	76	2	2		169
Municipal Code Violation	17	17	13				47
Suspect Flight	1		1				2
Consensual	5	2	6	1			14
Call For Service	11	14	7				32
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2	2	6	1			11
Penal Code Violation	11	17	25				53
Health & Safety Code Violation	11	2	5				18
Other	1	2	10		1		14
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	56	89	126	7		1	279
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	30	34	50	2			116
GRANTED?							
Yes	28	33	50	2			113
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	51	67	103	4			225
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	5	18	16	1			40
Odor of Contraband	2	2	11				15
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	5	18	24	1			48
Incident to Arrest	23	15	33	1			72
Impound Authority	3	4	4				11
Visible Contraband	4	1	1				6
Consent	26	31	45	2			104
Other			1				1
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	12	22	20	1			55
Person	48	63	96	4			211
Container		1	4				5
Other			1				1
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	16	20	29	1			66
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1	5	3				9
Money		1					1
Drugs	6	5	9	1			21
Alcohol	2	4	7				13
Other Contraband		2	3				5
Other Evidence of Crime	4	5	5				14
Other Property	1	3	1				5
Vehicle	2	2	3				7
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	31	25	29	3			88
Citation	51	47	162	8	2	3	273
Arrest - Total	34	30	49	1			114
Booking - Yes	22	20	27	1			70
Booking - No	13	10	22				45
Release From Custody	5		7				12
Field Interview Completed	44	73	85	5	1	1	209
None	11	15	21	1	1		49

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - Pacific Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	2,610	1,737	1,993	143	45	74	6,602
GENDER							
Male	2,029	1,419	1,691	106	36	63	5,344
Female	581	318	302	37	9	11	1,258
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	156	254	476	11	1	5	903
18 - 25	352	289	571	31	4	15	1,262
26 - 35	599	316	394	27	6	14	1,356
36 - 45	830	446	309	42	25	23	1,675
46 - 55	485	328	186	17	7	11	1,034
56+	188	104	57	15	2	6	372
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	109	49	74	5		5	242
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	184	98	128	28	1	14	453
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	48	46	36	1	1	1	133
Municipal Code Violation	922	508	649	15	14	6	2,114
Suspect Flight		12	9				21
Consensual	171	153	132	15	4	3	478
Call For Service	544	404	431	57	12	38	1,486
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	36	35	33	2	1	1	108
Penal Code Violation	233	179	243	13	3	3	674
Health & Safety Code Violation	96	125	60	3	1	2	287
Other	268	128	198	4	8	1	607
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	960	895	1,026	71	13	35	3,000
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	399	373	359	39	5	13	1,188
GRANTED?							
Yes	387	352	344	38	4	13	1,138
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	832	787	778	70	14	30	2,511
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	87	137	85	2	1		312
Odor of Contraband	9	8	16				33
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	173	190	213	9	2	8	595
Incident to Arrest	434	317	368	47	12	23	1,201
Impound Authority	4	1	2				7
Visible Contraband	16	14	23				53
Consent	327	316	299	18	4	5	969
Other	19	9	7	2			37
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	16	12	17	3	1		49
Person	804	776	758	70	13	30	2,451
Container	100	56	49	2	3	1	211
Other	40	12	22	1			75
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	164	147	143	7	3	3	467
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	13	10	21	1	1	1	47
Money	5	11	11		1		28
Drugs	79	69	44	3	1		196
Alcohol	25	7	19		2		53
Other Contraband	33	40	12	2	1	1	89
Other Evidence of Crime	17	22	27		1	1	68
Other Property	19	15	32	1	1	1	69
Vehicle	2	2	2				6
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	334	291	247	13	1	6	892
Citation	410	276	482	33	1	19	1,221
Arrest - Total	1,457	785	1,029	61	34	29	3,395
Booking - Yes	405	346	341	48	8	24	1,172
Booking - No	1,055	438	687	13	26	5	2,224
Release From Custody	959	334	459	14	25	2	1,793
Field Interview Completed	648	609	630	42	10	29	1,968
None	146	118	95	12	1	2	374

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - West Los Angeles Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	5,770	1,021	1,845	733	13	470	9,852
GENDER							
Male	3,551	642	1,356	389	6	336	6,280
Female	2,219	379	489	344	7	134	3,572
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	107	11	23	4		13	158
18 - 25	1,077	260	493	223	4	113	2,170
26 - 35	1,446	328	652	221	2	128	2,777
36 - 45	1,330	236	407	137	6	95	2,211
46 - 55	1,002	132	205	88	1	83	1,511
56+	808	54	65	60		38	1,025
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	4,623	647	1,283	587	12	384	7,536
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	1						1
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	1,038	330	474	138	1	64	2,045
Municipal Code Violation	28	6	12	3		7	56
Suspect Flight		1	2				3
Consensual	1		1			1	3
Call For Service	52	17	36	3		7	115
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	5	2	4			2	13
Penal Code Violation	11	10	16	1		3	41
Health & Safety Code Violation	7		2				9
Other	4	8	15	1		2	30
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	628	259	442	59	2	85	1,475
No	5,141	762	1,403	674	11	385	8,376
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	285	165	308	29	2	44	833
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	132	119	187	9		22	469
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	64	71	104	4		15	258
GRANTED?							
Yes	58	70	101	4		14	247
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	181	150	251	15	1	29	627
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	6	16	11			1	34
Odor of Contraband	3	3	5				11
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	38	26	39	1		8	112
Incident to Arrest	53	23	67	5		7	155
Impound Authority	70	60	130	10	1	12	283
Visible Contraband	4		4			1	9
Consent	52	64	95	4		12	227
Other	2	3	3				8
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	125	122	216	12	1	19	495
Person	111	88	146	7		19	371
Container	5	3	4	1		1	14
Other	1		2				3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	91	76	158	10	1	18	354
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1		4				5
Money	3	2	4			1	10
Drugs	9	7	15	1		3	35
Alcohol	3		6				9
Other Contraband	2	1	2			2	7
Other Evidence of Crime	1	3	7			3	14
Other Property	17	19	30	1		2	69
Vehicle	61	50	104	8	1	7	231
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	413	166	201	52		23	855
Citation	5,240	797	1,538	672	13	423	8,683
Arrest - Total	95	32	104	10		13	254
Booking - Yes	47	17	49	5		6	124
Booking - No	51	15	57	6		7	136
Release From Custody	19	4	9			7	39
Field Interview Completed	162	114	160	15	2	21	474
None	24	16	23	5		1	69

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - West Los Angeles Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS							
	56	65	105	8		11	245
GENDER							
Male	38	51	93	4		8	194
Female	18	14	12	4		3	51
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	5	9	20	3		3	40
18 - 25	28	37	50	3		6	124
26 - 35	13	11	25			2	51
36 - 45	7	4	7	2			20
46 - 55	3	3	3				9
56+		1					1
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	22	23	39	2		3	89
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	2		1	1			4
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	8	15	34				57
Municipal Code Violation	3	2	10				15
Suspect Flight		1	2				3
Consensual							0
Call For Service	8	11	10	2		2	33
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	1	1	1		5	9
Penal Code Violation	7	8	5	2			22
Health & Safety Code Violation	2		1				3
Other	3	4	2	1		1	11
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	28	47	56	5		7	143
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	16	24	21	1		4	66
GRANTED?							
Yes	15	24	21	1		4	65
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	25	39	40	4		7	115
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	2	1	6				9
Odor of Contraband	1	1					2
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	9	15	13	1		2	40
Incident to Arrest	6	7	10	2		2	27
Impound Authority	1	2	3				6
Visible Contraband	1		1				2
Consent	14	22	19			4	59
Other				1			1
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	2	4	11	1			18
Person	22	37	35	3		7	104
Container	3	3	1				7
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	6	6	10	1		4	27
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	1						1
Money							0
Drugs	1	4	1	1			7
Alcohol	1		2				3
Other Contraband	1	2					3
Other Evidence of Crime	1	1	2			3	7
Other Property	1	1	3			1	6
Vehicle	1	1	2				4
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	5	14	13			1	33
Citation	18	7	21	3		5	54
Arrest - Total	9	8	17	4		3	41
Booking - Yes	6	7	8	3		2	26
Booking - No	2	1	11	1		1	16
Release From Custody	2	1				1	4
Field Interview Completed	26	41	63	4		4	138
None	8	6	14				28

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - West Los Angeles Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,824	1,043	940	68	6	74	3,955
GENDER							
Male	1,491	910	828	49	6	57	3,341
Female	333	133	111	19		17	613
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	141	124	200	12		7	484
18 - 25	215	163	287	18	3	19	705
26 - 35	235	155	197	22		18	627
36 - 45	492	216	140	6	2	13	869
46 - 55	541	289	85	6	1	12	934
56+	200	96	31	4		5	336
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	105	63	46	3		6	223
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	258	161	55	12	1	13	500
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	9	12	21	3			45
Municipal Code Violation	600	286	317	10		9	1,222
Suspect Flight	3	15	7				25
Consensual	41	39	42			2	124
Call For Service	588	317	258	31	4	34	1,232
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	14	23	29	1			67
Penal Code Violation	113	90	104	5	1	6	319
Health & Safety Code Violation	22	10	8				40
Other	72	27	52	3		4	158
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	521	466	492	26	4	34	1,543
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	175	184	172	6		13	550
GRANTED?							
Yes	169	177	168	6		13	533
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	530	435	456	26	4	33	1,484
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	12	29	28	1		1	71
Odor of Contraband	1	3	2				6
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	129	132	127	9	2	6	405
Incident to Arrest	278	195	207	14	2	18	714
Impound Authority		1	1			1	3
Visible Contraband	49	25	29	1		2	106
Consent	154	161	148	5		13	481
Other	14	11	2				27
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	7	7	12	1		3	30
Person	470	399	418	23	4	30	1,344
Container	73	44	49	1		5	172
Other	35	33	21	1		4	94
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	181	112	121	5	3	13	435
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	5	5	5		1		16
Money	16	12	10	1		2	41
Drugs	22	15	15	2			54
Alcohol	67	29	46	1		2	145
Other Contraband	21	15	7				43
Other Evidence of Crime	19	22	12	2		4	59
Other Property	64	35	40	2	2	5	148
Vehicle	1	2	2			1	6
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	212	157	160	7		5	541
Citation	417	216	165	20	2	22	842
Arrest - Total	821	415	438	23	3	31	1,731
Booking - Yes	220	178	149	17	3	18	585
Booking - No	604	237	291	7		13	1,152
Release From Custody	540	213	227	7		10	997
Field Interview Completed	781	530	514	36	3	29	1,893
None	56	30	29	1		3	119

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - West Traffic Division**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	29,826	6,373	11,890	6,815	101	1,151	56,156
GENDER							
Male	18,811	3,783	8,657	4,341	64	850	36,506
Female	11,015	2,590	3,233	2,474	37	301	19,650
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	231	43	108	33		7	422
18 - 25	6,068	1,302	3,369	1,769	17	268	12,793
26 - 35	8,934	2,000	4,225	2,303	31	306	17,799
36 - 45	6,762	1,612	2,580	1,345	26	288	12,613
46 - 55	4,457	893	1,149	821	17	183	7,520
56+	3,374	523	459	544	10	99	5,009
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	15,776	3,033	5,255	3,143	60	656	27,923
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	49	10	16	10	1	2	88
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	12,665	3,021	6,075	3,318	36	449	25,564
Municipal Code Violation	1,158	259	384	309	3	25	2,138
Suspect Flight	1						1
Consensual	2	1		1			4
Call For Service	121	29	135	22	1	16	324
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	3						3
Penal Code Violation	11	5	6	4			26
Health & Safety Code Violation	3	1	2				6
Other	37	14	17	8		3	79
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	2,621	699	2,349	639	5	174	6,487
No	27,205	5,674	9,541	6,176	96	977	49,669
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	1,231	334	1,780	303	3	58	3,709
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	265	76	242	44	1	13	641
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	62	27	92	7	1	7	196
GRANTED?							
Yes	59	24	88	6	1	7	185
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	630	254	1,619	167	3	31	2,704
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation		2					2
Odor of Contraband		2	3			1	6
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	16	12	19				47
Incident to Arrest	279	56	209	45		15	604
Impound Authority	348	200	1,438	124	2	15	2,127
Visible Contraband	4					1	5
Consent	48	18	57	5	1	5	134
Other	5		3	1		1	10
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	368	210	1,468	130	3	18	2,197
Person	295	71	229	47	1	16	659
Container	2	1	1				4
Other	2		2				4
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	364	215	1,457	125	2	17	2,180
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		1	1				2
Money	4	6	13	2		1	26
Drugs	5	2	1			1	9
Alcohol	4	1	3				8
Other Contraband		2	1				3
Other Evidence of Crime			1				1
Other Property	10	11	23	2	1	3	50
Vehicle	346	199	1,434	122	1	13	2,115
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	7,181	1,907	2,770	1,985	18	229	14,090
Citation	22,313	4,407	8,900	4,785	83	904	41,392
Arrest - Total	393	90	261	66		17	827
Booking - Yes	293	57	214	45		16	625
Booking - No	103	33	48	22		1	207
Release From Custody	2		1				3
Field Interview Completed	153	32	138	27	1	4	355
None	37	10	20	5		2	74

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - West Traffic Division**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	Total
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	80	28	53	27		2	190
GENDER							
Male	57	20	33	18		1	129
Female	23	8	20	9		1	61
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	8		2				10
18 - 25	29	10	33	16		1	89
26 - 35	18	7	4	2			31
36 - 45	14	3	8	1		1	27
46 - 55	6	3	5	5			19
56+	5	5	1	3			14
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	77	25	44	24		1	171
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		1	1				2
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	1	1	6	3		1	12
Municipal Code Violation		1					1
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual							0
Call For Service			1				1
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1						1
Penal Code Violation	1						1
Health & Safety Code Violation							0
Other			1				1
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	4	2	5				11
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	1	2	2				5
GRANTED?							
Yes		2	2				4
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	5	2	9				16
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation							0
Odor of Contraband							0
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	2						2
Incident to Arrest	1	1	3				5
Impound Authority			5				5
Visible Contraband	1						1
Consent		1	1				2
Other	1						1
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	2		7				9
Person	4	2	3				9
Container			1				1
Other							0
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	2	1	6				9
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons							0
Money							0
Drugs			1				1
Alcohol	1						1
Other Contraband	1						1
Other Evidence of Crime							0
Other Property		1					1
Vehicle			5				5
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	15	3	4	7		1	30
Citation	58	24	46	20		1	149
Arrest - Total	2	1	3				6
Booking - Yes	1	1	2				4
Booking - No	1		1				2
Release From Custody							0
Field Interview Completed	2	1	3				6
None	5						5

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - West Traffic Division**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	461	94	145	68		24	792
GENDER							
Male	324	70	111	37		15	557
Female	137	24	34	31		9	235
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	1		13				14
18 - 25	119	17	42	21		6	205
26 - 35	138	26	50	21		4	239
36 - 45	89	25	20	8		5	147
46 - 55	67	21	12	8		8	116
56+	47	5	8	10		1	71
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	47	11	23	8		1	90
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	387	64	90	57		20	618
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation		2	5				7
Municipal Code Violation	8		3				11
Suspect Flight							0
Consensual		3	2				5
Call For Service	6	9	14	3		2	34
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	4						4
Penal Code Violation	4	3	3				10
Health & Safety Code Violation	1	1	1				3
Other	4	1	4			1	10
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	14	5	17	1		1	38
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	4	1	7	1			13
GRANTED?							
Yes	3	1	6	1			11
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	9	6	16	1		1	33
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation			1				1
Odor of Contraband							0
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	2	3	3				8
Incident to Arrest	5		8	1		1	15
Impound Authority		1	2				3
Visible Contraband			1				1
Consent	3	1	4				8
Other	1	2					3
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle		1	3				4
Person	8	4	14	1		1	28
Container	1						1
Other		1	1				2
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	2	2	5			1	10
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons			2				2
Money	1					1	2
Drugs							0
Alcohol	1						1
Other Contraband							0
Other Evidence of Crime			1			1	2
Other Property	1	1					2
Vehicle		1	2				3
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	85	19	22	8		4	138
Citation	362	66	108	59		18	613
Arrest - Total	5		9			1	15
Booking - Yes	4		5			1	10
Booking - No	2		4				6
Release From Custody	1		1				2
Field Interview Completed	11	6	7	1		1	26
None	5	4	6				15

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - Wilshire Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	DRIVER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	1,865	2,950	3,097	1,580	19	111	9,622
GENDER							
Male	1,201	2,188	2,562	1,044	14	89	7,098
Female	664	762	535	535	5	22	2,523
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	20	52	68	10		1	151
18 - 25	343	808	1,199	364	3	24	2,741
26 - 35	634	954	1,048	472	8	39	3,155
36 - 45	453	672	527	347	3	23	2,025
46 - 55	268	344	204	243	2	15	1,076
56+	147	120	51	143	3	9	473
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	1,176	1,004	1,347	1,118	15	72	4,732
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	7	2	11	2			22
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	642	1,800	1,508	426	3	33	4,412
Municipal Code Violation	5	7	20	6		1	39
Suspect Flight	1	2	6				9
Consensual	1	7	13	1		1	23
Call For Service	15	32	53	15		1	116
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	1	11	5	1			18
Penal Code Violation	11	44	61	6	1	1	124
Health & Safety Code Violation		7	7				14
Other	6	35	65	5		2	113
DID DRIVER EXIT VEHICLE?							
Yes	238	1,157	1,213	235	1	21	2,865
No	1,627	1,792	1,884	1,344	18	90	6,755
DID YOU ASK DRIVER TO EXIT?							
Yes	143	912	1,014	129		13	2,211
PAT DOWN/FRIK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	92	777	718	79		9	1,675
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	51	486	434	49		8	1,028
GRANTED?							
Yes	50	480	423	45		7	1,005
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	119	843	853	94		10	1,919
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	5	161	62	4			232
Odor of Contraband	4	26	9	3			42
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	11	68	72	9			160
Incident to Arrest	44	208	216	32		4	504
Impound Authority	48	164	357	23		1	593
Visible Contraband	2	12	13	2			29
Consent	46	452	396	41		7	942
Other		9	7	2			18
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	93	664	704	64		6	1,531
Person	81	659	568	70		8	1,386
Container	5	9	4	2			20
Other		3	2				5
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	66	300	411	36		3	816
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		12	12	2			26
Money	1	7	3				11
Drugs	22	106	55	9		2	194
Alcohol	3	9	12				24
Other Contraband	1	14	6	2			23
Other Evidence of Crime	1	17	16	2			36
Other Property	2	10	10				22
Vehicle	39	148	310	23		1	521
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	238	911	656	150	2	16	1,973
Citation	1,557	1,727	2,184	1,372	16	90	6,946
Arrest - Total	103	332	318	79	1	9	842
Booking - Yes	39	187	156	30		4	416
Booking - No	64	149	163	50	1	5	432
Release From Custody	2	5	7	5			19
Field Interview Completed	132	269	281	65	1	5	753
None	21	87	73	19			200

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - Wilshire Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PASSENGER						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	39	380	380	36	1	4	840
GENDER							
Male	21	265	323	28		4	641
Female	18	115	57	8	1		199
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	3	27	83	3			116
18 - 25	11	151	192	20	1	3	378
26 - 35	9	97	70	7			183
36 - 45	11	72	23	1			107
46 - 55	4	29	11	5		1	50
56+	1	4	1				6
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	14	95	136	21			266
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation		2	5	1			8
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	12	179	121	8	1		321
Municipal Code Violation		4	4	1		3	12
Suspect Flight		2	6				8
Consensual	1	20	20	2			43
Call For Service	6	17	27	1			51
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)		4	5				9
Penal Code Violation	4	33	36	2		1	76
Health & Safety Code Violation	1	9	6				16
Other	1	15	14				30
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	18	267	259	21	1	4	570
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	9	159	148	15		3	334
GRANTED?							
Yes	9	156	147	15		3	330
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	18	249	233	19	1	4	524
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	2	61	29	2			94
Odor of Contraband		12	8				20
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk		33	31	2			66
Incident to Arrest	8	59	58	5	1	1	132
Impound Authority	2	7	24				33
Visible Contraband	1	6	7	1			15
Consent	9	136	139	13		3	300
Other		4	4				8
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	9	56	72	7			144
Person	9	238	212	18	1	4	482
Container	3	9	3	1			16
Other		1	1	1			3
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	4	56	61	5			126
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons		5	8	1			14
Money		2					2
Drugs	1	37	17	4			59
Alcohol		3	9				12
Other Contraband	2	5	4				11
Other Evidence of Crime		3	8				11
Other Property		2					2
Vehicle	1	5	18				24
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	8	75	44	8		1	136
Citation	5	32	68	10			115
Arrest - Total	10	96	82	7	1	1	197
Booking - Yes	9	64	57	6	1		137
Booking - No	1	31	26	1		1	60
Release From Custody	1	24	6				31
Field Interview Completed	11	129	176	13	1	1	331
None	11	105	85	6		2	209

07/01/2004 - 12/31/2004

**LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
FIELD DATA STATISTICS
OWB - Wilshire Area**

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	PEDESTRIAN						Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Ind.	Other	
NUMBER OF DRIVERS	653	2,563	3,085	250	5	28	6,584
GENDER							
Male	520	2,090	2,712	194	4	23	5,543
Female	133	473	372	56	1	5	1,040
APPARENT AGE							
1 - 17	37	313	1,044	57		7	1,458
18 - 25	82	405	855	54	2	4	1,402
26 - 35	162	459	591	55	1	6	1,274
36 - 45	201	728	411	38	2	8	1,388
46 - 55	132	540	145	30		3	850
56+	39	118	39	16			212
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP							
Vehicle Code Moving Violation	11	113	87	12		1	224
Vehicle Code Pedestrian Violation	87	355	524	13	1	4	984
Vehicle Code Equipment/Registration Violation	12	107	82	1			202
Municipal Code Violation	127	510	952	53	1	6	1,649
Suspect Flight	2	20	15			1	38
Consensual	93	547	441	5		1,086	2,172
Call For Service	236	518	500	87	3	11	1,355
Department Briefing (Crime Broadcast, Bulletins, Roll Call)	2	44	31	2			79
Penal Code Violation	54	228	343	50		5	680
Health & Safety Code Violation	15	67	49	11			142
Other	14	54	61	16			145
PAT DOWN/FRISK SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	367	1,658	1,957	163	3	21	4,169
DETAINEE ASKED TO SUBMIT TO CONSENSUAL SEARCH?							
Yes	206	900	915	46	2	7	2,076
GRANTED?							
Yes	201	879	900	45	2	6	2,033
WAS SEARCH CONDUCTED?							
Yes	340	1,483	1,639	141	3	18	3,624
IF WARRANTLESS SEARCH CONDUCTED, SEARCH							
Parole/Probation	46	263	123			1	433
Odor of Contraband	3	13	19	1			36
Incident to Pat Down/Frisk	33	214	295	22		4	568
Incident to Arrest	154	542	704	91	1	9	1,501
Impound Authority		7	2				9
Visible Contraband	3	20	16	8			47
Consent	189	816	837	38	2	6	1,888
Other	12	14	15	6			47
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS SEARCHED?							
Vehicle	5	31	19	4		3	62
Person	330	1,451	1,624	131	3	17	3,556
Container	36	81	61	4	2	1	185
Other	7	29	17	16			69
WAS ANYTHING DISCOVERED/SEIZED?							
Yes	49	256	325	38	1	3	672
IF SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED, WHAT WAS DISCOVERED?							
Weapons	3	25	31	2			61
Money	2	14	13	2		1	32
Drugs	26	132	85	9			252
Alcohol	5	15	55	16	1	1	93
Other Contraband	13	66	54	7			140
Other Evidence of Crime	5	20	84	4		1	114
Other Property	3	7	26	1			37
Vehicle		5	2				7
ACTION TAKEN:							
Warning	160	577	500	23	1	5	1,266
Citation	94	406	1,099	64	2	6	1,671
Arrest - Total	232	897	1,168	137	2	11	2,447
Booking - Yes	167	602	564	76	1	7	1,417
Booking - No	65	298	604	61	1	4	1,033
Release From Custody	39	132	153	38		4	366
Field Interview Completed	220	904	1,151	87	2	16	2,380
None	75	369	259	20		2	725

***Consent Decree
Arrest, Discipline, Use of Force,
Field Data Capture, and Audit Statistics***

July 1, 2004 – December 31, 2004

This semiannual public report has been prepared pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 156. That paragraph states:

The LAPD shall prepare and publish on its website semiannual public reports by this paragraph. Such reports shall include aggregate statistics broken down by each LAPD geographic area and for the Operations Headquarters Bureau, and broken down by race/ethnicity/national origin of citizens involved, for arrests, information required to be maintained pursuant to paragraphs 104 and 105, and uses of force. Such reports shall include a brief description of each of the following that was completed during that period: (i) report of a specified audit completed, audits completed pursuant to paragraphs 111, 113, 125, 126, 130, 133, and 134, and any significant actions taken as a result of such audits or reports, (ii) a summary of all discipline imposed during the period reported by type of misconduct, broken down by type of discipline, bureau and rank, and (iii) any new policies or changes in policies made by the Department to address the requirements of this Agreement. Such reports shall also include the reports prepared pursuant to paragraph 173 and 175.

Section I

Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stop Data

Section II

Statistics

Section III

Audit Summaries

Section IV

New Policies / Changes In Policies

Section V

City Report

Sustained Allegations by Bureau

For Complaints Closed Between July 1, 2004 and December 31, 2004.

Classification	Total	OCB	OSB	OWB	OVB	DB	SOB	OO	OHR	OSS*	OCOP*	PC
Neglect of Duty	347	57	46	73	51	12	8	0	7	78	15	0
Unbecoming Conduct	240	69	30	37	57	15	3	0	3	20	6	0
Preventable Traffic Collision	201	51	39	34	41	10	4	2	3	8	8	1
Failure to Qualify	86	8	15	27	15	3	3	0	9	1	4	1
False Statements	58	38	5	6	3	0	2	0	1	3	0	0
Failure to Appear	49	9	11	12	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Discourtesy	47	8	8	6	7	7	0	0	1	8	2	0
Domestic Violence	31	7	7	1	10	0	4	0	0	2	0	0
Alcohol Related	21	3	4	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unauthorized Force	21	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fail to Report Misconduct	21	17	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual Misconduct	20	7	1	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dishonesty	14	2	2	1	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Insubordination	13	5	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
Improper Remark	10	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
Unlawful Search	8	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
False Imprisonment	8	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Unauthorized Tactics	8	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Theft	7	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Narcotics/Drugs	6	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Accidental Discharge	5	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Misleading Statements	4	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Bias	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Off-duty Altercation	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ethnic Remark	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shooting Violation	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Policy/Rule	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retaliation	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1235	321	182	224	238	49	26	2	29	125	37	2

* Note: OSS includes ICSB, FTSB, and TEAMS; OCOP includes CDB, CIMB, COSPS, DEACT, and UNK.

Key to Bureau

CDB Consent Decree Bureau
 COSPS Chief of Staff/Professional Standards
 DEACT Deactivated
 ICSB Information and Communication Services Bureau
 OCOP Office of Chief of Police
 OO Office of Operations
 OSS Office of Support Services
 OWB Operations-West Bureau
 SOB Special Operations Bureau
 UNK Unknown

CIMB Critical Incident Management Bureau
 DB Detective Bureau
 FTSB Fiscal and Technical Services Bureau
 OCB Operations-Central Bureau
 OHR Office of Human Resources
 OSB Operations-South Bureau
 OVB Operations-Valley Bureau
 PC Police Commission
 TEAMS TEAMS II Development

Sustained Allegations by Discipline Imposed

For Complaints Closed Between July 1, 2004 and December 31, 2004.

Classification	Total	REM	TERM	RESIG	DEMOT	RBOR	RCOMP	SUSP	INACT	OR	ADMON	WARN	NP	NA
Neglect of Duty	347	6	2	42	3	16	1	160	0	27	65	0	17	8
Unbecoming Conduct	240	24	0	70	1	24	0	84	0	8	15	0	11	3
Preventable Traffic Collision	201	0	0	3	0	0	0	53	0	24	103	0	18	0
Failure to Qualify	86	0	0	2	0	0	0	17	0	4	51	0	12	0
False Statements	58	9	1	37	0	6	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Failure to Appear	49	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	1	35	0	4	0
Discourtesy	47	1	0	3	0	2	0	24	0	4	13	0	0	0
Domestic Violence	31	10	0	6	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	0
Alcohol Related	21	0	0	4	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unauthorized Force	21	0	0	12	0	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	3
Fail to Report Misconduct	21	0	0	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0
Sexual Misconduct	20	1	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dishonesty	14	3	0	5	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insubordination	13	0	0	8	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Improper Remark	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4	0	0	0	0
Unlawful Search	8	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0
False Imprisonment	8	0	0	5	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unauthorized Tactics	8	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0
Theft	7	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Narcotics/Drugs	6	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Accidental Discharge	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Misleading Statements	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Bias	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Off-duty Altercation	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Ethnic Remark	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shooting Violation	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Policy/Rule	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retaliation	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1235	55	3	254	6	61	1	413	0	74	285	0	68	15

Key to Discipline

ADMON	Admonishment	DEMOT	Demotion	INACT	Inactive
NA	No Action	NP	No Penalty	OR	Official Reprimand
RBOR	Removed on Prior Board	RCOMP	Discharged on Prior Complaint	REM	Discharged/Removed/Transferred
RESIGN	Resign/Retire	SUSP	Suspension	TERM	Termination on Probation
WARN	Warning				

Sustained Allegations by Rank

For Complaints Closed Between July 1, 2004 and December 31, 2004.

Classification	Total	STAFF	CAPT	LT	SGT	DET	PO3	PO2	PO1	RES	UNK	CIVIL
Neglect of Duty	347	1	0	8	24	23	57	132	12	4	7	79
Unbecoming Conduct	240	0	0	3	21	27	41	118	4	1	3	22
Preventable Traffic Collision	201	3	0	3	20	16	45	102	5	2	0	5
Failure to Qualify	86	0	0	1	7	13	20	34	6	5	0	0
False Statements	58	0	0	0	1	7	11	34	1	0	0	4
Failure to Appear	49	0	0	0	0	0	8	35	6	0	0	0
Discourtesy	47	0	0	0	1	3	13	20	0	2	0	8
Domestic Violence	31	0	0	0	0	0	8	21	0	0	0	2
Alcohol Related	21	0	0	0	0	8	0	13	0	0	0	0
Unauthorized Force	21	0	0	0	1	0	7	10	0	0	3	0
Fail to Report Misconduct	21	0	0	0	1	0	11	9	0	0	0	0
Sexual Misconduct	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0
Dishonesty	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	6
Insubordination	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	0	0	0	2
Improper Remark	10	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	3
Unlawful Search	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	0	0	0	0
False Imprisonment	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0
Unauthorized Tactics	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0
Theft	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	1
Narcotics/Drugs	6	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Accidental Discharge	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0
Misleading Statements	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Gender Bias	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Off-duty Altercation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Ethnic Remark	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Shooting Violation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Other Policy/Rule	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Retaliation	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1235	4	0	15	89	105	242	584	35	15	14	132

Key to Rank Abbreviations

STAFF Staff Officer (Commander, Deputy Chief, Chief of Police)
 CAPT Captain
 LT Lieutenant
 SGT Sergeant
 DET Detective

PO1, PO2, PO3 Police Officer (1, 2, 3)
 RES Reserve Officer
 UNK Unknown Officer
 CIVIL Civilian Employee

Arrests By Geographic Areas - Total Numbers
From July 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004

Division	Ethnicity					Total
	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Other	
Central Area	4	3,511	1,554	500	490	6,059
Rampart Area	19	1,262	2,853	526	545	5,205
Southwest Area	6	2,858	1,020	87	444	4,415
Hollenbeck Area	8	87	2,207	69	301	2,672
Harbor Area	10	428	1,704	548	329	3,019
Hollywood Area	14	1,887	1,778	1,765	719	6,163
Wilshire Area	28	1,180	1,306	281	464	3,259
West LA Area	1	430	449	819	160	1,859
Van Nuys Area	33	520	1,536	708	411	3,208
West Valley Area	11	274	1,195	989	344	2,813
Northeast Area	44	282	2,455	520	302	3,603
77th Street Area	3	2,864	964	65	580	4,476
Newton Area	5	1,934	2,389	194	349	4,871
Pacific Area	8	1,071	1,323	1,699	371	4,472
N. Hollywood Area	4	284	1,465	816	278	2,847
Foothill Area	5	301	2,099	497	252	3,154
Devonshire Area	50	429	2,148	1,011	395	4,033
Southeast Area	0	1,931	761	34	425	3,151
TOTALS	253	21,533	29,206	11,128	7,159	69,279

Arrests By Geographic Areas - Percentage
From July 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004

Division	Total	Ethnicity				
		Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Other
Central Area	6,059	0.1%	57.9%	25.6%	8.3%	8.1%
Rampart Area	5,205	0.4%	24.2%	54.8%	10.1%	10.5%
Southwest Area	4,415	0.1%	64.7%	23.1%	2.0%	10.1%
Hollenbeck Area	2,672	0.3%	3.3%	82.6%	2.6%	11.3%
Harbor Area	3,019	0.3%	14.2%	56.4%	18.2%	10.9%
Hollywood Area	6,163	0.2%	30.6%	28.8%	28.6%	11.7%
Wilshire Area	3,259	0.9%	36.2%	40.1%	8.6%	14.2%
West LA Area	1,859	0.1%	23.1%	24.2%	44.1%	8.6%
Van Nuys Area	3,208	1.0%	16.2%	47.9%	22.1%	12.8%
West Valley Area	2,813	0.4%	9.7%	42.5%	35.2%	12.2%
Northeast Area	3,603	1.2%	7.8%	68.1%	14.4%	8.4%
77th Street Area	4,476	0.1%	64.0%	21.5%	1.5%	13.0%
Newton Area	4,871	0.1%	39.7%	49.0%	4.0%	7.2%
Pacific Area	4,472	0.2%	23.9%	29.6%	38.0%	8.3%
N. Hollywood Area	2,847	0.1%	10.0%	51.5%	28.7%	9.8%
Foothill Area	3,154	0.2%	9.5%	66.6%	15.8%	8.0%
Devonshire Area	4,033	1.2%	10.6%	53.3%	25.1%	9.8%
Southeast Area	3,151	0.0%	61.3%	24.2%	1.1%	13.5%

**Arrests by Other Bureaus & Divisions
From July to December 31, 2004**

Division	Ethnicity					Total
	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Other	
Operations Headquarters Bureau	0	1	2	3	2	8
Detective Support Division	1	246	233	98	111	689
Bunco Forgery Division	1	21	19	23	20	84
Robbery Homicide Division	0	14	10	2	4	30
Burglary Auto Theft Division	0	16	44	9	21	90
Juvenile Divison	1	116	363	48	42	570
Metropolitan Division	0	876	268	173	205	1,522
Narcotics Division	3	1,441	1,300	624	398	3,766
Total Arrests	6	2,731	2,239	980	803	6,759

Report Prepared By LAPD - Information Technology Division

CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE STATISTICS
JULY 1, 2004 TO DECEMBER 31, 2004

NUMBER OF SUSPECT'S DESCENT BY DIVISION

BUREAU'S	ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	LATIN	OTHER	TOTAL
CENTRAL						
Central	0	1	0	0	0	1
Hollenbeck	0	1	0	4	0	5
Newton	0	0	0	2	0	2
Northeast	0	0	1	0	0	1
Rampart	0	0	0	7	0	7
CTD	0	0	0	0	0	0
SEU	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total	0	2	1	13	0	16
SOUTH						
77th	0	1	0	3	0	4
Harbor	0	0	1	1	0	2
Southeast	0	2	0	2	0	4
Southwest	0	0	0	0	0	0
STD	0	0	0	0	0	0
SEU	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total	0	3	1	6	0	10
VALLEY						
Devonshire	0	1	1	0	0	2
Foothill	0	0	0	1	0	1
North Hollywood	0	1	0	1	0	2
Van Nuys	0	1	0	1	0	2
West Valley	0	0	0	0	0	0
VTD	0	0	0	0	0	0
SEU	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total	0	3	1	3	0	7
WEST						
Hollywood	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wilshire	0	3	1	3	0	7
WTD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total	0	3	1	3	0	7
DETECTIVE						
CCD	0	0	0	0	0	0
DSD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Juvenile	0	0	0	0	0	0
Narcotics	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER BURS/DIVS						
FTSB - Jail	0	2	1	1	0	4
PSB - IAG	0	0	0	1	0	1
SOB - CSOC	0	2	0	1	0	3
SOB - Metro	0	1	0	0	0	1
CIMB - SIS	0	0	1	1	0	2
Sub-Total	0	5	2	4	0	11
Totals	0	16	6	29	0	51

NON-CATEGORICAL USE OF FORCE STATISTICS
JULY 1, 2004 TO DECEMBER 31, 2004

NUMBER OF SUSPECT'S DESCENT BY DIVISION

BUREAU'S	ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	LATIN	OTHER	TOTAL
CENTRAL						
Central	1	33	6	12	1	53
Hollenbeck	0	0	0	36	0	36
Newton	0	26	2	30	0	58
Northeast	1	4	4	18	1	28
Rampart	0	11	3	21	0	35
CTD	0	0	0	1	1	2
SEU	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total	2	74	15	118	3	212
SOUTH						
77th	0	64	3	18	0	85
Harbor	0	9	3	13	0	25
Southeast	1	55	0	17	0	73
Southwest	0	52	1	17	0	70
STD	0	0	0	0	0	0
SEU	0	1	0	2	0	3
Sub-Total	1	181	7	67	0	256
VALLEY						
Devonshire	2	8	17	24	2	53
Foothill	1	6	11	40	0	58
North Hollywood	1	3	6	8	0	18
Van Nuys	0	6	12	21	1	40
West Valley	2	6	13	12	0	33
VTD	0	0	2	4	0	6
SEU	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total	6	29	61	109	3	208
WEST						
Hollywood	0	12	10	13	1	36
Pacific	3	10	10	10	0	33
West Los Angeles	0	3	5	5	2	15
Wilshire	4	28	3	21	0	56
WTD	0	1	0	1	0	2
Sub-Total	7	54	28	50	3	142
DETECTIVE						
CCD	0	1	0	0	0	1
DSD	0	1	0	0	0	1
Juvenile	0	0	0	1	0	1
Narcotics	0	2	0	0	0	2
Sub-Total	0	4	0	1	0	5
OTHER BURS/DIVS						
FTSB - Jail	0	2	0	3	0	5
OHR - OHR	0	1	0	0	0	1
SOB - CSOC	0	4	1	4	0	9
SOB - Metro	0	16	3	14	1	34
Sub-Total	0	23	4	21	1	49
Totals	16	365	115	366	10	872

Note: The numbers reflect the reports that have been processed thru February 1, 2005.

***Consent Decree
Arrest, Discipline, Use of Force,
Field Data Capture, and Audit Statistics***

July 1, 2004 – December 31, 2004

This semiannual public report has been prepared pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 156. That paragraph states:

The LAPD shall prepare and publish on its website semiannual public reports by this paragraph. Such reports shall include aggregate statistics broken down by each LAPD geographic area and for the Operations Headquarters Bureau, and broken down by race/ethnicity/national origin of citizens involved, for arrests, information required to be maintained pursuant to paragraphs 104 and 105, and uses of force. Such reports shall include a brief description of each of the following that was completed during that period: (i) report of a specified audit completed, audits completed pursuant to paragraphs 111, 113, 125, 126, 130, 133, and 134, and any significant actions taken as a result of such audits or reports, (ii) a summary of all discipline imposed during the period reported by type of misconduct, broken down by type of discipline, bureau and rank, and (iii) any new policies or changes in policies made by the Department to address the requirements of this Agreement. Such reports shall also include the reports prepared pursuant to paragraph 173 and 175.

Section I

Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stop Data

Section II

Statistics

Section III

Audit Summaries

Section IV

New Policies / Changes In Policies

Section V

City Report

CONSENT DECREE MANDATED AUDIT SUMMARIES

First and Second Quarter, Fiscal Year 2004/05 Prepared by Audit Division

Summaries of significant findings for all audits submitted during the First and Second Quarters of Fiscal Year 2004/05 are detailed below.

SUBMITTED IN FIRST QUARTER

Categorical Use of Force Investigations Final Report¹

The Categorical Use of Force Investigations Final Audit Report examined compliance with five Consent Decree paragraphs for 36 Categorical Use of Force investigations that occurred from January 2003 through September 2003. Problems were found with the adequacy of 50 percent of the investigations, as well as the review process. The audit recommended that both Force Investigation Division (FID) and the Use of Force Review Section hire civilian audit staff and that FID consider several suggestions when structuring its policies, including the development and implementation of a review process incorporating a more detailed review and evaluation of each Categorical Use of Force case by uninvolved employee(s) or unit prior to submission to the commanding officer. The review and evaluation should utilize a checklist or other instrument to aid the process.

Arrest, Booking, and Charging Reports (Including Juvenile Detention Procedures)

The Arrest, Booking, and Charging audit revealed that the Department remains strong in the areas of completeness and authenticity. The Department, however, needs improvement in the areas of underlying actions and conformance with Department procedures. The most common concerns pertain to the issuance of Receipts for Property Taken Into Custody and the articulation of Miranda Admonitions and subsequent responses in the associated arrest reports. These deficiencies were compounded by the failure of supervisors to identify and correct them during post-incident review. In response to these issues, the Standardized Quarterly Supervisor Training Program for the Third Quarter of 2004 included training on report review and approval; the issuance of Receipt for Property Taken Into Custody; and, supervisor responsibility. The Standardized Roll Call Training for Deployment Period No. 10, 2004, addressed the proper completion of forms relating to arrests, e.g., Receipt for Property Taken Into Custody. It was recommended that future Department training include improved articulation of probable cause to seize an item of evidence and the articulation of Miranda Admonition in Department reports. Further, the Director of the Office of Operations should review current operational procedures in order to improve the post-incident review of reports and to increase accountability.

Foreign Language/Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD)

This audit evaluated the effectiveness of Department personnel in providing telephonic service to non-English speaking, deaf, or hearing-impaired citizens. These are the first such audits conducted by geographic bureaus; previous audits were conducted by Audit Division. The results indicated that the Department has improved slightly in its level of service to non-English

¹ A summary of the Categorical Use of Force Interim Report was included in the report for audits submitted in the Third and Fourth Quarters of Fiscal Year 2003/04.

speaking individuals. However, the Department is still encountering problems completing three-way telephone calls among foreign language speakers, Communications Division, and an interpreter. A majority of the problems appear to be caused by a lack of familiarity with the procedure for completing a three-way call. The audit finding did reveal a slight improvement in the Department's level of service to deaf and hearing-impaired individuals. Department employees are becoming more familiar with the procedures and the use of the TDD equipment. It is recommended that Area commanding officers identify experienced officers who can provide desk personnel with hands-on training of proper TDD procedures. Geographic bureau commanding officers have reviewed the findings of their respective audits and directed appropriate action to address the deficiencies.

877 ASK-LAPD Menu Options

This audit focused on menu options offered for the non-emergency number 877 ASK-LAPD, e.g., the English and Spanish speaking menus; hearing impaired portions; and, the Zip Code Locator feature. The audit showed that applications for English and Spanish menus, including the Zip Code Locator, performed satisfactorily. There were, however, deficiencies regarding the TDD functions. These issues are being addressed with the cooperation of SBC.

Gang Enforcement Detail Pattern Assessment Audit Supplemental

The Gang Enforcement Detail Work Product Pattern Assessment Audit Supplemental was a further review of the Gang Enforcement Detail Work Product Audit completed the Second Quarter of FY 2003/04. That audit determined that the work product of five officers assigned to two Areas required further review, and this supplemental audit included a review of work products completed by these officers. The audit revealed that there were no patterns of conduct such as those identified in the Rampart Board of Inquiry.² Furthermore, no risk management concerns were identified.

Gang Enforcement Detail Work Product Pattern Assessment

The Gang Enforcement Detail Work Product Pattern Assessment Audit was a further review of the Gang Enforcement Detail Work Product Audit completed the Third Quarter of FY 2003/04. That audit revealed potential patterns of canned or boilerplate verbiage within arrest reports of four individual officers, predicated further review. This review determined whether the underlying actions of the involved officers were appropriate, legal, and in conformance with Department Policy. The further review showed no established patterns of inappropriate behaviors by the four officers.

Summaries of Statements Follow-Up for the Non-Categorical Use of Force and Gang Enforcement Detail Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports Audit Supplemental

The Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports Audit, Second Quarter of FY 2003/04, and the Gang Enforcement Detail Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports Audit Supplemental, Fourth Quarter of FY 2003/04, could not determine Consent Decree compliance regarding Objective No. 7,

² The pattern of elements identified by the Board of Inquiry includes spontaneous statements; consent searches, discarded evidence; and, Miranda waivers immediately followed by incriminating statements.

“Evaluation of Recorded Statements when Compared to Investigator’s Summaries.” This objective required a comparison of summaries of witness statements to recorded statements (referred to as “tapes”). Due to a lack of Department-wide controls in the storage of tapes, a significant number of tapes were not available for review. Consequently, a determination of compliance of Objective No. 7 was withheld.³ For this follow-up audit, renewed attempts were made to locate tapes from the two audits. For the Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports Audit, Second Quarter, over 20 percent of the tapes still were not found, thus precluding determination of overall Department compliance with Objective No. 7. For the Gang Enforcement Detail Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports Audit Supplemental, Fourth Quarter, the two outstanding tapes were found. A follow-up analysis of the tapes revealed 100 percent compliance with Objective No. 7.

Based on recommendations documented in the Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports Audit, Second Quarter, the Department has already taken action to resolve tracking deficiencies. On May 26, 2004, the Department issued Special Order No. 13, “Non-Categorical Use of Force Reporting – Revised,” requiring the booking of all tape recordings at Scientific Investigation Division; the issuing of tape numbers; and, the documentation of tape numbers in the Non-Categorical Use of Force Report. The Use of Force Review Section continues to enforce these requirements.

The audit summarized below was due in the Second Quarter of FY 2003/04, but was submitted to the Chief of Police in the First Quarter of FY 2004/05

Calls Involving the Mentally Ill

This is the Department’s first detailed review of its Mental Health Crisis Response Program. The areas of evaluation for this audit are established in the Consent Decree mandates. These mandates include evaluation of the handling and tracking of calls and incidents involving persons who appear to be mentally ill and the implementation of new policies, procedures, and training methods. The audit results led to the following recommendations. A scenario-based training program should be developed for all patrol officers at the divisional level, under the supervision of the Training Group. The Mental Evaluation Unit should be expanded to provide staffing 20 hours a day, seven days a week. The System-wide Mental Assessment Response Team (SMART) should be expanded to provide one SMART team per bureau, 20 hours a day, seven days a week. This expansion would enable patrol officers to turn the subject over to the SMART team and return to patrol functions. Finally, Audit Division should conduct future audits.

³ Overall Department compliance for audits required by the Consent Decree is achieved when 95 percent of the incidents or reports/documents examined are in compliance with Consent Decree mandates.

SUBMITTED IN SECOND QUARTER

Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations No. 1

Audit Division conducted an audit of the complaint process to assess the Los Angeles Police Department's compliance with the requirements of the CD. The audit was divided into two phases. Phase 1 covered (1) the complaint investigative resources, (2) public accessibility, and (3) complaint administration. Phase 2, a separate audit to be issued the Third Quarter of FY 2004/05, will assess complaint investigation quality. Phase 1 showed the Department either met or exceeded CD requirements in all audited areas with the exceptions of Paragraphs 95 (Professional Standards Bureau staffing) and Paragraph 79 (Ten-Day Review of Face Sheets by Internal Affairs Group). However, Audit Division concluded that the Department substantially met core objectives of these two paragraphs based on analysis of overall factors.

Detective Support Division (DSD) has been experiencing failures with the telephone equipment it uses to operate the 24-hour complaint hotline. Detective Support Division has requested that Information and Communications Services Bureau make the necessary repairs. The requisition to replace the DSD telephones has been approved.

Use of Training Evaluation and Management Systems (TEAMS) Data

This audit, conducted by Personnel Group, assessed the Department's compliance with respect to CD Paragraph 51a (review of Internal Affairs Group Form 1.80 and complaint files, in conjunction with TEAMS I records for personnel selection to Critical Incident Investigation Division or Internal Affairs Group investigators) and 51c (prompt review of TEAMS I records by a watch commander or supervisor for officer transfers into a new Area/Division). In addition, the audit monitored compliance with Special Order Nos. 23 and 24, 2003. Special Order No. 23, entitled "Criteria for Transfers/Loans of Sworn Personnel," addresses CD Paragraph 51c. Special Order No. 24, entitled "Selection and Assignment of Professional Standards Bureau," addresses CD Paragraphs 51a and c.

In order to assess the Department's compliance with CD Paragraph 51a, the auditors examined the total population of sworn personnel that transferred into Professional Standards Bureau and Critical Incident Investigation Division during the audit time period. No sworn personnel transferred into Critical Incident Investigation Division during the audit time period. The findings revealed that Professional Standards Bureau personnel were aware of and in compliance with Special Order Nos. 23 and 24, 2003.

With regards to CD Paragraph 51c, a total of 26 different entities were identified as having sworn personnel transferring in during the audit time period. Ten entities were randomly selected as sites that the auditors visited and examined the TEAMS Evaluation Report and associated record keeping practices. The remaining 16 entities were contacted via Intradepartmental Correspondence and were directed to provide copies of the concerned TEAMS Evaluation Reports. Of the ten Areas/Divisions visited, nine had very well organized systems for processing and maintaining the TEAMS Evaluation Reports. Nine completed the TEAMS

reports. Each Area/Division had at least one person who was responsible for ensuring that the reports were completed. The process for completing reports was consistent. All files examined were well maintained. Of the remaining Areas/Divisions initially contacted by Intradepartmental Correspondence, one Area did not submit copies of TEAMS printouts with the TEAMS Evaluation Reports; and one Area completed two reports for the same officer (officer had two different serial numbers).

Other issues included three Areas/Divisions not using the correct version of the TEAMS Report in the TEAMS evaluation process and another having TEAMS Evaluation Reports signed by the commanding officer's lieutenant as opposed to the commanding officer.

The audit recommended that all personnel assigned to process the TEAMS report review the instructions for completing the forms to ensure proper completion. It was further recommended that Planning and Research Division review Special Order Nos. 23 and 24, 2003, regarding who is required to sign the TEAMS Evaluation Report. The orders do not clearly state whether a commanding officer or a designee must sign the form.

Supervisor and Field Training Officer (FTO) Training (Including SEU Units)

This audit was conducted by the Quality Assurance Unit, Training Group. The audit revealed that the Department does not have any formal method to ensure that Police Officer IIIs who are not working as FTOs, but subsequently lateral into the assignment, receive the requisite FTO training prior to being placed into FTO positions at patrol divisions. Further, the Department's patrol divisions maintained copies of the TEAMS I or TEAMS II Evaluation Report in greater than 95% of the audit population. However, only two of the new officers working as FTOs had received the requisite FTO training.

The Department's training needs assessment process reasonably identified FTO training curriculum needs and included instructor training, and/or training regarding Department policies and procedures related to training probationary officers. Training for FTOs also included periodic training and retraining based on reasonable needs assessment. Yet, none of the FTOs had a Personnel Evaluation Report that documented FTO training and competency. Further, only four officers had the requisite trainer evaluation and only one had a current rating. Compliance with rating completion was 56 percent.

A review of Continuing Education Delivery Plans (CEDP) 6 and 7.5 showed that the Department had provided training to Department supervisors. The training included instruction on conducting non-categorical use of force investigations and complaint investigations; reviewing reports; incident control; and, ethical decision making. A total of 95.9 percent of Department supervisors attended CEDP 6, while 96.4 percent attended CEDP 7.5. Attendance for both courses was maintained properly.

Sworn supervisors at the rank of detective supervisor or sergeant, who are expected to perform administrative investigations, received requisite training. Overall, the Department achieved a 99.2 percent compliance rate in this area.

Recommendations included the following. All Police Officer IIs and Police Officer IIIs in non-FTO positions who are interested in training probationary officers should attend the 40-hour FTO School at their earliest convenience. A directive should be created that outlines a procedure for Area commanding officers to use to ensure that Police Officers IIIs working as FTOs have attended the requisite training. Training Division should identify and track officers who need to attend FTO update training. A proper process should be implemented for completing Personnel Evaluation Reports for FTOs.

Documentation of Community Outreach Meetings

This audit, conducted by the Community Relations Section, Office of the Chief of Police, reviewed the Community Outreach Meetings documentation from 18 geographic Areas. The audit found that all of the Areas conducted the required Community Outreach meetings as mandated by the CD and correctly forwarded the required documentation to the Community Relations Section.

Secret Service Funds

This audit, conducted by Organized Crime and Vice Division (OCVD), focused on the administration of Secret Service Funds in 18 geographic Area vice units. Auditors interviewed employees in charge of administering the Secret Service Funds to determine their working knowledge of Department-mandated procedures and to ascertain how the funds were being administered. A review of Secret Service Funds documentation was also conducted to assess compliance with Department directives and to gauge the completeness, accuracy, proper maintenance, and timeliness of these documents. This audit revealed an increase of administrative errors in completion of chits from one and a half to eight percent when compared to the April 2004 audit of Secret Service Funds. Of the 11 discrepancies identified, five (45 percent) were failures to include all of the involved officers' serial numbers in the narrative portion of the report. The remaining six (55 percent) had no apparent pattern of inaccuracies.

Where deficiencies were identified, Area vice units were contacted by OCVD. The deficiencies were corrected and appropriate training was provided. Additionally, it was recommended that the Field Evaluators, OCVD, continue to conduct both scheduled and sporadic audits of Area vice units.

Audio Tapes Used in Use of Force and Complaint Investigations

The audit was conducted by the four geographic bureaus and focused on the booking, storage, and accessibility of audio tapes used in Non-Categorical Use of Force (NCUOF) and Complaint Investigations. The findings revealed that audio tapes used in the NCUOF and Complaint Investigations that were booked at Scientific Investigation Division (SID) were locatable and

accessible. With the exception of one NCUOF, all audit tapes reviewed were consistent with paraphrased statements. However, in several cases, audit tapes used in NCUOF investigations Consent Decree Mandated Audit Summaries were either not booked at SID, or were not booked in a timely manner. In several other cases, audio tapes used in Complaint Investigations were not booked at SID, as required, or were retained by either investigating supervisors or Area tape coordinators.

Recommendations were provided to increase Operations-South Bureau geographic Areas' compliance with the Department's guidelines in the storage of audio tapes obtained during NCUOF and Complaint Investigations. The recommendations included a monthly audit of the Tape Inventory conducted by the Tape Coordinator; the timely submission of used tapes to the Division Tape Coordinator; and, the revision of Special Order No. 13, 2004, specifying a required time period during which tapes must be booked.

Supplemental Audit to Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports Audit Supplemental Submitted Fourth Quarter Fiscal Year 2003/04

The quarterly Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Work Product Audits conducted by Audit Division over the past year selected the use of force work products to be included in the GED NCUOF Audit Supplemental for the Fourth Quarter of FY 2003/04. However, the GED Work Product Audit for the Fourth Quarter of FY 2003/04 included six use of force incidents that had not completed the Department review cycle prior to publishing of the GED NCUOF Audit Supplemental. These six NCUOF incidents were evaluated in the current audit. All six (100 percent) were compliant with the relevant Department policy and CD mandates including completeness, authenticity, appropriateness/legality of underlying actions, supervisory oversight, timeliness of investigation, completeness of evidence documentation, and adequacy of investigation.

***Consent Decree
Arrest, Discipline, Use of Force,
Field Data Capture, and Audit Statistics***

July 1, 2004 – December 31, 2004

This semiannual public report has been prepared pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 156. That paragraph states:

The LAPD shall prepare and publish on its website semiannual public reports by this paragraph. Such reports shall include aggregate statistics broken down by each LAPD geographic area and for the Operations Headquarters Bureau, and broken down by race/ethnicity/national origin of citizens involved, for arrests, information required to be maintained pursuant to paragraphs 104 and 105, and uses of force. Such reports shall include a brief description of each of the following that was completed during that period: (i) report of a specified audit completed, audits completed pursuant to paragraphs 111, 113, 125, 126, 130, 133, and 134, and any significant actions taken as a result of such audits or reports, (ii) a summary of all discipline imposed during the period reported by type of misconduct, broken down by type of discipline, bureau and rank, and (iii) any new policies or changes in policies made by the Department to address the requirements of this Agreement. Such reports shall also include the reports prepared pursuant to paragraph 173 and 175.

Section I

Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stop Data

Section II

Statistics

Section III

Audit Summaries

Section IV

New Policies / Changes In Policies

Section V

City Report

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF POLICE

SPECIAL ORDER NO. 17

August 4, 2004

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS ON AUGUST 3, 2004

**SUBJECT: COMPLAINANT ADVISORY, FORM 1.28.10 - ACTIVATED, AND
COMPLAINT FORM, FORM 1.28.0 - REVISED**

PURPOSE: California Law provides members of the public the right to make complaints against Department personnel when they believe an officer's conduct to be inappropriate, including those instances where there is insufficient evidence that misconduct has occurred. This right is an important factor in gaining and continually maintaining the public's trust and confidence in law enforcement, and the Department is committed to the acceptance, thorough and proper investigation and fair adjudication of all such complaints. As such, Department Policy requires that Department employees shall accept, document and investigate all personnel complaints.

California Penal Code (PC) Section 148.6 requires that complainants read and sign an advisory regarding their right to file a complaint against a police officer, as well as certain information regarding complaint procedures. Additionally, this advisory also makes members of the public aware that when they knowingly make a false complaint against a sworn Department employee, the person doing so can be subject to criminal liability. In order to comply with the provisions of 148.6 PC, this Order activates the Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, and revises the Complaint Form, Form 1.28.0.

PROCEDURE:

- I. COMPLAINANT ADVISORY, FORM 1.28.10.** The Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, is activated.
 - A. Use of Form.** This form is used in conjunction with a complaint investigation to advise a complainant of the provisions of California Penal Code Section 148.6.
 - B. Completion.** The Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10 (Attachment 1), shall be completed for each complainant filing a formal complaint against a sworn Department employee.
 - C. Distribution.**

1 - Original to Internal Affairs Group (attached to

the Complaint Form, Form 1.28.0).

1 - Copy to complainant.

2 - TOTAL

II. COMPLAINT FORM, FORM 1.28.0 - REVISED

The Complaint Form, Form 1.28.0 (Attachment 2), has been revised to include a check box used to indicate that the 148.6 PC advisory was given to the complainant. Use and distribution of this form have not changed.

III. SUPERVISOR'S RESPONSIBILITY. In accordance with Special Order No. 1, 2003, the Department will accept, document and investigate all public complaints. When conducting a preliminary investigation of alleged misconduct, the interviewing supervisor shall:

- * Obtain a preliminary statement of the alleged misconduct from the complainant;
- * Require the complainant to read the Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10;
- * Ensure that the complainant understands the elements of 148.6 PC;
- * If the complainant is unable to read the Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, it shall be read to him/her verbatim;
- * Ensure that the complainant understands his/her rights and obligations in the Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10;

Note: This advisory shall not be presented in a way meant to dissuade any citizen from making or retracting a complaint. Personnel are reminded to maintain a professional demeanor at all times. Supervisors are encouraged to tape-record the advisement when feasible.

- * Request that the complainant sign the Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, on the "Complainant (Signature)" line indicating that the complainant understands his/her rights and obligations under the law;
- * Write "refused" on the "Complainant (Signature)" line if the complainant refuses to sign the form;
- * Sign the form on the "Interviewing Supervisor" line; and,

- * Complete a Complaint Form, Form 1.28.0, as directed in Special Order No. 1, 2003.

Note: The Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, is not required when the complaint is Department initiated (i.e., Failure to Appear, Failure to Qualify, Preventable Traffic Collision). However, if the complainant is a Department employee, the Complainant Advisory Form, 128.10, is required.

When a complaint is received by other means (i.e., letter, e-mail, etc.,) the Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, shall be completed upon the initial preliminary interview. When the complaint is received telephonically, the interviewing supervisor shall:

- * Conduct the interview with the complainant telephonically;
- * Read the Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, verbatim to the complainant and explain to him/her the provisions of 148.6 PC;

Note: Supervisors are encouraged to tape-record the advisement when feasible.

- * Sign the Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, on the "Investigating Supervisor" line;
- * Print the complainant's name, if known, or "Anonymous" if unknown, on the "Complainant (Print Name)" line;
- * Write "Telephonic" in place of the complainant's signature on the "Complainant (Signature)" line; and,
- * Mail a copy of the completed Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, to the complainant if their address is known.

IV. WATCH COMMANDER/OIC'S RESPONSIBILITY. In addition to ensuring that all allegation(s) of misconduct are thoroughly investigated in accordance with Special Order No. 1, 2003, the watch commander/OIC shall:

- * Review all Complaint Form(s), Form 1.28.0, and ensure that the Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, has been given; and,
- * Ensure that the check box on Complaint Form, Form 1.28.0, used to indicate receipt of a completed Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, has been checked by the investigating supervisor.

August 4, 2004

FORM AVAILABILTY: The Complainant Advisory, Form 1.28.10, and the revised Complaint Form, Form 1.28.0, will be available for ordering from the Department of General Services, Distribution Center, in approximately 90 days, and will be placed on the Local Area Network (LAN). Copies of the form, in English and Spanish, are attached for duplication and immediate use. Versions in other most commonly used languages will be made available for use. Other versions or self-improvised versions of this form shall not be used.

Note: Until the revised Complaint Form, Form 1.28.0, is available from the Distribution Center or on the LAN, supervisors may duplicate and use the attached copy, or use the old form by indicating on the lower left margin "Complaint Advisory Form Completed and Attached."

AMENDMENTS: This Order amends Sections 3/815.10, 5/128.0, and adds Section 5/1.28.10, to the Department Manual.

AUDIT RESPONSIBILITY: The Commanding Officer, Professional Standards Bureau, shall monitor compliance with this directive in accordance with Department Manual Section 0/080.30.

WILLIAM J. BRATTON
Chief of Police

Attachments

DISTRIBUTION "A"

***Consent Decree
Arrest, Discipline, Use of Force,
Field Data Capture, and Audit Statistics***

July 1, 2004 – December 31, 2004

This semiannual public report has been prepared pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 156. That paragraph states:

The LAPD shall prepare and publish on its website semiannual public reports by this paragraph. Such reports shall include aggregate statistics broken down by each LAPD geographic area and for the Operations Headquarters Bureau, and broken down by race/ethnicity/national origin of citizens involved, for arrests, information required to be maintained pursuant to paragraphs 104 and 105, and uses of force. Such reports shall include a brief description of each of the following that was completed during that period: (i) report of a specified audit completed, audits completed pursuant to paragraphs 111, 113, 125, 126, 130, 133, and 134, and any significant actions taken as a result of such audits or reports, (ii) a summary of all discipline imposed during the period reported by type of misconduct, broken down by type of discipline, bureau and rank, and (iii) any new policies or changes in policies made by the Department to address the requirements of this Agreement. Such reports shall also include the reports prepared pursuant to paragraph 173 and 175.

Section I

Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stop Data

Section II

Statistics

Section III

Audit Summaries

Section IV

New Policies / Changes In Policies

Section V

City Report

**Table 1:
Partial Compliance Paragraphs
(February 2005)**

Paragraph	Subject	Comments
50	TEAMS II Implementation Schedule	The City is in compliance with Paragraph 50(a), 50(b), and 50(c). However, the City cannot comply with the RMIS development schedule for RMIS established in 50 (e) and (f) and has established the most aggressive development schedule practicable with the Contractor.
51	Use of TEAMS pending TEAMS II Development	The meet and confer process regarding Paragraph 51 has been completed and the implementing Orders were published in July 2003. The City is in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 51(a),(b), and (d) as part of the selection review process for the Critical Incident Investigation Division (CIID), Professional Standards Bureau (PSB), and Gang Enforcement Details (GED). The City is in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 51(c) for the selection of new Field Training Officers (FTO); however, a recent audit identified deficiencies with compliance for procedures for lateral transfer of FTO officers. The City has made continued progress toward compliance with the provisions of 51(c) which requires receiving commands to review transferred officers' TEAMS Reports over the past 6-month period. Training regarding review of TEAMS reports of transferred employees was held in December 2003 and January 2004.
54	Annual Performance Evaluations	In September 2003 the meet and confer process regarding annual performance evaluations was completed, with implementing orders being issued by LAPD in September 2003. Due to the LAPD's annual performance evaluation review schedule, the first annual evaluations to be completed under the new procedures were for Sergeants' performance evaluations in January 2004. Police Officer evaluations were completed in September 2004, Lieutenant evaluations in October 2004, and detective evaluations in November 2004. An inspection of the October 2004 police officer evaluations concluded that 90% were completed and 68% were approved by the commanding officer on time. In regard to content, only 25% were judged to appropriately address the topic of civil rights integrity and 63% appropriately addressed community policing. Following the inspection, training was provided to commanding officers to assist them in the completion of detective, lieutenant and sergeant ratings. The Annual Performance Evaluation schedules will be revised in 2005 to facilitate completion of evaluations and improve the content.
62	Supervisors Presence/Absence at Categorical Use of Force/Search Warrant	The City has a 100% compliance rate for completing the required CUOF and search warrant supervisory reviews; however, there is a 97% and 88% compliance rate, respectively, with completing the reviews within the mandated 7-day time frame. CUOF and search warrant audits indicate that documentation of supervisory reviews completed pursuant to Paragraph 62 are not consistently filed in the employee's file for reference during the performance evaluation period. This may reflect confusion as to whether a comment card is required for each CUOF and service of a warrant or only if exceptional performance or issues of concern are identified. The LAPD is working to clarify the comment card procedure.

**Table 1:
Partial Compliance Paragraphs
(February 2005)**

Paragraph	Subject	Comments
63	Referral of Officers to BSS	The City is nearing compliance with this provision. Some documentation issues remain.
70	Supervisory Review of Arrest and Booking Reports	The City is in compliance with booking and arrest reviews required by Paragraph 70(a). The City is working toward compliance with reviews for Penal Code 148 incidents, Paragraph 70(b), with a current documented compliance level of 83%. Paragraph 70 also requires supervisory oversight for compliance with LAPD procedures. A recent audit found supervisory oversight documentation issues resulting in a 71% compliance rate. Paragraph 70(c) was a meet and confer item and will be implemented within the context of annual performance evaluations pursuant to Paragraph 54.
80	Categorical Use of Force and PSB Complaint Investigation Procedures	<u>CUOF Investigations</u> : Significant issues of concern regarding Categorical Use of Force investigations were identified in 2003. LAPD and the OIG have provided training and enhanced oversight over such investigations. In addition, LAPD transitioned responsibility for such investigations to the Professional Standards Bureau in August 2004. These remedies are anticipated to address the CUOF investigative deficiencies identified. The City continues to review these significant issues. <u>Complaint Investigations</u> : The City is largely in compliance with the investigative provisions for misconduct complaint investigations. The last Audit Division audit found compliance for 80(a), (b), (c), (d) (e), and (g) and partial compliance for Paragraph 80 (f). The OIG Audit found compliance for Paragraphs 80(d) and (f) and partial compliance for Paragraphs 80(a), (b), (c), (e), and (g). Biopsies of complaints conducted by IAG from July-December 2004 resulted in an overall 87% compliance rate, with deficiencies mainly involving documentation issues regarding canvassing the scene for witnesses and collection/preservation of evidence.
81	Non-Categorical and Chain-of-Command Complaint Investigation Procedures	<u>Non-Categorical Use of Force Investigations</u> : The City is in compliance with the non-categorical use of force investigation provisions of Paragraph 81. <u>Complaint Investigations</u> : see Paragraph 80 discussion.
108	Confidential Informant Procedures	A CRID inspection in January 2004 assessed 95% compliance and the Independent Monitor's 11th Quarterly Report assessed 98% compliance. However, although a recent LAPD Audit Division audit found appropriate supervisory oversight of the use of confidential informants and 100% compliance rate for Paragraphs 108(a), (b), (d), and (h); 99% compliance for 108(c); 97% compliance 108(g) and (i); 96% compliance for 108(f) and (j); and 94% for 108(e) individually. However, taken in the aggregate the City's compliance rate was determined to be 85%. The majority of the deficiencies identified were documentation related and are being remedied by LAPD, with subsequent compliance review pending the FY 04-05 audit.
114	FTO Selection Criteria	See Paragraph 51 above.
135	OIG Evaluation of LAPD Audits	The OIG continues to experience difficulty in complying with the audit review time frames mandated by the Consent Decree. In winter 2004, the City acted to provide \$500,000 in funding to expedite the OIG staffing transition and provide for "overlap of OIG staffing" during the transition period.

1 Rockard Delgadillo, City Attorney, State Bar No. 125465
Terree Bowers, Chief Deputy, State Bar No. 89334
2 Carlos De La Guerra, Deputy City Attorney, State Bar No. 164046
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
3 200 N. Main Street, 1700 City Hall East
Los Angeles, California 90012-4131
4 Telephone: (213) 978-8100
Facsimile: (213) 978-8312

5 Patricia L. Glaser, State Bar No. 055668
6 CHRISTENSEN, MILLER, FINK, JACOBS,
GLASER, WEIL & SHAPIRO, LLP
7 10250 Constellation Boulevard, 19th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067
8 Telephone: (310) 553-3000
Facsimile: (310) 556-2920

9 Attorneys for CITY OF LOS ANGELES
10 THE BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
and THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
11

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

13 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14

15 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)) Case No. CV 00-11769 GAF (RCx)
16))
17)) **STATUS REPORT**
18))

19 v.))

20 CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA,))
BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS OF
THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, AND THE
LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

The Honorable Gary A. Feess, United States
District Judge

21 Defendants.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SECTION 1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

This report summarizes the City of Los Angeles's (City's) Consent Decree implementation activities, focusing on actions taken since the City's August 2004 report to the court. City compliance efforts and activities over the past six-month period included:

- 1) Testing of the Risk Management Information System (RMIS) Prototype, finalization of the design for RMIS Release 2 (operational RMIS), and continued system development activities;
- 2) Testing of the Use of Force System (UOFS), resolution of functional and user system issues identified during testing, and initiation of UOFS user training;
- 3) Rolling-out of the Deployment Period System (DPS) to two Divisions, the Office of the Inspector General, Use of Force Review Section, and the Force Investigation Division, and continued system monitoring, interface development, and training efforts;
- 4) Completion of data audits of existing LAPD use of force and complaint applications and historic Categorical Use of Force data was in-put in response to the audit findings;
- 5) Finalizing the TEAMS II Use Protocol for U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) approval and initiating the associated meet and confer process;
- 6) Finalizing the proposed Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stop data analysis methodology for release for public review and comment;
- 7) Expediting Office of the Inspector General staffing modifications;
- 8) Continued implementation of the Department training plan;
- 9) Implementation of Mental Illness Program modifications;
- 10) Implementing improvements to retaliation complaint investigation procedures and developing long-term policy and procedures changes;
- 11) Continuing initiation of corrective actions when compliance and/or implementation issues were identified.

1 During this reporting period, LAPD Civil Rights Integrity Division (CRID) continued the *ad hoc*
2 inspections that it started in early 2003 to provide “real time” feedback on City compliance efforts. Results
3 of those inspections are discussed throughout this report. Beginning in January 2005, the scope of the
4 CRID inspections was significantly expanded. The practice of having LAPD and the Inspector General
5 report to the Police Commission on all compliance issues has continued during this reporting period, and all
6 of those entities similarly continue to report on compliance to the City Council. This process has continued
7 to assist in the remedying of compliance deficiencies, where they exist.

8 As previously reported, the LAPD continues its reorganization efforts and has acted to reassign
9 gang unit audits from Detective Support Division (DSD) to Audit Division. This has resulted in some
10 ministerial discrepancies with the Consent Decree. In addition, the LAPD has transitioned Categorical Use
11 of Force (CUOF) investigations from the Critical Incident Investigation Division (CIID) to a newly formed
12 Force Investigation Division (FID) within the Professional Standards Bureau (PSB), which require Consent
13 Decree modifications. The City, DOJ, and Independent Monitor have worked to develop agreed upon
14 Consent Decree changes to address these and other issues over the past several months. It is anticipated
15 that such Consent Decree clarifications and modifications will be submitted to the Court in the near future.

16 **Implementation Summary**

17 The list below summarizes the City’s current Consent Decree compliance status. Section 2 of this
18 report provides an overview of compliance status by major subject area. Details concerning the City’s
19 Consent Decree implementation activities and compliance evaluation are provided in the paragraph-by-
20 paragraph review presented in Section 3 of this report.

21 The City is currently in compliance with the following Consent Decree paragraphs:

22 Paragraph 8, Meet and Confer; Paragraph 11, Allocation of resources; Paragraph 55, OHB
23 unit; Paragraph 56, Categorical use of force response/notification; Paragraph 57, Categorical
24 use of force – Criminal investigations; Paragraph 58, District Attorney’s office notification;
25 Paragraph 59, cooperation with the District Attorney’s office; Paragraph 60, separate attorney
26 for officers involved in OIS; Paragraph 61, separation of officers involved in an OIS; Paragraph
27 64, consider officer history in CUOF investigations; Paragraph 65, self reporting of use of force;
28 Paragraph 66, modify use of force form; Paragraph 67, submittal of categorical use of force
investigation requirements; Paragraph 69, use of force review; Paragraph 71, search warrants;
Paragraph 72, search warrant tracking log; Paragraph 73, inspection and interview of arrestee’s;

Paragraph 74, receipt of complaints; Paragraph 75, LAPD complaint initiation; Paragraph 76, LAPD notification of civil suits and claims; Paragraph 77, duty to self-report; Paragraph 78, duty to report misconduct; Paragraph 79, complaint face sheet processing time; Paragraph 82, collateral misconduct investigations; Paragraph 83, TEAMS access for administrative investigations; Paragraph 84, standards for credibility determinations; Paragraph 85, adjudication of complaint investigations; Paragraph 86, reasonable efforts to investigate withdrawn/anonymous complaints; Paragraph 87, majority of complaint investigations completed within five months; Paragraph 88, quarterly discipline report; Paragraph 90, manager evaluation of complaints for training needs; Paragraph 89; Inspector General and Police Commission quarterly discipline report review; Paragraph 91, informing complainants of complaint resolution; Paragraph 92, anti-retaliation policy; Paragraph 93, complaint investigation responsibility; Paragraph 94, IAG complaint investigation responsibilities; Paragraph 95, IAG staffing; Paragraph 96, chief of police misconduct complaints investigation responsibility; Paragraph 97, IAG integrity audits; Paragraph 98, selection of IAG investigators/ supervisors; Paragraph 99, IAG term of duty; Paragraph 100, training and evaluation of IAG investigators; Paragraph 101, referrals of criminal misconduct to prosecutorial authorities; Paragraph 102, non-discrimination policy; Paragraph 103, non-discrimination policy; Paragraph 104, collection of motor vehicle stop data; Paragraph 105, collection of pedestrian stop data; Paragraph 106, SEU requirements; Paragraph 107, SEU selection criteria; Paragraph 109, confidential informant database; Paragraph 110, confidential informant manual; Paragraph 111, evaluation of training, policies and procedures for police contacts with mentally ill persons; Paragraph 112, police commission/city review of Paragraph 111 report; Paragraph 113, audit of mental illness procedures; Paragraph 115, ability to remove FTO's; Paragraph 116, training of FTOs; Paragraph 117, police integrity training; Paragraph 118, training for board of rights members; Paragraph 119, tuition reimbursement plan; Paragraph 120, procedures for communicating training suggestions; Paragraph 121, supervisory training for promoted officers; Paragraph 122, supervisory training; Paragraph 123, training for supervisors regarding administrative investigations; Paragraph 124, annual audit plan and Audit Division; Paragraph 125, initial work product audits; Paragraph 126, initial use of force audit; Paragraph 127, sting audit reports; Paragraph 128, periodic work product audits; Paragraph 129, periodic administrative investigation audit; Paragraph 130, annual discipline report; Paragraph 131, periodic SEU work product audits; Paragraph 132, financial disclosure; Paragraph 133, training audit, Paragraph 134, skeletal fracture audit; Paragraph 136, inspector general review and audit of LAPD administrative investigations; Paragraph 139, inspector general responsibilities for retaliation complaints; Paragraph 140, police commission ability to initiate audits; Paragraph 142, Police Commission and Inspector General annual review of categorical uses of force; Paragraph 143, Police Commission review of LAPD audits and policy and procedure changes regarding the Consent Decree; Paragraph 144, chief of police annual performance review; Paragraph 145, police commission investigation of police misconduct complaints; Paragraph 146, police commission approval of LAPD budget requests; Paragraph 147, inspector general notification of categorical uses of force; Paragraph 148, inspector general use of force review board attendance; Paragraph 149, inspector general information requests; Paragraph 150, inspector general acceptance of complaints; Paragraph 152, complaint intake information to inspector general; Paragraph 153, inspector general communication with police commission; Paragraph

1 155, community outreach; Paragraph 156, semi-annual LAPD website posting; Paragraph 157,
2 community advisory groups/media advisory working group; Paragraph 158, selection of
3 independent monitor; Paragraph 159, independent monitor staff/contractors; Paragraph 160,
4 City responsibility for independent monitor costs; Paragraph 161-171, independent monitor
5 access provisions; Paragraph 172, copies of reports to independent monitor; Paragraph 175,
6 City status reports to court; Paragraph 176, maintenance of records; Paragraph 177, DOJ
7 access provisions; Paragraph 184, meet and confer procedures.

8
9 The City is in partial compliance with the following paragraphs, excluding certain paragraphs related
10 to the details of TEAMS II development, which are discussed extensively elsewhere in this report:
11

12 Paragraph 62, supervisor's presence/absence at categorical use of force/search warrant;
13 Paragraph 63, BSS referral; Paragraph 70, supervisory review of arrest, booking and charging
14 reports; Paragraph 80, categorical use of force and IAG complaint investigation procedures;
15 Paragraph 81, non-categorical use of force and chain of command complaint investigation
16 procedures; Paragraph 108, confidential informant procedures; Paragraph 114, eligibility criteria
17 for field training officers; Paragraph 135, inspector general evaluation of LAPD audits.

18 The City continues to approach compliance with many of these paragraphs, and the majority of
19 compliance deficiencies remain centered around administrative issues, rather than functional operational
20 issues. Table 1, attached hereto, as in past reports, presents a brief, updated summary of the current
21 compliance level of all paragraphs for which the City has not yet achieved a 95% compliance level. Details
22 of City's compliance and monitoring efforts are presented in Section 3 of this report.
23
24
25
26
27
28

SECTION 2

STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MAJOR PROVISIONS

TEAMS II Development Program

The Management Systems Reengineering Project (MSRP) is a unique structure within the City, which combines LAPD and Information Technology Agency (ITA) resources to ensure close coordination and communication between these essential TEAMS II development entities. The MSRP has primary responsibility for the TEAMS II Development Program, including but not limited to the Risk Management Information System (RMIS), Use of Force System (UOFS), Complaint Management System (CMS), Deployment Period System (DPS), and LAPD source system data repository development.

The RMIS is largely the equivalent of “TEAMS II” as described in the Consent Decree. Some data elements of the new UOFS and the new CMS are considered part of “TEAMS II.” The Consent Decree does not require the development of a UOFS or a CMS. However, the City determined it was appropriate to redesign, enhance, and develop a new UOFS and CMS that provides greater functionality over the current LAPD use of force and complaint tracking systems. This redesign includes a collection of information that is not currently captured in LAPD’s existing systems. In addition, the new UOFS and CMS will provide for decentralized real time data entry, ensuring that the most up to date information possible is available to the RMIS.

The need to limit access to the confidential personnel records that will be included in the RMIS, along with the desired automated workflow components of the RMIS, UOFS, and CMS, requires the development of a more robust chain-of-command system than the one currently maintained by LAPD. The City has determined that a combination of off-the-shelf software with custom modifications/enhancements would best suit the City’s long-term needs. This new chain-of-command system is called the Deployment Period System (DPS) and is an essential component of RMIS, UOFS, and CMS system security.

The RMIS will utilize data from approximately 15 LAPD source systems, including the new UOFS, CMS, and DPS. Data from the disparate LAPD source systems will be cleansed, transformed, and stored in a central data staging repository (the single retrieval location (SRL)), which will be interfaced with the RMIS.

1 The City originally planned to deploy the individual systems Department-wide at a single point in
2 time. However, based upon the experience with the UOFS delay in November 2004 and with the DPS
3 Pilot Program, the City has now decided to phase the rollout of each individual system in an effort to
4 maximize opportunities for success and minimize impacts of system issues and user concerns. The phased
5 deployment of DPS, which is essential to security/access functions for all other TEAMS II related systems,
6 dictates that deployment of the UOFS would then need to be similarly phased, following DPS deployment.
7 The phasing of CMS and RMIS deployment is also planned. Such a phased deployment approach delays
8 the schedule of Department-wide rollout of TEAMS II Development Program systems by approximately 4-
9 6 months.

10 The benefits of phased deployment are that difficulties with the system can be identified and
11 managed within smaller groups, enabling the City to delay rollout for subsequent groups if significant system
12 or training issues are identified throughout the process. Further, there is an opportunity to better manage
13 system acceptance through a phased rollout process, which is essential to the overall success of the
14 TEAMS II Development Program by ensuring that early system problems are identified before large
15 numbers of users are exposed to such problems.

16 **Source Systems**

17 The MSRP completed analysis of the LAPD source systems for RMIS data and associated data
18 quality assessments. Source system modifications identified through this assessment effort have been largely
19 completed. The Single Retrieval Location (SRL), where data from the 15 disparate LAPD source systems
20 will be cleansed, transformed, and stored, has been developed. Testing of system interfaces to the SRL
21 has been initiated and will be phased over the next several months.

22 In addition, LAPD completed data accuracy audits of the existing LAPD use of force and
23 complaint management applications. Based upon the audit findings, historic data entry for Categorical Uses
24 of Force back to January 2003 was undertaken and has been completed. The LAPD will be auditing the
25 existing LAPD claims and lawsuits application next.

26 Loading of historic data from the existing LAPD use of force applications to the new UOFS will be
27 completed prior to initial rollout of the new UOFS system. The existing use of force data has been
28

1 successfully converted and conversion accuracy has been evaluated. A data conversion plan for the
2 existing LAPD complaint management applications has been completed.

3 **Risk Management Information System (RMIS)**

4 As previously reported, the City contracted with Sierra Systems Group, Inc. for the design,
5 development, implementation, and testing of the RMIS and UOFS on July 30, 2003. The contract
6 establishes a very aggressive RMIS development schedule. However, RMIS development could not be
7 accomplished on the schedule mandated by the Consent Decree. A detailed discussion of RMIS
8 development schedule is presented in Section 3, Paragraph 39, of this Report.

9 The RMIS prototype was provided to the City for evaluation in August 2004, one month ahead of
10 the prototype development schedule. The DOJ and Independent Monitor participated in an RMIS
11 prototype demonstration on August 12, 2004, as well as other RMIS prototype evaluation activities. The
12 RMIS prototype successfully demonstrated the functionality of the RMIS, an important milestone for the
13 TEAMS II project.

14 The City submitted comments on the RMIS prototype and pending RMIS development issues,
15 such as Action Item thresholds and organizational comparison reports (see RMIS Use Protocol discussion
16 below) to Sierra Systems. Sierra Systems subsequently completed an updated RMIS design document
17 (RMIS Release 2 – the operational system), which the City approved in December 2004.

18 The City currently anticipates readiness testing of the RMIS in spring of 2005. However, such
19 readiness testing is contingent upon the DPS-SRL-RMIS interfaces being successfully implemented in
20 February 2005. The interface between the DPS and the SRL and the interface between the SRL and
21 RMIS are currently being tested (see DPS discussion below).

22 **Use of Force System (UOFS)**

23 In August 2004, the City reported to the Court that the UOFS development schedule was largely
24 on track, with Department-wide deployment scheduled for November 2004. However, several UOFS
25 issues and training concerns were identified during UOFS readiness test training in late September/October
26 2004. The UOFS functional issues of concern can be classified into three general areas: 1) system
27 stability/performance issues; 2) system bugs; and 3) City errors and omissions in needed usability and
28

1 system functionality. The City and contractor have worked cooperatively to expeditiously address all of the
2 identified issues.

3 The City was provided with an updated UOFS on January 18, 2005, for testing. The City is in the
4 process of testing the revised UOFS. However, full testing of the UOFS cannot occur until the DPS-SRL-
5 RMIS interfaces are successfully implemented. As indicated above, these interfaces are currently in the
6 testing phase.

7 The initial phase of the UOFS deployment is currently scheduled for mid-February 2005,
8 contingent upon the DPS-SRL-RMIS interfaces being fully operational. UOFS training materials have
9 been reworked to address deficiencies identified during readiness test training and to reflect system
10 enhancements. UOFS training was initiated on January 18, 2005, in anticipation of the initial UOFS
11 deployment in February 2005.

12 **Complaint Management System (CMS)**

13 As previously reported, the City contracted with BearingPoint, Inc. for the design, development,
14 implementation, and testing of the CMS on December 23, 2003. Work on the CMS was initiated on
15 January 5, 2004 and was scheduled for completion in May 2005.

16 As a result of the issues the City identified during UOFS readiness testing, the Professional
17 Standards Bureau (PSB) was requested to conduct an early review of the in-progress CMS (review of
18 CMS Iteration 3) to avoid similar last-minute identification of system issues. PSB's review of CMS
19 Iteration 3 identified some functionality issues. The City is currently evaluating the CMS functionally and
20 user friendliness issues identified, all of which have cost and schedule implications.

21 Therefore, although it is currently anticipated that CMS Iteration 4 (planned to be the operational
22 system) will be provided to the City by BearingPoint in February 2005, it is likely that the current CMS
23 initial deployment schedule of May 2005 will be delayed in order to address the identified functional issues,
24 although the scope of such delay remains uncertain at this time.

25 Upon completion, the CMS will be deployed in phases, with deployment planned over an
26 approximately 4-month period.

27 **Deployment Period System (DPS)**

1 The City contracted with BearingPoint, Inc. for the design, development, implementation, and
2 testing of the DPS on March 19, 2004. Work on DPS was initiated on March 22, 2004, and the system
3 was scheduled for completion in February 2005.

4 A DPS Pilot Program to test the DPS system was conducted in LAPD Central Division from
5 October to December 2004. Some issues and report needs were identified through this process. The
6 issues identified have been largely addressed and the DPS was deployed on January 11, 2005, to Central
7 Division (this was a continuation from the Pilot Program), Northeast Division, Central Bureau management,
8 Use of Force Review Section, Force Investigation Division, Office of the Inspector General, and the Police
9 Commission. Feedback on the system has been generally positive.

10 There are two DPS interfaces that are not yet operational: the City payroll system (PAYSR) and
11 the RMIS centralized facilities interfaces. The interface with PAYSR is essential for further deployment of
12 the DPS. Without the PAYSR interface, LAPD personnel must perform dual record keeping activities.
13 While this is manageable with the current limited deployment, further deployment of DPS without the
14 PAYSR interface cannot be accomplished. The PAYSR interface can only be tested every two weeks,
15 concurrent with the payroll process. The interface will first be tested in late-January 2005. The first test is
16 unlikely to be 100% successful.

17 The DPS interface with RMIS centralized facilities is critical to RMIS, UOFS, and CMS
18 operations, and therefore impacts the deployment schedule of those systems. The RMIS centralized
19 facilities provide security/access control for the UOFS. The DPS provides the information fundamental to
20 such security and access control functionality. The interface between the DPS and the City Single Retrieval
21 Location (SRL) and the interface between the SRL and the RMIS have been tested, with problems
22 identified. In each test, problems identified have been remedied and the interfaces re-tested. Although
23 interface issues have been significantly reduced over the past few months, the end-to-end DPS-SRL-RMIS
24 interfaces are not yet fully operational.

25 The DPS system must be deployed at the beginning of an LAPD deployment period. Therefore,
26 the DPS phased rollout schedule is directly tied to the deployment period schedule, which is a 28-day
27 schedule. The next LAPD deployment period begins February 7, 2005. Although the City is training the
28 next Central Bureau Divisions scheduled for DPS deployment in anticipation of a February deployment, if

1 the PAYSR interface is not operational, the next phase of DPS deployment may need to be deferred until
2 LAPD deployment period 3, which starts March 7, 2005.

3 With the phased rollout of DPS, if the PAYSR interface is operational by February 7, 2005, DPS
4 is scheduled to be deployed Department-wide by May 2005. If the further deployment of DPS is delayed
5 until March 7, 2005, Department-wide deployment would occur in June 2005. As discussed above, the
6 phased rollout system deployment schedule allows the City and LAPD to assess the success of the system
7 as the system is rolled-out and adjust the rollout schedule as appropriate to accommodate any issues or
8 concerns identified during the deployment process. **RMIS Use Protocols**

9 The DOJ approved the RMIS Use Protocols on January 11, 2004. The City initiated the meet and
10 confer process regarding those TEAMS II Use Protocols with the Los Angeles Police Protective League
11 (PPL) on January 6, 2005, in anticipation of DOJ's approval of the TEAMS II Use Protocol. The Police
12 Commission and the City's Executive Employee Relations Committee (EERC) provided negotiating
13 instructions to the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and authorized the LAPD to initiate negotiations
14 with impacted unions regarding the TEAMS II Use Protocols on January 18 and January 24, 2005,
15 respectively. All LAPD employees will be included in the Risk Management System (RMIS), and
16 therefore several labor unions will need to be engaged as part of the TEAMS II Use Protocol meet and
17 confer processes.

18 At this point in time, it is anticipated that the TEAMS II Use Protocol meet and confer processes
19 will be completed prior to the planned RMIS operational timeframe of summer/fall 2005.

20 **Managing Risk Pending Completion of the TEAMS II Development Program**

21 As previously reported to the Court, although not required by the Consent Decree, LAPD
22 decentralized access to TEAMS (called "TEAMS 1.5"). TEAMS 1.5 enables the 4 geographic Bureaus,
23 18 geographic Areas, and several specialty Divisions to have direct access to employee information
24 contained in TEAMS. The implementation of TEAMS 1.5 has resulted in increased use of TEAMS
25 department-wide.

26 The City and LAPD have identified, and are implementing, numerous other methods of improving
27 risk management as the City develops TEAMS II and continues to implement the various other provisions
28 of the Consent Decree.

1 **USE OF FORCE INVESTIGATIONS**

2 **Categorical Use of Force Investigations**

3 During this reporting period, the City remained in compliance with the various categorical use of
4 force (CUOF) notification and response protocols established by the Consent Decree.

5 As previously reported, significant deficiencies regarding CUOF investigations were identified in
6 2003 and the City undertook several short and long-term actions to address the concerns identified. In
7 August 2004, the LAPD executed its planned transfer of CUOF investigative responsibility from Critical
8 Incident Investigation Division (CIID) to the newly formed Force Investigation Division (FID) within the
9 Professional Standards Bureau (PSB). This transition in CUOF investigation responsibility maximizes
10 oversight and independence of these investigations.

11 The City continues to review and monitor FID and CUOF investigations. However, since such
12 investigations take in excess of six months to complete, the City has not yet been able to audit the FID
13 investigations to illustrate compliance. A CUOF investigation audit is scheduled for summer 2005.

14 The OIG continues to operate under OIG and LAPD procedures modified in fall 2003, relative to
15 CUOF incidents, including the ability of the OIG to ask questions during Use of Force Review Board
16 proceedings. The OIG also continued to receive briefings regarding the CUOF investigative interview
17 process approximately one week after an incident. Additionally, in the past six-month period the OIG
18 enhanced its CUOF review procedures to further ensure consistent, comprehensive reviews, and to collect
19 additional data regarding CUOF. The OIG has developed a CUOF database for the capture and analysis
20 of CUOF data, which is currently in the testing phase and anticipated to be fully operational in March 2005.
21 OIG CUOF reviews are communicated to the Board of Police Commissioners, as well as responsible PSB
22 managers.

23 The FY 04-05 budget includes an additional Assistant Inspector General position. With three
24 Assistant Inspectors General, one position will now be focused on use of force investigations (previously
25 one Assistant Inspector General had oversight over both use of force issues/investigations and audits).

26 **Non-Categorical Use of Force**

27 The LAPD continues to be in compliance with the various non-categorical use of force investigative
28 requirements.

SEARCH WARRANT AND ARREST PROCEDURES

The City achieved compliance with the search warrant procedure provisions of the Consent Decree over the past six months. However, some minor manager review documentation issues remain to be addressed.

The City is currently in compliance with booking and arrest reviews required by Paragraph 70(a), with a 98% completeness rate and a 100% authenticity rate, and Paragraph 73 with a 100% compliance rate. The City continues to work toward compliance with Paragraph 70(b), relating to supervisory review of allegations of resisting arrest, with the October 8, 2004, Audit Division audit of arrest, booking and charging (ABC) documenting an 83% compliance rate.

Paragraph 70 also requires supervisory oversight for compliance with LAPD procedures. In late 2004, training was provided to supervisors and managers on Paragraph 70 requirements for arrest, booking and charging procedures. A CRID inspection completed in the 3rd quarter 2004 revealed 95% compliance with watch commander oversight related to booking and arrest report approval. A bureau gang coordinator inspection completed in December 2004 assessed 100% compliance with watch commander oversight related to booking and arrest report approval. The Audit Division audit of arrest, booking and charging (ABC) reports completed on October 8, 2004, found that compliance with documentation of Miranda admonishments and responses in the arrest reports was an area of continued concern (an 85% compliance rate). In addition, the audit identified supervisory oversight concerns that were largely documentation related.

MISCONDUCT COMPLAINT ACCEPTANCE AND INVESTIGATION

Acceptance of Public Complaints

The City has continued compliance with the provisions of Consent Decree Paragraph 74, which requires the LAPD to provide multiple avenues for the acceptance of complaints, in multiple languages. In addition, the LAPD proactively works to ensure that all officers are taking complaints as appropriate by performing integrity audits and auditing complaint hotline tapes.

Complaint Investigations

Complaint investigations are completed by both chain-of-command supervisors and Professional Standards Bureau (PSB), depending upon the type of complaint and seriousness of the allegations. The

Comment: Month on this inspection? 3rd fiscal or calendar quarter? Confusing.

1 City has achieved compliance with the complaint processing procedures established in the Consent Decree
2 and is nearing compliance with all complaint investigation requirements. The remaining complaint
3 investigative deficiencies mainly involve documentation issues regarding canvassing the scene for witnesses
4 and collection/preservation of evidence.

5 **RETALIATION POLICY**

6 On February 17, 2004, the Police Commission considered and adopted a report prepared by the
7 OIG regarding the retaliation policy and its implementation. The report identified concerns regarding
8 supervisory oversight and response to complaints of retaliation and the failure of LAPD to address
9 workplace concerns that lead to and/or foster perceptions of retaliation. The City Attorney's Office, OIG,
10 and LAPD have jointly worked to modify retaliation prevention and investigation procedures in the short-
11 term, while long-term policy and procedures modifications are evaluated.

12 In fall 2004, the LAPD completed its review and documented the roles of each of the 11
13 LAPD/City/State/Federal entities identified as being involved in retaliation related issues. On November 9,
14 2004, the Police Commission rejected the LAPD's proposed "best practices" model, in consideration of
15 the roles of the various entities and the OIG's recommendations and reassigned the retaliation policy and
16 procedures evaluation to CRID. CRID was directed to return to the Police Commission with proposed
17 policy and procedure changes in February 2005. Since that time, a draft revision to the Department
18 Retaliation policy has been created and is currently under review by the City Attorney and OIG. Further,
19 CRID has established a Retaliation Workgroup to study procedures associated with coordination of
20 retaliation complaints, management response to retaliation in the workplace, and training for managers and
21 supervisors.

22 Police Commission approved a training strategy for retaliation related issues in October 2004. The
23 strategy called for training to be initiated at the December 2004 General Staff meeting (Captains and above,
24 including civilian equivalents). This training was accomplished in December 2004. PSB is training Internal
25 Affairs Group (IAG) investigators in the area of retaliation related issues and investigative concerns.

26 The Inspector General anticipates that the next annual report on retaliation will be completed in
27 February 2005, on schedule.

28 **GANG UNIT OPERATIONS**

1 As previously reported, Special Enforcement Units (SEU) are now known as the Gang
2 Enforcement Detail (GED). The GEDs, in turn, work with other entities (such as Narcotics and
3 Robbery/Homicide) as part of what are classified as Gang Impact Teams (GITs).

4 The City is in compliance with the GED officer/supervisor selection criteria, monthly GED audit
5 requirements, and various operational and supervisory requirements established for gang units in the
6 Consent Decree. The City achieved compliance with Paragraph 106(d), which relates to gang unit term
7 limitations, over the past few months. In June 2004, a tracking database was established to automatically
8 calculate the date the officer is due out of the GED unit based upon the first date assigned. This resulted in
9 a 90% compliance rate with 106(d) in October 2004. However, improvements in the system and
10 processing have resulted in current compliance with Paragraph 106(d).

11 **PEDESTRIAN AND MOTOR VEHICLE STOP DATA**

12 **Data Collection**

13 Pedestrian and motor vehicle stop data collection continues. The volume of field data report (FDR)
14 forms being collected is consistent with the volume anticipated by LAPD, based on citation and field
15 interview card volumes. An LAPD audit, with a sample time frame of January 2004, found that FDRs are
16 being completed by officers for required stops 94% of the time. Data collected in the first six months of
17 2004 was posted on LAPD website August 26, 2004. Data for July through December 2004 will be
18 posted on the website by March 1, 2005.

19 As previously reported, Vytex Public Safety Solutions, Inc. was engaged by the City to implement
20 automated collection of motor vehicle and pedestrian stop data on June 5, 2003. The Portable Officer
21 Data Device System (PODDS) was fully accepted by the City in September 2004. The automated system
22 includes internal logic that has assisted in further improving data collection accuracy/completeness. The
23 City is currently acting to enhance the PODDS system to automate citations, which will further enhance
24 consistency between citations, FDRs, and field interview cards.

25 **LAPD Stop Data Analysis**

26 As previously reported, in November 2003, the City selected Analysis Group, Inc. to develop and
27 implement a methodology for pedestrian and motor vehicle stop data analysis and authorized the negotiation
28

Comment: Does PODDS render this language obsolete?

1 and execution of a contract not to exceed \$1 million. The City executed a contract with Analysis Group,
2 Inc. on April 4, 2004.

3 On January 19, 2005, the City released a proposed data analysis methodology developed by
4 Analysis Group for a 30-day public review and comment period. To enhance public participation in this
5 important City effort, a special website (<http://www.lacity.org/LAPDstops>) has been established that will
6 contain the various reports, meeting schedules, and other information pertinent to the LAPD stop data
7 analysis project. On January 18 and 24, presentations on the proposed methodology were made to the
8 Los Angeles Police Commission and Los Angeles City Council Public Safety Committee, respectively.
9 Further, public information and comment meetings will be held in each of the four LAPD geographic
10 bureaus.

11 A final data analysis methodology will be developed in consideration of public comments received.
12 The LAPD stop data will then be analyzed based upon that methodology. Results of the analysis will be
13 made public upon completion, which is currently anticipated in late summer/fall 2005.

14 **CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANTS**

15 As previously reported, a revised Confidential Informant Manual was released in August 2003.
16 CRID reviews in all 2003 and January 2004 found a 100% and 95% compliance rate, respectively, with
17 confidential informant procedures. The Independent Monitor's 11th Quarterly Report assessed a
18 compliance rate of 98%. However, although a recent LAPD audit found appropriate supervisory oversight
19 of the use of confidential informants, documentation deficiencies were identified that negatively impacted the
20 City's compliance level. LAPD is working to address the identified deficiencies.

21 The City experiences continued compliance with the confidential informant data base provision of
22 the Consent Decree.

23 **MENTAL ILLNESS-RELATED POLICY AND PROCEDURE REVIEW**

24 As previously reported, the Police Commission approved revisions to the LAPD Mental Illness
25 Program on May 18, 2004. LAPD expansion of the System-wide Mental Assessment Response Teams
26 (SMART) by approximately 80% (from 11 teams to 19 teams) and the expansion of the Mental Evaluation
27 Unit (MEU) to provide 7-day a week, 20-hour a day coverage was completed in June 2004. However,
28 SMART expansion also required additional resources from the Los Angeles County Department of Mental

1 Health (LACDMH), as SMART teams consist of one LAPD officer and one mental health professional.
2 By October 2004, the program reached full strength with a staffing of 18 LACDMH mental health
3 professionals.

4 Training curriculum enhancements were initiated in October 2004 that will provide additional
5 training for patrol officers. The revised curriculum was submitted to the California Department of Justice's
6 Peace Officers Standards and Training Commission (POST) for purposes of accreditation. It is anticipated
7 that the training will commence in March 2005.

8 Although not required by the Consent Decree, a follow-up audit to the Paragraph 113 required
9 audit submitted to the Police Commission in July 2004, is being planned for fiscal year 2005/2006.

10 **LAPD TRAINING**

11 The Department continues to remain in full compliance with the training provisions of the Consent
12 Decree.

13 **AUDIT DIVISION**

14 LAPD is in compliance with the auditing provisions of the Consent Decree. The Annual Audit plan
15 for FY 2004/2005 was submitted to the Police Commission on June 15, 2004, and approved by the Board
16 on July 13, 2004. Paragraph 131 requires gang unit (GED) audits to be completed by Detective Support
17 Division (DSD). The LAPD has assigned these audits to Audit Division due to Audit Division's abilities
18 and independence. Audit Division completed timely quality audits consistent with current audit plan and
19 associated updates. The one exception was the audit of warrant applications, which was not completed
20 prior to December 31, 2004, due to sampling methodology issues discovered in the course of the audit.
21 That audit is in-progress and will be completed in the near future. Audit Division is on track to complete all
22 Consent Decree mandated audits in FY 2004/2005.

23 **OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL**

24 The Office of the Inspector General has continued to perform informative, insightful audits and
25 reviews. However, the OIG continues to experience difficulty in complying with the audit review time
26 frames mandated by the Consent Decree. In summer/fall 2003, the Inspector General developed a revised
27 OIG staffing plan, which was based upon obtaining staff with skill sets different than the original staffing
28 authorized for the OIG. However, transitioning from current authorized staff to a new staffing cadre is a

1 complex civil service process. In winter 2004, the City acted to provide \$500,000 in funding to expedite
2 the OIG staffing transition and provide for “overlap of OIG staffing” during the transition period.

3 Several Management Analyst II positions have been reallocated to Special Investigator II and
4 Police Performance Auditor positions. These new positions will provide the OIG with the requisite
5 technical skill sets to conduct timely, compliant audits and reviews. Interviews of Special Investigator II
6 applicants are in progress and job specifications for the Police Performance Auditor positions are being
7 modified. The OIG prepares executive summaries on each audit reviewed, which are submitted to the
8 Police Commission. This provides the Board with the information necessary to facilitate management
9 decisions and to further enhance the accountability of the LAPD.

10 **POLICE COMMISSION ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES**

11 The Police Commission Executive Director and Inspector General continue to work in unison to
12 process reports, audits and reviews.

SECTION 3

PARAGRAPH BY PARAGRAPH REVIEW

This Section details compliance status and actions being taken by the City to remedy compliance issues for each non-administrative Consent Decree paragraph.

LAW OFFICES
CHRISTENSEN, MILLER, FINK, JACOBS, GLASER, WEIL & SHAPIRO
10250 Constellation Boulevard
Nineteenth Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067
(310) 552-3000

I. INTRODUCTION

A. General Provisions

Decree ¶8

Decree Language:

“8. Nothing in this Agreement is intended to: (a) alter the existing collective bargaining agreements between the City (as defined in paragraph 15) and LAPD employee bargaining units; or (b) impair the collective bargaining rights of employees in those units under state and local law. The parties acknowledge that as a matter of state and local law the implementation by the City of certain provisions of this Agreement may require compliance with the meet and confer process or consulting process. The City shall comply with any such legal requirements and shall do so with a goal of concluding any such processes in a manner that will permit the City’s timely implementation of this Agreement. The City shall give appropriate notice of this Agreement to affected employee bargaining units to allow such processes to begin as to this Agreement as filed with the Court. The City has received one demand to meet and confer in regard to the proposed Agreement and will use its best efforts to have expedited that process and any others that may be demanded. The City agrees to consult with the DOJ in regard to the positions it takes in any meeting and conferring or consulting processes connected with this Agreement.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance/Paragraph 8 and 184

Policy/Procedure: Meet and Confer Process

Activities:

The current outstanding meet and confer issue is Paragraph 132, financial disclosures, and Paragraph 47, TEAMS II Use Protocols.

Consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 8, the City has continued to consult the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) regarding the meet and confer process and positions being taken by the City

1 over the past reporting period. Consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 184, the City reported to
2 the Court on a monthly basis regarding the status of the meet and confer process.

3 **Financial Disclosures**

4 A Joint City and DOJ filing was submitted to the Court on March 1, 2004, establishing a schedule
5 for continuation of the meet and confer process for financial disclosures. Reflecting the complexity of the
6 issue and the meet and confer process, two extensions of time, subject to approval of the DOJ, were
7 provided in the March 1, 2004, agreement. The City requested, and the DOJ approved, both such
8 extensions. The filing set a date of September 1, 2004, for the City to take further action to comply with
9 Paragraph 184(c) in the event the meet and confer process had not been concluded.

10 A Joint City and DOJ filing was submitted to the Court on September 1, 2004, extending the meet
11 and confer process time frame to October 1, 2004. Subsequently, on October 1, 2004, a Joint filing was
12 submitted to the Court extending the date to November 1, 2004. On November 1, 2004, a Joint filing was
13 submitted extending the date to January 15, 2005. On January 15, 2005, a Joint filing was submitted to the
14 Court extending the date to March 15, 2005.

15 The pendency of the meet and confer process has impaired the City's ability to timely implement
16 Paragraph 132.

17 **TEAMS II Use Protocols**

18 The City initiated the meet and confer process regarding those TEAMS II Use Protocols with the
19 Los Angeles Police Protective League (PPL) on January 6, 2005, in anticipation of DOJ's approval of the
20 TEAMS II Use Protocol. DOJ approved the TEA MS II Use Protocol on January 11, 2005 (see also
21 Paragraph 47). The Police Commission and the City's Executive Employee Relations Committee (EERC)
22 provided negotiating instructions to the Los Angeles Police
23 Department (LAPD) and authorized the LAPD to initiate negotiations with impacted unions regarding the
24 TEAMS II Use Protocols on January 18 and January 24, 2005, respectively. All LAPD employees will be
25 included in the Risk Management System (RMIS), and therefore several labor unions will need to be
26 engaged as part of the TEAMS II Use Protocol meet and confer processes.

1 At this point in time, it is anticipated that the TEAMS II Use Protocol meet and confer processes
2 will be completed prior to the planned RMIS operational time frame of summer/fall 2005 (see Paragraph
3 39 for TEAMS II development schedule).

Decree ¶11

Decree Language:

“11. The City is responsible for providing necessary support to the Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners, the Inspector General, the LAPD and the Chief of Police to enable each of them to fulfill their obligations under this Agreement.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2001, ongoing

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Budget Appropriations

FY 01-02: \$29 million (including staff, training, equipment, and lease costs)

FY 02-03: \$38.3 million (including staff, training, equipment, and lease costs)

FY 03-04: \$50.4 million (including staff, training, equipment, and lease costs)

FY 04-05: \$7.275 million (*excluding* staff, training, equipment, and lease costs)

Activities:

In January 2001, a Consent Decree Work Group was established to identify and resolve Consent Decree implementation issues and facilitate allocation of resources as appropriate. The Consent Decree Work Group continues to meet weekly and includes the Chair of the Public Safety Committee staff, Mayor’s Office, Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA), City Attorney’s Office, LAPD, Office of the Inspector General (OIG), and Police Commission (Commission) staff. Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) representatives attend the Workgroup meetings as needed.

In fiscal year (FY) 01-02 the City established four main accounts related to implementation of specific Consent Decree provisions. These accounts have been maintained in each FY Budget since that time:

- The TEAMS II Development Account (subsequently modified into the TEAMS II Special Fund)
- Consent Decree Implementation Account
- Pedestrian and Traffic Stop Account
- The Independent Monitor Account

Since FY 00-01 a total of approximately \$36.8 million has been allocated by the City for TEAMS II implementation (including FY 04-05). The City established a TEAMS II Special Fund, via ordinance, in September 2003, to assist in the management of all TEAMS II funding needs. Monies in the TEAMS II Special Fund do not revert to the General Fund at the close of the fiscal year; therefore all monies in the TEAMS II Special Fund, including interest, remain available for the TEAMS II Development Program in FY 04-05. In addition, the TEAMS II Special Fund was supplemented with an additional \$4.3 million in the FY 04-05 Budget.

The Consent Decree Implementation Account was funded at a level of \$1 million in the FY 04-05 Budget. In November 2004, \$450,000 was allocated from this Account to fund Office of the Inspector General (OIG) staff transition costs (see Paragraph 143 for additional information regarding the OIG staff transition).

Since FY 01-02 a total of approximately \$6.9 million (including FY 04-05), \$3.9 million of which is from Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Funds, has been allocated by the City for pedestrian and motor vehicle stop data collection. All uncommitted funds in the Pedestrian and Traffic Stop Account were reallocated for the same purpose in FY 04-05 and supplemented with an additional \$300,000 in the FY 04-05 Budget. One million dollars in funding was allocated to fund the LAPD stop data analysis contract and continued scanning of LAPD Field Data Reports (FDR). In addition, the City is expanding the automated collection of data to include citations, which will be partially funded via the Pedestrian and Traffic Stop Account.

The contract for the Independent Monitor has a 5-year term with a not-to-exceed-amount of \$11,010,000 which requires annual contract appropriations. The FY 04-05 Budget included \$1.675 million in funding for the FY 04-05 costs of the Independent Monitor's contract.

1 Consent Decree-related staff positions, and associated training, equipment, and lease space costs
2 were continued from FY 03-04 and funded in the FY 04-05 Budget. Additionally, the FY 04-05 Budget
3 continued the position authorities for two additional Inspector General Special Investigator positions
4 approved by City Council and the Mayor in fall 2003. The FY 04-05 Budget also authorized and funded
5 an additional Assistant Inspector General position, at an annual cost of approximately \$159,821. Consent
6 Decree-related positions have been “regularized” in the Budget and therefore are not reported as separate
7 Consent Decree costs for FY 04-05, as was done in previous years. However, as all positions have been
8 continued, the costs are similar (plus salary cost increases) to previous years.

9 Actions were taken to exempt Consent Decree-related positions from the FY 03-04 hiring freeze,
10 instituted due to City financial concerns. This hiring freeze became more stringent over the past six months.
11 In January 2004, a “hard” hiring and equipment purchase freeze was implemented by the City due to
12 increasing financial concerns statewide. The hiring freeze did not prevent transfers within LAPD. Therefore,
13 LAPD was able to fill, via internal transfers, the most essential positions required for Consent Decree
14 implementation. The FY 04-05 Budget included an exemption from the hiring unfreeze of all Consent
15 Decree-related positions, however the overall FY 04-05 LAPD salaries budget must be maintained. All
16 TEAMS II Special Fund expenditures remain unfrozen, as that Account provides for special oversight by
17 the City.

18 The City continues to monitor, through the Consent Decree Work Group and LAPD Civil Rights
19 Integrity Division, the financial and staff resources important to Consent Decree implementation.

20 The development of the FY 05-06 Budget is in process. The Police Commission approved the
21 LAPD FY 05-06 Budget request on October 26, 2004, and transmitted the request to the Mayor and
22 CAO for consideration. The Consent Decree Work Group also provided funding recommendations for the
23 FY 05-06 Budget, as appropriate, for consideration by the Mayor and CAO.
24
25
26
27
28

**II. MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISORY MEASURES TO PROMOTE CIVIL RIGHTS
INTEGRITY**

A. TEAMS II

Decree ¶39

Decree Language:

“39. The City has taken steps to develop, and shall establish a database containing relevant information about its officers, supervisors and managers to promote professionalism and best policing practices and to identify and modify at-risk behavior (also known as an early warning system). This system shall be a successor to, and not simply a modification of, the existing computerized information processing system known as the Training Evaluation and Management System (TEAMS). The new system shall be known as “TEAMS II.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Dates: September 17, 2001 TEAMS II Design Document/

January 31, 2004 Beta Test Version & UOFS w/ Historic Data/

April 30, 2004 Protocol for Use/

October 31, 2004 TEAMS II Operational (Subject to DOJ approval of the Protocol)

Current Compliance Status : Compliance/In-Progress/ Paragraphs 8 & 184

Policy/Procedure: Submittal of RMIS data elements on September 17, 2001, and the

Requirements/Design document on October 1, 2001; Response to DOJ comments; Establishment of the

“*LAPD Management System Reengineering Project (MSRP)*,” approved by City Council on December

16, 2001, Police Commission conditional approval on December 11, 2001, approval January 8, 2002;

Additional MSRP Staff Authorization, approved by the Police Commission April 23, 2002, approved by

City Council April 30, 2002, approved by the Mayor May 7, 2002; Special Order No. 13, “*Training*

Evaluation and Management System – Guidelines”, dated April 5, 2002; Submittal of revised RMIS

Requirements/Design Document on September 6, 2002; October 28, 2002, renewed request for peer

group definition approval. DOJ approval of RMIS Requirements/Design Document, January 31, 2003;

1 Submittal of RMIS Use Protocol Phase 1 on April 27, 2004; Submittal of RMIS Use Protocol Phase 2 on
2 August 28, 2004; RMIS Prototype Demonstration, August 12, 2004; DOJ approval of the TEAMS II Use
3 Protocol, January 11, 2005.

4 **Activities:**

5 **TEAMS II Development Program Background**

6 In January 2001, the City established a TEAMS II Workgroup to oversee the TEAMS II
7 Development Program, including infrastructure, development of related source systems, training,
8 development of RMIS use protocols, funding, and all other related tasks essential to successful
9 implementation of the system. The TEAMS II workgroup currently includes representatives from the Chief
10 Legislative Analyst Office, the Mayor's Office, Information Technology Agency (ITA), LAPD
11 representatives from the Management Systems Reengineering Project (MSRP), and Information
12 Technology Division (ITD), and other entities as appropriate. The TEAMS II workgroup met weekly until
13 April 2002. With implementation of the Management Systems Re-engineering Project (MSRP), the
14 TEAMS II workgroup meets monthly. Independent Monitor representatives attend the meeting regularly.
15 In addition, monthly TEAMS II monitoring meetings are held with the Independent Monitor and DOJ.

16 As previously reported to the Court, on December 16, 2001, the City acted to establish the
17 Management Systems Reengineering Project (MSRP). The MSRP is a unique structure within the City that
18 combines LAPD and ITA resources to ensure close coordination and communication between these
19 essential TEAMS II development entities. The MSRP has primary responsibility for the TEAMS II
20 Development Program, including but not limited to the Risk Management Information System (RMIS), Use
21 of Force System (UOFS), Complaint Management System (CMS), Deployment Period System (DPS),
22 and LAPD source system data repository development.

23 The City is implementing several project management practices to manage the TEAMS II
24 Development Program. The City has required the RMIS and CMS Contractors to provide full access to
25 internal Contractor information related to project management and schedule. The Contractors are utilizing
26 an interactive system development process. This allows the City to review in-progress code and system
27 builds for evaluation throughout the system development period. Further, the City has required the
28

1 Contractors to undertake internal project audits, to be performed by Contractor personnel not assigned to
2 the project. Completed audits must be provided promptly to the City.

3 In addition, the City contracted with General Management Resources for independent quality
4 assurance control monitoring of the TEAMS II Development Program. The contract was executed in
5 March 2003.

6 The RMIS is largely the equivalent of "TEAMS II" as described in the Consent Decree. Some
7 data elements of the new UOFS and the CMS are considered part of "TEAMS II."

8 The Consent Decree does not require the development of a UOFS or a CMS. However, the City
9 determined it was appropriate to redesign, enhance, and develop a new UOFS and CMS that provide
10 greater functionality over the current LAPD use of force and complaint tracking systems. This redesign
11 includes collection of information that is not currently captured in LAPD's existing systems. In addition, the
12 new UOFS and CMS will provide for decentralized real time data entry, ensuring that the most accurate
13 and up to date information possible is available to the RMIS.

14 The concurrent development of the RMIS, UOFS, and the CMS, coupled with the City's desire to
15 develop systems in a cost efficient manner, that minimizes long-term maintenance costs, has led to a
16 "TEAMS II" architecture that provides for shared facilities. The RMIS is being developed with centralized
17 security/access, workflow, and common worklists for use by the RMIS, UOFS, CMS, and systems
18 developed in the future.

19 The need to limit access to the confidential personnel records that will be included in the RMIS,
20 along with the desired automated workflow components of the RMIS, UOFS, and CMS, requires the
21 development of a more robust chain-of-command system than the one currently maintained by LAPD. The
22 City determined that a combination of off-the-shelf software with custom modifications/enhancements
23 would best suit the City's long-term needs. This new chain-of-command system is called the Deployment
24 Period System (DPS) and is an essential component of RMIS, UOFS, and CMS system security.

25 The RMIS will utilize data from approximately 15 LAPD source systems, including the new UOFS,
26 CMS, and DPS. Data from the disparate LAPD source systems will be cleansed, transformed, and stored
27 in a central data-staging repository, which will be interfaced with the RMIS.
28

As previously reported, the City contracted with Sierra Systems Group, Inc. for the design, development, implementation, and testing of the RMIS and UOFS on July 30, 2003. The contract establishes a very aggressive RMIS development schedule. However, RMIS development could not be accomplished on the schedule mandated by the Consent Decree.

The Consent Decree establishes a TEAMS II due date of 21 months after the approval of the Design Document by DOJ. The project due dates established in the original contract with Sierra Systems Group, Inc. for the design, development, and implementation of the RMIS and UOFS were approximately 8-9 months longer than the Consent Decree-mandated TEAMS II development schedule. The phased rollout of the RMIS further delays the deployment of the RMIS department-wide. As previously reported to the Court, the original RMIS and UOFS contract dates have been extended over time. The current anticipated project completion contract dates, as revised, compare to the Consent Decree TEAMS II due dates as follows:

Deliverable	Consent Decree Schedule	Contract Schedule
RMIS beta test version	1/31/04	9/3/04 (prototype) <i>COMPLETED 8/04</i>
RMIS Operational	10/31/04	6/27/05

It should be noted that the functionality provided in the RMIS prototype required under the contract far exceeds the RMIS beta test version established in Paragraph 50(c), with the exception of use of force data availability. The requirements established for the RMIS beta version in Paragraph 50(c) were largely met in May-June 2004.

The Consent Decree TEAMS II schedule did not contemplate the extended DOJ review and approval process for the RMIS Requirements/Design Document or the Request for Proposal (RFP) process, necessary to identify qualified contractors and ensure a competitive process for system development, or the City contracting process. The RFP process requires detailed project definition, and therefore an RFP for RMIS design, development, and implementation could not be released until the RMIS Requirements/Design Document was largely completed and areas of DOJ concern largely remedied. An RFP for the RMIS and UOFS was released in November 2002, approximately two months prior to DOJ

1 approval of the Design Document on January 31, 2003. The RFP process was concluded, and a
2 contractor was selected on May 20, 2003. The contract with Sierra Systems Group, Inc. was executed on
3 July 30, 2003.

4 Other TEAMS II Development Program activities were planned and UOFS, CMS, and DPS
5 system development contract schedules developed based upon the RMIS development schedule to the
6 maximum extent feasible. However, each system project has dependencies with the other system projects.
7 Therefore, the City has now transitioned TEAMS II Program management to managing each project based
8 upon its overall impact of the TEAMS II Development Program as a whole and to focusing resources on
9 the most important overall development milestones, thereby ensuring the timeliest implementation of the
10 TEAMS II Program as a whole.

11 The City originally planned to deploy systems LAPD-wide at a single point in time. However,
12 based upon the experience with the UOFS delay in November 2004 and with the DPS Pilot Program, the
13 City has now decided to phase the rollout of each individual system in an effort to maximize opportunities
14 for success and minimize impacts of system issues and user concerns. The phased deployment of DPS,
15 which is essential to security/access functions for all other TEAMS II related systems, dictates that
16 deployment of the UOFS would then need to be similarly phased, following DPS deployment. The phasing
17 of CMS and RMIS deployment is also planned. Such a phased deployment approach delays the schedule
18 of department-wide rollout of TEAMS II systems by between 4-6 months.

19 The benefits of phased deployment are that difficulties with the system can be identified and
20 managed within smaller groups, enabling the City to delay rollout for subsequent groups if significant system
21 or training issues are identified throughout the process. Further, there is an opportunity to better manage
22 system acceptance through a phased rollout process, which is essential to the overall success of the
23 TEAMS II Development Program by ensuring that any early system problems are identified before large
24 numbers of users are exposed to such problems.

25 The LAPD has established an internal LAPD website regarding the TEAMS II Development
26 Program to provide easy access to information regarding the status of the various systems, the training
27 schedules, and other pertinent information. The Chief of Police recorded an audio tape message regarding
28 TEAMS II and the upcoming implementation of the various systems to be viewed by all LAPD employees

1 in January 2005, via roll-call meetings, etc.

2 The City continues to proceed with TEAMS II Development Program activities. Such activities are
3 further detailed below. DOJ and the Independent Monitor have participated in several of these activities.

4 **Deployment Period System (DPS)**

5 A contract was executed with BearingPoint, Inc. (BearingPoint) on March 19, 2004. Work on the
6 DPS was initiated on March 22, 2004. The major DPS project milestones in the contract are as follows:

<u>Deliverable</u>	<u>Consent Decree Schedule</u>	<u>Contract Schedule</u>
DPS Final Design Document	Not Required	completed
DPS Interim Solution	Not Required	7/29/04
DPS Operational	Not Required	2/22/05

7
8
9
10
11
12 DPS development is largely on track with the schedule. However, as discussed above, the City
13 now plans a phased rollout of the DPS, with DPS being fully deployed department wide in summer 2005.

14 A DPS Pilot Program to test the DPS system was conducted in LAPD Central Division from
15 October to December 2004. Some issues and report needs were identified through this process. The
16 issues identified have been largely addressed and the DPS was deployed on January 11, 2005, to Central
17 Division (this was a continuation from the Pilot Program), Northeast Division, Central Bureau management,
18 Use of Force Review Section, Force Investigation Division, Office of the Inspector General, and the Police
19 Commission. Feedback on the system has been generally positive.

20 There are two DPS interfaces that are not yet operational: the PAYSR (the City payroll system)
21 and the RMIS centralized facilities interfaces. The interface with PAYSR is essential for further deployment
22 of the DPS. Without the PAYSR interface, LAPD personnel must perform dual record keeping activities.
23 While this is manageable with the current limited deployment, further deployment of DPS without the
24 PAYSR interface cannot be accomplished.

25 The PAYSR interface can only be tested every two weeks, concurrent with the payroll process.
26 The interface will first be tested in late-January 2005. It is unlikely that the first test will be 100%
27 successful.
28

1 The DPS interface with RMIS centralized facilities is critical to UOFS, RMIS, and CMS
2 operations, and therefore impacts the deployment schedule of those individual systems. The RMIS
3 centralized facilities provide security/access control for the UOFS. The DPS provides the information
4 fundamental to such security and access control functionality. The interface between the DPS and the City
5 Single Retrieval Location (SRL) and the interface between the SRL and the RMIS have been tested, with
6 problems identified. In each test, problems identified have been remedied and the interfaces re-tested.
7 Although interface issues have been significantly reduced, the end-to-end DPS-SRL-RMIS interface is not
8 yet fully operational.

9 The DPS system must be deployed at the beginning of an LAPD deployment period. Therefore,
10 the phased rollout schedule is directly tied to the deployment period schedule, which is a 28-day schedule.
11 The next LAPD deployment period begins February 7, 2005. Although the City is training the next Central
12 Bureau Divisions scheduled for DPS deployment in anticipation of a February deployment, if the PAYSR
13 interface is not operational, the next phase of DPS deployment may need to be deferred until LAPD
14 deployment period 3, which starts March 7, 2005.

15 With the phased rollout of DPS, if the PAYSR interface is operational on February 7, 2005, DPS
16 is scheduled to be deployed department-wide by May 2005. If the further deployment of DPS is delayed
17 until March 7, 2005, department-wide deployment would occur in June 2005. As discussed above, the
18 phased roll-out system deployment schedule allows the City and LAPD to assess the success of the system
19 as the system is rolled-out and adjust the roll-out schedule as appropriate to accommodate any issues or
20 concerns identified during the deployment process.

21 Since the UOFS and RMIS prototype were originally scheduled for completion for fall 2004,
22 limited DPS functionality was anticipated to be needed for testing of the UOFS in September 2004 and
23 operation of the UOFS in early November 2004. Therefore, an interim DPS, with limited functionality, was
24 planned for use until the final DPS solution was completed in early 2005. The interim DPS solution was
25 completed in fall 2004. However, the deployment of the UOFS was delayed from November 2004 to
26 February 2005. Therefore, it was determined that the resources required to deploy, maintain, and train for
27 use of the interim DPS could be more effectively used in other areas. In the absence of complete real-time
28 DPS data, the RMIS Prototype and UOFS were tested using test data generated by LAPD.

1 **Use of Force System (UOFS)**

2 The City contracted with Sierra for the design, development, implementation, and testing of the
3 RMIS and UOFS on July 30, 2003. The City reported, in August 2004, that the UOFS was on track to
4 be deployed in November 2004. However, in September/October 2004, system and training issues were
5 identified, and UOFS deployment was delayed until February 2005.

6 Deployment readiness test training was initiated on the UOFS during the week of September 20,
7 2004, with Department-wide rollout of the UOFS scheduled for November 8, 2004. Train-the-trainer
8 training was planned for late October, however, to familiarize the trainers with the system, and the trainers
9 were invited to participate in the readiness test training. During the readiness test training activities issues
10 with the UOFS and the draft training materials were identified. Accordingly, the training was delayed and
11 efforts were undertaken to identify and establish procedures to remedy identified issues.

12 The UOFS functional issues identified can be classified into three general areas: 1) system
13 stability/performance issues; 2) system bugs; and 3) City errors and or omissions in needed usability and
14 system functionality.

15 UOFS stability issues were brought to the City's attention during the readiness test training
16 sessions. Sierra identified the problem as an integration issue of Oracle and WebSphere softwares. The
17 problem has now been remedied. The City requested that load testing be performed to identify any other
18 potential issues. Sierra selected a "stress" testing tool and performed the requested testing.

19 A workflow routing problem was also identified. This functional problem was actually a third party
20 software issue, which the vendor has fixed. In addition, the City requested development of a report to
21 enable it to monitor that the problem did not occur again, and if it did, that a "work around" was possible.
22 This is in the process of being accomplished by Sierra.

23 Systems "bugs" are always anticipated with custom system development. Such UOFS bugs were
24 identified by Sierra and the City through the RMIS centralized facilities (which will be utilized by the UOFS)
25 evaluation, UOFS readiness review, and the train-the-trainer sessions. The type and number of system
26 bugs, several of which were in the process of being remedied at the time of the readiness training, were
27 such that they appeared to disrupt training efforts. Therefore, it was determined that training needed to be
28 delayed until the bugs were fully corrected within the system. The majority of the "bugs" have now been

1 remedied by Sierra.

2 Finally, during the training activities, numerous usability and functional system deficiencies were
3 noted. These can be classified into three major categories: 1) errors or omissions by the City team in
4 developing the system functional and/or detailed specifications; 2) City omission of system functionality
5 needed to address the change in use of force procedures implemented in May 2004; and 3) functionality
6 needs that could not reasonably have been anticipated until the City had an opportunity to review and
7 evaluate the new system. These types of issues range from simple issues such as adding/deleting selection
8 items from scroll-down pick lists included in the system to more complex issues such as separation of
9 screens for data entry for non-categorical use of force versus categorical use of force information.

10 The City approved a Change Order for UOFS and RMIS centralized facility system modifications
11 to remedy the system issues identified. Sierra delivered the UOFS with the requested changes to the City
12 for testing on January 18, 2005. The City is in the process of testing the UOFS. However, full testing of
13 the UOFS cannot occur until the DPS-SRL-RMIS end-to-end DPS interface is fully operational. The
14 UOFS has been tested with test data generated by LAPD and more recently with data directly obtained
15 from the DPS. However, the security/access control has dynamic functionality that should be ideally tested
16 with a full DPS interface. The City desires at least one week to test the UOFS with the full DPS interface
17 functionality, prior to determining the UOFS ready for initial deployment.

18 Initial UOFS deployment is currently planned for mid-February 2005, contingent upon the DPS
19 interface being operational. The UOFS will have a phased deployment, which directly tracks the DPS
20 deployment. Therefore, the UOFS will be initially deployed to Central Division, Northeast Division,
21 Central Bureau management, Use of Force Review Section, Force Investigation Division, and the Office of
22 the Inspector General. Unlike DPS, the UOFS is not deployment period dependent; therefore, it can be
23 deployed at any time once the system is fully operational. However, it is dependent upon DPS, so UOFS
24 deployment must track DPS deployment. If the UOFS is successfully deployed in mid-February 2005,
25 department-wide deployment will proceed in stages following DPS deployment, with UOFS deployment
26 currently anticipated to be completed department-wide in summer 2005.

27 UOFS training materials have been reworked to address deficiencies identified during readiness test
28 training and to reflect system enhancements. UOFS training was initiated on January 18, 2005, in

1 anticipation of the initial system deployment in February 2005.

2 The City initiated a review process to understand the causes of the City UOFS errors and
3 omissions to ensure such issues are identified early in the CMS and RMIS Release 2 development
4 processes.

5 The Monitor and DOJ were expeditiously notified of the UOFS delay and further briefed regarding
6 the UOFS delay at the October 14, 2004 monthly TEAMS II meeting. With the numerous
7 interrelationships between systems, the City continues to make efforts to timely inform the DOJ and
8 Monitor of any major system or system integration issues as they arise.

9 An audit of historical use of force data elements captured in the current LAPD systems and
10 important to RMIS operation was conducted by the LAPD Audit Division. The audit covered the period
11 of January 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004. The audit found that non-categorical use of force data elements of
12 concern have a relatively high accuracy rate. The audit also identified that Supervisor on Scene and Partner
13 Serial Number data was not collected in a significant number of cases (69% and 35%, respectively).
14 Based upon the audit, historical data input for non-categorical uses of force is not planned. The LAPD has
15 developed, and placed into use, a supplemental use of force data collection form that will collect use of
16 force information that is not currently collected, but that will be collected in the new UOFS (including
17 Supervisor on Scene and Partner Serial Number). Use of this supplemental use of force data form is
18 required for all uses of force occurring after December 31, 2004. This will enable such data to be more
19 easily entered into the UOFS once it is operational.

20 The audit found that for Categorical Uses of Force, a large percentage of important information
21 was missing. Therefore, LAPD initiated historical data input for the 176 CUOF investigations that were
22 completed since January 1, 2003. The Use of Force Review Section has been alerted to ensure that all
23 future Categorical Use of Force cases have appropriate data input into the system.

24 Loading of data from the existing LAPD UOF applications to the new UOFS will be completed
25 prior to initial rollout of the system. The data has been successfully converted and the conversion accuracy
26 has been evaluated.

27 **Risk Management Information System (RMIS)**

As indicated above, the City contracted with Sierra Systems Group, Inc. for the design, development, implementation, and testing of the RMIS and UOFS on July 30, 2003. The major RMIS project milestones in the contract, as revised (discussed in the City's February 2, 2004, Status Report to the Court), are as follows:

Deliverable	Consent Decree Schedule	Contract Schedule (as revised)
RMIS Final Design Document	Not Required	completed
RMIS Prototype	1/31/04	completed
RMIS Pilot Program	Not Required	3/11/05
RMIS Operational	10/31/05	6/27/05

RMIS development is currently on track with this schedule. An internal audit of the RMIS and UOFS development projects was completed by Sierra, as required by the contract, in June 2004. The audit found that the project was healthy and on schedule.

As reported to the Court in February 2004, the City, DOJ, and Independent Monitor staff participated in a walkthrough of the RMIS Design Document in December 2003. The DOJ expeditiously reviewed the Design Document and provided comments to the City for consideration. The City completed its review of the RMIS Design Document and submitted comments to the Contractor during the first week of January 2004. In February 2004, the City approved the final RMIS design.

During RMIS design activities, several needed clarifications, modifications, and enhancements to RMIS functional requirements were identified. These project changes were documented in a Change Order to the contract on July 7, 2004. Further, as indicated above, additional changes to RMIS centralized facilities were identified during the UOFS readiness testing process. A Change Order to effectuate these changes was executed on December 21, 2004. These changes were implemented as part of the January 18, 2005, UOFS enhancements. These changes did not impact the RMIS development schedule.

The RMIS prototype was provided to the City for evaluation in August 2004, one month ahead of the revised schedule. The City conducted two weeks of prototype review and evaluation. This included a formal demonstration for City management, the DOJ and the Monitor on August 12, 2004. The DOJ and

1 Independent Monitor also participated in other various prototype review processes and demonstrations.
2 The RMIS prototype included centralized security, workflow, and system access modules functionality.
3 This was an important milestone for the TEAMS II project.

4 It should be noted that the functionality provided in the RMIS prototype delivered for City review
5 far exceeded the RMIS beta test version established in Paragraph 50(c). The requirements established for
6 the RMIS beta version in Paragraph 50(c) were largely met in May-June 2004.

7 Upon completion of the RMIS prototype review, the City provided comments and documentation
8 of identified system deficiencies to Sierra. Sierra then completed the design document for RMIS Release 2
9 (the operational system). The City reviewed and approved the RMIS Release 2 design document in winter
10 2004.

11 The DOJ approved the TEAMS II Use Protocols on January 11, 2005 (see also Paragraph 47).
12 These protocols include the Action Item thresholds that will be initially programmed into the RMIS. With
13 DOJ approval, RMIS programming of these thresholds is now underway. The RMIS prototype
14 demonstrated the flexibility of the system to allow for the changing of Action Item threshold levels, as well
15 as the ability to program new thresholds.

16 A phased deployment for the RMIS is now planned, with deployment being initiated in late
17 June/early July 2005 and extending through October 2005. The initial deployment will be department-wide
18 for access to TEAMS reports, however other system functionality, such as automated Action Items, will be
19 phased in over time. The LAPD plans to utilize e-learning for access to TEAMS reports, enabling broad
20 training in a relatively short period of time.

21 The DPS must be deployed department-wide prior to RMIS deployment. Therefore, any
22 significant delays in DPS deployment could negatively impact RMIS deployment.

23 As discussed previously, RMIS development includes centralized facilities that will be utilized by
24 new TEAMS II-related systems. Therefore, close coordination between Sierra, the RMIS Contractor, and
25 BearingPoint, Inc., the DPS and CMS Contractor, is required. With both Contractors engaging in
26 concurrent design and development activities, some coordination issues were identified. Procedures to
27 ensure coordination between the Contractors and the City were formalized and are working well.

28 **Complaint Management System (CMS)**

1 A contract was executed with BearingPoint, Inc. (BearingPoint) on December 23, 2003. Work on
2 the CMS was initiated on January 5, 2004.

3 As reported to the Court in February 2004, the Complaint Management System (CMS) was
4 delayed approximately six weeks from the original contract schedule CMS operational date of April 18,
5 2005, to late May 2005. The revised schedule bifurcated design and established a very aggressive
6 schedule to finalize CMS design, with final design scheduled for completion in late August. The final CMS
7 design was approved by LAPD in September 2004, however the approval was two weeks behind the
8 revised schedule.

9 As a result of the issues the City identified during UOFS readiness testing, the Professional
10 Standards Bureau (PSB) was requested to conduct an early review of CMS (review of CMS Iteration 3)
11 to avoid similar last-minute identification of system issues. PSB's review of CMS Iteration 3 identified
12 some functionality issues. The City is currently evaluating the CMS functionality and user friendliness issues
13 identified, all of which have cost and schedule implications. The City is in the process of meeting with
14 BearingPoint regarding cost and schedule implications of making desired system
15 modifications/enhancements. Therefore, although it is currently anticipated that CMS Iteration 4 will be
16 provided to the City by BearingPoint in February 2005, it is likely that the current CMS initial deployment
17 schedule of May 2005 will be delayed in order to address the identified functionality issues, although the
18 scope of such delay remains uncertain at this time.

19 Upon completion, the CMS will be deployed in phases, with deployment planned over an
20 approximately 4-month period.

21 The LAPD Audit Division conducted an audit of the accuracy of the complaint data elements in the
22 existing LAPD system and important to RMIS operation from January 1, 2003. Preliminary results indicate
23 a high level of accuracy for all data elements of concern. Therefore, no historical data input is planned for
24 complaint information.

25 Conversion of data from predecessor systems to the new CMS is included in the CMS contract.
26 The City has reviewed and approved the data conversion plan for the new CMS.
27
28

1 **Data Staging Repository (Single Retrieval Location)**

2 Analysis of the LAPD source systems for RMIS data and associated data quality assessments have
3 been completed for existing LAPD complaint tracking systems, use of force precursor systems, Claims and
4 Lawsuits Information System (CLIS), Traffic Information System (TIS), Consolidated Crime Analysis
5 Database (CCAD), Shooting Qualification and Bonus System (SQUAB), Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian
6 Stop Data System (STOPS), and Training Management System (TMS). Needed system modifications
7 identified through the source system assessment effort have largely been completed.

8 Since DPS and CMS are being built concurrent with the SRL and RMIS, differences in the
9 systems, SRL, and RMIS data transmission formats are anticipated. Such differences in data have been
10 experienced with the DPS end-to-end DPS-SRL-RMIS interface testing. Issues are being resolved as
11 they are identified.

12 **APRIS/ICARS**

13 On April 30, 2002, the City executed a \$2.4 million contract with KPMG Consulting, Inc., now
14 Bearing Point Inc. (hereinafter "Contractor"), for stabilization and enhancement of the LAPD Automated
15 Personnel Records Imaging System (APRIS) and Integrated Crime and Arrest Records System (ICARS).
16 Although not considered part of the TEAMS II Development Program, this project is essential to meeting
17 the City's TEAMS II commitments regarding access to arrest and priority one crime reports. APRIS was
18 placed into production mode in July 2003. With the exception of the ability to convert microfilm images
19 and provide for decentralized ("remote") access, ICARS was functional for centralized image capture and
20 retrieval in July 2003.

21 As previously reported, ICARS remote access was placed in production in June 2004. The LAPD
22 reports no problems with the remote access. LAPD completed a survey of remote access users to assist in
23 identifying and resolving outstanding system issues or training needs. The feedback on the surveys was
24 generally positive.

25 The two additional ICARS scanners funded by Council in late May 2004 were received by LAPD
26 July 12, 2004. Upon being configured for the ICARS, Records and Identification Division (R&I) will have
27 two scanners operational in the ICARS Unit, one scanner operational in the Automated Vehicle and
28 Property Section (AVPS), and one scanner operational in the Specialized Reports Distribution Unit

1 (SRDU). It is anticipated that the two additional scanners in AVPS and SRDU will reduce the Automated
2 Records Section monthly workload by approximately 3,150 reports.

3 **RMIS Use Protocol Development**

4 The City submitted Part 1 of the RMIS use protocols, and RMIS Action Item Thresholds, required
5 to be completed by April 30, 2004, pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 50, to DOJ for review and
6 approval on April 27, 2004. DOJ completed its review and responded to the City with some issues on
7 July 6, 2004.

8 Part 2 of the TEAMS II use protocol, responses and reviews, required as a result of exceeding
9 Action Item thresholds, was approved for submittal to DOJ for review and approval by the Police
10 Commission and Executive Employee Relations Committee (EERC) in late July 2004. The City provided
11 Part 2 of the TEAMS II use protocol to DOJ on August 9, 2004, and met to discuss the DOJ's comments
12 on Part 1 of the use protocol. The City formally submitted, via written correspondence, Part 2 of the
13 TEAMS II Use Protocols for DOJ review and approval on August 28, 2004. A meeting to further discuss
14 the TEAMS II Use Protocols was held on September 8, 2004. It was agreed at that time that monthly
15 meetings would be held through December 2004 to facilitate resolution of issues and expedite development
16 of the use protocols, ensuring adequate time for the meet and confer process related to Part 2 of the
17 TEAMS II Use Protocol to be completed in time for RMIS training in spring 2005.

18 The DOJ approved the RMIS Use Protocols on January 11, 2005. The City initiated the meet and
19 confer process regarding those TEAMS II Use Protocols with the Los Angeles Police Protective League
20 (PPL) on January 6, 2005, in anticipation of DOJ's approval of the TEAMS II Use Protocol. The Police
21 Commission and the City's Executive Employee Relations Committee (EERC) provided negotiating
22 instructions to the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and authorized the LAPD to initiate negotiations
23 with impacted unions regarding the TEAMS II Use Protocols on January 18 and January 24, 2005,
24 respectively. All LAPD employees will be included in the Risk Management System (RMIS), and
25 therefore several labor unions will need to be engaged as part of the TEAMS II Use Protocol meet and
26 confer processes.

1 At this point in time it is anticipated that the TEAMS II Use Protocol meet and confer processes
2 will be completed prior to the planned RMIS operational timeframe of summer/fall 2005 (see above for
3 TEAMS II development schedule). See also Paragraph 46.

4 **TEAMS 1.5**

5 As previously reported to the Court, the City implemented TEAMS 1.5, which is designed to
6 provide greater access to TEAMS I information department-wide. TEAMS 1.5 has been implemented in
7 the 4 geographic Bureaus, 18 geographic Areas, and several specialty divisions.

8 The implementation of TEAMS 1.5 has resulted in increased use of TEAMS department-wide.

9 An audit of LAPD that was completed in summer 2004 revealed that law enforcement activity
10 related death (LEARD) and law enforcement related injury (LERI) uses of force were not included in
11 TEAMS 1.5. The LAPD released a notice in June 2004 regarding the data gap that encourages officers to
12 contact the Use of Force Review Section regarding uses of force when reviewing TEAMS reports. This
13 "gap" in information was anticipated to be fully addressed with the then-scheduled deployment of the
14 UOFS in November 2004. With the delay in the deployment of the UOFS, the LAPD is working to
15 further ensure that the procedures outlined in the June 2004 Notice are being followed.

16 In addition to implementing TEAMS 1.5, the LAPD has worked to modify the existing complaint
17 and use of force tracking systems to collect and provide more information, pending completion of the new
18 systems. In addition, PSB has developed seven reports that are provided to Bureau commands monthly
19 that provide supervisors with information regarding misconduct complaint processing performance. Similar
20 reports are prepared for use of force investigations.

21 The City and LAPD have identified and are implementing many other methods of improving risk
22 management as the City develops TEAMS II and implements the various other provisions of the Consent
23 Decree. Actions and programs that are currently in place to improve LAPD management and supervisory
24 oversight include:

- 25 • Centralized LAPD review of all non-categorical use of force investigations to ensure
26 consistent standards and application of procedures.
- 27 • Audits and ad hoc reviews to identify problem policies or procedures and potentially at-risk
28 employees, including Audit Division, OIG, PSB integrity audits, and CRID reviews.

- Reviews for personnel actions involving selection, de-selection, transfer, and loan to PSB, FTO, GED, and CUOF investigation positions.
- TEAMS I.5 reviews of all employees transferred into a command.
- Enhanced annual employee evaluations.
- Including risk statistics in monthly COMPSTAT reviews.
- Organizational comparisons of complaints and uses of force made available to all commands.
- Annual review of CUOF incidents.
- Review of potentially at-risk officers based upon lessons learned in developing RMIS Action Item thresholds.

Further, management oversight capabilities will be increased over the next year, with the decentralization of ICARS in July 2004, operation of the new decentralized UOFS, operation of the DPS, operation of the new decentralized CMS in spring 2005, and operation of the RMIS.

1 **Decree ¶40**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “40. The Commission, the Inspector General, and the Chief of Police shall each
4 have equal and full access to TEAMS II, and may each use TEAMS II to its fullest
5 capabilities in performing their duties and responsibilities, subject to restrictions on use of
6 information contained in applicable law. To the extent that highly sensitive information is
7 contained in TEAMS II, the Commission may impose an identical access restriction on
8 itself and the Inspector General to such information, provided that no such access
9 restriction may in any way impair or impede implementation of this Agreement. The
10 Department shall establish a policy with respect to granting or limiting access to TEAMS II
11 by all other persons, including the staff of the Commission and the Inspector General, but
12 excluding DOJ and the Monitor, whose access to TEAMS II is governed by paragraphs
13 166, 167, and 177.”

14 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

15 **Due Dates:**

16 **Current Compliance Status:** See Paragraph 39

17 **Policy/Procedure:**

18 **Activities:**

19 General access requirements, consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 40, are presented in
20 the RMIS Requirements/Design Document approved by DOJ on January 31, 2003. The RMIS Design
21 Document developed by the RMIS Contractor incorporates these requirements.
22 RMIS access and control is being addressed in both the RMIS and DPS (see Paragraph 39).

23 RMIS access and control is being addressed in both the RMIS and DPS (see Paragraph 39).

1 **Decree ¶41**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “41. TEAMS II shall contain information on the following matters:

4 a. all non-lethal uses of force that are required to be reported in LAPD “use
5 of force” reports or otherwise are the subject of an administrative investigation by the
6 Department;

7 b. all instances in which a police canine bites a member of the public;

8 c. all officer-involved shootings and firearms discharges, both on-duty and
9 off-duty (excluding training or target range shootings, authorized ballistic testing, legal sport
10 shooting events, or those incidents that occur off-duty in connection with the recreational
11 use of firearms, in each case, where no person is hit by the discharge);

12 d. all other, lethal uses of force;

13 e. all other injuries and deaths that are reviewed by the LAPD Use of Force
14 Review Board (or otherwise are the subject of an administrative investigation);

15 f. all vehicle pursuits and traffic collisions;

16 g. all Complaint Form 1.28 investigations;

17 h. with respect to the foregoing clauses (a) through (g), the results of
18 adjudication of all investigations (whether criminal or administrative) and discipline imposed
19 or non-disciplinary action taken;

20 i. all written compliments received by the LAPD about officer performance;

21 j. all commendations and awards;

22 k. all criminal arrests and investigations known to LAPD of, and all charges
23 against, LAPD employees;

24 l. all civil or administrative claims filed with and all lawsuits served upon the
25 City or its officers, or agents, in each case resulting from LAPD operations, and all lawsuits
26 served on an officer of the LAPD resulting from LAPD operations and known by the City,
27 the Department, or the City Attorney’s Office;

- 1 m. all civil lawsuits filed against LAPD officers which are required to be
2 reported to the LAPD pursuant to paragraph 77;
- 3 n. all arrest reports, crime reports, and citations made by officers, and all
4 motor vehicle stops and pedestrian stops that are required to be documented in the manner
5 specified in paragraphs 104 and 105;
- 6 o. assignment and rank history, and information from performance evaluations
7 for each officer;
- 8 p. training history and any failure of an officer to meet weapons qualification
9 requirements; and
- 10 q. all management and supervisory actions taken pursuant to a review of
11 TEAMS II information, including non-disciplinary actions.

12 TEAMS II further shall include, for the incidents included in the database, appropriate additional
13 information about involved officers (*e.g.*, name and serial number), and appropriate information about the
14 involved members of the public (including demographic information such as race, ethnicity, or national
15 origin). Additional information on officers involved in incidents (*e.g.*, work assignment, officer partner, field
16 supervisor, and shift at the time of the incident) shall be determinable from TEAMS II.”

18 PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

19 **Due Dates:**

20 **Current Compliance Status:** See Paragraph 39

21 **Policy/Procedure:**

22 **Activities:**

23 The data elements and data element values to be included in the RMIS, consistent with the
24 information requirements of Paragraph 41, are presented in the RMIS Requirements/Design Document
25 approved by DOJ on January 31, 2003. The RMIS Design Document developed by the RMIS
26 Contractor incorporates these requirements (see Paragraph 39). Data values have been modified during
27 the RMIS development to reflect the best information available. DOJ has been consulted regarding some
28 of these changes.

1 **Decree ¶42**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “42. The Department shall prepare and implement a plan for in-putting historical data
4 into TEAMS II (the Data Input Plan). The City shall have flexibility in determining the most cost
5 effective, reliable and time sensitive means for inputting such data, which may include conversion of
6 existing computerized databases. The Data Input Plan will identify the data to be included and the
7 means for inputting such data (whether conversion or otherwise), the specific fields of information to
8 be included, the past time periods for which information is to be included, the deadlines for inputting
9 the data, and will assign responsibility for the input of the data. The City will use reasonable efforts
10 to include historical data that are up-to-date and complete in TEAMS II. The amount, type and
11 scope of historical data to be included in TEAMS II shall be determined by the City, after
12 consultation with the DOJ, on the basis of the availability and accuracy of such data in existing
13 computer systems, the cost of obtaining or converting such data, and the impact of including or not
14 including such data will have on the overall ability of the Department to use TEAMS II as an
15 effective tool to manage at-risk behavior. The means and schedule for inputting such data will be
16 determined by the City in consultation with DOJ, taking into consideration the above factors, as
17 well as the City’s ability to meet its obligations under paragraph 50. With regard to historic use of
18 force data, the City shall make the determinations required by this paragraph for the beta version of
19 TEAMS II required by paragraph 50(c) and again for the final version of TEAMS II.”
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Dates:

Current Compliance Status: See Paragraph 39

Policy/Procedure:

Activities:

Assessment of existing RMIS source systems and associated data quality, identification of data gaps, and development of RMIS thresholds are important precursors to the development of historic data input needs.

Initial analysis of the LAPD source systems for RMIS data and associated data quality assessments have been completed for existing LAPD complaint tracking systems, use of force precursor systems, Claims and Lawsuits Information System (CLIS), Traffic Information System (TIS), Consolidated Crime Analysis Database (CCAD), Shooting Qualification and Bonus System (SQUAB), Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stop Data System (STOPS), and Training Management System (TMS). Needed system modifications identified through the source system assessment effort have been completed.

An audit of historical use of force data elements captured in the current LAPD systems and important to RMIS operation was conducted by the LAPD Audit Division. The audit covered the period of January 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004. The audit found that non-categorical use of force data elements of concern have a relatively high accuracy rate. The audit also identified that Supervisor on Scene and Partner Serial number was not collected in a significant number of cases (69% and 35%, respectively). Based upon the audit, historical data input for non-categorical uses of force is not planned. The LAPD has developed, and placed into use, a supplemental use of force data collection form, which will collect use of force information that is not currently collected, but that will be collected in the new UOFS (including Supervisor on Scene and Partner Serial number). Use of this supplemental use of force data form is required for all uses of force occurring after December 31, 2004. This will enable such data to be more easily entered into the UOFS once completed.

The audit found that for Categorical Uses of Force, a large percentage of important information

1 was missing. Therefore, LAPD initiated historical data input for the 176 CUOF investigations that were
2 completed since January 1, 2003. The Use of Force Review Section has been alerted to ensure that all
3 future Categorical Use of Force cases have appropriate data input into the system.

4 Loading of data from the existing LAPD UOF applications to the new UOFS will be completed
5 prior to initial rollout of the UOFS system. That data has been successfully converted and the conversion
6 accuracy has been evaluated.

7 The LAPD Audit Division conducted an audit of the accuracy of the compliant data elements in the
8 existing LAPD system and important to RMIS operation from January 1, 2003. Preliminary results indicate
9 a high level of accuracy for all data elements of concern. Therefore, no historical data input is planned for
10 complaint information.

11 Conversion of data from predecessor systems to the new CMS is included in the CMS contract.
12 The City has reviewed and approved the data conversion plan for the new CMS.

13 Upon finalization of the compliant application audit, the Audit Division will initiate review of the
14 Claims and Lawsuit System (CLIS).

15 See also Paragraph 39 discussion.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶43**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “43. TEAMS II shall include relevant numerical and descriptive information about
4 each incorporated item and incident, and scanned or electronic attachments of copies of
5 relevant documents (e.g., through scanning or using computerized word processing).
6 TEAMS II shall have the capability to search and retrieve (through reports and queries)
7 numerical counts, percentages and other statistical analyses derived from numerical
8 information in the database; listings; descriptive information; and electronic document
9 copies for (a) individual employees, LAPD units, and groups of officers, and (b) incidents
10 or items and groups of incidents or items. TEAMS II shall have the capability to search
11 and retrieve this information for specified time periods, based on combinations of data fields
12 contained in TEAMS II (as designated by the authorized user).
13

14 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

15 **Due Dates:**

16 **Current Compliance Status:** See Paragraph 39

17 **Policy/Procedure:**

18 **Activities:**

19 The RMIS functionality, consistent with the information requirements of Paragraph 43, is presented
20 in the RMIS Requirements/Design Documents approved by DOJ on January 31, 2003. The RMIS Design
21 Document developed by the RMIS Contractor incorporates these requirements (see Paragraph 39). Much
22 of this functionality was illustrated in the RMIS Prototype demonstration in August 2004.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶44**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “44. Where information about a single incident is entered in TEAMS II from
4 more than one document (e.g., from a Complaint Form 1.28 and a use of force report),
5 TEAMS II shall use a common control number or other equally effective means to link the
6 information from different sources so that the user can cross-reference the information and
7 perform analyses. Similarly, all personally identifiable information relating to LAPD officers
8 shall contain the serial or other employee identification number of the officer to allow for
9 linking and cross-referencing information.”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Dates:**

13 **Current Compliance Status:** See Paragraph 39

14 **Policy/Procedure:**

15 **Activities:**

16 The RMIS includes cross-referencing capabilities, consistent with the information requirements of
17 Paragraph 44. Cross-referencing functionality requirements are presented in the RMIS
18 Requirements/Design approved by DOJ on January 31, 2003. The RMIS Design Document developed by
19 the RMIS Contractor incorporates these requirements (see Paragraph 39).

1 **Decree ¶45**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “45. The City shall prepare a design document for TEAMS II that sets forth in
4 detail the City’s plan for ensuring that the requirements of paragraphs 41, 43, and 44 are
5 met, including: (i) the data tables and fields and values to be included pursuant to
6 paragraphs 41 and 43 and (ii) the documents that will be electronically attached. The City
7 shall prepare this document in consultation with the DOJ and the Monitor, and shall obtain
8 approval for such design document from the DOJ, which approval shall not be
9 unreasonably withheld.”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Dates:** September 17, 2001 TEAMS II Design Document

13 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

14 **Policy/Procedure:** Submittal of RMIS data elements on September 17, 2001 and the
15 Requirements/Design document on October 1, 2001; Response to DOJ comments; Establishment of the
16 “*LAPD Management System Reengineering Project (MSRP)*,” approved by City Council on December
17 16, 2001, Police Commission conditional approval on December 11, 2001, approval January 8, 2002;
18 Additional MSRP Staff Authorization, approved by the Police Commission April 23, 2002, approved by
19 City Council April 30, 2002, approved by the Mayor May 7, 2002; Special Order No. 13, “*Training*
20 *Evaluation and Management System – Guidelines*,” dated April 5, 2002; Submittal of revised RMIS
21 Requirements/Design Document on September 6, 2002; October 28, 2002, renewed request for peer
22 group definition approval.

23 **Activities:**

24 The City has provided the DOJ and the Independent Monitor, for comment and review, several
25 draft Contractor deliverables and demonstrations of the RMIS and UOFS architecture and preliminary
26 builds since DOJ’s January 31, 2003, approval of the RMIS Requirements/Design. Further, the City,
27 DOJ, and Independent Monitor meet monthly to discuss the status of the TEAMS II Development
28 Program.

1 Of note, over the past several months the City was provided a demonstration to the DOJ and the
2 Independent Monitor of a UOFS build (June 10, 2004), RMIS functionality (June 23 and 25, 2004) and
3 the RMIS Prototype (August 12, 2004).

4 **Historical Compliance Actions**

5 The City submitted the RMIS data elements on September 17, 2001 and the RMIS
6 Requirements/Design document on October 1, 2001, to the DOJ and the Independent Monitor. DOJ
7 provided comments on the document to the City on November 7, 2001. Pursuant to the time frames
8 established in Paragraph 50, the City was required to respond to the comments submitted by DOJ on the
9 RMIS Requirements/Design Document within 10 days; November 26, 2001. The City submitted a global
10 response to DOJ's comments on December 13, 2001. Response to the approximately 140 data element
11 requests was submitted to DOJ on January 15, 2002. On February 11, 2002, the DOJ responded to the
12 City's December 13, 2001 and January 15, 2002, responses to DOJ comments. The week of February
13 11, 2002, the City and DOJ met over a three-day period to discuss issues. Several subsequent dialogs and
14 informal exchanges of information between the City and DOJ occurred in February and early March. In
15 consideration of the discussions with DOJ, the City again reviewed each of the 140 data element items
16 included in DOJ's November 7, 2001, RMIS Requirements/Design Document comment letter to which the
17 City responded on January 15, 2002. City staff informally shared draft written information with DOJ staff
18 on February 26, 2002, and March 11, 2002, in an effort to further resolve issues. The City and DOJ met
19 over a three-day period during the week of March 15, 2002, in an effort to resolve outstanding issues. On
20 May 8, 2002, the City submitted a draft of a comprehensive written response to DOJ detailing the City's
21 position with regard to each requested item, as well as supporting information, allowing for further
22 discussion to DOJ. The City and DOJ met to discuss outstanding issues on May 9, 2002, and follow-up
23 conference calls were held May 23, and May 29, 2002. Several additional informal conversations were
24 held, as well as the monthly monitoring TEAMS II meeting in June 2002. On July 11, 2002, the City
25 provided DOJ with a discussion draft of the revised RMIS Requirements/Design Document that
26 incorporates the agreed upon changes. The DOJ provided comments on some aspects of the draft
27 document on July 22, 2002. The City and DOJ continued discussions and informal exchange s of
28 documents through August 2002.

1 On September 6, 2002, the City submitted the final RMIS Requirements/Design Document to DOJ
2 for approval. On September 11, 2002, the City submitted a corrected page 84 to RMIS
3 Requirements/Design Document to DOJ. On October 3, 2002, the DOJ submitted a letter to the City
4 seeking clarification regarding applicability of the Consent Decree TEAMS II provision to the Use of Force
5 System (UOFS) and the Complaint Management System (CMS). The City clarification was discussed
6 with the Independent Monitor and the DOJ in the October 2000 monthly TEAMS II monitoring meeting.
7 The City responded in writing to the DOJ on October 18, 2002.

8 On November 15 and December 5, 2002, the DOJ submitted letters to the City requesting that the
9 City advise the DOJ as to whether or not the City had changed its position on including in the RMIS the
10 data identifying use of force incidents where the suspect appeared to be mentally ill, and proposing an
11 alternative for City consideration, respectively. The City's response was submitted to DOJ on December
12 11, 2002, as requested by DOJ. The DOJ approved the RMIS Design/Requirements Document on
13 January 31, 2003. Although DOJ approval of the RMIS Requirements/Design Document was significantly
14 delayed, the City proceeded with RMIS-related development activities. The City included DOJ in review
15 of many such activities.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶46**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “46. The Department shall develop and implement a protocol for using TEAMS
4 II, for purposes including supervising and auditing the performance of specific officers,
5 supervisors, managers, and LAPD units, as well as the LAPD as a whole. The City shall
6 prepare this protocol in consultation with the DOJ and the Monitor, and shall obtain
7 approval for the protocol and any subsequent modifications to the protocol from the DOJ
8 for matters covered by paragraph 47, which approval(s) shall not be unreasonably
9 withheld. The City shall notify DOJ of proposed modifications to the protocol that do not
10 address matters covered by paragraph 47 prior to implementing such modifications. In
11 reviewing the protocol and the design document for approval, DOJ shall use reasonable
12 efforts to respond promptly to the City in order to enable the City to meet the deadlines
13 imposed by paragraph 50.”

14 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

15
16 **Due Dates:** April 30, 2004

17 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance/Paragraphs 8 & 184

18 **Policy/Procedure:** Meet and Confer; Submittal of RMIS Use Protocol Phase 1 on April 27, 2004;
19 Submittal of RMIS Use Protocol Phase 2 on August 28, 2004; DOJ approval of the TEAMS II Use
20 Protocol, January 11, 2005.

21 **Activities:**

22 The TEAMS II unit within the Human Resources Bureau, Risk Management Group, established
23 and operational on April 30, 2000, is the lead on development of RMIS use protocols (see Paragraph 53).
24 The TEAMS II section of the Risk Management Group has been incorporated into the MSRP during
25 TEAMS II development activities (see Paragraph 39). The current restructuring of LAPD eliminated the
26 HRB, with the Risk Management Group now being under the command of the Office of Personnel
27 Services.
28

1 The development of: 1) thresholds pursuant to Paragraph 47(d) which require RMIS review by
2 supervisors and managers; 2) reports and comparisons pursuant to Paragraph 47(k); and 3) peer groups
3 for threshold comparison purposes have been identified as priorities, as this information is needed for the
4 RMIS design effort. Therefore, as discussed in Section 11.1 of the August 2002 RMIS
5 Requirements/Design Document, although the Consent Decree provides for the completion of the RMIS
6 use protocol after the development of the RMIS beta version, the resolution of certain RMIS use protocol
7 issues (including the peer group definition) was essential to RMIS data mart design and development. To
8 accommodate this need, a phased RMIS use protocol process was established.

9 On October 28, 2002, the City formally requested DOJ to approve the peer group definition
10 included in the RMIS Requirements/Design Document. The DOJ responded regarding Risk Management
11 Information System (RMIS) peer group definition approval in a letter dated December 20, 2002. On
12 January 16, 2003, the City submitted a letter to DOJ seeking to clarify DOJ's response and proposed peer
13 group definition approval. The DOJ approved the peer group definition.

14 A Protocols Development Committee was established in July 2003, comprised of various LAPD
15 Bureau Commanders and Captains, the Office of the Inspector General, Los Angeles Police Protective
16 League, and MSRP staff. The Independent Monitor staff also participates in this Committee at times. The
17 Protocols Development Committee was formed to assist in the process of developing proposed thresholds
18 of potential risk indicators (e.g. Action Item thresholds) and supporting statistics. The Committee also has
19 worked to establish peer groups appropriate for comparisons in reviewing potential at-risk indicators.
20 Action Item thresholds for individuals in a specific threshold comparison peer group for use of force,
21 complaints, claims and lawsuits, pursuits, and collisions have been developed.

22 As discussed under Paragraph 39, the RMIS Design Document includes prototype functionality,
23 including Action Item thresholds. The City submitted use of force Action Item thresholds that are proposed
24 to be included in the Prototype for DOJ review and approval in October 2003.

25
26 The Protocols Development Committee's proposal for the RMIS Use Protocol Phase 1, covering
27 Action Item Thresholds and associated peer groups, was reviewed by the Chief of Police and approved by
28 the Police Commission on April 20, 2004. The City provided the DOJ and Independent Monitor with a

1 final draft of the proposed Phase 1 RMIS Use Protocol on April 15, 2004. The City further notified the
2 DOJ, via e-mail, on April 20, 2004, that the proposed Phase 1 RMIS Use Protocol has been approved by
3 the Police Commission on April 20, 2004, without modification, and requested DOJ to initiate the review
4 and approval process. The City submitted Part 1 of the RMIS use protocols required to be completed by
5 April 30, 2004, pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 50(b), to DOJ for review and approval via
6 "official" City correspondence on April 27, 2004. DOJ completed its review of Phase 1 of the RMIS Use
7 Protocol and responded to the City with some issues on July 6, 2004.

8 Part 2 of the RMIS Use Protocols, addressing responses and reviews required as a result of
9 exceeding Action Item thresholds, was approved for submittal to the DOJ for review and approval by the
10 Police Commission on June 22, 2004, and the Executive Employee Relations Committee (EERC) on June
11 28, 2004. Part 2 of the RMIS Use Protocol was provided to DOJ on August 9, 2004, with a formal letter
12 requesting approval of the RMIS Use Protocol submitted to DOJ on August 28, 2004.

13 A meeting to further discuss the TEAMS II Use Protocols was held on September 8, 2004. It was
14 agreed at that time that monthly meetings would be held through December 2004 to facilitate resolution of
15 issues and expedite development of the use protocols, ensuring adequate time for the meet and confer
16 process related to Part 2 of the TEAMS II Use Protocol to be completed in time for RMIS training in
17 spring 2005.

18 The DOJ approved the RMIS Use Protocols on January 11, 2004. The City initiated the meet and
19 confer process regarding those TEAMS II Use Protocols with the Los Angeles Police Protective League
20 (PPL) on January 6, 2005, in anticipation of DOJ's approval of the TEAMS II Use Protocol. The Police
21 Commission and the City's Executive Employee Relations Committee (EERC) provided negotiating
22 instructions to the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and authorized the LAPD to initiate negotiations
23 with impacted unions regarding the TEAMS II Use Protocols on January 18 and January 24, 2005,
24 respectively. All LAPD employees will be included in the Risk Management System (RMIS), and
25 therefore several labor unions will need to be engaged as part of the TEAMS II Use Protocol meet and
26 confer processes.

1 It is anticipated that the TEAMS II Use Protocol meet and confer processes will be completed
2 prior to the planned RMIS operational timeframe of summer/fall 2005 (see Paragraph 39 for TEAMS II
3 development schedule).

1 **Decree ¶47**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “47. The protocol for using TEAMS II shall include the following provisions and
4 elements:

5 a The protocol shall require that, on a regular basis, supervisors review and
6 analyze all relevant information in TEAMS II about officers under their supervision to detect
7 any pattern or series of incidents that indicate that an officer, group of officers, or an LAPD
8 unit under his or her supervision may be engaging in at-risk behavior.

9 b. The protocol shall provide that when at-risk behavior may be occurring
10 based on a review and analysis described in the preceding subparagraph, appropriate
11 managers and supervisors shall undertake a more intensive review of the officer’s
12 performance.

13 c. The protocol shall require that LAPD managers on a regular basis review
14 and analyze relevant information in TEAMS II about subordinate managers and supervisors
15 in their command regarding the subordinate’s ability to manage adherence to policy and to
16 address at-risk behavior.

17 d The protocol shall state guidelines for numbers and types of incidents
18 requiring a TEAMS II review by supervisors and managers (in addition to the regular
19 reviews required by the preceding subparagraphs), and the frequency of these reviews.

20 e. The protocol shall state guideline for the follow-up managerial or
21 supervisory actions (including non-disciplinary actions) to be taken based on reviews of the
22 information in TEAMS II required pursuant to this protocol.

23 f. The protocol shall require that manages and supervisors use TEAMS II
24 information as one source of information in determining when to undertake an audit of an
25 LAPD unit or group of officers.

26 g. The protocol shall require that all relevant and appropriate information in
27 TEAMS II be taken into account when selecting officers for assignment to the OHB Unit
28 established in paragraph 55, units covered by paragraph 106, pay grade advancement,

1 promotion, assignment as an IAG investigator or as a Field Training Officer, or when
2 preparing annual personnel performance evaluations. Complaints and portions of
3 complaints not permitted to be used in making certain decisions under state law shall not be
4 used in connection with such decisions and TEAMS II shall reflect this limitation by
5 excluding such complaints and portions of complaints from the information that is retrieved
6 by a query or report regarding such decisions. Supervisors and managers shall be required
7 to document their consideration of any sustained administrative investigation, adverse
8 judicial finding, or discipline against an officer in each case for excessive force, false arrest
9 or charge, improper search or seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty in
10 determining when such officer is selected for assignment to the OHB Unit, units covered by
11 paragraph 106, pay grade advancement, promotion, or assignment as an IAG investigator
12 or as a Field Training Officer, or when preparing annual personnel performance evaluations.

13 h. The protocol shall specify that actions taken as a result of information from
14 TEAMS II shall be based on all relevant and appropriate information, and not solely on the
15 number or percentages of incidents in any category recorded in TEAMS II.

16 i. The protocol shall provide that managers' and supervisors' performance in
17 implementing the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol shall be taken into account in their
18 annual personnel performance evaluations.

19 j. The protocol shall provide specific procedures that provide for each LAPD
20 officer to be able to review on a regular basis all personally-identifiable data about him or
21 her in TEAMS II in order to ensure the accuracy of that data. The protocol also shall
22 provide for procedures for correcting data errors discovered by officers in their review of
23 the TEAMS II data.

24 k. The protocol shall require regular review by appropriate managers of all
25 relevant TEAMS II information to evaluate officer performance citywide, and to evaluate
26 and make appropriate comparisons regarding the performance of all LAPD units in order
27 to identify any patterns or series of incidents that may indicate at-risk behavior. These
28

evaluations shall include evaluating the performance over time of individual units, and comparing the performance of units with similar responsibilities:

l. The protocol shall provide for the routine and timely documentation in TEAMS II of actions taken as a result of reviews of TEAMS II information.

m. The protocol shall require that whenever an officer transfers into a new Division or Area, the Commanding officer of such new Division or Area shall promptly cause the transferred officer's TEAMS II record to be reviewed by the transferred officer's watch commander or supervisor. This shall not apply to probationary Police Officers I."

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Dates:

Current Compliance Status: See Paragraphs 39, 46, and 50(b)

Policy/Procedure:

Activities:

The DOJ approved the RMIS Use Protocols on January 11, 2004. The City initiated the meet and confer process regarding those TEAMS II Use Protocols with the Los Angeles Police Protective League (PPL) on January 6, 2005, in anticipation of DOJ's approval of the TEAMS II Use Protocol. The Police Commission and the City's Executive Employee Relations Committee (EERC) provided negotiating instructions to the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and authorized the LAPD to initiate negotiations with impacted unions regarding the TEAMS II Use Protocols on January 18 and January 24, 2005, respectively. All LAPD employees will be included in the Risk Management System (RMIS), and therefore several labor unions will need to be engaged as part of the TEAMS II Use Protocol meet and confer processes.

It is anticipated that the TEAMS II Use Protocol meet and confer processes will be completed prior to the planned RMIS operational timeframe of summer/fall 2005 (see Paragraph 39 for TEAMS II development schedule)

1 RMIS use protocols also address other TEAMS II review mandates contained throughout the
2 Consent Decree, such as Paragraphs 53, 64, 83, 97, 107, 137, and 138.

3 Paragraph 47(g) and (i) were identified as meet and confer items pursuant to Paragraphs 8 and
4 184.

5 See also Paragraph 46.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Decree ¶48

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “48. The LAPD shall train managers and supervisors, consistent with their
4 authority, to use TEAMS II to address at-risk behavior and to implement the protocol
5 described in paragraphs 46 and 47.”

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Dates:**

9 **Current Compliance Status:** See Paragraph 39

10 **Policy/Procedure:**

11 **Activities:**

12 Training regarding RMIS will be undertaken when the system is provided for use in mid-2005.
13 Minimum training needs were identified in the RMIS Requirements/Design Documents approved by DOJ
14 on January 31, 2003. The contract with Sierra Systems Group, Inc. for RMIS design, development, and
15 implementation includes development of an RMIS Training Plan, training materials, training of LAPD
16 trainers and expert users, and evaluation of LAPD system training classes.

17 The City reviewed and approved the RMIS training plan developed by the Contractor in May
18 2004. In addition, the UOFS training will include training elements regarding the RMIS centralized facilities
19 (e.g. common log on, access/control, and workflow). The UOFS training has been modified in response to
20 issues identified during system readiness testing. UOFS training was initiated in January 2005.

21 The City originally planned to deploy TEAMS II Development Program systems LAPD-wide at a
22 single point in time. However, based upon the experience with the UOFS delay in November 2004, and
23 with the DPS Pilot Program, the City has now decided to phase the rollout of each individual system in an
24 effort to maximize opportunities for success and minimize impacts of system issues and user concerns.

25 The benefits of phased deployment are that difficulties with the system can be identified and
26 managed within smaller groups, enabling the City to delay rollout for subsequent groups if significant system
27 or training issues are identified throughout the process. Further, there is an opportunity to better manage
28 system acceptance through a phased rollout process, which is essential to the overall success of the

1 TEAMS II Development Program by ensuring that any early system problems are identified before large
2 numbers of users are exposed to such problems.

3 The LAPD is planning e-learning programs for various aspects of the CMS and RMIS training
4 processes. This will allow broad training within a limited amount of time for various system functionalities
5 that LAPD employees are already somewhat familiar with, such as access to TEAMS reports.

6 The LAPD has established an internal LAPD website regarding the TEAMS II Development
7 Program to provide easy access to information regarding the status of the various systems, the training
8 schedules, and other pertinent information. The Chief of Police recorded an audio tape message regarding
9 TEAMS II and the upcoming implementation of the various systems to be reviewed by all LAPD
10 employees in January 2005, via roll-call meetings, etc.

11 See also Paragraph 39.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶49**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “49. The City shall maintain all personally identifiable information about an officer
4 included in TEAMS II during the officer’s employment with the LAPD and for at least three
5 years thereafter (unless otherwise required by law to be maintained for a longer period).
6 Information necessary for aggregate statistical analysis shall be maintained indefinitely in
7 TEAMS II. On an ongoing basis, the City shall make all reasonable efforts to enter
8 information in TEAMS II in a timely, accurate, and complete manner, and to maintain the
9 data in a secure and confidential manner consistent with the applicable access policy as
10 established pursuant to paragraph 40.”

12 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

13 **Due Dates:**

14 **Current Compliance Status:** See Paragraph 39

15 **Policy/Procedure:**

16 **Activities:**

17 The RMIS Requirements/Design Documents submitted to the DOJ and the Independent Monitor
18 approved by DOJ on January 31, 2003, include specifications regarding data retention. The RMIS Design
19 Document developed by the RMIS Contractor incorporates these requirements (see Paragraph 39).

1 **Decree ¶50**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “50. TEAMS II shall be developed and implemented according to the following
4 schedule:

5 a. Within three months of the effective date of this Agreement, the City shall
6 submit the design document required by paragraph 45 to DOJ for approval. The City shall
7 share drafts of this document with the DOJ and the Monitor to allow the DOJ and the
8 Monitor to become familiar with the document as it develops and to provide informal
9 comments on it. The City and the DOJ shall together seek to ensure that the design
10 document receives formal approval within 30 days after it is submitted for approval. The
11 City shall respond to any DOJ written comments or objections during the approval process
12 within 10 days, excluding weekends and state and federal holidays. Such response shall
13 explain the City’s position and propose changes to the design document as appropriate to
14 respond to DOJ’s concerns.

15 b. Within 15 months of DOJ’s approval of the design document pursuant to
16 paragraph 50(a), the City shall submit the protocol for using TEAMS II required by
17 paragraph 46 to DOJ for approval. The City shall share drafts of this document with the
18 DOJ and the Monitor to allow the DOJ and the Monitor to become familiar with the
19 document as it develops and to provide informal continents on it. The City and DOJ shall
20 together seek to ensure that the protocol receives final approval within 60 days after it is
21 presented for approval. The City shall respond to any DOJ written comments or
22 objections during the approval process within 10 days, excluding weekends and state and
23 federal holidays. Such response shall explain the City’s position and propose any changes
24 to the protocol as appropriate to respond to DOJ’s concerns, together with a schedule for
25 making the proposed changes.

26 c. Within 12 months of the approval of the design document pursuant to
27 paragraph 50(a), the City shall have ready for testing a beta version of TEAMS II
28 consisting of: (i) server hardware and operating systems installed, configured and integrated

1 with the LAPD intranet; (ii) necessary data base software installed and configured; (iii) data
2 structures created, including interfaces to source data; and (iv) the use of force information
3 system completed, including, subject to paragraph 42, historic data. The DOJ and the
4 Monitor shall have the opportunity to participate in testing the beta version using use of
5 force data and test data created specifically for purposes of checking the TEAMS II
6 system. As a beta version of TEAMS II becomes operational, it shall be used is
7 conjunction with TEAMS I and Internal Affairs Group Form 1.80's to satisfy the
8 requirements of paragraph 51 until TEAMS II is fully implemented.

9 d. The TEAMS II computer program and computer hardware shall be
10 operational and implemented to the extent possible, subject to the completion of the
11 protocol for using TEAMS II required by paragraph 46, within 21 months of the approval
12 of the design document pursuant to paragraph 50(a).

13 e. TEAMS II shall be implemented fully within the later of 21 months of the approval
14 of the design document pursuant to paragraph 50(a), or 6 months of the approval of the
15 protocol for using TEAMS II pursuant to paragraph 50(b)."

17 PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

18 **Due Dates:** September 17, 2001 TEAMS II Design Document/
19 January 31, 2004 Beta Test Version & UOFS w/ Historic Data/
20 April 30, 2004 Protocol for Use/
21 October 31, 2004 TEAMS II Operational (Subject to DOJ approval of the Protocol)

22 **Current Compliance Status :** Partial Compliance/In Progress

23 **Policy/Procedure:** RMIS Requirements/Design Document approved by DOJ January 31, 2003; RMIS
24 Prototype Demonstration, August 12, 2004; DOJ approval of the RMIS Use Protocol, January 11, 2005.
25
26
27
28

1 **Activities:**

2 The DOJ approved the RMIS Requirements/Design on January 31, 2003. Therefore, the City is in
3 compliance with the provision of Paragraph 50(a). See the discussion under Paragraph 45.

4 The RMIS Use Protocol was approved by DOJ on January 11, 2005. Therefore, the City is in
5 compliance with the provision of Paragraph 50(b). The RMIS Use Protocol will be submitted to affected
6 bargaining units, as appropriate, to initiate the meet and confer process. See the discussion under
7 Paragraph 46.

8 The RMIS Prototype was demonstrated to the DOJ and Independent Monitor on August 12, 2004.
9 It should be noted that the functionality to be provided in the RMIS prototype required under the contract
10 far exceeds the RMIS beta test version established in Paragraph 50(c). The requirements established for
11 the RMIS beta version in Paragraph 50(c) were largely met in May-June 2004. Therefore, the City is in
12 compliance with the provision of Paragraph 50(c). See also Paragraph 39.

13 The Consent Decree establishes a TEAMS II due date based upon 21 months from approval of
14 the Design Document by DOJ. The project due dates established in the contract with Sierra Systems
15 Group, Inc. for the design, development, and implementation of the RMIS and UFOFS, are approximately
16 8-9 months longer than the Consent Decree mandated TEAMS II development schedule. Therefore, the
17 City is in partial compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 50(c), (d), and (e). The project due dates
18 established in the Sierra Systems Group, Inc. contract compare to the Consent Decree TEAMS II due
19 dates as follows:

20 Deliverable	21 Consent Decree Schedule	22 Contract Schedule (revised)
23 RMIS beta test version	1/31/04	9/3/04 (prototype) <i>COMPLETED 8/04</i>
24 RMIS Operational	10/31/04	6/27/05

25 The Consent Decree TEAMS II schedule did not contemplate the extended DOJ approval process
26 of the RMIS Requirements/Design Document or the Request for Proposal (RFP) process, necessary to
27 identify qualified contractors and ensure a competitive process for system development, or the City
28 contracting process. The RFP process requires detailed project definition, and therefore an RFP for RMIS
design, development, and implementation could not be released until the RMIS Requirements/Design

1 Document was largely completed and areas of DOJ concern largely remedied. An RFP for the RMIS and
2 UOFS was released in November 2002, approximately two months prior to DOJ approval of the Design
3 Document on January 31, 2003. The RFP process was concluded, and a contractor selected on May 20,
4 2003. The contract with Sierra Systems Group, Inc. was executed on July 30, 2003.

5 See also Paragraph 39 discussion.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶51**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “51. The LAPD shall, until such time as TEAMS II is implemented, utilize existing
4 databases, information and documents to make certain decisions, as follows:

- 5 a. Selection of officers for assignment to the OHB Unit or as IAG
6 investigators shall require that the LAPD review the applicable IAG Form 1.80's, and all
7 pending complaint files for such officers, in conjunction with the officer's TEAMS I record.
8 b. Selection of officers as FTOs or for units covered by paragraph 106 shall
9 require that the LAPD review the applicable TEAMS I record for such officer.
10 c. Whenever an officer transfers into a new Division or Area, the
11 Commanding Officer of such new Division or Area shall promptly cause the transferred
12 officer's TEAMS I record to be reviewed by the transferred officer's watch commander or
13 supervisor. This shall not apply to Probationary Police Officers.
14 d. To the extent available from the reviews required by this paragraph,
15 supervisors and managers shall be required to document their consideration of any
16 sustained administrative investigation, adverse judicial finding, or discipline against an
17 officer, in each case, for excessive force, false arrest or charge, improper search or seizure,
18 sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty in determining when such officer is selected
19 for assignment to the OHB Unit, units covered by paragraph 106, or assignment as an IAG
20 investigator or Field Training Officer.”
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Partial Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Special Order No. 41, "*Training Evaluation and Management System/Personnel History Management Policy*," published December 19, 2001; Special Order 23, "*Criteria for Transfer/Loans of Sworn Personnel – Established*," approved by the Police Commission June 24, 2003, published July 10, 2003; Special Order No. 24, "*Selection and Assignment to Professional Standards Bureau*," approved by the Police Commission June 24, 2003, published July 10, 2003; Special Order No. 25, Special Order No. 25, "*Field Training Officer Selection and Deselection – Established*," approved by the Police Commission June 24, 2003, published July 10, 2003; Special Order No. 27, "*Selection and Assignment to Gang Enforcement Units*," approved by the Police Commission June 24, 2003, published July 10, 2003; Special Order No. 30, "*Selection and Assignment to Critical Incident Investigation Division*," approved by the Police Commission July 15, 2003, published July 25, 2003; Notice from Commanding Officer Consent Decree Bureau, "*Categorical Use of Force Incidents – Inclusion into Training Evaluation Management System*," dated June 9, 2004.

Activities:

Paragraph 51 in total was identified as a meet and confer item. As previously reported, the meet and confer process was completed in June 2003, and implementing Orders were published in July 2003.

The Special Orders published in July 2003 exceed the requirements of Paragraph 51 in some instances. Professional Standards Bureau (PSB) and Critical Incident Investigation Division (CIID) selection criteria were expanded by LAPD to include adverse judicial findings and pending complaints. Gang enforcement detail selection requirements also incorporate the review of adverse judicial findings. Further, FTO selection criteria were expanded to include review of PSB Form 1.80s, as well as adverse judicial findings. In addition, TEAMS 1.5, designed to provide greater access to TEAMS I information, is making it easier for supervisors to review employee TEAMS I records as appropriate (see Paragraph 39).

LAPD has reviewed TEAMS I records and PSB Form 1.80s for appointments to Professional Standards Bureau (PSB) (see Paragraph 98) and CIID since June 15, 2001. This process was expanded

1 to include adverse judicial findings and pending complaints in the July 2003 Orders. Although a Civil Rights
2 Integrity Division (CRID) review in winter 2003 identified some documentation deficiencies, the review
3 found continued compliance with the selection criteria established in Paragraph 51(a).

4 As discussed in Paragraph 55, the City transitioned CIID to a new Force Investigation Division
5 (FID) within PSB. This transition included selection of a substantial number of new staff to be involved in
6 Categorical Use of Force investigations. The LAPD ensured that appropriate criteria and employee vetting
7 procedures were used in the selection process.

8 CRID's winter 2003 review found compliance with the selection criteria established in Paragraph
9 51(b) for SEUs (e.g. gang enforcement officers), although again documentation deficiencies were noted. In
10 addition, an Audit Division Audit of "Gang Enforcement Detail Selection Criteria Audit," dated June 25,
11 2004, reviewing Gang Enforcement Division (GED) officer selections, found compliance for this provision.
12 An Audit Division audit of GED Selections, completed June 29, 2004, found that the GED selections since
13 August 2003 addressed the provision of Paragraph 51(b); although, in many cases, Area commanding
14 officer appeared to approve the TEAMS reports subsequent to the officer's appointment to the GED.

15 CRID's winter 2003 review found partial compliance with the selection criteria mandates of
16 Paragraph 51(b) for FTOs. The LAPD reported the inspection results LAPD-wide to facilitate future
17 compliance with the FTO selection requirements. An audit conducted by Training Division, dated
18 December 29, 2004, found that LAPD patrol divisions maintained TEAMS Reports at a greater than 95%
19 compliance level. No new FTO selections were made over the past six-month period. However, a
20 December 6, 2004, audit by Police Training and Education (PTE) identified nine FTO positions filled via
21 lateral transfers. The audit revealed that none of the 9 laterals selected adhered to all of the mandates
22 required by Special Order No. 25 (2003) or the Human Resource Notice dated August 16, 2004. LAPD
23 is in the process of taking action to remedy deficiencies identified. Therefore, the City finds partial
24 compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 51(b).

25 The Paragraph 51(c) requirement for the receiving command to review the TEAMS report of all
26 transferred employees was a wholly new requirement and procedure within the LAPD, first implemented on
27 July 10, 2003. CRID's winter 2003 review found partial compliance with this provision of the Consent
28 Decree. An April 2004 CRID review found a 74% compliance rate. Personnel Group conducted an audit

1 of Paragraph 51(c) requirements using a sampling from the LAPD deployment period transfers (May
2 2004). The limited sampling indicated a 72% compliance with the mandates with the lack of a
3 Commanding Officer signature noted to be the most frequent deficiency. A CRID Inspection of the
4 deployment period 9 transfers (August 2004) reviewed all 97 sworn employees on the transfer.
5 Compliance was assessed at 81% as 15 employees did not receive the appropriate TEAMS Evaluation.
6 The majority of these deficiencies were employees transferring into administrative or specialized
7 assignments. These assignments receive transfers infrequently and are less familiar with the mandate.
8 Training was provided to these commands following this inspection. A CRID Inspection of Southeast Area
9 compliance with 51(c) reviewed the deployment period 12 transfer (November 2004). Compliance was
10 assessed at 93% for completion of the TEAMS review. However, seven of the 13 employees were
11 reviewed by an individual other than the employees' watch commander or supervisor. These increasing
12 rates of compliance are encouraging regarding the City's ability to quickly achieve a 95% compliance level
13 with Paragraph 51(c).

14 Paragraph 51(d) requires that consideration of certain sustained complaint types be documented for
15 selections of PSB, CIID, GED and FTO personnel. As indicated above, such procedures have been
16 practiced since June 15, 2001, for selections to PSB and CIID positions and the LAPD has continued
17 compliance in this area. The Continuing Education Division Training Group completed an audit of FTOs on
18 December 31, 2003. The audit reviewed fifteen FTO selection packages for FTOs selected between July
19 27-September 20, 2003. The audit found compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 51(b), with the
20 exception of TEAMS evaluation report documentation. However, in these instances, the FTO interviews
21 and selection packages were completed prior to the July 10, 2003, release of the new form. Further, new
22 FTOs were selected over the past 6-month period.

23 An Audit Division audit of "Gang Enforcement Detail Selection Criteria Audit," dated June 25,
24 2004, reviewing Gang Enforcement Division (GED) officer selections, found that, of the 82 GED officers
25 reviewed, two had complaints in the specific categories listed in Paragraph 51(d) on the TEAMS report.
26 However, one of these officers was selected in September 2002, prior to the establishment of the
27 procedures in July 2003. One officer selected in November 2003 had a sustained complaint in the
28 category of false statement, with the selection package failing to document consideration of that complaint.

1 The three GED officer selections made between January 1, 2004 and June 30, 2004 met the requirements
2 of Paragraph 51. This provision was reviewed again in relation to GED selections in the past six-month
3 period. In that regard, none of the selections made to GED units involved officers with sustained
4 misconduct of the type outlined in this subsection. Therefore, no additional review and consideration was
5 required, and the City finds compliance with the provision of Paragraph 51(d).

6 As indicated above, the LAPD adopted selection procedures for GEDs that exceed the
7 requirements of the Consent Decree. The June 2004 GED Selection audit included additional
8 recommendations over and beyond what is required by the Consent Decree, including review of 1.80s for
9 GED selections. At the direction of the Police Commission, the LAPD is crafting a new policy that would
10 require the written consideration of all sustained complaints when making GED and FTO selection.
11 Although this further exceeds the mandates of the Decree, the City and Department consider it to be the
12 best business practice. This enhancement to GED and FTO selection procedures is anticipated to be in
13 place by Spring 2005.

14 A LAPD audit completed in summer 2004 revealed that law enforcement activity
15 related death (LEARD) and law enforcement related injury (LERI) uses of force were not included in
16 TEAMS 1.5. The LAPD released a notice in June 2004 regarding the data gap that encourages officers to
17 contact the Use of Force Review Section regarding uses of force when reviewing TEAMS reports. This
18 "gap" in information was anticipated to be fully addressed with the then-scheduled deployment of the
19 UOFS in November 2004. With the delay in the deployment of the UOFS, the LAPD is working to
20 further ensure that the procedures outlined in the June 2004 Notice are being satisfied.

21 Training

22 Training regarding review of transferred employees TEAMS reports was provided to administrative
23 or specialized units in response to an August CRID inspection.

24 Training regarding SEU selection procedures and TEAMS reviews for transferred employees was
25 provided at the January 8, 2004 and December 11, 2003, Consent Decree coordinators meetings,
26 respectively. Training regarding GED selection procedures was provided at the January 8, 2004,
27 Command Officer's meeting.
28

1 Training on the Special Order for the selection of Field Training Officers (FTOs) was held on
2 February 12, 2004.

3 **Audits**

4 Personnel Group conducted an audit of Paragraph 51(c) for May 2004 transfers. The limited
5 sampling indicated a 72% compliance with the mandates, and noted that the lack of a Commanding Officer
6 signature was the most frequent deficiency.

7 Training Group "Audit of Supervisor and Field Training Officer Training," dated December 29,
8 2004, found a greater than 95% compliance rate for maintaining TEAMS reports for FTOs.

9 An Audit Division audit of "Gang Enforcement Detail Selection Criteria Audit," dated June 25,
10 2004, covers personnel assigned to GEDs and CLEAR details during March 7 through April 3, 2004. The
11 initial selection of the GED officers included in the audit occurred as early as March 2002 or as late as
12 March 6, 2004.

13 CRID performed a compliance review of Paragraph 51 in winter 2003 and again for 51(c) in April,
14 August, and November 2004. The results of those reviews are discussed above.

15 The Continuing Education Division Training Group completed an audit of Field Training Officers on
16 December 31, 2003. The audit reviewed fifteen FTO selection packages for FTOs selected between July
17 27 and September 20, 2003. The audit found compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 51(b), with the
18 exception of TEAMS evaluation report documentation. However, in these instances, the FTO interviews
19 and selection packages were completed prior to the July 10, 2003, release of the new form.

1 **Decree ¶52**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “52. Following the initial implementation of TEAMS II, and as experience and the
4 availability of new technology may warrant, the City may or may cause the Department to
5 add, subtract, or modify data tables and fields, modify the list of documents electronically
6 attached, and add, subtract, or modify standardized reports and queries. The City shall or
7 shall cause the Department to consult with the DOJ and the Monitor before subtracting or
8 modifying any data tables or data fields, or modifying the list of documents to be
9 electronically attached, and make all reasonable modifications to the proposed alterations
10 based on any objections by the DOJ.
11

12 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

13 **Due Date:** Post RMIS Requirements/Design Document Approval/Post TEAMS II

14 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

15 **Policies/Procedures:** RMIS Requirements/Design Document

16 **Activities:**

17 Compliance with the procedures established in Consent Decree Paragraph 52 regarding changes to
18 the RMIS Design and changes after the system is operational are memorialized in the revised RMIS
19 Requirements/Design Document, approved by DOJ on January 31, 2003.

20 Clarifications, modifications, and/or enhancements to the RMIS Requirements/Design Document
21 approved by DOJ have been identified via the RMIS design effort. The City has notified DOJ of these
22 needed changes in writing in some instances and verbally in other instances, due to the fast pace of the
23 design effort. The City will document other needed changes for DOJ review and approval, consistent with
24 Paragraph 52 (see also Paragraph 39).

25 As part of the RMIS Use Protocol approval process, DOJ requested that the City reevaluate the
26 Action Item thresholds upon their use for a period of time. The City plans to undertake such reviews as an
27 ongoing process and will consult with DOJ as appropriate.
28

B. Management and Coordination of Risk Assessment Responsibilities

Decree ¶53

Decree Language:

“53. The LAPD shall designate a unit within the Human Resources Bureau that is responsible for developing, implementing, and coordinating LAPD-wide risk assessments. Such unit shall be responsible for the operation of TEAMS II, and for ensuring that information is entered into and maintained in TEAMS II in accordance with this Agreement. Such unit further shall provide assistance to managers and supervisors who are using TEAMS II to perform the tasks required hereunder and in the protocol adopted pursuant to paragraphs 46 and 47 above, and shall be responsible for ensuring that appropriate standardized reports and queries are programmed to provide the information necessary to perform these tasks. Nothing in this Agreement shall preclude such unit from also having the responsibility for providing investigative support and liaison with the Office of the City Attorney.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: The TEAMS II unit within the Human Resources Bureau, Risk Management Group, was established and operational on April 30, 2000; Special Order No. 18 – “*Risk Management Group – Established,*” approved by the Police Commission September 18, 2001; Establishment of the Management Systems Reengineering Project (MSRP) approved by City Council on December 16, 2001, approved by the Police Commission December 11, 2001 and establishment of MSRP reaffirmed on January 8, 2002; Additional MSRP Staff Authorization, approved by the Police Commission April 23, 2002, approved by City Council, April 30, 2002, approved by the Mayor, May 7, 2002.

1 **Activities:**

2 The TEAMS II unit within the Human Resources Bureau, Risk Management Group, established
3 and operational on April 30, 2000, is the lead on development of RMIS use protocols (see Paragraph 53).
4 The TEAMS II section of the Risk Management Group has been incorporated into the MSRP during
5 TEAMS II development activities (see Paragraph 39). The current restructuring of LAPD eliminated the
6 HRB, with the Risk Management Group now being under the command of the Office of Personnel
7 Services.

8 The RMIS use protocols are under development and will address use of the RMIS for
9 development of LAPD-wide risk assessments and access to TEAMS II. A staged protocol development
10 process has been utilized in cooperation with DOJ for peer group definition review and approval and is
11 anticipated to be similarly utilized in the future to further facilitate RMIS development. See also Paragraph
12 46.

1 C. Performance Evaluation System

2 **Decree ¶54**

3 **Decree Language:**

4 “54. Within 24 months of the effective date of this Agreement, the Department
5 shall develop and initiate implementation of a plan consistent with applicable federal and
6 state law and the City Charter that ensures that annual personnel performance evaluations
7 are prepared for all LAPD sworn employees that accurately reflect the quality of each
8 sworn employee’s performance, including with respect to: (a) civil rights integrity and the
9 employee’s community policing efforts (commensurate with the employee’s duties and
10 responsibilities); (b) managers’ and supervisors’ performance in addressing at-risk behavior
11 including the responses to Complaint, Form 1.28 investigations; (c) managers’ and
12 supervisors’ response to and review of Categorical and Non-Categorical Use of Force
13 incidents, review of arrest, booking, and charging decisions and review of requests for
14 warrants and affidavits to support warrant applications; and (d) managers’ and supervisors’
15 performance in preventing retaliation. The plan shall include provisions to add factors
16 described in subparts (a)-(d), above, to employees’ job descriptions, where applicable.”

17
18 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

19 **Due Date:** June 15, 2003

20 **Current Compliance Status :** Partial Compliance

21 **Policy/Procedure:** Special Order 47, “*Performance Evaluation Procedures For Lieutenants and*
22 *Below-Revised*,” approved by the Police Commission September 23, 2003, published November 13,
23 2003; Special Order 51, “*Performance Evaluation Procedures for Captains and Above-Revised*,”
24 approved by the Police Commission September 30, 2003, published December 24, 2003.

1 **Activities:**

2 Paragraph 54 was identified as a meet and confer item (see Paragraphs 8 and 184). In September
3 2003, the meet and confer process was completed, with implementing orders being issued by LAPD on
4 September 23 and 30, 2003:

5 Due to the LAPD's annual performance evaluation review schedule, the first annual evaluations to
6 be completed under the new procedures was the Sergeants' performance evaluations, in January 2004.
7 Police Officer evaluations were completed in September 2004, Lieutenant evaluations in October 2004,
8 and detective evaluations in November 2004.

9 In October 2004, CRID conducted an inspection of police officer evaluations. From a review of
10 285 evaluations, the inspection concluded that 90% were completed and 68% were approved by the
11 commanding officer on time. As for content, only 25% were judged to appropriately address the topic of
12 civil rights integrity and 63% appropriately addressed community policing. Following the inspection,
13 training was provided to commanding officers to assist them in the completion of detective, lieutenant and
14 sergeant ratings.

15 The Annual Performance Evaluation schedules will be revised in 2005 to facilitate completion of
16 evaluations and improve the content.

17 **Training**

18 CRID provided training to supervisors and manager in July-September 2004 to assist in
19 preparation of the police officer evaluations. This covered both the Lieutenant and below ranks as well as
20 the Captain and above.

21 Continuing Education Division provided training to LAPD Training Coordinators on the
22 performance evaluations for Lieutenants and below on November 20, 2003. Training coordinators then
23 provided training in a subsequent supervisor meeting.

24 **Audit**

25 In October 2004, CRID conducted an inspection of police officer evaluations. Results are detailed
26 above.

27 A CRID inspection of sergeant ratings will be conducted in March 2005.
28

1 **III. INCIDENTS, PROCEDURES, DOCUMENTATION, INVESTIGATION, AND**
2 **REVIEW**

3 A Use of Force

4 **Decree ¶55**

5 **Decree Language:**

6 “55. Within six months of the effective date of this Agreement, all Categorical Use
7 of Force administrative investigations, including those formerly conducted by the Robbery
8 Homicide Division (“RHD”) or the Detectives Headquarters Division (“DHD”), shall be
9 conducted by a unit assigned to the Operations Headquarters Bureau (“OHB”), which unit
10 (the “OHB Unit”) shall report directly to the commanding officer of OHB.

11 a. Investigators in this unit shall be detectives, sergeants, or other officers with
12 supervisory rank.

13 b. In the organizational structure of the LAPD, the commanding officer of
14 OHB shall not have direct line supervision for the LAPD’s geographic bureaus; provided,
15 however, that such commanding officer may continue to serve on the Operations
16 Committee (or any successor thereto), issue orders applicable to the LAPD (including the
17 geographic bureaus), assume staff responsibilities, as defined in the LAPD manual, and
18 undertake special assignments as determined by the Chief of Police.

19 c. Investigators in this unit shall be trained in conducting administrative
20 investigations as specified in paragraph 80.”

21
22 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

23 **Due Date:** December 15, 2001

24 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

25 **Policy/Procedure:** Special Order 39, 2001 – “*Critical Incident Investigation Division – Established*,”
26 approved by the Police Commission, December 11, 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice -
27 “*Administrative Investigation Training*,” approved by the Commission October 9, 2001; Special Order
28

No. 30, "*Selection and Assignment to Critical Incident Investigation Division*," published July 25, 2003.

Activities:

The Critical Incident Investigation Division (CIID) was operational and responded to all Categorical Uses of Force incidents since April 8, 2001. CIID was originally in OHB. The current restructuring of LAPD eliminated the OHB, and CIID subsequently was attached to Detective Bureau within the Office of Operations. In 2004, investigative deficiencies at CIID resulted in a complete restructuring. Transition of CIID from Detective Bureau to PSB took place on August 23, 2004. CIID was deactivated and Force Investigation Division (FID) within PSB was created. All sworn personnel, including those previously assigned to CIID, were required to apply and compete for assignments at FID. Selection requirements of Paragraph 51(a) and (d) were satisfied in this process. All 47 sworn personnel involved in the Categorical Use of Force Investigation process were selected during the review period. Additionally, one of the lieutenants has since promoted to captain and transferred, which resulted in the selection of another lieutenant.

All FID investigators hold the rank of Detective-II, Sergeant, or above. The structure at FID contains an internal audit component to assess the investigations prior to the Use of Force Board hearing. A Special Order establishing FID responsibilities is currently under review.

Between July 1 and December 31, 2004, 68 Categorical Use of Force incidents were reported to CIID/FID. Two of those incidents were later determined to be non-categorical uses of force, resulting in 66 CUOF investigations. Critical Incident Investigation Division (CIID) responded to 17 incidents and Force Investigation (FID) responded to 51 incidents.

Training

The annual Force Investigation Division (FID) training session took place on December 3, 2004. Force Investigation Division investigators received a four hour block of instruction from Professional Standards Bureau on personnel complaint investigation protocols and a 4 hour block of instruction from FID personnel on Use of Force investigations. Issues related to the CIID/FID transition were also addressed at this training session.

1 An audit of FID staff will be conducted to verify that all investigators have successfully completed
2 Homicide School. Homicide School is not required pursuant to the Consent Decree, however LAPD has
3 determined this to be a best management practice.

4 **Audits**

5 Categorical Use of Force issues will be audited in the 3rd and 4th Quarters of FY 2004/2005.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶56**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “56. The OHB Unit shall have the capability to “roll out” to all Categorical Use of
4 Force incidents 24 hours a day. The Department shall require immediate notification to the
5 Chief of Police, the OHB Unit, the Commission and the Inspector General by the LAPD
6 whenever there is a Categorical Use of Force. Upon receiving each such notification, an
7 OHB Unit investigator shall promptly respond to the scene of each Categorical Use of
8 Force and commence his or her investigation. The senior OHB Unit manager present shall
9 have overall command of the crime scene and investigation at the scene where multiple units
10 are present to investigate a Categorical Use of Force incident; provided, however, that this
11 shall not prevent the Chief of Police, the Chief of Staff, the Department Commander or the
12 Chief’s Duty Officer from assuming command from a junior OHB supervisor or manager
13 when there is a specific need to do so.”

14 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

15
16 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001/December 15, 2001

17 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

18 **Policy/Procedure:** March 6, 2001, Commission Motion regarding Use of Force; Critical Incident
19 Investigation Division (CIID) was established in the Operations Headquarters Bureau (OHB) and became
20 operational on April 8, 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice, July 30, 2001 – “*Categorical and Non-*
21 *Categorical Use of Force Classifications and Investigative Responsibility*,” published July 30, 2001,
22 pursuant to March 6, 2001 Police Commission Motion; Special Order 39 – “*Critical Incident*
23 *Investigation Division – Established*” approved by the Police Commission December 11, 2001.

1 **Activities:**

2 The Critical Incident Investigation Division (CIID) became operational and has rolled out on a 24-
3 hour basis to Categorical Uses of Force incidents since April 8, 2001. Beginning August 23, 2004, this
4 responsibility was reassigned to the newly created Force Investigation Division (FID).

5 The Department Command Post is responsible for notifying appropriate entities regarding
6 Categorical Use of Force incidents. In February 2004, the LAPD implemented a CUOF database that is
7 accessible in all 18 geographic Areas. The database allows the Department Command Post to enter
8 CUOF notification information into the system. During the past 6-month period, 66 Categorical Use of
9 Force incidents took place. Ongoing FID review of notification logs maintained by the Department
10 Command Post (DCP) indicates that LAPD complied with the notification mandates of Paragraph 56. The
11 OIG reports that it has been timely notified of CUOF incidents. Further, the "Categorical Use of Force
12 Interim Audit Report," dated May 27, 2004, found that LAPD was in compliance with the notification
13 provision of Paragraph 56. However, the audit noted that with use of the use of the Blackberry handhelds
14 for notifications, there was no manner in which to verify the message was received. Modifications to the
15 Blackberry software have been requested to assist in tracking the opening of text messages.

16 During the period of July 1 through December 31, 2004, there were no cases in which a staff
17 officer assumed command of a Categorical Use of Force scene.

18 **Audit/Inspection**

19 The "Categorical Use of Force Interim Audit Report," dated May 27, 2004, found that LAPD was
20 in compliance with the notification provision of Paragraph 56.

21 Categorical Use of Force issues will be audited in the 3rd and 4th Quarters of FY 2004/2005.

22 The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) monitors compliance notification of the OIG pursuant to
23 Paragraph 147.

24 **Training**

25 See Paragraph 55.

1 **Decree ¶57**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “57. In addition to administrative investigations and where the facts so warrant,
4 the LAPD shall also conduct a separate criminal investigation of Categorical Uses of Force.
5 The criminal investigation shall not be conducted by the OHB Unit.”
6

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

9 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

10 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 3/794.25 and 3/794.32; Special Order 39 – “Critical Incident
11 Investigation Division – Established,” approved by the Police Commission December 11, 2001; Special
12 Order 15 – “Revision to Special Order No. 39, CIID Investigations,” approved by Police Commission
13 May 7, 2002; Office of the Chief of Police Notice, "Department Criminal Filing Review Procedures for
14 Employees Accused of Prima Fascia Misconduct," approved by Chief of Police October 25, 2000.

15 **Activities:**

16 CIID did not conduct criminal investigations. However, with the restructuring of the CUOF
17 investigative process and transition of CUOF investigative responsibilities to FID within PSB, FID conducts
18 concurrent criminal and administrative investigations by separate and distinct units within FID. As
19 previously reported, the CIID to FID transition has implications to various provisions of the Consent
20 Decree. The City and DOJ are currently in the process of submitting Consent Decree modifications to
21 address these issues to the Court.

22 Between July and December 2004, one Categorical Use of Force under investigation by CIID
23 investigation was referred to PSB for criminal misconduct investigation.

24 **Training**

25 See Paragraph 55.

26 **Audit**

27 The OIG and Police Commission review all Categorical Use of Force investigations.
28

1 **Decree ¶58**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “58. The LAPD shall continue its policy of notifying the County of Los Angeles
4 District Attorney’s Office whenever an LAPD officer, on or off-duty, shoots and injures
5 any person during the scope and course of employment. In addition, the LAPD shall notify
6 the District Attorney’s Office whenever an individual dies while in the custody or control of
7 an LAPD officer or the LAPD, and a use of force by a peace officer may be a proximate
8 cause of the death.”

10 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

11 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

12 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

13 **Policy/Procedure:** Special Order 39 – “*Critical Incident Investigation Division – Established,*”
14 approved by the Police Commission December 11, 2001; Protocol with the Los Angeles County District
15 Attorney’s Office; District Attorney “*Protocol for District Attorney Officer-Involved Shooting*
16 *Response Program.*” Special Order 6, “*Notifications to the Department Command Post,*” published
17 February 19, 2004.

18 **Activities:**

19 During the period of July-December 2004, 66 Categorical Use of Force Incidents occurred. Of
20 those, 19 required notification to the District Attorney. Department records verify that a notification took
21 place in each of the 19 incidents.

22 Upon arrival at the scene, the assigned District Attorney staff members are added to the incident
23 log maintained at the scene.

24 District Attorney notification is assessed as part of Paragraph 56, with which the City is in
25 compliance.

26 **Training**

27 See Paragraph 55.

Audits

This provision was not the subject of an audit during this period. Categorical Use of Audits will be conducted during the 3rd and 4th Quarters FY 2004/2005.

1 **Decree ¶59**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “59. The LAPD shall continue to provide cooperation to the District Attorney’s
4 Office personnel who arrive on the scene of the incident.”

6 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

7 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

8 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

9 **Policy/Procedure:** Special Order 39 – “*Critical Incident Investigation Division – Established,*”
10 approved by the Police Commission December 11, 2001; Protocol with the Los Angeles County District
11 Attorney’s Office; District Attorney “*Protocol for District Attorney Officer-Involved Shooting*
12 *Response Program.*”

13 **Activities:**

14 As part of Categorical Use of Force Investigation Interim Audit, completed May 27, 2004,
15 Richard Doyle, Head Deputy District Attorney, was interviewed regarding cooperation provided to the
16 District Attorney Response Team (DART). Mr. Doyle stated that, since the resolution of minor problems
17 in early 2003, cooperation with DART personnel had been satisfactory.

18 Correspondence from the Office of the District Attorney, on March 25, 2004, addressed
19 Categorical Use of Force incidents that had occurred between July 3, 2003 and February 27, 2004. The
20 correspondence indicated that the DART Teams were generally provided with prompt access to the scene
21 and an initial briefing of the incident.

22 The Office of the District Attorney participated in a series of meetings on the development of Force
23 Investigation Division. Beginning in February 2004, this group met twice per month until FID became
24 operational in August 2004. Issues specific to District Attorney notification, access to scenes and overall
25 cooperation were discussed in these sessions.

26 The annual letter to the Office of the District Attorney requesting feedback on cooperation at
27 Categorical Use of Force scenes will be sent in April 2005.

Training

See Paragraph 55.

Audit

Audit Division completed a “Categorical Use of Force Interim Audit Report,” dated May 27, 2004, which reviewed CUOF notifications for the 24 CUOF incidents that occurred from October – December 2003. The audit found compliance with the administrative provisions of Categorical Use of Force response procedures and investigator selection procedures.

Categorical Use of Force Audits will be conducted during the 3rd and 4th Quarters FY 2004/2005.

LAPD contacts the District Attorney’s Office on an annual basis to discuss the notification process.

The OIG reviews LAPD activities at Categorical Use of Force incident scenes to which they respond.

1 **Decree ¶60**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “60. The Department shall renew its request to the appropriate bargaining unit(s)
4 for a provision in its collective bargaining agreements that when more than one officer fires
5 his or her weapon in a single OIS incident, then each officer should be represented by a
6 different attorney during the investigation and subsequent proceedings. The foregoing
7 acknowledges that each officer retains the right to be represented by an attorney of his or
8 her choice.”

10 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

11 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

12 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance/Paragraph 8 and 184

13 **Policy/Procedure:** July 24, 2001, letter from the City Attorney’s Office to the Los Angeles Police
14 Protective League.

15 **Activities:**

16 On July 24, 2001, a letter from the City Attorney’s Office to the Los Angeles Police Protective
17 League was sent renewing the City’s request that when more than one officer fires his or her weapon in a
18 single OIS incident, then each officer should be represented by a different attorney during the investigation
19 and subsequent proceedings.

20 As previously reported, the City has identified Paragraph 60 as a meet and confer issue for tracking
21 purposes only.

22 **Training**

23 No training activities are required.

24 **Audit**

25 No auditing activities are required.

1 **Decree ¶61**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “61. All involved officers and witness officers shall be separated immediately after
4 an OIS, and shall remain separated until all such officers have given statements or, in the
5 case of involved officers, declined to give a statement; provided, however, that nothing in
6 this Agreement prevents the Department from compelling a statement or requires the
7 Department to compel a statement in the event that the officer has declined to give a
8 statement. In such a case, all officers shall remain separated until such compelled statement
9 has been given.”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

13 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

14 **Policy/Procedure:** Officer Involved Shootings Manual published in April 1995; Special Order 39 –
15 “*Critical Incident Investigation Division – Established*,” approved by the Police Commission
16 December 11, 2001. Chief of Support Services Notice, “*Separation of Officers Involved in a*
17 *Categorical Use of Force Incident*,” published February 27, 2003; Special Order 19, 2003, “*Obtaining*
18 *a Public Safety Statement and Separating Officers Following a Categorical Use of Force Incident*,”
19 published May 22, 2003.

20 **Activities:**

21 Between July and December 2004, the Use of Force Review Board reviewed 58 Categorical Use
22 of Force cases. In all cases, the Board assessed the level of involved officer and witness separation
23 accomplished.

24 The “Categorical Use of Force Investigation Interim Audit Report,” completed May 27, 2004,
25 found compliance with requirements of Paragraph 61. The audit identified one OIS where the shooting
26 offers were separated, but the witness officers were monitored in a group. This is acceptable procedure.

1 Although not required by the Consent Decree, the LAPD requires separation of officers in all
2 CUOF incidents, not just OIS incidents. The Categorical Use of Force Investigation Interim Audit Report
3 identifies two instances in which officers were monitored in a group. This is acceptable procedure.

4 The Independent Monitor has made modifications to the Monitoring Criteria regarding separation
5 of officers, providing for “functional” separation via monitoring versus physical separation. In response to
6 this modification, the Department has initiated a Special Order revision. The Order is currently in the formal
7 review process.

8 Training

9 A Chief of Detective Notice, “Consent Decree Mandates – Categorical Use of Force Incidents,”
10 was published on March 2, 2004. This Notice reviewed Consent Decree mandates, including but not
11 limited to, Paragraph 61 requirements.

12 Audit

13 Audit Division completed a “Categorical Use of Force Interim Audit Report,” dated May 27,
14 2004, which reviewed CUOF notifications for the 24 CUOF incidents that occurred between October and
15 December 2003.

16 Separation of Officers will be audited in the Categorical Use of Force audits to be conducted
17 during the 3rd Quarter FY 2004/2005.

18 The OIG and Police Commission review all Categorical Use of Force investigations.

19 The Use of Force Review Board reviews the level of involved officer and witness separation
20 accomplished.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶62**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “62. Managers shall analyze the circumstances surrounding the presence or
4 absence of a supervisor at (a) a Categorical Use of Force incident, and (b) the service of a
5 search warrant. In each case, such analysis shall occur within one week of the occurrence
6 of the incident or service to determine if the supervisor’s response to the incident or service
7 was appropriate. Such supervisory conduct shall be taken into account in each
8 supervisor’s annual personnel performance evaluation.”

10 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

11 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

12 **Current Compliance Status:** Partial Compliance

13 **Policy/Procedure:** Commission Motion regarding Categorical Use of Force, March 6, 2001, implementing
14 HRB Notice, “*Categorical Use of Force Classifications and Investigative Responsibility*,” distributed
15 July 30, 2001; HRB Notice, “*Commanding Officer Review of Categorical Use of Force*,” approved
16 by the Commission October 11, 2001; Special Order 39, “*Critical Incident Investigation Division –*
17 *Established*,” approved by the Police Commission December 11, 2001; Special Order 25, 2001, “*Search*
18 *Warrant and Probable Cause Arrest Warrant Procedures*,” approved by the Police Commission
19 September 18, 2001; Chief of Police Notice, distributed October 9, 2002, approved by the Police
20 Commission October 15, 2002; Special Order 21, 2003, “*Return to Field Duty of Personnel Involved*
21 *in an Officer Involved Shooting Resulting in Injury or a Categorical Use of Force Resulting in Death*
22 *or the Substantial Possibility of Death*,” approved by Police Commission July 22, 2003, published July
23 9, 2003; Special Order 35, “*Duty to Assess a Supervisor’s Response to a Categorical Use of Force*,”
24 approved by Police Commission September 9, 2003, published August 26, 2003.

25 **Activities:**

26 In February 2004, the LAPD implemented a CUOF database that is accessible in all 18
27 geographic Areas. The database allows supervisors to directly enter Paragraph 62 CUOF reviews into the
28 system. In addition, Commanding Officers receive reminders to comply with the 7-day analysis of

1 supervision at Categorical Use of Force scenes via the database. This prompt has greatly assisted the
2 Department in meeting the timeliness requirement of this provision. This provides for compliance with the
3 CUOF provision of Paragraph 62 with a minimum amount of paperwork and also allows for direct access
4 to such reviews by appropriate managers.

5 The Audit Division "Categorical Use of Force Investigations Interim Audit Report," dated May 27,
6 2004, found a 100% compliance rate for completing the required Paragraph 62 CUOF supervisory
7 reviews, however, 2 of the 24 reviews were submitted more than 7-days after the incident. Additionally,
8 the Audit identified eight reviews as being deficient in content. A CRID inspection of CUOF incidents that
9 occurred during the period between January and May 2004, revealed a 100% compliance rate for
10 completing the required review with sufficient content, with 45 of 47 reports being completed within 7-days
11 (a 96% compliance rate). The CRID review illustrates compliance for required CUOF supervisory
12 reviews.

13 Special Order No. 28, which activated the Search Warrant Tactical Plan Report, was approved in
14 July 2003. The new procedures include a form for documenting the supervisor response to warrant
15 service. The Audit Division "Audit of Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits," dated March 30,
16 2004, found a 94% compliance rate for supervisory review of circumstances surrounding the service of a
17 search warrant; however only 88% of the reviews were completed within the established 7-day time frame.
18 The Audit found a continued compliance rate of 100% for the presence of supervisors at the execution of a
19 search warrant. A CRID review in May found compliance with the search warrant provisions of Paragraph
20 62.

21 A FY 04-05 audit of search warrants is currently in progress. Preliminary results of the audit
22 indicate some confusion between the need to fill out Search Warrant Tactical Plan Reports for non-tactical
23 search warrants (e.g. a search where the site is secured prior to serving the warrant). Although portions of
24 the Search Warrant Tactical Plan Report are not required for non-tactical search warrants, other portions
25 are the basis of documentation of supervisory oversight. Therefore, the preliminary results of the audit
26 indicate that documentation required to fully illustrate compliance is not available in 10% of the warrants, all
27 of which are non-tactical. Service of such warrants are low risk and therefore the City is in substantial
28

1 compliance with the search warrant provisions of Paragraph 62, with some documentation issues remaining
2 to be fully addressed.

3 The last sentence of Paragraph 62 was identified as a meet and confer item. The meet and confer
4 process has been completed and the provision of the last sentence of Paragraph 62 is incorporated into
5 Special Orders 47 and 51 regarding annual performance evaluations (see Paragraph 54). A CRID
6 inspection of supervisor performance evaluations will be conducted in March 2005 to determine if the
7 manager analysis is being utilized in the annual evaluations.

8 **Training**

9 Training was provided to commanding officers as part of the CRID Inspection of search
10 warrant documents.

11 CRID provided training to commanding officers on the performance evaluation aspect of this
12 provision at an Office of Operations Meeting on December 17, 2004.

13 **Audits/Inspections**

14 The Audit Division "Categorical Use of Force Investigations Interim Audit Report," dated May 27,
15 2004, reviewed 24 CUOF incidents that occurred during October through December 2003 for Paragra ph
16 62 compliance. Results are detailed above.

17 Audits of Categorical Use of Force Investigations will be completed during the 3rd and 4th Quarters
18 FY 2004/2005.

19 The Audit Division "Audit of Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits," dated March 30,
20 2004, reviewed 75 of the 175 warrants written in Deployment Period 11 (October 15 to November 19,
21 2004). The audit found compliance with search warrant procedures.

22 The Audit Division Audit of Search Warrant Applications, initially scheduled for completion in the
23 2nd Quarter FY 2004/2005, has been delayed until the 3rd Quarter to address a sample size issue identified
24 with the audit. Preliminary results of the audit are presented above.

25 A CRID Inspection of search warrant documents reviewed the manager analysis of supervisor
26 presence at the service of search warrants. This inspection assessed a 94% compliance rate.

27 The OIG and Police Commission review all Categorical Use of Force investigations.
28

1 **Decree ¶63**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “63. The Department shall continue its practice of referring all officers involved in
4 a Categorical Use of Force resulting in death or the substantial possibility of death (whether
5 on or off duty) to BSS for a psychological evaluation by a licensed mental health
6 professional. The matters discussed in such evaluation shall be strictly confidential and shall
7 not be communicated to other LAPD officers without the consent of the officer evaluated.
8 No such officer shall return to field duty until his or her manager determines that the officer
9 should be returned to field duty upon consultation with BSS.”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

13 **Current Compliance Status:** Partial Compliance

14 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Sections 3/799.10 and 4/245.15; Special Order 39, “*Critical Incident*
15 *Investigation Division – Established*,” approved by the Commission December 11, 2001; Special Order
16 15, “*Revision to Special Order No. 39, CIID Investigations*,” approved by Police Commission May 7,
17 2002; Special Order 21, 2003 “*Return to Field Duty of Personnel Involved in an Officer Involved*
18 *Shooting Resulting in Injury or a Categorical Use of Force Resulting in Death or the Substantial*
19 *Possibility of Death*,” approved by Police Commission on July 22, 2003; Chief of Detective Notice,
20 “*Consent Decree Mandates – Categorical Use of Force Incidents*,” dated March 2, 2004.

21 **Activities:**

22 Between July and December 2004, 18 Categorical Use of Force Incidents required referral of
23 involved officers to Behavioral Science Service (BSS), with 40 officers being referred to BSS pursuant to
24 Paragraph 63. LAPD indicates that all officers participated in the BSS referral process. Documentation
25 deficiencies still exist in that all required approval signatures are not present for all 40 officers referred to
26 BSS.

27 According to the “Categorical Use of Force Interim Audit Report,” dated May 27, 2004, 11
28 incidents required referral to BSS. In one instance, an involved officer was returned to the field prior to

1 being seen by BSS or approved by Department managers. That incident was an in-custody death not
2 involving a use of force and there was a command officer decision not to remove the officer from field duty.

3 A CRID Inspection identified 17 CUOF incidents between October 2003 and February 2004, as
4 requiring referrals to BSS. CRID found that 100% of the officers were appropriately removed from the
5 field, referred to BSS within two days, and participated in an evaluation. One officer inappropriately
6 worked a field assignment prior to being cleared and non-field deployment could not be verified for two
7 other officers.

8 Although the City is nearing compliance with Paragraph 63, additional work regarding
9 documentation remains to be completed in this area. A Notice outlining the procedure was sent to
10 commanding officers on March 2, 2004.

11 Audit

12 Audit Division completed a "Categorical Use of Force Interim Audit Report," dated May 27,
13 2004, which reviewed CUOF notifications for the 24 CUOF incidents that occurred between October and
14 December 2003. The audit found compliance with the administrative provisions of Categorical Use of
15 Force response procedures and investigator selection procedures.

16 Audits of Categorical Use of Force investigations will be conducted during the 3rd and 4th Quarters
17 of FY 2004/2005.

18 This provision will also be the subject of the CRID Area-wide inspections that began in January
19 2005.

20 Training

21 Chief of Detective Notice, "Consent Decree Mandates – Categorical Use of Force Incidents,"
22 dated March 2, 2004. This Notice affirmed existing procedure related to this provision and was
23 disseminated to all commanding officers.

1 **Decree ¶64**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “64. Except as limited or prohibited by applicable state law, when a manager
4 reviews and makes recommendations regarding discipline or non-disciplinary action as a
5 result of a Categorical Use of Force, the manager will consider the officer’s work history,
6 including information contained in the TEAMS II system, and that officer’s Categorical Use
7 of Force history, including a review of the tactics the officer has used in past uses of force.”
8

9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001/Post TEAMS II

11 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance/Use of TEAMS 1.5 pending TEAMS II Development

12 **Policy/Procedure:** Manager’s Guide to Discipline published January 2000; Human Resources Bureau
13 Notice, “*Commanding Officer Review of Categorical Use of Force*,” approved by the Commission
14 October 9, 2001; Special Order 39, “*Critical Incident Investigation Division – Established*,”
15 approved by the Police Commission December 11, 2001; Use of Force Review Board Procedure
16 Modification; Notice from Commanding Officer Consent Decree Bureau, “*Categorical Use of Force*
17 *Incidents – Inclusion into Training Evaluation Management System*,” dated June 9, 2004; RMIS
18 Development Activities.

19 **Activities:**

20 The Use of Force Review Board implemented procedures to ensure that involved officer work
21 histories are appropriately considered and documented in notes recorded during the Use of Force Review
22 Board proceedings. This process became effective September 30, 2002 and all subsequent Categorical
23 Use of Force cases document this review. Between July and December 2004, 58 Categorical Use of
24 Force Investigations were reviewed by the Use of Force Review Board. Notes taken during the review
25 board proceedings indicate that the Board appropriately considered the officer’s work history.
26

27 The “Categorical Use of Force Interim Audit Report,” dated May 27, 2004, found the Use of
28 Force Review Board in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 64. The audit also determined that,

1 due to existing limitations, TEAMS does not contain information on Non-Shooting Categorical Uses of
2 Force. That information must be obtained by contacting the Use of Force Review Section. This limitation
3 was not known by the commanding officers that are responsible for conducting a work history review. The
4 LAPD released a notice in June 2004 regarding the data gap that encourages officers to contact the Use of
5 Force Review Section regarding uses of force when reviewing TEAMS reports. This “gap” in information
6 was anticipated to be fully addressed with the then-scheduled deployment of the UOFS in November
7 2004. With the delay in the deployment of the UOFS, the LAPD is working to further ensure that the
8 procedures outlined in the June 2004 Notice are being complied with.

9 **Training**

10 The LAPD Use of Force Review Section was informed of the change in policy regarding
11 documentation of consideration of work and Categorical Use of Force histories in investigations before the
12 Use of Force Review Board. In addition, staff was informed of the new procedure requiring a reminder
13 notice if the investigation results in an out-of-policy finding and forwarding to Internal Affairs Group for
14 processing.

15 **Audit**

16 Categorical Use of Force Audits completed in the 3rd and 4th Quarters of FY 2004/2005.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶65**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “65. The Department shall continue to require officers to report to the LAPD
4 without delay the officer’s own use of force (on the use of force form as revised pursuant to
5 paragraph 66).”

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

9 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

10 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 4/245.10; Special Order 27, “*Investigating and*
11 *Adjudicating Non-Categorical Use of Force Incidents*,” approved by the Police Commission
12 September 25, 2001; Special Order 18, “*Revisions to Special Order No. 27, 2001 – Investigating and*
13 *Adjudicating Non-Categorical Use of Force Incidents*,” approved by the Police Commission May 7,
14 2002. Special Order 13, 2004, “*Non-Categorical Use of Force Reporting – Revised*,” published May
15 26, 2004 and approved by the Police Commission on June 8, 2004.

16 **Activities:**

17 The provisions of Paragraph 65 are current practice. During the period of June 27-December 11,
18 2004, 769 non-categorical use of force incidents were reported.

19 Personnel misconduct complaints alleging failure to report a use of force are categorized as Neglect
20 of Duty and are initiated by the LAPD when officers fail to timely report uses of force.

21 Monitoring compliance with this provision is problematic, as it is generally difficult to prove a
22 negative. Only one Unauthorized Use of Force Integrity Audit, conducted pursuant to Paragraph 97, was
23 undertaken between January and June 2004 and was deemed as “pass” (in compliance). This is consistent
24 with the findings of prior integrity audits on this subject.

25 One Unauthorized Use of Force Integrity Audit, conducted pursuant to Paragraph 97, was
26 undertaken in this reporting period, but it did not result in a use of force. Therefore, the failure to report a
27 use of force component of the audit resulted in a null set.

1 The Independent Monitor has previously found the City in compliance with this provision. The
2 Non-Categorical Use of Force Form was revised consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 66 on
3 September 1, 2001 (see Paragraph 66).

4 **Audit**

5 Integrity Audits – see Paragraph 97.

6 Review of identified incidents of potential non-reporting.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶66**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “66. The LAPD shall modify its current use of force report form to include data
4 fields that require officers to identify with specificity the type of force used for the physical
5 force category, to record the body area impacted by such physical use of force, to identify
6 fractures and dislocations as a type of injury, and to include beanbag shot gun as a type of
7 force category.”

8
9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

11 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

12 **Compliance Action:** Special Order 27, “*Investigating Non-Categorical Use of Force Incidents*,”
13 approved by the Police Commission September 25, 2001; Special Order 18, “*Revisions to Special Order*
14 *No. 27, 2001 – Investigating and Adjudicating Non-Categorical Use of Force Incidents*,” approved
15 by the Police Commission May 7, 2002. Special Order 13, 2004, “*Non-Categorical Use of Force*
16 *Reporting – Revised*,” published May 26, 2004 and approved by the Police Commission on June 8, 2004

17 **Activities:**

18 The revised Non-Categorical Use of Force form was released with the publication of Special
19 Order No. 13, which was distributed May 26, 2004. The report contains the data required by Paragraph
20 66.

21 The use of force reporting procedure was refined by Special Order No. 13. The revisions include
22 the creation of two levels of Non-Categorical Use of Force reporting. This streamlines the reporting
23 process and expedites the investigative/review process (also see Paragraph 69).

24 The revised form is being consistently used by LAPD.

25 As discussed in Paragraph 39, the LAPD has developed, and placed into use, a supplemental use
26 of force data collection form, which will collect use of force information that is not currently collected, but
27 that will be collected in the new UOFS (including Supervisor on Scene and Partner Serial Number). Use
28

1 of this supplemental use of force data form is required for all uses of force occurring after December 31,
2 2004. This will enable such data to be more easily entered into the UOFS once operational.

3 **Training**

4 Training on Special Order 13 protocols was presented to Department Managers in May and June
5 2004 as part of CEDP 7.5. Follow up training to commanding officers was delivered following a CRID
6 inspection in November 2004.

7 **Audit/Inspections**

8 The annual Non-Categorical Use of Force Audit was postponed to the 4th Quarter FY
9 2004/2005 in order to obtain a meaningful sample of post Special Order 13 investigations.

10 A CRID Inspection of 51 post Special Order 13 investigations indicated 100% compliance with
11 the use of the revised form to report Non-Categorical Use of Force.

1 **Decree ¶67**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “67. The Commission shall continue its practice of reviewing all Categorical Uses
4 of Force including all the reports prepared by the Chief of Police regarding such incidents
5 and related investigation files. These reports shall be provided to the Police Commission at
6 least 60 days before the running of any statute of limitations that would restrict the
7 imposition of discipline related to such Categorical Use of Force. Provided, however, if the
8 investigation file has not been completed by this time, the LAPD shall provide the
9 Commission with a copy of the underlying file, including all evidence gathered, with a status
10 report of the investigation that includes an explanation of why the investigation has not been
11 completed, a description of the investigative steps still to be completed, and a schedule for
12 the completion of the investigation. The Commission shall review whether any
13 administrative investigation was unduly delayed due to a related criminal investigation, and,
14 if so, shall assess the reasons therefore.”

15
16 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

17 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

18 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

19 **Policy/Procedure:** March 6, 2001, Commission Motion regarding Categorical Use of Force implementing
20 Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Categorical Use of Force Classifications and Investigative*
21 *Responsibility*”; Special Order 39 – “*Critical Incident Investigation Division – Established*,”
22 approved by the Police Commission December 11, 2001; Use of Force Review Section Staff Report on
23 Categorical Use of Force Reports, June 15, 2001, approved by the Police Commission February 26,
24 2002.

25 **Activities:**

26 Between July 1 and December 31, 2004, 51 Categorical Use of Force cases were forwarded to
27 the Police Commission. Of the 51 cases, 37 cases were forwarded to Police Commission more than 60
28 days prior to running of the statute of limitations. Fourteen cases were submitted to the Police Commission

less than 60 days prior to the statute date (see below for Case Incident Number, date case submitted to the Police Commission and case statute date).

Correspondence on the 14 cases was forwarded to the Police Commission prior to the 60-day deadline, detailing the reasons for the delays and providing estimated dates of completion.

Inc#:	Statute Date	60 Day Letter	COP Rept to PC
A031-03	09-11-04	07/01/04	07-15-04
A033-03	10-19-04	08-20-04	09-24-04
A034-03	11-01-04	08-26-04	10-21-04
A038-03	11-19-04	09-16-04	11-11-04
A039-03	11-22-04	09-16-04	11-11-04
A040-03	11-22-04	09-16-04	11-11-04
A043-03	12-10-04	09-23-04	12-02-04
A044-03	12-13-04	09-23-04	12-02-04
046-03	09-02-04	07-01-04	08-26-04
048-03	09-16-04	07-21-04	09-03-04
050-03	09-21-04	07-01-04	09-16-04
064-03	12-18-04	10-14-04	11-18-04
002-04	01-05-05	11-14-04	12-10-04
008-04	01-17-05	Unknown	12-10-04

LAPD was unable to verify that a 60-day correspondence was forwarded to the Police Commission on 008-04. However, the completed case was submitted to the Board prior to statute. Completed investigations continue to be provided to the Inspector General prior to the Use of Force Board. The Inspector General reviewed Categorical Use of Force investigations and provided information to the Commission as appropriate. The Categorical Use of Force incidents were appropriately agendized by the Commission and were acted upon within the statute of limitations period.

The FID has a backlog of investigations for adjudication resulting from the CIID to FID transition. The case backlog is being managed and submittal of investigations and findings is being coordinated with

1 the Use of Force Review Board, OIG, and Police Commission to ensure that cases are completed within
2 the statute of limitations.

3 **Audit**

4 Audits of Categorical Use of Force Investigations will be conducted in the 3rd and 4th Quarters FY
5 2004/2005.

6 LAPD Use of Force Review Section tracks Categorical Use of Force investigations for compliance
7 with the statute of limitations and 60-day reporting requirement to the Police Commission.

1 **Decree ¶68**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “68. The LAPD shall continue to require that all uses of force that are not
4 Categorical Uses of Force (“Non-Categorical Uses of Force”) be reported to a supervisor
5 who shall conduct a timely supervisory investigation of the incident, as required under
6 LAPD policy and paragraphs 69 and 81, including collecting and analyzing relevant
7 documents and witness interviews, and completing a use of force report form.”
8

9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

11 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

12 **Policy/Procedure:** Manual Section 4/245.10; March 6, 2001, Commission Motion regarding Categorical
13 Use of Force, implementing Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Categorical Use of Force*
14 *Classifications and Investigative Responsibility*,” published July 30, 2001; Special Order 27,
15 “*Investigating Non-Categorical Use of Force Incidents*,” approved by the Commission September 25,
16 2001; Special Order 18, “*Revisions to Special Order No. 27, 2001 – Investigating and adjudicating*
17 *Non-Categorical Use of Force Incidents*,” approved by the Police Commission May 7, 2002; HRB
18 Notice, “*Digital Cameras for Non-Categorical Use of Force Investigations*,” published October 25,
19 2002, approved by the Police Commission November 5, 2002; Special Order 13, 2004, “*Non-*
20 *Categorical Use of Force Reporting – Revised*,” published May 26, 2004 and approved by the Police
21 Commission on June 8, 2004.

22 **Activities:**

23 Although not required by the Consent Decree, LAPD revised non-categorical use of force review
24 procedures to require a centralized review and adjudication of all such incidents. This helps to ensure
25 consistent analysis and review of these issues. A Department reorganization that took place in December
26 2004 shifted this responsibility to the newly created Use of Force Review Section; an entity that reports
27 directly to the Chief of Staff.
28

1 Special Order 13 which was published on May 26, 2004, streamlined the Non-Categorical Use of
2 Force investigative process, establishing two levels of reporting.

3 A CRID Inspection of Non-categorical Use of Force Investigations (November 2004) reviewed
4 51 post Special Order 13 investigations. The inspection revealed 100% compliance with the mandates of
5 Paragraph 68.

6 To facilitate non-categorical use of force investigations, the City purchased digital cameras for use
7 by Area commands. These cameras were distributed to commands during July 2003. Additional cameras
8 are in the process of being purchased.

9 See also Paragraphs 69 and 81.

10 **Training**

11 Training on the protocols in Special Order 13 was provided to Department managers and
12 supervisors in May 2004 as part of CEDP 7.5.

13 **Audit/Inspections**

14 The next Non-Categorical Use of Force Audit is scheduled for the 4th Quarter FY 2004/2005.

15 A CRID Inspection of Non-categorical Use of Force Investigations (November 2004) reviewed
16 51 post Special Order 13 investigations. The inspection revealed 100% compliance with the mandates of
17 Paragraph 68.

1 **Decree ¶69**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “69. The Department shall continue to have the Use of Force Review Board
4 review all Categorical Uses of Force. The LAPD shall continue to have Non-Categorical
5 Uses of Force reviewed by chain-of-command managers at the Division and Bureau level.
6 Non-Categorical Use of Force investigations shall be reviewed by Division management
7 within 14 days of the incident, unless a member of the chain-of-command reviewing the
8 investigation detects a deficiency in the investigation, in which case the review shall be
9 completed within a period of time reasonably necessary to correct such deficiency in the
10 investigation or reports.”

12 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

13 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

14 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

15 **Policies/Procedures:** LAPD Manual Sections 2/092.50 and 4/245.10; March 6, 2001, Commission
16 Motion regarding Categorical Use of Force, implementing Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Categorical*
17 *Use of Force Classifications and Investigative Responsibility*,” published July 30, 2001; Special Order
18 27, “*Investigating Non-Categorical Use of Force Incidents*,” approved by Police Commission
19 September 25, 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Commanding Officer Review of Use of Force*
20 *Board – Revised*,” approved by the Police Commission October 9, 2001; Chief of Police
21 Correspondence, “*Review of Department Canine Bite Incidents Requiring Hospitalization*,”
22 approved by the Police Commission October 9, 2001; Special Order 18, “*Revisions to Special Order*
23 *No. 27, 2001 – Investigating and Adjudicating Non-Categorical Use of Force Incidents*,” approved
24 by the Police Commission May 7, 2002; Chief of Police Correspondence, “*Review of Department*
25 *Canine Bite Incidents Requiring Hospitalization*,” approved by Commission February 26, 2002; Chief
26 of Police Correspondence, “*Review of Canine Bites Resulting in Hospitalization – Revised*,”
27 distributed April 8, 2002.

Activities:

The responsibilities of the Use of Force Review Board are outlined in Manual Section 2/092.50.

Categorical Uses of Force are being reviewed by the Use of Force Review Board. A review panel for dog bites that result in hospitalization, consistent with the level of review and oversight provided for Categorical Uses of Force other than dog bites, has been established. Between July 1 and December 31, 2004, 58 Categorical Use of Force cases were reviewed by the Use of Force Review Board.

The City has been in compliance with the 14-day non-categorical use of force investigation period requirement since late 2002 and remained in compliance during this reporting period, as determined by the monthly compliance reports compiled by the Use of Force Review Section.

<u>2004 Deployment Period</u>	<u>Compliance Rate</u>
#7 (June -July)	98%
#8 (July -August)	97%
#9 (August- Sept.)	97%
#10 (Sept.-Oct.)	97%
#11 (Oct.-Nov.)	96%
#12 (Nov.-Dec.)	99%

Training

Training on the protocols in Special Order 13 was provided to Department managers and supervisors in May 2004 as part of CEDP 7.5.

Audit

The next Non-Categorical Use of Force Audit is scheduled for the 4th Quarter FY 2004/2005.

1 B. Search and Arrest Procedures

2 **Decree ¶70**

3 **Decree Language:**

4 “70. The Department shall continue to require all booking recommendations be
5 personally reviewed and approved by a watch commander as to appropriateness, legality,
6 and conformance with Department policies. Additionally, the watch commander or
7 designee will personally review and approve supporting arrest reports as to
8 appropriateness, legality and conformance with Department policies in light of the booking
9 recommendation.

10 a. Such reviews shall continue to entail a review for completeness of the
11 information that is contained on the applicable forms and an authenticity review to include
12 examining the form for “canned” language, inconsistent information, lack of articulation of
13 the legal basis for the action or other indicia that the information on the forms is not
14 authentic or correct.

15 b. Supervisors shall evaluate each incident in which a person is charged with
16 interfering with a police officer (California Penal Code § 148), resisting arrest, or assault on
17 an officer to determine whether it raises any issue or concern regarding training, policy, or
18 tactics.

19 c. The quality of these supervisory reviews shall be taken into account in the
20 supervisor’s annual personnel performance evaluations.”
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2001/July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Partial Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Manual Section 4/601 et. al.; Special Order 10, 2000; Special Order 13, "*Booking Approval Procedure-Revised*," approved by the Police Commission July 10, 2001; Special Order 12, "*Evaluation of Arrests for Booking*," approved by the Police Commission on December 31, 2001; Special Order 47, "*Performance Evaluation Procedures For Lieutenants and Below-Revised*," approved by the Police Commission September 23, 2003, published November 13, 2003; Special Order 51, "*Performance Evaluation Procedures for Captains and Above-Revised*," approved by the Police Commission September 30, 2003, published December 24, 2003; Special Order 49, "*Mandatory Pre-Booking Evaluation of Certain Arrests*," approved by the Police Commission December 9, 2003, published November 25, 2003.

Activities:

An Audit Division "Audit of Arrest, Booking, and Charging Reports," (ABC audit) was completed on October 8, 2004. The audit reviewed 260 arrest packages created between April and May 2004. The sampling included 115 arrest reports generated by Gang Enforcement Details. Department-wide results found a 95% compliance level for completeness and a 100% compliance level for authenticity. GED compliance rates were 99% for completeness and 98% for authenticity.

A Bureau Gang Coordinator inspection completed December 6, 2004 reviewed 104 arrest reports from the month of October 2004. The inspection assessed 100% compliance with watch commander oversight, legality and conformance with Department policy. A "SEU ABC Audit," Third Quarter of FY 03-04, found a 99% compliance rate with the provision of Paragraph 70(a).

A CRID inspection of 85 arrest reports from the 3rd Quarter 2004 revealed 95% compliance with watch commander oversight related to booking and arrest report approval.

The Audit Division completed an "Audit of Arrest, Booking, and Charging Reports," dated March 30, 2004, which reviewed arrests from October 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003. The audit found

1 compliance for the provisions of Paragraph 70(a), with a 96% compliance rate. Therefore, the City is in
2 compliance with the provisions of 70(a).

3 The October 2004 ABC Audit reviewed arrest reports completed between April and May 2004.
4 That sample included 16 reports that met the criteria for a Paragraph 70(b) review. The audit revealed an
5 83% compliance with the mandate. A CRID inspection of 85 arrest reports from the 3rd Quarter 2004
6 revealed 78% compliance with the requirement for additional watch commander review of arrests for
7 resisting, interfering or assault on a police officer. Seven of the incidents reviewed by CRID did not
8 document the additional review and 8 others did not appropriately address policy or tactics concerns.
9 Although the LAPD continues to make progress toward compliance with provisions of Paragraph 70(b),
10 additional improvement in the substance of reviews is needed.

11 Paragraph 70 requires supervisory review of booking recommendations and supporting arrest
12 reports for compliance with Paragraph 70(a) and (b) and for compliance with LAPD policies. The "Audit
13 of Arrest, Booking, and Charging Reports," dated October 8, 2004, identified that the LAPD policy
14 requiring documentation of Miranda admonishments and responses in the arrest reports continues to be an
15 area of compliance concern. In addition, supervisory oversight issues were identified, with a compliance
16 rate of 71%.

17 Paragraph 70(c) was identified as a meet and confer item. The meet and confer process has been
18 completed and the provisions of Paragraph 70(c) are incorporated into Special Orders 47 and 51
19 regarding annual performance evaluations (see Paragraph 54). Compliance with the requirements of
20 Paragraph 70(c) will be assessed via a CRID inspection of supervisor Performance Evaluation Report
21 which will be conducted in March 2005.

22 **Training**

23 Training on the components of Paragraph 70(c) was provided to Department managers at an Office
24 of Operations meeting on December 17, 2004. Quarterly Supervisor training for the 3rd Quarter 2004
25 addressed Arrest Report Review and Approval.

26 Watch Commander training specific to 70(b) at direction of Area Commanding Officers.

27 Audit Division staff attends divisional roll calls to discuss common mistakes in arrest reporting.

28 Training is delivered to managers and supervisors as a follow up to the audits and inspections.

1 Inclusion of insights from Audits in Basic Supervisor Schools.

2 Inclusion of issues of concern in LAPD promotional exams.

3 CDEP 7 training, provided in winter 2003, included arrest procedure elements.

4 **Audit**

5 The Audit Division completed an "Audit of Arrest, Booking, and Charging Reports," dated
6 October 8, 2004, which reviewed 260 arrest packages created between April and May 2004. Audit
7 findings are discussed above. LAPD has taken actions to remedy identified deficiencies.

8 The Audit Division completed an "Audit of Arrest, Booking, and Charging Reports," dated March
9 30, 2004, which reviewed 155 arrest packages of the 2,775 narcotic arrests made between October 1,
10 2003 and December 31, 2003. Audit findings are discussed above. LAPD has taken actions to remedy
11 identified deficiencies.

12 The Audit Division completed a "SEU ABC Audit," Third Quarter of FY 03-04, examining 156
13 arrest packages from November 2003, and found a 99% compliance rate with the provision of Paragraph
14 70(a).

15 CRID Inspections. CRID Inspection protocols are being retooled to assess the subjective
16 requirement of Paragraph 70(a) such as canned language, authenticity and appropriateness. These
17 inspection modifications will be tested in the new Divisional Inspection Compliance Evaluations (DICE) that
18 began January 2005.

1 **Decree ¶71**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “71. The LAPD shall continue to implement procedures with respect to search
4 warrants and probable cause arrest warrants as defined in the LAPD manual (commonly
5 known as “Ramey” warrants), which require, among other things, that a supervisor shall
6 review each request for a warrant and each affidavit filed by a police officer to support the
7 warrant application. Such review shall include:

- 8 a. a review for completeness of the information contained therein and an
9 authenticity review to include an examination for “canned” language, inconsistent
10 information, and lack of articulation of the legal basis for the warrant; and
11 b. a review of the information on the application and affidavit, where
12 applicable, to determine whether the warrant is appropriate, legal and in conformance with
13 LAPD procedure.
14 c. In addition, a supervisor shall review the officer’s plan for executing the
15 search warrant and, after execution of the search warrant, review the execution of the
16 search warrant. A supervisor shall be present for execution of the search warrant.”

17
18 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

19 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

20 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

21 **Policy/Procedure:** Search Warrant Procedures Guide published in December 1996; Special Order 25,
22 “*Search Warrant Procedures*,” approved by the Commission September 18, 2001; Chief of Police
23 Notice, “*Compliance with Consent Decree Provisions Governing Search Warrant Procedures*,”
24 distributed October 9, 2002, approved by the Police Commission October 15, 2002; Special Order 28,
25 2003, “*Activation of the Warrant Service/Tactical Plan Report*,” approved by the Police Commission
26 July 29, 2003.
27
28

1 **Activities:**

2 The Audit Division "Audit of Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits," dated March 30,
3 2004, found 97% compliance rate with the provisions of Paragraph 71(a) and (b). CRID performed a
4 review in August 2003, immediately after publication of the revised procedures and forms, and found
5 compliance with completeness and authenticity requirements. CRID performed another review in June
6 2004 and found continued compliance at the 97% level. Minor documentation issues were identified and
7 are being addressed by the LAPD.

8 The City is in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 71(c). The "Audit of Warrant
9 Applications and Supporting Affidavits," dated March 30, 2004, found a 96% compliance rate for
10 supervisory review of warrant service/tactical plan reports that are required to be completed prior to
11 issuance of certain search warrants. Further, 100% of debriefing summaries, completed after execution of
12 a search warrant, were reviewed by a supervisor within a one-day period. The Audit also found a 100%
13 compliance rate with the provision that requires the presence of a supervisor at the execution of a warrant.
14 CRID performed a review of the supervisory review provision and found similar compliance levels. The
15 Audit did identify that supervisors were not conforming to the LAPD procedure that supervisors initial
16 every page of a search warrant. The LAPD is reviewing this finding and the associated procedure, as
17 appropriate.

18 A CRID inspection of search warrants served in May 2004 identify that supervisors were
19 continuing to fail to conform to the LAPD procedure that supervisors initial every page of a search warrant.
20 However, supervisor oversight of the warrant application was evident by the presence of supervisory initials
21 on page 1 of the affidavit. The inspection also indicated 100% compliance with the requirement of having a
22 supervisor present at the warrant service. Finally, documentation shortcomings were seen in the warrant
23 debriefings indicating that additional training was needed in this area. That training was conveyed to
24 managers as part of the inspection process.

25 A FY 04-05 Audit Division audit of search warrants is currently in progress. Preliminary results of
26 the audit indicate a 100% compliance level for authenticity. Therefore, the City has continued compliance
27 with the provisions of Paragraph 71(a).
28

1 Preliminary results of the in-progress audit indicate a compliance rate of 97% with the provisions of
2 70(b) that information on the warrant applications and affidavit is appropriate and legal and a 98%
3 compliance rate for following LAPD procedures. Therefore, the City finds continued compliance with the
4 provision of 70(b) over the past 6-month reporting period.

5 As discussed in Paragraph 62, some confusion between the need to fill out the Search Warrant
6 Tactical Plan Report for non-tactical search warrants (*e.g.*, a search where the site is secured prior to
7 serving the warrant) exists. Although portions of the Search Warrant Tactical Plan Report are not required
8 for non-tactical search warrants, other portions are the basis of documentation of supervisory review of
9 actions taken. The preliminary results of the in-progress audit indicate that documentation required to fully
10 illustrate compliance with Paragraph 62 is not available in 10% of the warrants, all five of which are non-
11 tactical. Service of such warrants is low risk, compliance issues are related to documentation issues, and
12 supervisory oversight is illustrated by initials on the first page of the affidavit. Further, the LAPD maintains a
13 100% compliance rate for the requirement that supervisors be present for execution of the search warrant.
14 Therefore, the City finds continued compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 71(c), with some
15 documentation issues remaining to be fully addressed.

16 **Training**

17 See Paragraph 62.

18 Training is conveyed to managers as part of the CRID inspection process.

19 **Audit**

20 In-progress Audit Division FY 04-05 search warrant audit.

21 The Audit Division "Audit of Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits," dated March 30,
22 2004, reviewed 75 of the 175 warrants written in Deployment Period 11 (October 15 to November 19,
23 2004). The audit found compliance with search warrant procedures.

24 The Audit Division "Gang Enforcement Detail Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits
25 Work Product Audit Supplemental," dated June 29, 2004, found 100% compliance for the provisions of
26 Paragraph 71.

27 "Office of the Inspector General's Review of the Department's Arrest, Booking, and Charging
28 Reports Audit Third Quarter – Fiscal Year 2003-2004," dated May 26, 2004.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

GED Work Product Audits (see Paragraph 106).
CRID performs real-time reviews of compliance with periodic reviews of search warrant
procedures, as appropriate.

1 **Decree ¶72**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “72. Each Area and specialized Division of the LAPD shall maintain a log listing
4 each search warrant, the case file where a copy of such warrant is maintained, and the
5 officer who applied for and each supervisor who reviewed the application for such
6 warrant.”

8 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

9 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

10 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

11 **Policy/Procedure:** Search Warrant Procedures Guide published in December 1996; Special Order 25,
12 “*Search Warrant Procedures*,” approved by the Commission September 18, 2001; Chief of Police
13 Notice, “*Compliance with Consent Decree Provisions Governing Search Warrant Procedures*,”
14 distributed October 9, 2002, approved by the Police Commission October 15, 2002; Special Order 28,
15 2003 “*Activation of the Warrant Service/Tactical Plan Report*”, approved by the Police Commission
16 July 29, 2003.

17 **Activities:**

18 The Audit Division “Audit of Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits,” dated March 30,
19 2004, found a 93% compliance rate for Paragraph 92 requiring search warrant tracking log entries.

20 A CRID Inspection completed in June 2004 reviewed Search Warrant Tracking Logs completed in
21 May 2004. The inspection indicated 92% compliance with this mandate. The errors noted were related to
22 completion of all fields on the tracking log, some of which are not required pursuant to the Consent Decree.

23 The Audit Division “Gang Enforcement Detail Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits
24 Work Product Audit Supplemental,” dated June 29, 2004, found 95% compliance for the provisions of
25 Paragraph 72.

26 A FY 04-05 Audit Division audit of search warrants is currently in progress. Preliminary results of
27 the audit indicate a 96% compliance rate for Paragraph 92 requiring search warrant tracking log entries.
28

1 Therefore, the LAPD has progressed from a 93% compliance rate to a 96% compliance rate over the past
2 6-month period and has achieved full compliance with Paragraph 72.

3 **Training**

4 See Paragraph 62.

5 **Audit**

6 An Audit Division FY 04-05 search warrant audit is in progress.

7 The Audit Division "Audit of Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits," dated March 30,
8 2004, reviewed 75 of the 175 warrant written in Deployment Period 11 (October 15 to November 19,
9 2004). The audit found compliance with search warrant procedures.

10 The Audit Division "Gang Enforcement Detail Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits
11 Work Product Audit Supplemental," dated June 29, 2004, found 95% compliance for the provisions of
12 Paragraph 72.

13 CRID performs periodic reviews of search warrant procedures, as appropriate.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶73**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “73. All detainees and arrestees brought to an LAPD facility shall be brought
4 before a watch commander for inspection. The watch commander shall visually inspect
5 each such detainee or arrestee for injuries as required by LAPD procedures and, at a
6 minimum, ask the detainee or arrestee the questions required by current LAPD procedures,
7 which are: 1) “Do you understand why you were detained/arrested?”; 2) “Are you sick, ill,
8 or injured?”; 3) “Do you have any questions or concerns?” In the rare cases where
9 circumstances preclude such an inspection and interview by a watch commander, the
10 LAPD shall ensure that the person is inspected and interviewed by a supervisor who did
11 not assist or participate in the person’s arrest or detention. In each instance, the watch
12 commander or supervisor, as appropriate, shall sign the related booking documentation,
13 which shall indicate their compliance with these procedures.”

14 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

15
16 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

17 **Primary Compliance Status:** Compliance

18 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 4/604; Special Order 10, 2000; Special Order 13, “*Booking*
19 *Approval Procedures – Revised*,” approved by the Commission July 10, 2001; Special Order 42,
20 “*Detention Logs-Revised*,” approved by the Police Commission December 13, 2002. Special Order 18,
21 2003 “*Detention Logs – Revised*,” published May 19, 2003; approved by the Police Commission June
22 3, 2003.

23 **Activities:**

24 In January 2004, CRID performed a review of 25 GED arrests. The review found a 96%
25 compliance rate with the provisions of Paragraph 73. The City is finding compliance based upon this most
26 recent review.

27 A Bureau Gang Coordinator inspection completed in July 2004 reviewed 95 arrests from May
28 2004. 100% compliance was noted with the requirements of Paragraph 73.

Training

Quarterly Supervisor training for the 3rd Quarter FY 2004/2005 addressed arrest report review and approval.

Commands provided training as appropriate regarding detention log requirements in response to ad hoc detention log inspections.

Audit

This provision is included in the CRID Divisional Inspection Compliance Evaluations (DICE) that began January 2005.

1 *C. Initiation of Complaints*

2 **Decree ¶74**

3 **Decree Language:**

4 “74. The Department shall continue to provide for the receipt of complaints as
5 follows:

6 a. in writing or verbally, in person, by mail, by telephone (or TDD), facsimile
7 transmission, or by electronic mail;

8 b. anonymous complaints;

9 c. at LAPD headquarters, any LAPD station or substation, or the offices of
10 the Police Commission or the Inspector General;

11 d. distribution of complaint materials and self-addressed postage-paid
12 envelopes is easily accessible City locations throughout Los Angeles and in languages
13 utilized by the City of Los Angeles in municipal election ballot materials;

14 e. distribution of the materials needed to file a complaint upon request to
15 community groups, community centers, and public and private service centers;

16 f. the assignment of a case number to each complaint; and

17 g. continuation of a 24-hour toll-free telephone complaint hotline. Within six
18 months of the effective date of this Agreement, the Department shall record all calls made
19 on this hotline.

20 h. In addition, the Department shall prohibit officers from asking or requiring a
21 potential complainant to sign any form that in any manner limits or waives the ability of a
22 civilian to file a police complaint with the LAPD or any other entity. The Department shall
23 also prohibit officers, as a condition for filing a misconduct complaint, from asking or
24 requiring a potential complainant to sign a form that limits or waives the ability of a civilian
25 to file a lawsuit in court.”
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2001/December 15, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: LAPD Manual Sections 3/810 and 3/815.25; Special Order, 2000; Special Order 17, "Complaint Investigation Procedures-Revised," approved by Commission September 18, 2001; Special Order 19, "Complaint Information Provided in Additional Languages," approved by the Commission September 6, 2001; Office of the Chief of Police Notice, June 20, 2001, "Internal Affairs Group-24-Hour Complaint Hotline," approved by the Commission July 10, 2001; Special Order 36, "Complaint Reporting Procedures- Revised," approved by the Police Commission, November 13, 2001. Special Order 17, "Complaint Advisory Form 1.28 – Activated," approved by the Police Commission August 3, 2004.

Activities:

The LAPD continues to accept and investigate complaints from any source, including anonymous complaints.

July 1 – December 31, 2004

Total Complaints -	3,321
Anonymous Complaints –	75
Received via e-mail -	55
Received via Duty Room/Complaint Hotline -	156

An IAG "Audit of Initiation of Complaints," dated January 20, 2004, found 100% compliance with the requirement to accept anonymous complaints. Further, the "Office of the Inspector General's Review of the Department's Review of the Department's Initiation of Complaints Audit – Consent Decree Paragraph 74," dated July 12, 2004, randomly selected 5 of the 29 anonymous complaints filed in the first quarter of FY 2003 and determined that the LAPD used reasonable efforts to investigate the complaints and to determine whether the complaints could be corroborated.

The LAPD maintains and makes available complaint materials in English, Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Tagalog, Japanese, and Vietnamese. Additionally, foreign language posters in support of the requirements of Paragraph 74(d) were developed and have been displayed in the 18 geographic Areas

1 since February 2002. Periodic front-desk reviews are conducted to ensure appropriate complaint
2 materials are available. A CRID Inspection of Department facilities in April 2004 reviewed complaint
3 materials that are required to be available to the public as per Paragraph 74(d). The inspection assessed
4 compliance at 95%. An Audit Division "Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit," was completed in
5 December 2004, which found a 98% compliance rate for such materials being available at LAPD facilities.
6 The LAPD remains in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 74(c), (d), and (e).

7 All complaints are assigned a Complaint File Number by PSB. The Audit Division "Complaint,
8 Form 1.28, Investigations Audit," completed in December 2004, found a 100% compliance rate for
9 Paragraph 74(f), and verified LAPD's continued compliance with this provision.

10 The Audit Division "Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit," completed in December 2004,
11 found that calls to the Professional Standards Bureau (PSB) Duty Room are recorded as required by
12 Paragraph 74(g), and that the complaint hotline is staffed and operational 24-hours a day. Non-compliance
13 with Paragraph 74(g) was assessed by the Independent Monitor in the 13th quarterly Report. This finding
14 was based on concerns over the accuracy of complaints being completed by the off-hour complaint hotline.
15 The City reviewed the cases identified by the Monitor as being problematic and disagrees with the
16 Monitor's findings. The City's concerns were communicated to the Monitor on January 13, 2005, and the
17 Monitor is evaluating the City concerns and assessment. Based upon the Audit Division's December 2004
18 audit findings, and the specific review completed in response to concerns raised by the Monitor, the City
19 finds compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 74(g).

20 Prior to the Consent Decree, the Department utilized a Complaint Advisory Form to advise
21 complainants of the provisions of California Penal Code Section 148.6 (the right to file complaints and
22 penalties for filing false complaints). Use of the form was discontinued in 2000 in response to a judicial
23 ruling. In 2003 another court ruling opined that a complaint advisory did not limit or waive the availability to
24 file a complaint and was required pursuant to state law. In response to this ruling, the Department adopted
25 the Complaint Advisory Form on August 2004, which is consistent with the provisions of Paragraph 74(h).
26 Special Order 17 details the appropriate use of the form.

27 PSB complaint investigation biopsies completed between July and December 2004 found
28 compliance with Paragraph 74.

Training

Paragraph 74 mandates have been incorporated into the following LAPD schools: Continuing Education Delivery Plan (CEDP) Module 1, Recruit Training, Supervisor Development School, Detective Supervisor Continuing School, Watch Commander School, Command Development School, and Consent Decree Source Document Training.

Feedback from audits and IAG biopsies.

Standardized Roll Call Training Program, DP No. 5-03, Accepting Public Complaints.

Quarterly IAG staff training, which outlines the responsibilities of initiating and receipt of complaints.

Training was provided on February 19 and June 2, 2004.

See also Paragraph 75 discussion.

Paragraph 74 mandates were addressed in CEDP 7.5 which was delivered to managers and supervisors in May-June 2004.

Audits

Audit Division "Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit," completed in December 2004, found compliance for reviewed Paragraph 74 provisions (74(d), (f) and (g)).

An IAG "Audit of Initiation of Complaints" was completed on January 20, 2004.

Audit Division completed an "Audit of Front Desk Operations," dated March 11, 2004. Consent Decree related Audit results are discussed above.

The "Office of the Inspector General's Review of the Department's Review of the Department's Initiation of Complaints Audit – Consent Decree Paragraph 74," dated July 12, 2004.

PSB case biopsies.

CRID Inspections.

1 **Decree ¶75**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “75. The LAPD shall initiate a Complaint Form 1.28 investigation against (i) any
4 officer who allegedly fails to inform any civilian who indicates a desire to file a complaint of
5 the means by which a complaint may be filed; (ii) any officer who allegedly attempts to
6 dissuade a civilian from filing a complaint; or (iii) any officer who is authorized to accept a
7 complaint who allegedly refuses to do so.”

8
9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

11 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

12 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Sections 3/805.25 and 3/810; Special Order, 17, “*Complaint*
13 *Investigation Procedures – Revised*,” approved by the Commission September 18, 2001; Special Order
14 36, “*Complaint Reporting Procedures – Revised*,” approved by the Police Commission, November 13,
15 2001.

16 **Activities:**

17 The LAPD acts to initiate complaints against any officer that fails to take a complaint. In addition,
18 the LAPD has undertaken extensive training efforts to ensure officers are aware of the importance of
19 responding to public complaints and concerns. Further, the LAPD proactively works to ensure that all
20 officers are taking complaints as appropriate by performing integrity audits and auditing complaint hotline
21 tapes.

22 Between July and December 2004, the Ethics Enforcement Section (EES) conducted 45 integrity
23 audits related to the acceptance of complaints. Six failures were noted. Personnel complaints have been
24 initiated in five of the six failures. The sixth failure involved a civilian volunteer and that issue has been
25 addressed through training.

26 The Audit Division “Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit,” completed in December 2004,
27 reviewed one day, randomly selected, hotline complaint tapes. The review found that one reported
28

1 compliant was not appropriately documented for a complaint investigation. The finding was referred to
2 PSB for review.

3 Integrity Audit results are reported quarterly to the Chief of Police, Police Commission and the
4 Inspector General.

5 **Training**

6 Paragraph 75 information has been incorporated into the following Department schools: CEDP 1,
7 Recruit Training, Supervisor Development School, Detective Supervisor School, Watch Commander
8 School, Command Development School, and Consent Decree Source Document Training.

9 Department-wide education efforts include the Chief of Police reiterating the LAPD's zero
10 tolerance policy regarding officers not accepting complaints or failure to properly handle public complaints
11 in a timely manner (Spring 2003).

12 Training was provided by the Chief of Police in the Assistant Chief's staff meetings, general staff
13 meetings, and COMPSTAT inspections in Spring 2003.

14 In May 2003 the Chief included a section in the "Los Angeles Police Beat" publication regarding
15 the results of the integrity audit and the LAPD's zero tolerance policy.

16 Roll-call training regarding acceptance of complaints was provided in Deployment Period #5 (May
17 4, 2003 to May 31, 2003). The LAPD "Guidelines for Accepting Public Complaints," were updated on
18 March 25, 2003 and posted on the LAPD's intranet web site.

19 **Audit**

20 Integrity Audits, conducted pursuant to Paragraph 97, will seek to identify officers who discourage
21 the filing of a complaint.

22 Audit Division "Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit," completed in December 2004.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶76**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “76. The city shall cause the LAPD to be notified whenever a person serves a
4 civil lawsuit on or files a claim against the City alleging misconduct by an LAPD officer or
5 other employee of the LAPD.”

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

9 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

10 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 3/782.30; Risk Management Division Order No. 1,
11 “Notification of Civil Suits,” approved by the Commission June 19, 2001.

12 **Activities:**

13 The LAPD Risk Management Group (RMG) maintains a database to track and monitor the claims
14 and lawsuits that have been forwarded from the City Attorney’s Office pursuant to this paragraph. The
15 City Attorney assigns a file number to each claim/lawsuit. Any claim or lawsuit received without a file
16 number is immediately referred to the City Attorney’s Office. RMG will not accept a claim without the
17 appropriate City Attorney file number for tracking purposes.

18 All claims/lawsuits received from the City Attorney’s Office have been forwarded to Professional
19 Standards Bureau (PSB) for investigation. Risk Management Group maintains logs of the claims/lawsuits
20 forwarded by the City Attorney’s Office and telephonically verifies PSB’s receipt of the documents. PSB
21 logs receipt of all claims and lawsuits and enters the information into their Claims For Damages Database.

22 A RMG audit of claims received during the 3rd Quarter of 2004 verified that Risk Management
23 Division had received all 108 claims that had been received and entered into the City Attorney Omega
24 System database.

25 A RMG audit of claims received during the 4th Quarter 2004 verified that Risk Management
26 Division had received all 83 claims that had been received and entered into the City Attorney Omega
27 System database.

1 The Audit Division "Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit," completed in December 2004,
2 found 100% compliance for the provisions of Paragraph 96.

3 **Audit**

4 Risk Management Group audits their database quarterly and reports the results to the Consent
5 Decree Task Force.

6 The Audit Division "Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit," completed in December 2004,
7 found 100% compliance for the provisions of Paragraph 96.

1 **Decree ¶77**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “77. The Department shall continue to require all officers to notify without delay
4 the LAPD whenever the officer is arrested or criminally charged for any conduct, or the
5 officer is named as a party in any civil suit involving his or her conduct while on duty (or
6 otherwise while acting in an official capacity). In addition, the Department shall require
7 such notification from any officer who is named as a defendant in any civil suit that results in
8 a temporary, preliminary, or final adjudication on the merits in favor of a plaintiff
9 complaining of off-duty physical violence, threats of physical violence, or domestic violence
10 by the officer.”

12 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

13 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001/July 1, 2001

14 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

15 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Sections 1/210.46, 3/815.05 and 3/837.10; Risk Management
16 Division Order No. 1, approved by the Risk Management Division and published June 7, 2001, approved
17 by the Commission June 19, 2001; Special Order No. 30, 2001, “*Duty to Report Misconduct-Revised*,”
18 approved by the Police Commission September 6, 2001; Special Order 26, 2003, “*Employee’s Duty to*
19 *Report When Criminally Charged or Named as a Defendant in Certain Lawsuits*,” approved by the
20 Police Commission June 24, 2003, published July 10, 2003.

21 **Activities:**

22 After a period of negotiation with the Los Angeles Police Protective League, the LAPD published
23 Special Order 28, 2003, which implemented the second half of Paragraph 77. LAPD Department Manual
24 Section 3/837.10 requires any Department employee who is detained/arrested, or transported to any jail or
25 police facility for any offense, excluding traffic infractions, to advise the arresting officer of his/her
26 Department employee status and to notify the watch commander from his/her Area of assignment without
27 delay, or the Department Command Post if the employee’s Area of assignment is closed. Notifications are
28 then made to PSB by the Department Command Post or the watch commander. Civil suits filed against a

1 LAPD employee regarding activities while on duty would be addressed through the civil lawsuit process
2 established in Risk Management Division Order No. 1, published June 7, 2001 (see Paragraph 76).

3 Failure to notify would result in a Department-initiated personnel complaint and the allegation would
4 be categorized as Neglect of Duty. As required by the Consent Decree, the LAPD has appropriate
5 policies in place and procedures to discipline employees who fail to follow procedures. These procedures
6 are being appropriately utilized by LAPD.

1 **Decree ¶78**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “78. The Department shall continue to require officers to report to the LAPD
4 without delay: any conduct by other officers that reasonably appears to constitute (a) an
5 excessive use of force or improper threat of force; (b) a false arrest or filing of false
6 charges; (c) an unlawful search or seizure; (d) invidious discrimination; (e) an intentional
7 failure to complete forms required by LAPD policies and in accordance with procedures;
8 (f) an act of retaliation for complying with any LAPD policy or procedure; or (g) an
9 intentional provision of false information in an administrative investigation or in any official
10 report, log, or electronic transmittal of information. Officers shall report such alleged
11 misconduct by fellow officers either directly to IAG or to a supervisor who shall complete a
12 Complaint Form 1.28. This requirement applies to all officers, including supervisors and
13 managers who learn of evidence of possible misconduct through their review of an officer’s
14 work. Failure to voluntarily report as described in this paragraph shall be an offense
15 subject to discipline if sustained.”

17 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

18 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001/July 1, 2001

19 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

20 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 3/805.25, 3/815.05, and 1/210.46; Special Order 30, “*Duty*
21 *to Report Misconduct*,” approved by the Commission September 6, 2001.

22 **Activities:**

23 LAPD employees’ duty and responsibility to report misconduct to a supervisor is current LAPD
24 policy (Manual Section 3/805.25, 3/815.05, and 1/210.46).

25 The LAPD has established agreements with adjacent law enforcement agencies to disclose
26 whenever an officer in their jurisdiction arrests an LAPD officer. In addition, the LAPD participates in the
27 “pull program” with the California Department of Motor Vehicles. Under the program, the LAPD is
28 notified whenever an LAPD employee’s license is suspended for driving under the influence offense.

Training

Training is provided to IAG personnel via the Quarterly PSB training sessions.

Audit

The Department has reciprocal reporting agreements with other law enforcement agencies.

California Department of Vehicles Pull Program.

D. Conduct of Investigations

Decree ¶79

Decree Language:

“79. Within 10 days of their receipt by the LAPD, the IAG shall receive and promptly review the “face sheet” of all complaints to determine whether they meet the criteria in paragraphs 93, 94 and 95 for being investigated by IAG, or the OHB Unit, or chain of command supervisors.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: October 15, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Special Order 17, “*Complaint Investigation Procedures – Established*,” approved by the Commission September 18, 2001; Special Order 36 – “*Complaint Reporting Procedures – Revised*,” approved by Police Commission November 13, 2001.

Activities:

LAPD reports the following compliance rates for this period:

Month	CFs Issued	In-Compliance	%
July	532	505	95%
Aug	522	507	97%
Sept	630	600	95%
Oct	445	422	95%
Nov	437	411	94%
Dec	478	452	95%

The Audit Division “Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit,” completed in December 2004, found 90% compliance for the provisions of Paragraph 97, based on a sample of 82 complaints initiated in July 2004. The audit reveals extenuating causes for the delays for those 8 complaints that were not processed in 10-days. The City finds continued compliance with the 10-day processing time established in Paragraph 79 based upon the 100% sampling used to determine compliance on a monthly basis.

1 Upon receipt of the complaints, Professional Standards Bureau classifies the complaints in
2 accordance with Paragraphs 93 and 94 (see also Paragraphs 93 and 94).

3 **Audits**

4 The OIG audits compliance monthly.

5 The Civil Rights Integrity Division reviews compliance monthly.

6 The Audit Division "Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit," completed in December 2004.

1 **Decree ¶80**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “80. In conducting all Categorical Use of Force investigations, and complaint
4 investigations regarding the categories of misconduct allegations and matters identified in
5 paragraphs 93 and 94 (whether conducted by IAG, the OHB Unit, or by chain of
6 command during the transition period specified in paragraph 95), the LAPD shall, subject
7 to and in conformance with applicable state law:

- 8 a. tape record or videotape interviews of complainants, involved officers, and
9 witnesses;
10 b. whenever practicable and appropriate, and not inconsistent with good
11 investigatory practices such as canvassing a scene, interview complainants and witnesses at
12 sites and times convenient for them, including at their residences or places of business;
13 c. prohibit group interviews;
14 d. notify involved officers and the supervisors of involved officers, except
15 when LAPD deems the complaint to be confidential under the law;
16 e. interview all supervisors with respect to their conduct at the scene during
17 the incident;
18 f. collect and preserve all appropriate evidence, including canvassing the
19 scene to locate witnesses where appropriate, with the burden for such collection on the
20 LAPD, not the complainant; and
21 g. identify and report in writing all inconsistencies in officer and witness
22 interview statements gathered during the investigation.”
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: July 1, 2001/October 15, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Partial Compliance

Policy/Procedure: LAPD “*Complaint Investigations Guide for Supervisors*,” October, 2000; Robbery Homicide Division Officer Involved Shooting Manual, 1994; Administrative Order 12, “*Investigating a Personnel Complaint and Evaluating Witness Credibility*,” approved by the Police Commission September 25, 2001; HRB Notice, “*Administrative Investigation Training*,” approved by the Police Commission October 9, 2001; Special Order 39, “*Critical Incident Investigation Division – Established*,” approved by the Police Commission December 11, 2001; Special Order No. 15, “*Revision to Special Order No. 39, 2001 – CIID Investigations*,” approved by the Police Commission May 3, 2002; Special Order No. 36, “*Complaint Reporting Procedures – Revised*,” approved by the Police Commission November 13, 2000; Special Order No. 1, “*Department Complaint Process-Revised*,” approved by the Police Commission on February 25, 2003, published January 1, 2003.

Activities:

Categorical Use of Force

As previously reported to the Court, concerns regarding Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) investigation quality led to significant changes to LAPD procedures for investigating such incidents, most notably the creation of the Force Investigation Division (FID) within the Professional Standards Bureau (PSB) which became operational on August 23, 2004. The transition of CUOF investigations from CIID to FID included enhanced training for investigative personnel, increased oversight responsibilities for supervisors and managers attached to FID, and auditing of investigation completeness. The internal audit component of the FID organizational structure will assist in ensuring that ongoing investigations are reviewed for quality and completeness. This ongoing review of open investigations is important to ensuring that FID investigations are of the appropriate quality as they proceed, rather than identifying investigation deficiencies later in the process.

1 The Commanding Officer of the Consent Decree Bureau continues to review completed CUOF
2 investigations. The Use of Force Review Board members have been briefed on the identified investigative
3 deficiencies, as is important to their role in review and adjudication of such incidents.

4 Use of Force Review Board procedures were modified in fall 2003, providing for the OIG to ask
5 questions during the proceedings. In addition, the OIG revised its CUOF investigation review procedures,
6 including reviewing and documenting investigation and investigative deficiencies, if any. This included
7 development of a matrix that provides for a more consistent and thorough review of each individual CUOF
8 case. The results of OIG reviews are communicated to the Board of Police Commissioners, as well as
9 responsible PSB managers.

10 Additionally, the OIG now is also receiving briefings regarding the CUOF investigative interview
11 process approximately one week after the incident. The FY 04-05 budget included an additional Assistant
12 Inspector General position. With three Assistant IG's, one position will be focused on use of force
13 investigations (previously one Assistant Inspector General had oversight over both use of force
14 issues/investigations and audits).

15 Since July 1, through December 31, 2004, FID responded to 66 Categorical Use of Force
16 incidents and assumed investigative responsibility for all. Additionally, 17 cases previously assigned to
17 CIID are now being investigated by FID.

18 The FID has a backlog of CUOF investigations/adjudications resulting from the CIID to FID
19 transition. The case backlog is being managed and submittal of investigations and findings is being
20 coordinated with the Use of Force Review Board, OIG, and Police Commission to ensure that cases are
21 completed within the statute of limitations.

22 An audit of Categorical Use of Force Investigations was completed by the Audit Division on
23 August 13, 2004. However the cases sampled were from 2003 and pre-dated any of the modifications put
24 in place at FID. The audit found the following:

25	Recorded Interviews (80a)	83.3%
26	Interviews at convenient times (80b)	97.2%
27	No group interviews (80c)	86.1%
28	Interviews of on-scene supervisors (80e)	100%
	Collect & preserve evidence (80f)	94.4%
	Document inconsistencies (80g)	97.2%

1 The City continues to Monitor FID and CUOF investigations. However, since such investigations
2 take in excess of six months to complete, the City has not yet been able to audit the FID investigations to
3 illustrate compliance.

4 The transition of CUOF investigations to FID in PSB has implications on various Consent Decree
5 provisions. The DOJ and Independent Monitor support the transition. The City and DOJ are currently
6 working to draft the appropriate Consent Decree changes for submittal to the Court.

7 **Misconduct Complaint Investigations**

8 The City is approaching compliance with the investigative provisions of PSB misconduct complaint
9 investigations, however some issues remain to be addressed. An "Audit of Complaint Investigations,"
10 dated March 31, 2004, found that all complaint investigations audited documented proper review and
11 adjudication by LAPD managers, and all cases of criminal misconduct were properly referred to the District
12 Attorney. Further, the audit found a 100% compliance rate for tape recording of interviews, conducting
13 interviews at convenient times and locations for witnesses, prohibiting group interviews, and notifying
14 officers and supervisors. A 98% compliance level was found for interviewing all supervisors and identifying
15 and documenting inconsistent statements.

16 Four investigations reviewed indicated that additional witnesses were present or possibly present
17 during the incident. In these instances the investigator did not document why no additional
18 canvassing/follow-up was conducted. This resulted in a 93% compliance rate for canvassing the area and
19 collection and preserving all evidence.

20 In seven of the investigations (12%), the Audit identified inaccurate paraphrasing of tape-recorded
21 interviews. While none of the inaccuracies appeared to have an adverse impact on the final adjudication,
22 the presence of inaccurate paraphrasing is of concern.

23 In response to the March 2003 complaint audit findings regarding paraphrased statements, the
24 LAPD undertook follow-up review of this issue. The FY 04-05 Geographic Bureau "Audio Tapes Used in
25 Non-Categorical and Complaint Investigations Audit," completed December 29, 2004, found that all
26 audiotapes reviewed were consistent with paraphrased statements. The audit did identify issues associated
27 with timely booking of tapes at the Scientific Investigation Division (SID).
28

1 Biopsies of complaints conducted by IAG between July and December 2004 resulted in an 87%
2 compliance rate for Paragraph 80 overall. The major deficiency identified for the cases reviewed was
3 canvassing the scene for witnesses. This is thought to be due largely to a documentation issue.

4 The OIG identified some issues with investigation of complaints adjudicated as “other judicial
5 review” (OJR) in its “Review of the Department’s Quarterly Discipline Report for the First Quarter of
6 2004,” dated June 17, 2004. The investigative process established for these types of complaints involve a
7 “truncated” process. The OIG found that this resulted in witness interviews not being conducted and/or
8 investigators/adjudicators not understanding the underlying criminal processes sufficiently to make a
9 determination. The LAPD and the OIG are working to address the OIG’s concerns.

10 The OIG identified some issues with investigation of complaints in the category of “domestic
11 violence” in its “Review of the Department’s Quarterly Discipline Report for the Third Quarter of 2004,”
12 dated December 9, 2004, regarding one case of improper paraphrasing of statements, one case in which
13 “essential witnesses” were not interviewed, and two cases in which additional allegations were not
14 adjudicated.

15 **Training**

16 Professional Standards Bureau conducts quarterly training for all personnel assigned to the Internal
17 Affairs Group. Details regarding that training are contained in Paragraph 100.

18 2,290 Department supervisors attended CEDP 7.5 between April and July 2004. The curriculum
19 addressed the requirements of Paragraph 80 a, c, e, f, g.

20 FID participated in an 8 hour training session in December 2004. FID will continue to hold these
21 training sessions on an annual basis. See Paragraph 55.

22 FID investigators attend Homicide School and PSB training.

23 **Audits**

24 An audit of Categorical Use of Force Investigations was completed by the Audit Division on
25 August 13, 2004. However the cases sampled were from 2003 and pre-dated any of the modifications put
26 in place at FID. The audit identified concerns with recorded interviews and group interviews, with other
27 requirements being in compliance.

28 Categorical Use of Force Audits are scheduled for the 3rd and 4th Quarters FY 2004/2005.

1 Audit Division completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, that
2 reviewed 60 complaints filed between January 1, 2003 and August 31, 2003.

3 FY 04-05 Geographic Bureau "Audio Tapes Used in Non-Categorical and Complaint
4 Investigations Audit," completed December 29, 2004, found that all audiotapes reviewed were consistent
5 with paraphrased statements.

6 OIG "Review of the Department's Quarterly Discipline Report for the First Quarter of 2004,"
7 dated June 17, 2004.

8 The OIG "Review of the Department's Quarterly Discipline Report for the Third Quarter of 2004,"
9 dated December 9, 2004.

10 PSB complaint investigation biopsies.

11 A complaint investigative quality audit is planned for the 3rd quarter of FY 04-05.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶81**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “81. Chain of command investigations of complaints (other than those covered by
4 paragraph 80), and Non-Categorical Uses of Force shall comply with subsections, c, e,
5 and f of paragraph 80 where applicable.”

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

9 **Current Compliance Status:** Partial Compliance

10 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD “*Complaint Investigations Guide for Supervisors*,” October, 2000; LAPD
11 Use of Force Handbook, August 1995; Commission Motion regarding Categorical Use of Force;
12 implementing Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Categorical Use of Force Classifications and*
13 *Investigative Responsibility*,” published July 30, 2001; Administrative Order 12, “*Investigating a*
14 *Personnel Complaint*,” approved by the Police Commission September 25, 2001; Special Order 27,
15 “*Investigation of Non-Categorical Use of Force Incidents*,” approved by the Police Commission
16 September 25, 2001; Special Order No. 39, “*Critical Incident Investigation Division – Establish ed*,”
17 approved by the Police Commission December 11, 2001; Special Order No. 15, “*Revision to Special*
18 *Order No. 39, 2001 – CIID Investigations*,” approved by the Police Commission April 22, 2002;
19 Special Order No. 36, “*Complaint Reporting Procedures – Revised*,” approved by the Police
20 Commission, November 13, 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Administrative Investigation*
21 *Training Requirements – Revised*,” approved by the Police Commission October 9, 2001. Human
22 Resources Bureau Notice, “*Consent Decree Required Information on Non-Categorical Use of Force*
23 *Investigations*,” approved by the Police Commission January 28, 2003. Human Resources Bureau
24 Notice, “*Non-Categorical Use of Force Reporting Where an Arrest is Made*,” published February 24,
25 2003. Special Order 13, 2004, “*Non-Categorical Use of Force Reporting – Revised*,” published May
26 26, 2004 and approved by the Police Commission on June 8, 2004.

1 **Activities:**

2 **Non-Categorical Use of Force Investigations**

3 A Non-Categorical Use of Force Audit was completed on December 30, 2003. The sample for
4 the audit was all non-categorical use of force incidents that occurred during February 2003. The audit
5 found 100% compliance for the provisions of Paragraph 81, with the sample period being February 2003.
6 A "Gang Enforcement Detail Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports Audit – Supplemental," dated June
7 28, 2004, found 100% compliance for the provisions of Paragraph 81.

8 LAPD procedures relative to Non-Categorical Use of Force Reporting proved inefficient and
9 cumbersome. Special Order 13, "Non-Categorical Use of Force Reporting- Revised," published May 26,
10 2004, streamlined the process and created two classifications for Non-Categorical reporting. Revisions to
11 the Use of Force Form were implemented and additional officer specific information will be captured on the
12 Internal Process Report.

13 A CRID Inspection of post Special Order 13 incidents was conducted in November 2004. That
14 inspection found compliance with the non-categorical use of force provisions of Paragraph 81. The Audit
15 Division "Supplemental Audit of the Gang Enforcement Detail Non-Categorical Use of force Reports Audit
16 Supplemental Submitted Fourth Quarter Fiscal Year 2003/04," dated November 8, 2004, found 100%
17 compliance.

18 The FY 04-05 Geographic Bureau "Audio Tapes Used in Non-Categorical and Complaint
19 Investigations Audit," completed December 29, 2004, found that for one non-categorical use of force
20 taped interview, inconsistencies between tapes and paraphrased statements in the report existed.

21 Based upon the recent reviews of non-categorical use of force investigations, the City finds
22 continued compliance with the non-categorical use of force provisions of Paragraph 81.

23 **Chain-of-Command Compliant Investigations**

24 The City is approaching compliance with the investigative provisions of PSB misconduct complaint
25 investigations, however some issues remain to be addressed. An "Audit of Complaint Investigations,"
26 dated March 31, 2004, found that all complaint investigations audited documented proper review and
27 adjudication by LAPD managers, and all cases of criminal misconduct were properly referred to the District
28

1 Attorney. The Audit identified deficiencies regarding failure to tape record interviews, the requirement to
2 canvass for witnesses, and inconsistencies between tapes and paraphrased statements.

3 In response to the March 2003 complaint audit findings regarding paraphrased statements, the
4 LAPD undertook follow-up review of this issue. The FY 04-05 Geographic Bureau "Audio Tapes Used in
5 Non-Categorical and Complaint Investigations Audit," completed December 29, 2004, found that all
6 audiotapes reviewed were consistent with paraphrased statements. The audit did identify issues associated
7 with timely booking of tapes at the Scientific Investigation Division (SID).

8 Also see Paragraph 80 discussion.

9 Training

10 Training regarding investigative procedures is provided in the curriculum for Watch Commander
11 School, Detective Supervisor School, and Basic Supervisor School. The curriculum has been enhanced to
12 further highlight these investigative procedures consistent with the Consent Decree (also see Paragraphs 55,
13 100, and 123).

14 On January 15, 2004, LAPD provided chain-of-command investigative training.

15 CEDP 7.5 provided training to 2,290 Department supervisors and managers on the revised non-
16 categorical use of force investigative procedures and administrative investigations between May and June
17 2004.

18 See also Paragraphs 68 and 80.

19 Audits

20 CRID Inspection of post Special Order 13 incidents conducted in November 2004, found
21 compliance with non-categorical use of force investigative procedures.

22 Audit Division "Supplemental Audit of the Gang Enforcement Detail Non-Categorical Use of force
23 Reports Audit Supplemental Submitted Fourth Quarter Fiscal Year 2003/04," dated November 8, 2004,
24 found 100% compliance.

25 FY 04-05 Geographic Bureau "Audio Tapes Used in Non-Categorical and Complaint
26 Investigations Audit," completed December 29, 2004, found that all audiotapes reviewed were consistent
27 with paraphrased statements.

28 PSB performs biopsies of complaint investigations monthly.

1 Audit Division completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, that
2 reviewed 60 complaints filed between January 1, 2003 and August 31, 2003.

3 Audit Division completed a "Gang Enforcement Detail Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports
4 Audit – Supplemental," dated June 28, 2004. The Audit found 100% compliance for the provisions of
5 Paragraph 81.

6 Audit Division completed an "Audit of a Non-Categorical Use of Force Investigations, dated
7 December 30, 2003, which reviewed all non-categorical use of force incidents that occurred in February
8 2003. The audit found compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 81.

9 The next audit of Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports is scheduled for the 4th Quarter FY
10 2004/2005.

11 An audit of personnel complaint investigation protocols is scheduled for the 3rd Quarter FY
12 2004/2005.

13 CRID conducts periodic reviews of administrative investigations, as appropriate.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶82**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “82. If during the course of any investigation of a Categorical Use of Force, Non-
4 Categorical Use of Force, or complaint, the investigating officer has reason to believe that
5 misconduct may have occurred other than that alleged by the complainant, the alleged
6 victim of misconduct, or the triggering item or report, the investigating officer must notify a
7 supervisor, and an additional Complaint Form 1.28 investigation of the additional
8 misconduct issue shall be conducted.”

9
10 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

11 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

12 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

13 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 3/810.20 and 3/810.30; Special Order 8, 2000, “*Complaint*
14 *Reporting Procedures- Revised*,” February 24, 2000; Special Order 30, 2001, “*Duty to Report*
15 *Misconduct*,” approved by the Police Commission September 6, 2001; Special Order 39, “*Critical*
16 *Incident Investigation Division – Established*,” approved by the Police Commission December 11,
17 2000; Administrative Order 12, “*Investigating a Personnel Complaint and Evaluating Witness*
18 *Credibility*,” approved by Police Commission, September 25, 2001.

19 **Activities:**

20 FID (and previously CIID) reviews all Categorical Use of Force incidents and forwards any
21 identified misconduct allegations to the Internal Affairs Group (IAG) of PSB as appropriate. Similarly,
22 potential misconduct identified during non-categorical use of force investigations is reported to IAG.
23 Additional misconduct allegations identified during the course of a misconduct investigation are generally
24 incorporated into that misconduct investigation.

25 A Non-Categorical Use of Force Audit was completed on December 30, 2003. The sample for
26 the audit was all non-categorical incidents that occurred during February 2003. The audit found
27 compliance for the provisions of Paragraph 82.
28

1 An "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, found a 98% compliance rate with
2 the provisions of Paragraph 82. Complaint investigation biopsies performed by IAG between January and
3 June 2004 found a 98% compliance rate. The OIG completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," in
4 the fourth quarter of FY 2003-2004, and found a 92% compliance rate.

5 An August 13, 2004, Audit Division audit of Categorical Use of Force Investigations assessed
6 100% compliance with the mandate of Paragraph 82.

7 A review by CRID for compliance with Paragraph 82 for the period between April and July 2003
8 also found compliance.

9 **Training**

10 See Paragraphs 55, 80 and 81.

11 **Audits**

12 An audit of Categorical Use of Force Investigations was completed by the Audit Division on
13 August 13, 2004 and assessed 100% compliance with Paragraph 82.

14 Audit Division completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, that
15 reviewed 60 complaints filed between January 1, 2003 and August 31, 2003.

16 PSB performs biopsies of complaint investigations monthly.

17 CRID conducts periodic reviews of administrative investigations, as appropriate.

18 The OIG completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations" in the fourth quarter of FY 2003-2004,
19 which examined 91 complaint investigations (63 completed by PSB) from December 2003 to February
20 2004.

21 The Non-Categorical component will be the subject of an audit conducted in the 4th Quarter FY
22 2004/2005.

23 CRID conducts periodic reviews of administrative investigations, as appropriate.

1 **Decree ¶83**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “83. Subject to restrictions on use of information contained in applicable state
4 law, the OHB unit investigating Categorical Uses of Force as described in paragraph 55
5 and 93 and IAG investigators conducting investigations as described in paragraphs 93 and
6 94, shall have access to all information contained in TEAMS II, where such information is
7 relevant and appropriate to such investigations, including training records, Complaint Form
8 1.28 investigations, and discipline histories, and performance evaluations.”

10 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

11 **Due Date:** Post Teams II

12 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance with the Use of TEAMS 1.5 Pending TEAMS II Development

13 **Policy/Procedure:** Special Order No. 13, “*Training Evaluation and Management System –*
14 *Guidelines,*” dated April 5, 2002.

15 **Activities:**

16 The RMIS and its protocol for use are under development and will include the provisions of
17 Paragraph 83. Also see Paragraphs 47 and 64.

18 TEAMS 1.5, designed to provide greater access to TEAMS I information, thereby making it easier
19 for supervisors to review employee TEAMS I records as appropriate, is now operational in all 18
20 geographical Areas (see Paragraph 39). TEAMS I records are available to IAG and FID, as appropriate
21 and consistent with state law.

22 An “Audit of Complaint Investigations,” dated March 31, 2004, found that all IAG investigators
23 have access to TEAMS information, for investigation purposes. The OIG completed an “Audit of
24 Complaint Investigations,” in the fourth quarter of FY 2003-2004, which found a 100% compliance rate.
25 The Audit Division “Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit,” completed in December 2004, found
26 continued compliance with PSB investigator access to TEAMS.

27 **Training**

28 See Paragraphs 80 and 81.

1 FID and PSB investigators have received training regarding access and use of TEAMS 1.5
2 information as appropriate. A Basic User Guide and an Advanced User Guide were also distributed as
3 appropriate and made available on the LAPD's Intranet.

4 **Audit**

5 FID and IAG internal reviews.

6 The Audit Division "Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit," completed in December 2004.

7 Audit Division completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, that
8 reviewed 60 complaints filed between January 1, 2003 and August 31, 2003.

9 The OIG completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations" in the fourth quarter of FY 2003-2004,
10 which examined 91 complaint investigations (63 completed by PSB) between December 2003 and
11 February 2004.

12 Categorical Use of Force Audits will be conducted during the 3rd and 4th Quarters FY 2004/2005.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

E. Adjudicating Investigations

Decree ¶84

Decree Language:

“84. The Department shall continue to employ the following standards when it makes credibility determinations: use of standard California Jury Instructions to evaluate credibility; consideration of the accused officer’s history of complaint investigations and disciplinary records concerning that officer, where relevant and appropriate; and consideration of the civilian’s criminal history, where appropriate. There shall be no automatic preference of an officer’s statement over the statement of any other witness including a complainant who is also a witness. There shall be no automatic judgment that there is insufficient information to make a credibility determination when the only or principal information about an incident is contained in conflicting statements made by the involved officer and the complainant. Absent other indicators of bias or untruthfulness, mere familial or social relationship with a victim or officer shall not render a witness’ statement as biased or untruthful; however, the fact of such relationship may be noted.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2001/July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Department Management Guide to Discipline, January 2000; Administrative Order 12, “*Investigating a Personnel Complaint*,” approved by the Police Commission September 25, 2001; LAPD “*Complaint Investigations Guide for Supervisors*”, October, 2000; Intradepartmental Correspondence to all Concerned Commanding Officers documenting “*Guidelines for Using Credibility Determinations when Adjudicating Personnel Complaints*,” May 7, 2004.

1 **Activities:**

2 The application of credibility determination standards occurs in the adjudication phase of
3 complaints. Commanding officers, in communicating their rationale for adjudication, document their
4 perception of the veracity of witnesses in the Letter of Transmittal. Credibility determinations are included
5 in the rationale passed down at Board of Rights Hearings and Use of Force Review Boards.

6 PSB, Review and Evaluation Section, reviews all completed LAPD complaint investigations to
7 ensure quality investigations department-wide. This review includes evaluation of documentation of witness
8 credibility determinations.

9 The "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, found 100% compliance with
10 Paragraph 84. Complaint investigation biopsies performed by IAG between January and June 2004 found
11 a 96% compliance rate. The OIG completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," in the fourth quarter
12 of FY 2003-2004, and found a 98% compliance rate.

13 In response to a non-compliance Monitor finding for Paragraph 84 in November 2004, a CRID
14 Inspection was conducted in December 2004 which reviewed 40 closed personnel complaints for
15 compliance with this provision. Compliance with 39 of the complaints was assessed. The lone deficiency
16 involved a lack of documentation to verify that the employee's complaint history had been adequately
17 considered. Therefore, the City finds continued compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 84.

18 See Paragraphs 80 and 81.

19 On January 15, 2004, LAPD provided chain-of-command investigative training, which addressed
20 credibility determinations.

21 Release of the Intradepartmental Correspondence to all Concerned Commanding Officers
22 documenting "Guidelines for Using Credibility Determinations when Adjudicating Personnel Complaints."

23 **Audit**

24 Audit Division completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, that
25 reviewed 60 complaints filed between January 1, 2003 to August 31, 2003.

26 BSP biopsies a sample of complaint investigations monthly.
27
28

1 The OIG completed an “Audit of Complaint Investigations” in the fourth quarter of FY 2003-2004,
2 which examined 91 complaint investigations (63 completed by PSB) from December 2003 to February
3 2004.
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶85**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “85. The LAPD shall adjudicate all complaints using a preponderance of the
4 evidence standard. Wherever supported by evidence collected in the investigation,
5 complaints shall be adjudicated as “sustained,” “sustained-no penalty,” “not resolved,”
6 “unfounded,” “exonerated,” “duplicate” or “no Department employee.” In no case may a
7 Complaint Form 1.28 investigation be closed without a final adjudication.”
8

9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

11 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

12 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 3/820.20; Special Order 8, “*Complaint Reporting*
13 *Procedures-Revised*,” February 24, 2000; Management Guide to Discipline, January 2000; Board of
14 Rights Manual; Special Order 36, “*Complaint Reporting Procedures – Revised*,” approved by Police
15 Commission November 13, 2001.

16 **Activities:**

17 The LAPD adjudicates all complaints using a preponderance of the evidence standard. The OIG
18 and PSB, Review and Evaluation Section, review complaint investigations and adjudications for quality and
19 findings (see also Paragraphs 80 and 81). These reviews indicate compliance with the provisions of
20 Paragraph 85.

21 The current LAPD dispositions used for complaint adjudication are: Insufficient Evidence to
22 Adjudicate, Sustained, Sustained-No Penalty, Not Resolved, No Misconduct, Other Judicial Review, No
23 Department Employee, Duplicate, and Withdrawn by the Chief of Police. The No Misconduct disposition
24 includes the following sub-dispositions: Unfounded, Exonerated, and Policy/Procedure. In addition,
25 complaints considered by the Board of Rights are adjudicated as Guilty and Not Guilty. The Other Judicial
26 Review classification was first implemented in October 2001, to address two types of complaints. One
27 involves post-conviction criminal matters where the facts have already been adjudicated in Court. The
28 other pertains to civil matters not involving duty-related activity where no finding of criminal or civil

1 misconduct against an employee has been made, such as an alleged violation of a temporary restraining or
2 child custody order.

3 Between July 1 and December 31, 2004, approximately 3,280 complaints, consisting of 8,048
4 allegations were closed. The adjudications of the allegations were supported by evidence collected in the
5 investigation and classified as follows: 153 Guilty; 128 Not Guilty; 326 Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate;
6 1,194 Sustained; 560 Not resolved; 76 Sustained No Penalty; 398 Exonerated; 3,057 Unfounded; 1,012
7 No Misconduct; 117 Policy/Procedure; 148 Other Judicial Review; 193 Employee Actions Could Have
8 Been Different; 236 Alternative Complaint Resolution; 202 Demonstrably False; 137 Non-Department
9 Employee; 89 Out of Statute, and 22 Withdrawn by the Chief of Police.

10 The "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, found 100% compliance for
11 adjudications being based upon the preponderance of the evidence and all investigations being closed with
12 a final adjudication. PSB complaint investigations biopsies between January and June 2004 found a 100%
13 compliance rate for adjudication of complaints. The OIG completed an "Audit of Complaint
14 Investigations," in the fourth quarter of FY 2003-2004, and found a 99% compliance rate.

15 The OIG did identify some issues with adjudication of complaints in the category of "other judicial
16 review" (OJR) in its "Review of the Department's Quarterly Discipline Report for the First Quarter of
17 2004," dated June 17, 2004. The investigative process established for these types of complaints involve a
18 "truncated" process. The OIG found that this resulted in witness interviews not being conducted and/or
19 investigators/adjudicators not understanding the underlying criminal processes sufficiently to make a
20 determination. The LAPD and OIG are evaluating LAPD procedures in light of the issues identified by the
21 OIG.

22 Training

23 See Paragraphs 80 and 81.

24 Audits

25 PSB performs biopsies of complaint investigations on a monthly basis.

26 Audit Division completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004 that
27 reviewed 60 complaints filed between January 1, 2003 and August 31, 2003.

1 OIG “Review of the Department’s Quarterly Discipline Report for the First Quarter of 2004,”
2 dated June 17, 2004.

3 The OIG completed an “Audit of Complaint Investigations,” in the fourth quarter of FY 2003-
4 2004, which examined 91 complaint investigations (63 completed by PSB) between December 2003 and
5 February 2004.

6 Quarterly Discipline Reports.

7 Annual Complaint Report for 2003.

1 **Decree ¶86**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “86. Withdrawal of a complaint, unavailability of a complainant to make a
4 statement, or the fact that the complaint was filed anonymously or by a person other than
5 the victim of the misconduct, shall not be a basis for adjudicating a complaint without further
6 attempt at investigation. The LAPD shall use reasonable efforts to investigate such
7 complaints to determine whether the complaint can be corroborated.”

9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

11 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

12 **Policy/Procedure:** Administrative Order 12, “*Investigating a Personnel Complaint*,” approved by the
13 Commission September 25, 2001; Special Order 36, “*Complaint Reporting Procedures – Revised*,”
14 approved by Police Commission November 13, 2001.

15 **Activities:**

16 The LAPD continues to accept and investigate complaints from any source, including anonymous
17 complaints. Between July 1 and December 31, 2004, 75 anonymous complaints were initiated.

18 The LAPD uses reasonable efforts to investigate complaints received, including complaints
19 withdrawn by the original complainant, complaints where complainant is unavailable to make a statement,
20 anonymously filed complaints, or complaints filed by a person other than the victim of the misconduct.
21 However, completion of some investigations is hampered by an inability to obtain necessary information
22 and/or interview witnesses, which results in insufficient evidence to adjudicate the complaint.

23 An IAG “Audit of Initiation of Complaints,” dated January 20, 2004, found 100% compliance with
24 the requirement to accept anonymous complaints. Further, the “Office of the Inspector General’s Review
25 of the Department’s Review of the Department’s Initiation of Complaints Audit – Consent Decree
26 Paragraph 74,” dated July 12, 2004, randomly selected 5 of the 29 anonymous complaints filed in the first
27 quarter of FY 2003 and determined that the LAPD used reasonable efforts to investigate the complaints
28 and to determine whether the complaints could be corroborated.

1 The "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, found 97% compliance with the
2 provisions of Paragraph 86. The PSB complaint investigation biopsies between January and June 2004
3 found 100% compliance.

4 **Training**

5 See Paragraphs 80 and 81.

6 **Audits**

7 Professional Standards Bureau biopsies samples of complaints monthly.

8 An IAG "Audit of Initiation of Complaints," dated January 20, 2004.

9 The "Office of the Inspector General's Review of the Department's Review of the Department's
10 Initiation of Complaints Audit – Consent Decree Paragraph 74," dated July 12, 2004.

11 Audit Division completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004 that
12 reviewed 60 complaints filed between January 1, 2003 and August 31, 2003.

13 A complaint investigation audit is scheduled for the third quarter (January-March) FY 04-05.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶87**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “87. All investigations of complaints shall be completed in a timely manner, taking
4 into account: (a) the investigation’s complexity; (b) the availability of evidence; and (c)
5 overriding or extenuating circumstances underlying exceptions or tolling doctrines that may
6 be applied to the disciplinary limitations provisions (i) applicable to LAPD officers and (ii)
7 applicable to many other law enforcement agencies in the State of California. The parties
8 expect that, even after taking these circumstances into account, most investigations will be
9 completed within five months.”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

13 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

14 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 3/820.01; Administrative Order 12, 2001, “*Investigating a*
15 *Personnel Complaint and Evaluating Witness Credibility*,” approved by the Police Commission
16 September 25, 2001; Special Order 36, “*Complaint Reporting Procedures – Revised*,” approved by
17 the Police Commission November 13, 2001; Chief of Staff Notice “*Referencing The Investigation*
18 *Complete Date For Complaint Investigations*” May 9, 2002.

19 **Activities:**

20 A minimum five-month lag time exists for assessing compliance with this provision, as the
21 investigation time frame is assessed only when the investigation has been received at PSB. For complaints
22 initiated in the 12 month period between August 2003 and July 2004 the following were investigated within
23 5 months:

Internal Affairs Investigations	40.9%
Chain of Command Investigations	74.1%
Department Total	60.7%

1 These numbers represent an upward trend over the past few months. In January 2004, the 12-
2 month Department-wide measurement was 53%, and in February 2004 it was 58%.

3 In February 2004, the City reported that it had identified a backlog in closing misconduct
4 investigations in late 2003. PSB acted to expeditiously address the backlog, with efforts being completed
5 between February and March 2004. In addition, PSB initiated an enhanced complaint investigation
6 tracking procedure in late 2003. This includes the distribution of six monthly reports distributed
7 Department-wide regarding complaint investigation status. These monthly reports have also been integrated
8 into the COMPSTAT process. In addition, a new section has been added to the Quarterly Discipline
9 Report documenting out-of-statute investigations, providing the Police Commission with regular status
10 updates regarding this issue.

11 The Third Quarterly Discipline Report identified 24 complaints (61 allegations) that went out of
12 statute in the third quarter. These 24 complaints represent 1.67% of the 1,434 complaints completed in the
13 quarter. The out-of-statute complaints consist of relatively minor misconduct allegations. Although it is not
14 unreasonable to expect some complaint cases may “fall through the cracks,” it is imperative that the City
15 and LAPD take every reasonable measure to ensure that all complaints are investigated within the statute of
16 limitations. This requires that all out-of-statute cases be reviewed to understand the reasons for the cases
17 not being completed “on time.” Therefore, the City Council has requested that LAPD report in greater
18 detail regarding any cases that fall out-of-statute in the future, including the complaint allegations, the
19 investigative time period and investigating entity, and the adjudication time period for each step of the chain-
20 of-command adjudication process.

21 **Training**

22 See Paragraphs 80 and 81.

23 **Audits**

24 PSB biopsies samples of complaints monthly.

25 Monthly tracking by PSB.

26 Audit Division completed an “Audit of Complaint Investigations,” dated March 31, 2004, that
27 reviewed 60 complaints filed between January 1, 2003 and August 31, 2003.
28

1 The OIG completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," in the fourth quarter of FY 2003-
2 2004, that examined 91 complaint investigations (63 completed by PSB) between December 2003 and
3 February 2004.

4 Quarterly Discipline Reports.

5 A complaint investigation audit is scheduled for the third quarter (January-March) FY 04-05.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

F. Discipline & Non-Disciplinary Action

Decree ¶88

Decree Language:

“88. The Chief of Police, no later than 45 calendar days following the end of each calendar quarter, shall report to the Commission, with a copy to the Inspector General, on the imposition of discipline during such quarter (the “Discipline Report”). The Chief of Police shall provide the first such report to the Police Commission by February 15, 2001, and such report shall provide the information listed below for the period from the effective date of this Agreement until December 31, 2000; thereafter such report will be provided on a calendar quarter basis. Such report shall contain: (a) a summary of all discipline imposed during the quarter reported by type of misconduct, broken down by type of discipline, bureau, and rank; (b) a summary comparison between discipline imposed and determinations made by the Boards of Rights during the quarter, (c) a written explanation of each reduction in penalty from that prescribed by the Board of Rights; (d) a description of all discipline and non-disciplinary actions for each Categorical Use of Force the Commission has determined was out of policy; and (e) a written explanation, following the Chief of Police’s final determination regarding the imposition of discipline, when discipline has not been imposed (other than exoneration by the Board of Rights) and the following has occurred: the officer has entered a guilty plea or has been found guilty in a criminal case; the officer had a Complaint Form 1.28 investigation, in the categories identified in paragraphs 93 and 94 (whether conducted by the OHB Unit, IAG, or by chain of command during the transition period specified in paragraph 95) sustained; or the officer has been found civilly liable by a judge or jury of conduct committed on duty or while acting in his or her official capacity; or the officer’s conduct has been the basis for the City being found civilly liable by a judge or jury. Each quarterly Discipline Report shall include as attachments copies of the monthly Internal Affairs Group Reports on Administration of Internal Discipline for that quarter, which, during the term of this Agreement, shall continue to contain at least the level of detail included in the August 1999 report.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: February 15, 2001/quarterly thereafter

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: February 27, 2001, Commission Motion regarding Creation and Review of Disciplinary Reports and Disciplinary Investigations.

Activities:

The Quarterly Discipline Report for the 2nd quarter of calendar year 2004 was submitted to the Police Commission on August 10, 2004. The OIG completed its review of the report on September 16, 2004, and the reports were approved by the Police Commission on October 5, 2004.

The Quarterly Discipline Report for the 3rd quarter of calendar year 2004 was submitted to the Police Commission on November 10, 2004. The OIG completed its review on December 9, 2004, and the reports were approved by the Police Commission on December 14, 2004.

The Quarterly Discipline Report for the 4th Quarter 2004 will be submitted to the Police Commission by February 15, 2004.

Audit

OIG and Police Commission review of Quarterly Discipline Reports pursuant to Paragraph 89.

Decree ¶89

Decree Language:

“89. The Inspector General shall review, analyze and report to the Commission on each Discipline Report, including the circumstances under which discipline was imposed and the severity of any discipline imposed. The Commission, no later than 45 days after receipt of the Discipline Report, following consultation with the Chief of Police, shall review the Discipline Report and document the Commission’s assessment of the appropriateness of the actions of the Chief of Police described in the Discipline Report. With respect to Categorical Uses of Force, such assessment and documentation shall be made for each officer whose conduct was determined to be out of policy by the Commission. Such assessment and documentation shall be considered as part of the Chief’s annual evaluation as provided in paragraph 144.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: April 2, 2001/ quarterly thereafter

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: City Charter Section 573; February 27, 2001, Commission Motion regarding Creation and Review of Disciplinary Reports and Disciplinary Investigations; Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners Policies and Authority Relative to the Inspector General, approved by the Commission, November 21, 2000; Special Order No. 5, “*Policies and Authority Relative to the Inspector General*,” approved by the Police Commission February 9, 2001; “*Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Commission, June 29, 2001; “*Revised Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Commission on February 5, 2002.

Activities:

The OIG’s and Police Commission’s review of the Quarterly Discipline Reports were completed within the 45-day timeframe, illustrating continued compliance with Paragraph 89. The Discipline Report for the 2nd Quarter 2004 was received by the Inspector General on August 11, 2004. The Inspector

1 General Review of the Report was completed on September 16, 2004 and both reports were approved by
2 the Police Commission on October 5, 2004.

3 The Discipline Report for the 3rd Quarter 2004 was received by the Inspector General on
4 November 17, 2004. The Inspector General review of the Report was completed on December 9, 2004
5 and both reports were approved by the Police Commission on December 14, 2004.

6 The OIG selected particular complaint categories or issues of concern to evaluate in greater detail
7 for each Quarterly Discipline Report, reported the findings of that evaluation to the Police Commission, and
8 made recommendations as appropriate. The OIG prefers to accomplish such detailed reviews, however
9 such reviews are resource and time intensive. Therefore, OIG has requested additional time to complete its
10 reviews of the Quarterly Discipline Report. This request is under discussion with the DOJ and changes to
11 the Consent Decree in this regard are anticipated to be submitted to the Court in the near future.

12 The Reports were agendaized for Commission consideration in both open and closed session. This
13 allows the Police Commission to accept public comment on the report, and to make personnel evaluation
14 decisions in closed session, as is required, with the benefit of the Quarterly Discipline Report, public
15 comment made on the report, and discussions in closed session. The Police Commission's assessment
16 related to Chief of Police discipline decisions is documented in a confidential file, and is used in the Chief of
17 Police's annual evaluation (see Paragraph 144).

18 **Audit**

19 OIG monitors time period to ensure OIG reviews are completed in a timely fashion.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶90**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “90. The LAPD shall continue its practice of having managers evaluate all
4 Complaint Form 1.28 investigations to identify underlying problems and training needs.
5 After such evaluations the manager shall implement appropriate non-disciplinary actions or
6 make a recommendation to the proper LAPD entity to implement such actions.”

8 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

9 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

10 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

11 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 3/830.20; Department Guide to Discipline.

12 **Activities:**

13 The requirements of Paragraph 90 are current LAPD practice. Commanding Officers, in response
14 to complaint investigations and adjudication findings, make recommendations regarding disciplinary and
15 non-disciplinary actions as appropriate. These recommendations are reviewed through the chain-of-
16 command.

17 PSB complaint biopsies performed between January and June 2004 found 98 % compliance with
18 the requirement of Paragraph 90. Further, the “Audit of Complaint Investigations,” dated March 31, 2004,
19 found 100% compliance. The OIG completed an “Audit of Complaint Investigations,” in the fourth quarter
20 of FY 2003-2004, which found a 100% compliance rate. A CRID Inspection conducted in December
21 2004 reviewed 40 closed personnel complaints for compliance with this provision. The inspection
22 determined that commanding officers had appropriately considered underlying problems and training needs
23 in all the complaints reviewed. Therefore, LAPD has continued compliance with Paragraph 90.

Training

See Paragraphs 80 and 81.

Audits

A CRID Inspection conducted in December 2004 reviewed 40 closed personnel complaints for compliance with this provision. The inspection determined that commanding officers had appropriately considered underlying problems and training needs in all the complaints reviewed.

PSB case biopsies.

Audit Division completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, that reviewed 60 complaints filed between January 1, 2003 and August 31, 2003.

The OIG completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," in the fourth quarter of FY 2003-2004, which examined 91 complaint investigations (63 completed by PSB) between December 2003 and February 2004.

This provision will be the subject of a formal audit in the 3rd Quarter FY 2004/2005.

1 **Decree ¶91**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “91. After a complaint is resolved by the LAPD, the LAPD shall inform the
4 complainant of the resolution, in writing, including the investigation’s significant dates,
5 general allegations, and disposition.
6

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

9 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

10 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 3/820.11; Chief of Staff Notice “*Referencing The*
11 *Investigation Complete Date For Complaint Investigations*” May 8, 2002; Administrative Order 5,
12 July 30, 2003, “*Standardizing Reply Letters and Establishing a Status Update Correspondence to*
13 *Complainants.*”

14 **Activities:**

15 The “Audit of Complaint Investigations,” dated March 31, 2004, found 100% compliance with the
16 provisions of Paragraph 91. PSB complaint biopsies performed from January through June 2004 found
17 97% compliance with the requirement of Paragraph 91. The OIG completed an “Audit of Complaint
18 Investigations,” in the fourth quarter of FY 2003-2004, which found a 99% compliance rate. A CRID
19 Inspection completed in September 2004 reviewed 73 complaints and found 100% compliance with the
20 requirement to forward correspondence to the complainant. This illustrates continued LAPD compliance
21 with Paragraph 91.

22 As reported in February 2004, LAPD undertook a review of the complaint resolution letters
23 forwarded to the complainant at the conclusion of the complaint adjudication process. The current letter
24 includes the telephone numbers of the complained-against officer’s Commanding Officer and the OIG.
25 Inquiries received in response to these letters, along with concerns expressed by the Independent Monitor,
26 resulted in the review of the letters’ content and language. LAPD released a revised reply letter format on
27 July 22, 2004.
28

1 Although not required by the Consent Decree, the LAPD initiated a process for sending
2 complainant response letters if the investigation was not completed within a 5-month time frame to update
3 the complainant regarding the status of their complaint. LAPD illustrates a continued improvement with
4 compliance with this procedure, however there is a continued need to monitor and facilitate additional
5 improvements.

6 **Training**

7 See Paragraphs 80 and 81.

8 **Audits**

9 PSB biopsies samples of complaints monthly.

10 Audit Division completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, that
11 reviewed 60 complaints filed between January 1, 2003 and August 31, 2003.

12 The OIG completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations" in the fourth quarter of FY 2003-2004,
13 which examined 91 complaints.

14 CRID Inspections.

15 A complaint investigation audit is scheduled for the third quarter (January-March) FY 04-05.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶92**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “92. The City and the Department shall prohibit retaliation in any form against any
4 employee for reporting possible misconduct by any other employee of the LAPD. Within
5 six months of the effective date of this Agreement and annually thereafter, the Police
6 Commission shall review the Department’s anti-retaliation policy and its implementation and
7 make modifications as appropriate to protect officers from reprisals for reporting
8 misconduct. The Commission’s review of such policy and its implementation shall consider
9 the discipline imposed for retaliation and supervisors’ performance in addressing and
10 preventing retaliation.”

12 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

13 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001/December 15, 2002

14 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

15 **Policy/Procedure:** Administrative Order No. 2, “Anti-Discrimination Efforts of the LAPD,” January 1999;
16 February 27, 2001, Commission Motion regarding “Creation and Review of Disciplinary Reports and
17 Disciplinary Investigations”; September 18, 2001, the Commission action on Report from the Chief of
18 Police regarding the anti-discrimination efforts of the LAPD in the workplace; Commission’s annual review
19 of retaliation policy, January 8, 2002.

20 **Activities:**

21 The Police Commission re-affirmed the LAPD anti-retaliation policy on January 8, 2002. The
22 Police Commission reviewed and considered the Department’s anti-retaliation policy on February 18,
23 March 4, and March 18, 2003. The Police Commission directed its staff and the Inspector General to
24 prepare a report on the Department’s anti-retaliation efforts, consistent with the requirements of Paragraph
25 92.

26 On February 17, 2004, the Police Commission considered and adopted a report prepared by the
27 OIG regarding the retaliation policy and its implementation. The report identified concerns regarding
28 supervisory oversight and response to complaints of retaliation and the failure of LAPD to address

1 workplace concerns that lead to and/or foster perceptions of retaliation. The report included twelve
2 specific recommendations to address these concerns. On February 23, 2004, the Public Safety Committee
3 supported the OIG's report and requested the LAPD to provide a schedule for implementation for the OIG
4 recommendations. The LAPD is currently reporting to the Police Commission and Public Safety
5 Committee monthly regarding actions being taken to address the issues, concerns, and recommendations
6 presented in the OIG's report.

7 The City, City Attorney's Office, OIG, and LAPD have jointly worked to modify retaliation
8 prevention and investigation procedures in the short-term, while long-term policy and procedures
9 modifications are evaluated.

10 LAPD Training Division prepared a recommended training strategy that was approved by the
11 Police Commission in October 2004. The plan called for training to be initiated at the December 2004
12 General Staff meeting (Captains and above, including civilian equivalents). This training was accomplished
13 in December 2004. IAG is training investigators on retaliation-related issues and investigative concerns.

14 In fall 2004 the LAPD completed its review and documented the roles of each of the 11
15 LAPD/City/State/Federal entities identified as being involved in retaliation-related issues. On November 9,
16 2004, the Police Commission rejected the LAPD's proposed "best practices" model, in consideration of
17 the roles of the various entities and the OIG's recommendations and reassigned the retaliation policy and
18 procedures evaluation to the LAPD Civil Rights Integrity Division (CRID). CRID was directed to return to
19 the Police Commission with proposed policy and procedure changes in February 2005. Since that time, a
20 draft revision to the Department Retaliation policy has been created and is currently under review by the
21 City Attorney and OIG. Further, CRID has established a Retaliation Workgroup to study procedures
22 associated with acceptance of retaliation complaints, management response to retaliation in the workplace
23 and to establish training for managers and supervisors.

24 The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) has implemented a system to specifically track
25 retaliation complaints. The OIG also may accept retaliation complaints (see Paragraph 139). The OIG
26 reports to the Police Commission monthly regarding complaints received by the OIG, including complaints
27 regarding retaliation. When retaliation complaints raise issues involving adequacy of supervisory oversight,
28 such issues are within the scope of the OIG's review.

1 The Inspector General anticipates that the next annual report on retaliation will be completed in
2 February 2005, on schedule.

3 The discipline imposed for sustained retaliation complaints is presented in the Quarterly Discipline
4 Reports (see Paragraph 88).

5 **Training**

6 The anti-retaliation training has been incorporated into the eight “core” Department schools: Recruit
7 Training, Field Training Officer School, Basic Detective School, Detective Supervisor School, Watch
8 Commander School, Supervisor Development School, Command Development School and CEDP.

9 General Staff meeting (Captains and above, including civilian equivalents) training December 2004.

10 CRID is crafting curriculum for training to be provided to managers and supervisors.

11 **Audit**

12 Annual review of the policy by the Police Commission.

13 Quarterly Discipline Reports and OIG review of Quarterly Discipline Reports.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 G. Internal Affairs Group

2 Decree ¶93

3 Decree Language:

4 “93. The City shall reallocate responsibility for complaint investigations between
5 IAG and chain-of-command supervisors. Under this reallocation, IAG, and not
6 chain-of-command supervisors shall investigate (a) all civil suits or claims for damages
7 involving on duty conduct by LAPD officers or civil suits and claims involving off-duty
8 conduct required to be reported under paragraph 77j and (b) all complaints which allege:

9 (i) unauthorized uses of force, other than administrative Categorical Use of
10 Force investigations (which shall be investigated by the OHB Unit as part of its investigation
11 of such Categorical Uses of Force);

12 (ii) invidious discrimination (e.g., on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender,
13 religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability), including improper ethnic remarks
14 and gender bias;

15 (iii) unlawful search;

16 (iv) unlawful seizure (including false imprisonment and false arrest);

17 (v) dishonesty;

18 (vi) domestic violence;

19 (vii) improper behavior involving narcotics or drugs;

20 (viii) sexual misconduct;

21 (ix) theft; and

22 (x) any act of retaliation or retribution against an officer or civilian.”
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: July 1, 2001 w/ transition completed December 31, 2002

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Special Order 17, "*Complaint Investigation Procedures-Revised*," approved by the Commission September 18, 2001; Special Order 17, "*Complaint Investigation Procedures-Revised*," approved by the Police Commission September 18, 2001; IAG Notice, "*Internal Affairs Investigation Transition Plan*," approved by the Police March 12, 2002.

Activities:

PSB performs monthly biopsies of complaints and has found compliance with assignment of complaint investigation responsibility as required by Paragraphs 93 and 94. Audit Division completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, and found 96% compliance. The Audit Division Audit "Complaint, Form 1.28 Investigations Audit-Second Quarter Fiscal Year 2004-2005," completed December 22, 2004, found 100% compliance. Therefore the LAPD has continued compliance with the provisions of Paragraphs 93 and 94.

Training

See Paragraphs 80 and 95.

Audit

The Audit Division audit "Complaint, Form 1.28 Investigations Audit-Second Quarter Fiscal Year 2004-2005," completed December 22, 2004, reviewed complaints generated in July 2004. The audit found 100% compliance with the requirements of Paragraphs 93 and 94.

Audit Division completed an "Audit of Complaint Investigations," dated March 31, 2004, that reviewed 60 complaints filed between January 1, 2003 and August 31, 2003.

1 **Decree ¶94**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “94. In addition to the categories of complaint allegations set forth in paragraph
4 93, IAG and not chain of command supervisors, shall investigate the following:

5 a. all incidents in which both (i) a civilian is charged by an officer with
6 interfering with a police officer (California Penal Code § 148), resisting arrest, or disorderly
7 conduct, and (ii) the prosecutor’s office notifies the Department either that it is dismissing
8 the charge based upon officer credibility or a judge dismissed the charge based upon officer
9 credibility;

10 b. all incidents in which the Department has received written notification from
11 a prosecuting agency in a criminal case that there has been as order suppressing evidence
12 because of any constitutional violation involving potential misconduct by an LAPD officer,
13 any other judicial finding of officer misconduct made in the course of a judicial proceeding
14 or any request by a federal or state judge or magistrate that a misconduct investigation be
15 initiated pursuant to some information developed during a judicial proceeding before a
16 judge or magistrate. The LAPD shall request that all prosecuting agencies provide them
17 with written notification whenever the prosecuting agency has determined that any of the
18 above has occurred;

19 c. all incidents in which an officer is arrested or charged with a crime other
20 than low grade misdemeanors, as defined in the LAPD manual, which misdemeanors shall
21 be investigated by chain-of-command supervisors; and

22 d. any request by a judge or prosecutor that a misconduct investigation be
23 initiated pursuant to information developed during the course of an official proceeding in
24 which such judge or prosecutor has been involved.”
25
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: July 1, 2001 with transition completed December 31, 2002

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Special Order 17, "*Complaint Investigation Procedures-Revised*," approved by the Commission September 18, 2001; Special Order 17, "*Complaint Investigation Procedures-Revised*," approved by the Police Commission September 18, 2001; IAG Notice, "*Internal Affairs Investigation Transition Plan*," approved by the Police Commission March 12, 2002; Special Order 12, "*Evaluation of Arrests for Booking*," approved by the Commission July 10, 2001; Letter to Prosecuting Agencies and Public Defenders regarding notification procedures for potential misconduct, April 27, 2001.

Activities:

PSB performs monthly biopsies of complaints and has found compliance with assignment of complaint investigation responsibility as required by Paragraphs 93 and 94. See Paragraph 93 discussion above.

Training

See Paragraph 93.

Audit

See Paragraph 93.

1 **Decree ¶95**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “95. The City shall in fiscal year 2001-2002 provide all necessary position
4 authorities to fully implement paragraphs 93 and 94. Investigation responsibilities shall be
5 transitioned as positions are filled. Prior to positions being filled, investigation
6 responsibilities shall be transitioned commensurate with available resources. Positions will
7 be filled and investigation responsibility transition shall be completed by December 31,
8 2002. For complaints filed on or after July 1, 2001, the Department shall make a first
9 priority of allocating to IAG complaints in the categories specified in paragraphs 93 and 94
10 against officers assigned to special units covered by paragraph 106. The LAPD shall make
11 a second priority of allocating to IAG complaints alleging unauthorized uses of force (other
12 than administrative Categorical Uses of Force). These complaint investigations will be
13 allocated to IAG so as to allow the City to meet its obligations under paragraph 87 of this
14 Agreement.”

16 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

17 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001 with transition completed December 31, 2002

18 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

19 **Policy/Procedure:** Special Order 17, “*Complaint Investigation Procedures-Revised*,” approved by the
20 Commission September 18, 2001; Special Order 17, “*Complaint Investigation Procedures-Revised*,”
21 approved by the Police Commission September 18, 2001; IAG Notice, “*Internal Affairs Investigation*
22 *Transition Plan*,” approved by the Police March 12, 2002; Chief of Police Correspondence, “*Revising*
23 *the Internal Affairs Group Investigative Transition Plan and Addressing Staffing Shortages*,”
24 September 27, 2002, approved by the Police Commission October 15, 2002.

25 **Activities:**

26 Investigative responsibility for complaints listed in Paragraphs 93 and 94 were transitioned to
27 Professional Standards Bureau by December 31, 2002, as required.
28

1 The City implemented a staffing plan for PSB in 2002. CRID monitors compliance with the 5-
2 month investigative goal established in Paragraph 87 monthly and the Police Commission monitors out of
3 statute cases quarterly via the Quarterly Discipline Report.

4 The Audit Division Audit "Complaint, Form 1.28 Investigations Audit -Second Quarter Fiscal Year
5 2004- 2005," completed December 22, 2004, reviewed staffing levels and found that 190 of the 207 PSB
6 investigator positions authorized were filled.

7 The Monitor has indicated that the 18- month rolling average of open complaint investigations
8 climbed to 1,259 on October 31, 2004 from 1,053 on May 1, 2004. This represents an increase of 17%.
9 At this point this change in 18- month rolling average cases is not a significant concern, as case volume
10 fluctuates over time and the LAPD has an increasing rate of completion of investigations within 5 months
11 (see Paragraph 87). However, staffing levels could be impacted by the need for PSB staff to participate in
12 Complaint Management System (CMS) training and testing activities. Therefore, the City Consent Decree
13 Work Group is reviewing PSB resource levels and will work with LAPD to address resource issues as
14 appropriate.

15 The PSB Special Operations Section and Ethics Enforcement Section are currently staffed at an
16 appropriate level for their operations.

17 See also Paragraph 11.

18 **Training**

19 Training on classification of complaints is provided to PSB personnel through the quarterly training
20 sessions conducted by PSB.

21 See also Paragraph 93.

22 **Audit**

23 Professional Standards Bureau audits samples of complaints monthly.

24 The Audit Division Audit "Complaint, Form 1.28 Investigations Audit -Second Quarter Fiscal Year
25 2004- 2005," completed December 22, 2004.

26 CRID, the Police Commission, and City monitor PSB staffing levels and compliance with
27 Paragraph 87 regarding complaint investigative timelines.
28

1 **Decree ¶97**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “97. By July 1, 2001, the City shall develop and initiate a plan for organizing and
4 executing regular, targeted, and random integrity audit checks, or “sting” operations
5 (hereinafter “sting audits,”) to identify and investigate officers engaging in at-risk behavior,
6 including: unlawful stops, searches, seizures (including false arrests), uses of excessive
7 force, or violations of LAPD’s Manual Section 4/264.50 (or its successor). These
8 operations shall also seek to identify officers who discourage the filing of a complaint or fail
9 to report misconduct or complaints. IAG shall be the unit within the LAPD responsible for
10 these operations. The Department shall use the relevant TEAMS II data, and other
11 relevant information, in selecting targets for these sting audits. Sting audits shall be
12 conducted for each subsequent fiscal year for the duration of this Agreement. Nothing in
13 this Agreement is intended to limit the application of any federal statute.”

14 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

15
16 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

17 **Primary Compliance Status:** Compliance

18 **Policy/Procedure:** Special Order 22, “*Ethics Enforcement Section-Established*,” approved by the
19 Commission September 18, 2001.

20 **Activities:**

21 The operation of the Ethics Enforcement Section is managed by the Commanding Officer,
22 Professional Standards Bureau (PSB). Quarterly Audit reports are approved by the Chief of Police and
23 forwarded to the Police Commission pursuant to Paragraph 127.

24 The Ethics Enforcement Section Report for the 2nd Quarter 2004 was initially submitted to the
25 Police Commission on August 10, 2004 but was returned to address formatting concerns voiced by the
26 City Attorney. The 2nd Quarter Report was resubmitted to the Police Commission on December 16, 2004
27 with the 3rd Quarter 2004 Report.
28

1 Sting audits reported in the 2nd and 3rd Quarterly Reports tested for unlawful seizures (including
2 false arrest), uses of excessive force, and officers who discourage the filing of complaints or fail to report
3 misconduct.

4 TEAMS I data, complaint information, and other relevant data/information was utilized to select the
5 targets for integrity audits.

6 **Training**

7 Training is provided to EES personnel via the Quarterly PSB Training sessions.

8 **Audit**

9 OIG and Police Commission review the quarterly reports submitted by EES and discuss specific
10 cases in closed sessions of the Police Commission.

1 **Decree ¶98**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “98. The commanding officer of IAG shall select the staff who are hired and
4 retained as IAG investigators and supervisors, subject to the applicable provisions of the
5 City’s civil service rules and regulations and collective bargaining agreements. Investigative
6 experience shall be a desirable, but not a required, criterion for an IAG investigatory
7 position. Officers who have a history of any sustained investigation or discipline received
8 for the use of excessive force, a false arrest or charge, or an improper search or seizure,
9 sexual harassment, discrimination or dishonesty shall be disqualified from IAG positions
10 unless the IAG commanding officer justifies in writing the hiring of such officer despite such
11 a history.”

12
13 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

14 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

15 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

16 **Policy/Procedure:** Employee Selection Manual; Special Order 24, 2003 “*Selection and Assignment to*
17 *Professional Standards Bureau*,” published July 10, 2003, was approved by the Police Commission June
18 24, 2003; and Special Order No 24, “*Selection and Assignment to Professional Standards Bureau*,”
19 was approved by the Police Commission on June 24, 2003 and published on July 10, 2003.

20 **Activities:**

21 It is current LAPD practice that Commanding Officers are responsible for selecting staff and
22 ensuring selected staff are qualified to perform the duties of the position for which they are selected. The
23 PSB staff “on-loan” program is unique to PSB and provides for personnel to work in PSB positions for
24 approximately 2 months, providing management the opportunity to review the employee’s qualifications
25 prior to a formal selection being made.

26 Job advertisement postings clearly state that investigative experience is a desirable, but not required
27 criteria for the position of PSB investigator.

1 This Paragraph was subject to meet and confer. The meet and confer process was completed and
2 Special Order No. 24, Selection and Assignment to Professional Standards Bureau, was published on July
3 10, 2003. Special Order No. 24 exceeds the requirements of Paragraph 98 in some instances. PSB
4 selection criteria was expanded by LAPD to include adverse judicial findings and pending complaints.
5 TEAMS 1.5, designed to provide greater access to TEAMS I information, is making it easier for
6 supervisors to review employee TEAMS I records as appropriate (see Paragraph 39).

7 During this period, 18 individuals were selected to IAG assignments. None of the selections had a
8 disciplinary history that required justification by the commanding officer of IAG. Work histories were
9 appropriately documented on the TEAMS Evaluation Report.

10 See also Paragraph 51.

11 **Audit**

12 Internal PSB review, September 11, 2003.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Decree ¶99

Decree Language:

“99. The Department shall establish a term of duty of up to three years for the IAG Sergeants, Detectives and Lieutenants who conduct investigations, and may reappoint an officer to a new term of duty only if that officer has performed in a competent manner. Such IAG investigators may be removed during their term of duty for acts or behaviors that would disqualify the officer from selection to IAG or under any other personnel authority available to the Department.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: LAPD Manual Sections 3/763.55, 3/763.60, 3/763.65, and 3/763.67; and Special Order No 24, “*Selection and Assignment to Professional Standards Bureau*,” was approved by the Police Commission on June 24, 2003 and published on July 10, 2003.

Activities:

The limited tour provisions of Paragraph 99 are consistent with current LAPD practice. The commanding officer of PSB has conducted required review of employee performance prior to re-appointing personnel.

CRID undertook a review of Paragraph 99 in August of 2003 and found 100% compliance. An “Audit of the Requirements for Members of Professional Standards Bureau and Civilian Board of Rights” was conducted by PSB during the First Quarter FY 2003/2004. The audit identified 41 PSB investigators assigned to PSB during the majority of the rating period. A random stratified sample of 10 employees was conducted and the Performance Evaluation Reports for the selected employees were reviewed. The audit found that all of the Performance Evaluations included specific evaluation of each investigator’s ability to complete complaint investigations.

1 During this period, only one tour expired at IAG. This involved an employee who is off on injury
2 status. It is anticipated that the employee will leave PSB upon his return so there is no need for a tour
3 extension or review of the employee's work history.

4 **Audits**

5 Internal PSB reviews.

6 An audit of this provision will be conducted during the 4th Quarter FY 2004/2005.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶100**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “100. IAG investigators shall be evaluated based on their competency in following
4 the policies and procedures for Complaint Form 1.28 investigations. The LAPD shall
5 provide regular and periodic re-training and re-evaluations on topics relevant to their
6 duties.”

8 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

9 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

10 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

11 **Policy/Procedure:** Performance Evaluation Guide; Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Administrative*
12 *Investigation Training*,” approved by the Commission October 9, 2001.

13 **Activities:**

14 It is current LAPD practice that PSB investigators be evaluated based upon their competency
15 related to personnel complaint investigations. Such reviews are further enhanced by the limited tour
16 provisions of Paragraph 99, which requires appropriate review of employee performance prior to re-
17 appointing personnel (see Paragraph 99). PSB reviews the evaluations to ensure the provisions of
18 Paragraph 100 are addressed.

19 Paragraph 54, which implements annual performance evaluation requirements, addresses
20 performance issues, and therefore complements Paragraph 100 requirements. PSB Detective ratings were
21 completed, served and appropriately filed as of December 31, 2004.

22 PSB conducts quarterly training for all personnel assigned to IAG. In addition, IAG tracks training
23 and evaluations for IAG investigators to ensure investigative competence via a Monthly Progress Report.

24 **Training**

25 PSB continues to conduct quarterly training for all personnel assigned to the IAG.
26 See Paragraphs 80 and 81.

27 **Audit**

28 An audit of this provision will be conducted during the 4th Quarter FY 2004/2005.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

See also Paragraph 54.

1 **Decree ¶101**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “101. The LAPD shall refer to the appropriate criminal prosecutorial authorities all
4 incidents involving LAPD officers with facts indicating criminal conduct.”

5
6 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

7 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

8 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

9 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 2/214.22; District Attorney Special Directive 01-10, “*Referral*
10 *of Allegations of Criminal Misconduct to the Justice System Integrity Division*,” November 7, 2001;
11 District Attorney “*Protocol for the Referral of Allegations of Criminal Misconduct by Law*
12 *Enforcement Personnel to the Los Angeles District Attorney*,” November 7, 2001; Office of the Chief
13 of Police Notice, “*Department Criminal Filing Review Procedures for Employees Accused of Prima*
14 *Fascia Misconduct*,” approved by Chief of Police on October 25, 2001; OCOP Notice, March 27,
15 2002, “*Department Criminal Filing Procedures for Employees Accused of Prima Facie*
16 *Misconduct*,” approved by the Police Commission April 8, 2003.

17 **Activities:**

18 The LAPD reports quarterly to the Police Commission regarding criminal cases submitted for
19 prosecutor review. The LAPD continues to refer cases to the City Attorney and District Attorney
20 consistent with agreed upon protocols.

21 The Second Quarter Report on Criminal Cases Submitted to Prosecutors for Review was
22 completed on July 9, 2004 and the Third Quarter Report was completed on October 8, 2004.

23 Second Quarter 2004 Results:

24 44 cases presented to District Attorney

25 1 Filed
26 21 Rejected
27 10 Pending decisions
28 12 Declined prosecution

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

0 cases presented to the City Attorney.

Third Quarter 2004 results:

41 cases presented to District Attorney

0 Filed

8 Rejected

5 Pending decision

28 Declined prosecution

1 Case presented to the City Attorney.

1 Filed.

Training

PSB training updates scheduled for 2004 on a quarterly basis. See Paragraph 123.

H. Non Discrimination Policy and Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stops

Decree ¶102

Decree Language:

“102. The Department shall continue to prohibit discriminatory conduct on the basis of race, color, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, or disability in the conduct of law enforcement activities. The Department shall continue to require that, to the extent required by federal and state law, all stops and detentions, and activities following stops or detentions, by the LAPD shall be made on the basis of legitimate, articulable reasons consistent with the standards of reasonable suspicion or probable cause.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: LAPD Manual Sections 1/110.20, 1/115.01, 1/115.40, 1/120, 1/120.10, 1/210.13, 1/240.05, 1/508, and 1/522; Department Legal Bulletins dated March 1995 and January 1996; Special Order 23, “*Policy Prohibiting Racial Profiling*,” approved by the Police Commission August 8, 2001.

Activities:

The City has long-standing anti-discrimination policies in place. Between July 1 and December 31, 2004, 100 personnel complaints alleging racial profiling and 31 alleging discrimination were initiated. Discipline imposed for sustained racial profiling and discrimination allegations is reported in the Quarterly Discipline Reports.

As previously reported, although not required by the Consent Decree, the City contracted with Analysis Group, Inc., on April 4, 2004, for the development and implementation of a methodology for pedestrian and motor vehicle stop data analysis. The contract specifically requires the completion of the following tasks:

- Literature Review/Interview Professionals and Review of Other Jurisdictions
- Review of Available Data Sources
- Feasibility Study on Motor Vehicle Benchmark (including ride along surveys)

- Data Analysis Methodology Development and Assessment
- Recommendations Regarding Data Collection Modifications
- Data Analysis

A draft Methodology Report was released for a 30-day public review period on January 19, 2005.

To enhance public participation in this important City effort, a special website (<http://www.lacity.org/LAPDstops>) has been established that contains the various reports, meeting schedules, and other information pertinent to this project. "LAPDstops, Analysis of Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) Pedestrian and Motor Vehicle Stops," will be listed on the City home page "Highlights" until the close of the public comment period. The website lists a contact person with a phone number, and provides a direct e-mail link. The website will be maintained and updated through at least the release of the analysis results.

E-mail notices of the availability of the report, the public comment period, and the public information meeting schedule were sent to all Neighborhood Councils. The LAPD, Police Commission, and Human Relations Commission direct mailed or e-mailed notices of availability to appropriate persons. Notices were mailed to persons who signed up for such notification at the LAPD Consent Decree update meetings held in 2003.

Thirteen jurisdictions were reviewed as part of the analysis methodology development process. These jurisdictions were also notified of the release of the draft methodology and the public review and comment period. In addition, professionals in the field of law enforcement stop data analysis will be notified of the release of a draft methodology for public review and comment.

The release of the report and the public hearing schedule were noticed in fifteen newspaper publications (Chinese Daily News, Downtown News, Hollywood/Wilshire Independent, Korea Times, La Opinion, Los Angeles Daily News, Los Angeles Sentinel, Los Angeles Times, Los Angeles Watts Times, Los Angeles Daily Journal, Nguoi Viet, Rafu Shimpo, Torrance Daily News, Southwest Wave, and Mundo LA) as of Thursday, January 20, 2005.

Hard copies of the report will be available in all City of Los Angeles Public Libraries.

A summary of the methodology and schedule of the four public information meetings was presented at the January 18, 2005, Police Commission meeting, which Channel 35 subsequently broadcasted. The

1 schedule of the public information meetings was also on the Channel 35 City Text service. The meeting
2 schedule and draft methodology was also discussed in the January 24, 2005, Public Safety Committee
3 meeting.

4 A final data analysis methodology will be developed in consideration of public comments received.
5 The LAPD stop data will then be analyzed based upon that methodology. Results of the analysis will be
6 made public upon completion, which is currently anticipated in late summer/fall 2005.

7 The LAPD continues to have procedures in place to ensure that discrimination is reported and
8 addressed. As previously reported to the Court, these procedures include:

9 **NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY**

10 LAPD has established the following Management Principal which states: "The ability of the police
11 to perform their duties is dependent upon public approval of police existence, actions, and behavior, and
12 the ability of the police to secure and maintain public respect" (LAPD Manual Section 1/115.10).

13 In August 2001, LAPD updated its non-discrimination policy to directly define and prohibit racial
14 profiling.

15 In January 2003 the City reviewed the LAPD non-discrimination policy and determined that it was
16 consistent with the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California October 7, 2002,
17 recommendations.

18 The "Vision Statement 2003," adopted by the Police Commission, includes several actions
19 regarding integrity, community policing, and non-discrimination.

20 **ACCEPTANCE OF COMPLAINTS**

21 LAPD has greatly enhanced the methods by which constituents can submit complaints against
22 LAPD officers. LAPD accepts complaints verbally, in person, by mail, by phone (or TDD), facsimile or by
23 electronic mail.

24 Complaint materials, with self-addressed postage paid envelopes, are available in seven languages.
25 Such materials are available at LAPD stations, and other areas throughout the City. In addition, such
26 materials are provided upon request to community groups and public and private service centers.

1 The LAPD web site contains instructions on how to file a complaint via the web site, information
2 regarding filing of a complaint at a local police station, the LAPD 24-hour toll-free complaint hot-line
3 number, and the OIG's number and contact information.

4 The LAPD maintains a 24-hour toll-free telephone complaint hotline.

5 The Inspector General maintains a toll-free complaint line.

6 All LAPD stations have posters, in the appropriate languages for that Area, explaining the
7 complaint process posted in prominent locations.

8 Drivers and individuals involved in motor vehicle or pedestrian stops are provided with
9 documentation identifying the officer involved. Such documentation could include a citation, warning, etc.

10 In the event no action is taken by an officer in response to a stop, officers are required to provide persons
11 with a business card detailing the officer's serial number and date and time of the stop. This "receipt"
12 process provides constituents with the information necessary to initiate a complaint if they believe they have
13 been stopped inappropriately, and provides the LAPD with the information necessary to investigate such a
14 complaint.

15 LAPD business cards include LAPD's 1-800 complaint hotline number on the back.

16 The LAPD periodically performs integrity audits to identify officers who discourage the filing of a
17 complaint.

18 **MISCONDUCT COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION/REVIEW PROCESSES**

19 In July 2001, LAPD established a specific personnel complaint allegation category of racial
20 profiling, thereby enhancing the LAPD's ability to track such complaints and associated discipline.

21 Internal Affairs Group, as opposed to the chain-of-command, is responsible for investigation of
22 complaints regarding discrimination, including racial profiling.

23 At the completion of a complaint investigation, complainants are sent letters documenting the
24 conclusion of the investigation and providing phone numbers of both the Commanding Officer of the
25 employee involved and of the Office of the Inspector General.

26 In the fall/winter of 2002 the Inspector General specifically reviewed racial profiling complaint
27 investigations and made several recommendations to improve such investigations.

28

1 In January 2003, LAPD established a policy specifically regarding the initiation of misconduct
2 complaints when “a [MDT] message involves, or is perceived to involve, remarks regarding race, ethnicity,
3 gender, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability.”

4 Discipline for racial profiling allegations is reported in the Quarterly Discipline Report reviewed by
5 the Police Commission.

6 Discipline imposed by the Chief of Police, for all misconduct, is considered by the Police
7 Commission in its annual review of the Chief of Police.

8 **MOTOR VEHICLE AND PEDESTRIAN STOP DATA COLLECTION**

9 The LAPD initiated collection of information regarding motor vehicle and pedestrian stops on
10 November 1, 2001. LAPD has continually monitored these activities for error rates, training issues, and
11 consistency of data collection methods. The data collection forms were modified in July 2003 to provide
12 for more consistent data collection.

13 LAPD has conducted training regarding motor vehicle and pedestrian stop data collection since late
14 2001 in various venues. Training is updated based upon information obtained through organizational
15 reviews of the data collection process and associated errors, and in light of audit findings.

16 LAPD has implemented an organizational infrastructure to review, correct, and process data
17 collected by LAPD, as well as provide resources to address any questions officers may have about data
18 collection procedures.

19 The Planning and Research Division (PRD) Field Data Report (FDR) Unit conducts weekly
20 random audits of areas to determine their pre and post stop FDR error rates. This information is then given
21 to the area training coordinators and Commanding Officer of CRID. When the automated data collection
22 system is deployed in February, the PRD FDR unit will change its focus from checking FDRs for errors to
23 conducting Authenticity Audits of associated paperwork (*e.g.*, arrest reports, citations, FIs, etc.) to make
24 sure the information contained on the FDR coincides with the associated paperwork.

25 LAPD is now in the process of automating data collection through the purchase, programming,
26 deployment, and use of hand-held devices.

27 LAPD Audit Division conducts periodic audits of data collection to review compliance with LAPD
28 policies and procedures, as well as reviews the accuracy of the data collected.

1 Motor vehicle and pedestrian stop data collected is posted semi-annually on the LAPD web site,
2 with a year's worth of data maintained on the LAPD web site for public review. Data was first posted on
3 January 8, 2003.

4 The LAPD met with community leaders upon posting of the data on the LAPD web site in January
5 2003. Additional public outreach regarding review and analysis of the data is planned in 2004 (see
6 contracting for expert services item below).

7 The City is contracting for expert services to review and analyze, in a fair and unbiased manner, the
8 motor vehicle and pedestrian stop data collected.

9 The LAPD will include in the Risk Management Information System (RMIS) the motor vehicle and
10 pedestrian stop data collected to assist, as appropriate, in identifying potentially at risk LAPD
11 policies/procedures and employees.

12 **TRAINING**

13 LAPD has conducted training regarding the non-discrimination policy in multiple venues over the
14 past two-years.

15 LAPD has conducted training regarding motor vehicle and pedestrian stop data collection since late
16 2001 in various venues (see above).

17 LAPD has, and continues to, integrate non-discrimination concepts into its various training classes
18 and programs.

19 LAPD employees will attend the "Racial Profiling" training presented by the "Tools for Tolerance
20 for Law Enforcement" program by the Museum of Tolerance. This training was initiated in 2002, with all
21 employees scheduled to complete the training by 2006.

22 Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stop Data error rates are discussed and reviewed with each Area
23 Commanding Officer during their monthly COMPSTAT meetings. They also have to be reported and
24 discussed in each Area's monthly activity report.

25 **AUDITS**

26 The LAPD Audit Division performs audits throughout the year regarding various issues, such as
27 arrest procedures and documents, search warrant procedures and documents, pedestrian and motor
28

1 vehicle stop data collection (see above), use of force investigations, misconduct complaint investigations,
2 gang unit work product, etc. The Audit Division reviews indicators of bias in such audits.

3 LAPD management conducts internal reviews of various issues. The LAPD Audit Division has
4 provided training to appropriate LAPD staff regarding review for indicators of bias as part of such
5 management reviews.

6 The LAPD conducts audits periodically which include review of activities where discriminatory
7 behavior may be observed, such as review of language used by officers in mobile digital terminal (MDT)
8 transmissions in MDT audits (Dec. 2002, Dec. 2003), and review of internet access to internet "hate" sites
9 when auditing internet access (Oct. 2003). Such audits not only identify individuals of concern, but also
10 precipitate changes in LAPD policies as appropriate (see above).

11 Quarterly Discipline Reports.

12 Integrity audits (see Paragraph 97).

1 **Decree ¶103**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “103. LAPD officers may not use race, color, ethnicity, or national origin (to any
4 extent or degree) in conducting stops or detentions, or activities following stops or
5 detentions, except when engaging in appropriate suspect-specific activity to identify a
6 particular person or group. When LAPD officers are seeking one or more specific persons
7 who have been identified or described in part by their race, color, ethnicity, or national
8 origin, they may rely in part on race, color, ethnicity, or national origin only in combination
9 with other appropriate identifying factors and may not give race, color, ethnicity or national
10 origin undue weight.”

12 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

13 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

14 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

15 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section LAPD Manual Sections 1/110.20, 1/115.01, 1/115.40, 1/120.
16 1/120.10, 1/210.13, 1/240.05, 1/508, and 1/522; Department Legal Bulletins dated March 1995 and
17 January 1996; Special Order 23, “*Policy Prohibiting Racial Profiling*,” approved by the Commission
18 August 8, 2001.

19 **Activities:**

20 See Paragraph 102.

21 **Training**

22 See Paragraph 102.

23 **Audit**

24 See Paragraph 102.

1 **Decree ¶104**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “104. By November 1, 2001, the Department shall require LAPD officers to
4 complete a written or electronic report each time an officer conducts a motor vehicle stop.

5 a. The report shall include the following:

6 (i) the officer’s serial number;

7 (ii) date and approximate time of the stop;

8 (iii) reporting district where the stop occurred;

9 (iv) driver’s apparent race, ethnicity, or national origin;

10 (v) driver’s gender and apparent age;

11 (vi) reason for the stop, to include check boxes for (1) suspected
12 moving violation of the vehicle code; (2) suspected violation of the Penal or Health
13 and Safety Codes; (3) suspected violation of a City ordinance; (4) Departmental
14 briefing (including crime broadcast/crime bulletin/roll call briefing); (5) suspected
15 equipment/registration violation; (6) call for service; and (7) other (with a brief text
16 field);

17 (vii) whether the driver was required to exit the vehicle;

18 (viii) whether a pat-down/frisk was conducted;

19 (ix) action taken, to include check boxes for warning, citation, arrest,
20 completion of a field interview card, with appropriate identification number for the
21 citation or arrest report; and

22 (x) whether the driver was asked to submit to a consensual search of
23 person, vehicle, or belongings, and whether permission was granted or denied.

24 b. Information described in (iv), (v), (viii), (ix) and (x) of the preceding
25 subparagraph shall be collected for each passenger required to exit the vehicle.

26 c. If a warrantless search is conducted, the report shall include check boxes
27 for the following:
28

- (i) search authority, to include: (1) consent; (2) incident to an arrest;
(3) parole/probation; (4) visible contraband; (5) odor of contraband; (6) incident to
pat-down/frisk; (7) impound inventory; and (8) other (with a brief text field);
- (ii) what was searched, to include: (1) vehicle; (2) person; and
(3) container, and
- (iii) what was discovered/seized, to include: (1) weapons; (2) drugs;
(3) alcohol; (4) money; (5) other contraband; (6) other evidence of a crime; and (7)
nothing.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: November 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Special Order 23, “*Policy Prohibiting Racial Profiling*,” approved by the
Commission August 8, 2001; Special Order 35, “*Data Collection for Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian
Stops*,” approved by the Police Commission October 30, 2001; Chief of Police Notice “*Correction of
Returned Field Data Reports and General Batching Instructions*,” dated June 18, 2002, and Special
Order No. 25 “*Data Collection for Motor Vehicle or Pedestrian Stops – Revised*,” dated September
24, 2002; Special Order No. 29, “*Data Collection for Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stops- Revised*,”
approved by the Police Commission on August 5, 2003, published July 23, 2003.

Activities:

Pedestrian and motor vehicle stop data collection continues. The volume of forms being collected
is consistent with the volume anticipated by LAPD, based upon citation and field interview card volumes.
An Audit Division audit which reviewed a sampling of Field Data Reports (FDR) generated in January
2004 found that FDRs are being completed by officers for stops 94% of the time. Bureau Gang
Coordinators conducted Stop Data Inspections on March 9, 2004 and June 9, 2004. The June inspection
assessed 95% compliance or higher on all issues related to locating and connecting FDR numbers with
reports. That inspection also revealed a 93% compliance rate on the consistency between FDR
information and the related arrest report. However, due to concerns regarding data collection errors (91%

1 compliance level), the City found partial compliance for stop data collection in August 2004.

2 As previously reported to the Court, Vytek Public Safety Solutions, Inc. was engaged by the City
3 to implement automated collection of motor vehicle and pedestrian stop data on June 5, 2003. The
4 Portable Officer Data Device System (PODDS) was accepted as complete by the City in September
5 2004. The automated system includes internal logic that will assist in improving data collection
6 accuracy/completeness. The majority of FDRs are now being completed on the PODDS devices, resulting
7 in improved accuracy of the data. The LAPD Information Technology Division reports that 2500-3000
8 FDRs are being downloaded to the database daily. Due to improved FDR accuracy associated with
9 PODDS, the City finds compliance.

10 In addition to capturing the necessary FDR data, PODDS is also collecting information for the Field
11 Interview System. The City is in the process of contracting for the expansion of PODDS to include the
12 automation of traffic citations. This will reduce officer time to complete related forms as well, and ensure
13 consistency between reports.

14 The Scantron Corporation (Scantron) is providing FDR scanning and data extraction services at a
15 consistently high level of proficiency. With implementation of PODDS, scanning needs have substantially
16 been reduced. However, scanning services will always be required, as paper FDR forms will be used by
17 persons who infrequently make stops and in instances when hand-held devices are non-operational for
18 some reason. The Scantron contract was amended in early 2004 to extend the contract and provide
19 additional funding for scanning services, as appropriate.

20 The LAPD posted pedestrian and motor vehicle stop data collected in the first six months of 2004
21 on LAPD's website by September 1, 2004. Data collected between July and December 2004 will be
22 posted in February 2005.

23 **Training**

24 Department-wide training on the revised FDR Form occurred in June 2003. Training Coordinators
25 were trained by Training Division on the proper use of the STOP application program in the Local Area
26 Network (LAN) system. These Training Coordinators will provide training to the geographic Areas.

1 LAPD has conducted training regarding motor vehicle and pedestrian stop data collection since late
2 2001 in various venues. Training is updated based upon information obtained through organizational
3 reviews of the data collection process and associated errors, and in light of audit findings.

4 PODDS training was provided in spring 2004, which included FDR and non-discrimination training
5 elements.

6 **Audit**

7 Random ad-hoc audits are conducted by the Department Commander and Chief's Duty Officer of
8 field officers regarding their knowledge and use of the STOP program.

9 Planning and Research Division weekly audits of two to four Divisions.

10 Audit Division completed the "Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stop Collection Audit," dated June
11 30, 2004, with reviewed FDRs collected on three days in January 2004. Results are discussed above.

1 **Decree ¶105**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “105. By November 1, 2001, the Department shall require LAPD officers to
4 complete a written or electronic report each time an officer conducts a pedestrian stop.

5 a. The report shall include the following:

- 6 (I) the officer’s serial number;
7 (ii) date and approximate time of the stop;
8 (iii) reporting district when the stop occurred;
9 (iv) person’s apparent race, ethnicity, or national origin;
10 (v) person’s gender and apparent age;
11 (vi) reason for the stop, to include check boxes for (1) suspected
12 violation of the Penal Code; (2) suspected violation of the Health and Safety Code;
13 (3) suspected violation of the Municipal Code; (4) suspected violation of the Vehicle
14 Code; (5) Departmental briefing (including crime broadcast/crime bulletin/roll call
15 briefing); (6) suspect flight; (7) consensual (which need only be checked if there is a
16 citation, arrest, completion of a field interview card, search or seizure (other than
17 searches or seizures incident to arrest) or pat-down/frisk); (8) call for service; or (9)
18 other (with brief text field);
19 (vi) whether a pat-down/frisk was conducted;
20 (viii) action taken, to include check boxes for (1) warning; (2) citation;
21 (3) arrest; and (4) completion of a field interview card, with appropriate
22 identification number for the citation or arrest report; and
23 (ix) whether the person was asked to submit to a consensual search of
24 their person or belongings, and whether permission was granted or denied.

25 b. If a warrantless search is conducted, the report shall include check boxes
26 for the following:

- 27 (I) search authority, to include: (1) consent; (2) incident to as
28 an arrest; (3) parole/probation; (4) visible contraband, (5) odor of

contraband; (6) incident to a pat-down/frisk; and (7) other (with a brief text field);

(ii) what was searched, to include: (1) vehicle; (2) person; and (3) container, and

(iii) what was discovered/seized, to include: (1) weapons; (2) drugs; (3) alcohol; (4) money; (5) other contraband; (6) other evidence of a crime; and (7) nothing.

c. In preparing the form of the reports required by paragraphs 104 and 105, the Department may use “check off” type boxes to facilitate completion of such reports. In documenting motor vehicle and pedestrian stops as required by these paragraphs, the Department may create new forms or modify existing forms.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: November 1, 2001

Primary Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: See Paragraph 104

Activities:

See Paragraph 104.

1 **Decree ¶106**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “106. The LAPD has developed and shall continue to implement a protocol that
4 includes the following requirements for managing and supervising all LAPD units that are
5 primarily responsible for monitoring or reducing gang activity, including the Special
6 Enforcement Units:

7 a. Each unit shall be assigned to an Area or Bureau, and shall be managed
8 and controlled by the Area or Bureau command staff where it is assigned. The Bureau gang
9 coordinators and the citywide gang coordinator (the Detective Support Division
10 Commanding Officer) coordinate the Bureau-wide and citywide activities of these units,
11 provide training and technical assistance, and are involved in coordinating and providing
12 information for the audits of these units.

13 b. Eligibility criteria for selection of a non-supervisory officer in these units
14 shall include that officers have completed probation, have acquired a minimum number of
15 years as a police officer in the LAPD, and have demonstrated proficiency in a variety of
16 law enforcement activities, interpersonal and administrative skills, cultural and community
17 sensitivity, and a commitment to police integrity. Without the prior written approval of the
18 Chief of Police, a non-supervisory officer shall not be reassigned to a unit until 13 LAPD
19 Deployment Periods have elapsed since their previous assignment in these units.

20 c. Eligibility criteria for selection as a supervisor in these units shall include that
21 supervisors have one year experience as a patrol supervisor, have been wheeled from their
22 probationary Area of assignment, and have demonstrated outstanding leadership,
23 supervisory, and administrative skills. In addition, without the prior written approval of the
24 Chief of Police, an individual shall not be selected as a supervisor in these units until 13
25 LAPD Deployment Periods have elapsed since the individual's previous assignment in these
26 units as officer or supervisor.

27 d. Supervisors and non-supervisory officers in these units shall have limited
28 tour assignment to these units, for a period not to exceed 39 LAPD Deployment Periods.

1 An extension of such assignment for up to three LAPD Deployment Periods may be
2 granted upon the written approval of the Bureau commanding officer. Any longer
3 extension shall be permitted upon written approval of the Chief of Police.

4 e. Unit supervisors and non-supervisory officers shall continue to: (i) be
5 subject to existing procedures for uniformed patrol officers regarding detention,
6 transportation, arrest, processing and booking of arrestees and other persons; (ii) wear
7 Class A or Class C uniforms (and may not wear clothing with unauthorized insignias
8 identifying them as working at a particular unit); (iii) use marked police vehicles for all
9 activities; (iv) check out and return all field equipment from the Area kit room on a daily
10 basis; (v) attend scheduled patrol roll calls; (vi) base all unit activities out of the concerned
11 Area station; and (vii) not use off-site locations at night other than LAPD primary area
12 stations for holding arrestees (including interviews) or interviewing witnesses; provided,
13 however, that the foregoing does not apply to interviews at the scene of a crime, interviews
14 in connection with a canvass of a scene, or when the witness requests to be interviewed at
15 a different location. Any exceptions from these requirements shall require the approval of
16 the appropriate managers, and shall be for a specified, limited period of time.

17 Exceptions to the requirements set forth in subparagraphs (ii) and (iii) shall be in
18 writing.

19 f. A unit supervisor shall provide a daily field presence and maintain an active
20 role in unit operations. Unit supervisors shall brief the Area watch commander regularly
21 regarding the activities of their unit, and shall coordinate unit activities with other Area
22 supervisors.

23 g. Area managers shall be responsible for ensuring that supervisors exercise
24 proper control over these units, and for providing oversight over planned tactical
25 operations.

26 h. Each Bureau gang coordinator shall be responsible for monitoring and
27 assessing the operation of all units in the Bureau that address gang activity. The coordinator
28 shall personally inspect and audit at least one Area unit each month, and shall submit copies

of completed audits to the pertinent Bureau and Area. OHB Detective Support Division Command office, and the LAPD Audit Unit created in paragraph 124 below. The coordinator may use bureau staff to conduct such audits who themselves serve in a Bureau or Area gang-activity unit and are deployed in the field to monitor or reduce gang activity. The provisions of this paragraph do not apply to the Detective Support Division's gang unit whose primary, gang-related responsibility is to provide administrative support."

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2001/July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Administrative Order No. 3, June 2000, "*Activation of the Special Enforcement Unit*," amended on December 7, 2001; Special Order No. 20, 2003; "*Gang Enforcement Detail – Supervisor's Daily Report*," published June 24, 2003; Special Order No. 27, 2003; "*Selection and Assignment to Gang Enforcement Details*," published July 10, 2003; approved by the Police Commission June 24, 2003.

Activities:

The City has continued compliance with the gang unit operational parameters of Paragraph 106, with minor documentation issues being addressed by LAPD. Over the past six month period, the City has achieved substantial compliance with the gang unit supervisory oversight provisions of Paragraph 106, with LAPD continuing to work to further maintain compliance and enhance compliance to above the 95% level.

The organizational restructuring of the new Gang Impact Teams (GIT) has been completed. Special Order No. 7, "*Gang Impact Teams Established*," was approved by the Police Commission February 23, 2004. The City is in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 106(a), as illustrated by the GIT structure, GED training provided, review of inspections and audits, and the use of such information to manage GIT.

In June 2003, the meet and confer process was completed for the Special Enforcement Units (SEU) selection and assignment (Paragraphs 51(b) and (d), 106(b)-(d), 107 (a) and (c)), with the issuance of Special Order No. 27 by LAPD on July 10, 2003.

1 The Special Order published in July 2003 exceeds the requirements of Paragraph 106; specifically,
2 gang enforcement detail selection requirements incorporate the review of adverse judicial findings. In
3 addition, TEAMS 1.5, designed to provide greater access to TEAMS I information, is making it easier for
4 supervisors to review employee TEAMS I records as appropriate (see Paragraph 39).

5 In the fall of 2003, CRID reviewed compliance with the Special Order No. 27. CRID's review
6 found compliance with the selection criteria established in Paragraph 106 for GEDs, although
7 documentation deficiencies were noted. The Bureau Gang Coordinators (BGC) audited GED selection
8 criteria in February and June 2004 and found compliance. A "Gang Enforcement Selection Criteria Audit,"
9 dated June 25, 2004, found 99% compliance with the requirements of Paragraph 106(b) and 97%
10 compliance with the requirements of Paragraph 106(c).

11 The April 14, 2004, BGC Inspection of GED Tour Extensions reviewed the period between July
12 2003 and April 2004 (30 extensions). The inspection assessed 90% compliance with the requirement to
13 obtain management approval prior to the tour expiring; and 100% compliance with the TEAMS review
14 requirement. A "Gang Enforcement Selection Criteria Audit," dated June 25, 2004, found that, out of 16
15 extensions approved during the period reviewed, three were approved over two months late. The Audit
16 found 100% compliance with the TEAMS review requirement. In response to concerns expressed by the
17 Independent Monitor and deficiencies identified in GED tour extension reviews, an audit of the 39
18 Deployment Period Roster maintained by Special Operations Support Division (SOSD) was conducted to
19 verify its accuracy. Subsequent to the audit, a tracking database was established to automatically calculate
20 the date the officer is due out based on the date first assigned. The system became operational in June
21 2004. An October 24, 2004 BGC Inspection of GED Tour Extensions 106(d) assessed 90% compliance
22 with the requirement to obtain management approval prior to the expiration of the tour, and 100%
23 compliance with the TEAMS review requirement. However, improvements to the system and processing
24 have resulted in current compliance with Paragraph 106(d).

25 The City made substantial progress towards compliance with the various SEU operational
26 parameters established in Paragraph 106(e). A BGC Inspection in March 2004 found compliance with the
27 uniform and vehicle requirements of Paragraph 106 (e), (ii), and (iii). A BGC Inspection of attendance at
28 patrol roll calls was completed in March 2004 and assessed 90% compliance with Paragraph 106 (e) and

1 (v). BGC inspections conducted during this period indicate minor documentation issues continue in this
2 area. A BGC Inspection of Vehicle Equipment Check-in dated April 2004 assessed 75% compliance with
3 the vehicle and equipment check-in documentation, a 25% improvement from the previous inspection in
4 January 2004. Changes to the kit room recording forms were implemented to address this issue.
5 Subsequent BCG inspections indicate minor documentation errors continue in this area. Follow-up BCG
6 inspections regarding this issue were conducted in June and December 2004 and found compliance. On-
7 going BCG inspections continue to find compliance with the various other provisions of Paragraph 106(e).
8 An inspection completed in January 2005 identified that, in some instances, Watch Commanders did not
9 follow-up, and/or document follow-up, with arrestees that were interviewed and indicated they were not
10 clear on why they were arrested. LAPD is acting to expeditiously resolve this issue.

11 A BGC Inspection of GED supervisory oversight (Paragraph 106(f)) completed in March 2004
12 found compliance with the requirement to maintain a daily supervisory field presence and an 86%
13 compliance rate with the requirement to brief the Area watch commander on unit activities. The level of
14 detail and accuracy of GED supervisor logs improved dramatically since January 2004. Subsequent BCG
15 inspections document improved supervisory oversight and compliance with supervisory oversight mandates.

16 Area managers continue to ensure GED compliance with LAPD procedures and provide oversight
17 for planned tactical operations. BGC inspection of search warrant service conducted between February
18 and April 2004 found that the appropriate level of supervision was present 98% of the time and the
19 manager analysis was completed on each warrant as required by Paragraph 62(b). A "Gang Enforcement
20 Detail Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits Work Product Audit Supplemental," dated June 29,
21 2004, found 100% compliance for the search warrant provisions of Paragraph 71. Preliminary results of
22 the in-progress FY 04-05 Audit Division search warrant audit indicates continued supervisory oversight at
23 such levels.

24 Supervisory oversight was also measured in the BGC Inspection of Non-Categorical Use of Force
25 incidents that occurred in the 1st Quarter 2004. All Non-Categorical Use of Force reports were reviewed
26 by Area managers within the 14-day time frame as required by Paragraph 69. A "Gang Enforcement
27 Detail Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports Audit – Supplemental," dated June 28, 2004, found 100%
28 compliance for the non-categorical investigation provisions of Paragraph 81. A "Supplemental Audit to the

1 Gang Enforcement Detail Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports Audit Supplemental Submitted Fourth
2 Quarter, Fiscal Year 2003/04,” was completed on November 8, 2004. That audit found 100%
3 compliance with non-categorical use of force investigation procedures and 100% compliance with
4 associated supervisory oversight provisions.

5 The June 24, 2004 Audit Division audit of Gang Unit Work Product reviewed arrest and detention
6 documentation generated in February 2004. The review consisted of 179 arrest reports and assessed the
7 following compliance levels: completeness 94%, authenticity review 98%, underlying actions 96%, and
8 supervisory oversight 93%. An Audit Division “Audit of Arrest, Booking, and Charging Reports,” dated
9 October 8, 2004, which reviewed arrest packages created between April and May 2004, found the
10 following compliance levels: completeness 99%, authenticity review 98%, underlying actions 85%, and
11 supervisory oversight 72%.

12 Current information indicates that the GED procedures pertaining to GED informant usage are
13 being followed. A “Confidential Informant Control Packages Audit,” dated June 28, 2004, identified two
14 GED informant packages that were not well managed.

15 The City is in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 106(h). The process for completing
16 Bureau Coordinator audits was revised in January 2003 and a specific audit schedule was created. GED
17 compliance concerns resulted in a desire for more frequent reviews than monthly. CRID assisted the
18 Bureau Gang Coordinator with development of weekly gang unit audit methodologies and matrices. As of
19 July 1, 2004, GED inspection responsibilities were turned over to the Bureau Gang Coordinator.
20 Inspection results of these reviews are provided to GED commands in real time to ensure expeditious
21 remedy of identified issues and integration into COMPSTAT. In addition, with more frequent reviews,
22 there is ability to revisit previous areas of deficiencies to ensure such deficiencies have been effectively
23 remedied.

24 An independent review of BGC inspections in late 2004 revealed sampling methodology flaws in
25 three BCG inspections. The information was conveyed to Special Operations Bureau and the inspections
26 were either revised or repeated, utilizing appropriate sampling methodology. This is an example of
27 successful internal quality control that underscores the importance LAPD has placed on GED oversight.

28 **Training**

1 Curriculum for the Gang School, Vice School and Narcotics School, including instruction on
2 Confidential Informant procedure, is currently being developed and, once completed, will be implemented.

3 On July 6, 2004, training was provided to Gang Unit personnel on warrant preparation, gang
4 injunctions and wire taps.

5 Department Gang Coordinator met with Bureau Commanding Officers on March 10, 2004 to
6 outline efforts to achieve Consent Decree compliance and to clarify documentation requirements.

7 Department Gang Coordinator (DGC) conducted bi-weekly meetings with Bureau Gang
8 Coordinators to discuss the BGC Inspections solutions for deficiencies.

9 The DGC met with all Department GIT OICs to discuss and identify any operational and
10 administrative issues related to GED units.

11 April 8, 2004 - Training provided by the Department Gang Coordinator to all GED and GIT
12 supervisors. The training covered a multitude of gang unit operational issues and Consent Decree
13 compliance documentation.

14 On January 14, 2004, training was provided to all Area Captains and GIT Lieutenants on
15 procedures for documenting supervisor field activities.

16 Training regarding SEU selection procedures and TEAMS reviews for transferred employees were
17 provided at the January 8, 2004 and December 11, 2003 Consent Decree coordinator meetings. Training
18 regarding GED selection procedures was provided at the January 8, 2004, Command Officer's meeting.

19 **Audits**

20 The BGC Inspection process and CRID reviews.

21 A "Supplemental Audit to the Gang Enforcement Detail Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports
22 Audit Supplemental Submitted Fourth Quarter, Fiscal Year 2003/04," was completed November 8, 2004,
23 and found 100% compliance for non-categorical use of force investigations.

24 The Audit Division completed an "Audit of Arrest, Booking, and Charging Reports," dated October
25 8, 2004, which reviewed 260 arrest packages created between April and May 2004. Audit findings are
26 discussed above. LAPD has taken actions to remedy identified deficiencies.

27 The Audit Division completed a "Gang Enforcement Detail Work Product Audit," dated March 30,
28 2004.

1 The Audit Division "Gang Enforcement Detail Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits
2 Work Product Audit Supplemental," dated June 29, 2004, found 100% compliance for the provisions of
3 Paragraph 71.

4 Audit Division completed a "Confidential Informant Control Packages Audit," dated June 28,
5 2004, that examined 69 informant packages. Results are discussed above.

6 Audit Division completed a "Gang Enforcement Detail Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports
7 Audit – Supplemental," dated June 28, 2004. The Audit found 100% compliance for the provisions of
8 Paragraph 81.

9 DSD completed an "Audit of Training for Gang Enforcement Detail Personnel," dated June 29,
10 2004.

11 The Audit Division completed a "SEU ABC Audit," Third Quarter of FY 03-04, examining 156
12 arrest packages from November 2003.

1 **Decree ¶107**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “107. In addition to the requirements set forth in the preceding paragraph, the
4 LAPD shall implement the following requirements, which shall be applicable to all LAPD
5 units that are covered by the preceding Paragraph.

6 a. The eligibility criteria for selection of an officer in these units shall require a
7 positive evaluation of the officer based upon the officer’s relevant and appropriate TEAMS
8 II record. Supervisors shall be required to document in writing their consideration of any
9 sustained Complaint Form 1.28 investigation, adverse judicial finding, or discipline for use
10 of excessive force, a false arrest or charge, an improper search and seizure, sexual
11 harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty in determining whether an officer shall be selected
12 for the unit.

13 b. The procedures for the selection of supervisors and non-supervisory
14 officers in these units shall include a formal, written application process, oral interview(s),
15 and the use of TEAMS II and annual performance evaluations to assist in evaluating the
16 application.

17 c. Without limiting - any other personnel authority available to the Department,
18 during a supervisor’s or non-supervisory officer’s assignment tour in these units, a sustained
19 complaint or adverse judicial finding for use of excessive force, a false arrest or charge, an
20 unreasonable search or seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty, shall
21 result in the officer’s supervisor reviewing the incident and making a written determination
22 as to whether the subject officer should remain in the unit.”
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Compliance Action: Administrative Order No. 3, June 2000; Department Gang Coordinator Notice, "Interim Special Enforcement Unit Selection Procedures," published October 15, 2001; Special Order 27, "Selection and Assignment to Gang Enforcement Details," published July 10, 2003, approved by the Police Commission June 24, 2003.

Activities:

The LAPD eligibility criteria for selection of a SEU non-supervisory and supervisory officers, and the selection process, consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 107, are in place.

The Paragraph 107(a) requirements are the same as the requirements of Paragraph 51(d), pending development of TEAMS II. As detailed in Paragraph 51, the City is in compliance with this provision.

A "Gang Enforcement Detail Selection Criteria Audit," dated June 25, 2004, found 100% compliance with the written applications and oral interview requirements of Paragraph 107(b). The Audit did not note that TEAMS reports appeared to have been approved by the supervisors after the officer's appointment to the GED one-third of the time. The subsequent October 24, 2004, BGC Inspection of GED Tour Extensions 106(d) found 100% compliance with the TEAMS review requirement.

A GED Selection Checklist created by the Department Gang Coordinator greatly enhanced the Department's compliance with all GED selection requirements.

Training

Training on GED selection procedures has been provided to GIT supervisors via monthly meetings.

Audit/Inspections

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

A BGC Inspection of GED Selection Criteria and Process was completed on October 11, 2004.
The inspection reviewed selections made in May 2004 and found compliance with the majority of the requirements of this paragraph.
A GED Selection Criteria Audit is scheduled for the Fourth Quarter of FY 04-05.

1 **V. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANTS**

2 **Decree ¶108**

3 **Decree Language:**

4 “108. The LAPD has developed and shall continue to implement procedures for
5 the handling of informants. The procedures include and LAPD shall continue to require the
6 following:

7 a The use of informants by LAPD personnel is limited to those non-
8 uniformed personnel assigned to investigative units, such as Area Detective, Narcotics
9 Division, and Specialized Detective Divisions. Personnel in uniform assignments shall not
10 maintain or use informants.

11 b. An officer desiring to utilize an individual as an informant shall identify that
12 person by completing an informant control package.

13 c. The officer shall submit that package to his or her chain-of-command
14 supervisor for review and approval by the appropriate manager prior to utilizing that
15 individual as an informant, which review shall be for completeness and compliance with
16 LAPD procedures.

17 d. Each informant shall be assigned a Confidential Informant (CI) number.

18 e. The commanding offices shall be responsible for ensuring that informant
19 control packages are stored in a secure location that provides for restricted access and
20 sign-out approval by the officer in charge or watch commander. There shall be a written
21 record including each accessing officer's name and date of access in the informant control
22 package.

23 f. Informant control packages shall not be retained beyond end of watch
24 without approval of the officer in charge or watch commander.

25 g. Whenever information is supplied by an informant whom the investigating officer has
26 not used as a source within the past three months, the officer shall check the
27 Department-wide undesirable informant file and update the individual's informant control
28 package prior to acting on such information.

h. Investigating officers shall be required to confer with a supervisor prior to meeting with an informant; document all meetings, significant contacts, and information received from an informant in the informant control package; inform their supervisor of any contact with an informant; and admonish the informant that he or she shall not violate any laws in the gathering of information.

i. Supervisors shall be required to meet with each confidential informant at least once prior to the information control package being submitted to the commanding officer. The quality of supervisors' oversight with respect to adherence to LAPD guidelines and procedure regarding informant use by officers under his or her command and such supervisors' own adherence thereto, shall be factors in such supervisor's annual personnel performance evaluation.

j. Whenever an officer takes action based on information supplied by an informant, the officer shall document the information supplied, and the results of the investigation, in the individual's informant control package."

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Partial Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Operational Order No. 1, "*Use of Informants by Department Personnel*," January 14, 2000; Special Order No. 6, 2002, "*Use of Informants and Activation of the Informant Manual*," approved by the Police Commission February 26, 2002; "*Confidential Informant Manual*," approved by the Police Commission February 26, 2002; "*Confidential Informant Manual*," approved by the Police Commission July 22, 2003.

Activities:

The City was in compliance with the confidential informant file provisions during 2003. A CRID Inspection, dated January 9, 2004, assessed 95% compliance with the requirements of Paragraph 108. The Independent Monitor's 11th Quarterly Report assessed 98% compliance.

1 The "Confidential Informant Control Packages Audit," dated June 28, 2004, found 100%
2 compliance for Paragraphs 108(a), (b), (d), and (h); 99% compliance for 108(c); 97% compliance 108(g)
3 and (i); 96% compliance for 108(f) and (j); and 94% for 108(e). However, taken in the aggregate, the
4 City's compliance rate is determined to be 85%. The majority of the deficiencies identified were related to
5 documentation. The Audit found appropriate supervisory oversight of the use of confidential informants,
6 with the exception of two GED informants. LAPD worked over the last six-months to address the
7 identified deficiencies. However, the City continues to find partial compliance, as a follow-up review to
8 ensure effectiveness of measures implemented has not yet been completed.

9 **Training**

10 A training video on informant procedures began production in January 2005 and is scheduled to be
11 released in March 2005.

12 Curriculum for the Gang School, Vice School and Narcotics School, including instruction on
13 Confidential Informant procedure, is currently being developed and, once complete, will be implemented.

14 Training was provided to 38 Divisional Informant Coordinators on January 18, 2004. A total of
15 142 officers were trained.

16 Training on Confidential Informant Packages has been incorporated into the following Department
17 schools: Basic Detective School and Detective Supervisory School. The instruction was modified to
18 address the policy modifications on procedures as outlined in the CI manual. The Detective Training Unit,
19 Continuing Education Division (CED), coordinates the course.

20 A stand-alone 2-hour course on Informant Management and Control was delivered to detective
21 personnel during February and March 2004.

22 Confidential informants are addressed in training provided to officers in gang enforcement
23 assignments and coordinated by SOSD. It is also included in Vice and Narcotic Schools that are
24 coordinated by CED.

25 The Department incorporated training on the new manual into its Basic Detective and Narcotics
26 Schools, which took place in March and April 2004.

Audits

Audit Division completed a "Confidential Informant Control Packages Audit," dated June 28, 2004, which examined 69 informant packages. Results are discussed above.

CRID periodically reviews compliance with confidential informant procedures.

CRID is reviewing Active Informant Files as part of the Area DICE Inspections which began in January 2005.

Paragraph 108(i), regarding supervisor performance evaluations considering oversight and adherence to confidential informant procedures was identified as a meet and confer item. That process has been completed and those provisions of Paragraph 108(i) are incorporated into Special Orders 47 and 51 regarding annual performance evaluations (see Paragraph 54).

An Audit of confidential informants is scheduled for the fourth quarter of FY 04-05.

1 **Decree ¶109**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “109. The LAPD shall establish a permanent Department-wide confidential
4 database or listing of all LAPD confidential informants except those listed by the
5 Anti-Terrorist Division and those used in conjunction with another agency, containing the
6 following information: Confidential Informant number, name, aliases, and date of birth.”

8 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

9 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

10 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

11 **Policy/Procedure:** Special Order 28, “*Confidential Informant Tracking System*,” approved by the
12 Police Commission September 25, 2001.

13 **Activities:**

14 The Administrative Order implementing the Confidential Informant database and associated
15 procedures was distributed September 17, 2001. The system is fully operational. The database is audited
16 monthly by the LAPD to ensure completeness and accuracy of data. A database for management of
17 undesirable confidential informant information has been implemented.

18 CRID reviewed the confidential informant database between August and September 2003 and
19 found 100% compliance.

20 The “Confidential Informant Control Packages Audit,” dated June 28, 2004, identified seven
21 instances in which the 56 confidential informant files reviewed had discrepancies with the confidential
22 informant database. The most common discrepancies were in the AKA/moniker information. Such
23 discrepancies are expected as files are updated more often than the database. Further, based upon the
24 number fields present in the database, such discrepancies do not impact the City’s compliance with the
25 provisions of Paragraph 109.

26 The Independent Monitor assessed non-compliance with Paragraph 109 in the 11th Quarterly
27 Report citing missing and/or inconsistent data, similar to that identified in the LAPD “Confidential Informant
28 Control Packages Audit,” dated June 28, 2004. The City disagrees that if a single data element for an

individual Confidential Informant is missing that the entire file fails the compliance test. Indeed, in most cases, 100% of the data elements for an individual informant are complete and correct. However, in a few instances, only 3 of 4 aliases may be listed in the system. Such a single omission, especially in light of the continual updating of the paper files, with only periodic reconciliation of the database pursuant to procedures established to balance confidentiality concerns and in consideration of when the database is accessed to evaluate confidential informants, should not result in a non-compliance finding.

Procedures for reviewing and updating information in the database for informants managed by entities other than Narcotics Division, to the extent practicable, are being established by LAPD. Additionally, the database software is being re-evaluated to determine if the number of fields for AKA and alias information can be expanded.

Training

See Paragraph 108.

Audit

See Paragraph 108.

1 **Decree ¶110**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “110. Within six months of the effective date of this Agreement, the LAPD shall
4 publish a confidential informant manual which further expands and defines the procedures
5 for identifying and utilizing informants, and which will include all of the requirements set out
6 in paragraphs 108 and 109.”

7
8 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

9 **Due Date:** December 15, 2001

10 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

11 **Policy/Procedure:** Special Order No. 6, 2002, “*Use of Informants and Activation of the Informant*
12 *Manual*,” approved by the Police Commission February 26, 2002; “*Confidential Informant Manual*,”
13 approved by the Police Commission February 26, 2002; “*Confidential Informant Manual*,” approved
14 by the Police Commission July 22, 2003.

15 **Activities:**

16 Following the publication of the Informant Manual in February 2002, concerns were raised by the
17 Monitor and LAPD Department commands regarding procedures delineated in the Manual. The
18 Confidential Informant Manual was revised in July 22, 2003.

19 **Training**

20 See Paragraph 108.

21 **Audits**

22 See Paragraph 108.
23
24
25
26
27
28

**VI. DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM FOR RESPONDING TO PERSONS WITH
MENTAL ILLNESS**

Decree ¶111

Decree Language:

“111. Within one year of the effective date of this Agreement, the Department shall: (a) conduct an in-depth evaluation of successful programs in other law enforcement agencies across the United States dealing with police contacts with persons who may be mentally ill; and (b) conduct an in-depth evaluation of LAPD training, policies, and procedures for dealing with persons who may be mentally ill, including detailed reviews of at least ten incidents since January 1, 1999 in which a person who appeared to be mentally ill was the subject of a Categorical Use of Force and at least 15 incidents since January 1, 1999 in which the LAPD mental health evaluation unit was contacted.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2002

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Chief Of Police Correspondence, “*Consent Decree Mental Illness Project Recommendations*,” July 3, 2002.

Activities:

Although not required by the Consent Decree, the City engaged outside professional services to assist in the evaluation of other law enforcement programs and LAPD policies and procedures for dealing with persons who may be mentally ill. The Contract with Lodestar was executed on December 10, 2001, with work on the project initiated on December 11, 2001. The five law enforcement programs reviewed as part of the study were San Diego, California; Memphis, Tennessee; Seattle, Washington; New York, New York; and Portland, Oregon.

The Contractor submitted three interim reports that were reviewed and commented upon by LAPD: 1) Interim Report on Calls, Incidents and Tracking Systems, February 28, 2002; LAPD comments were provided on March 14, 2002; 2) Interim Report on the Evaluation of Successful Practices in Other

1 Law Enforcement Agencies, March 15, 2002; LAPD comments were provided on March 29, 2002, and
2 3) Interim Report on the Evaluation of Current LAPD Training, Policies and Procedures, March 29, 2002;
3 LAPD comments were provided on April 11, 2002. Meetings were held with the Contractor to discuss
4 LAPD's comments. City, Independent Monitor, and DOJ representatives were provided copies of the
5 interim reports and participated in those meetings.

6 Lodestar's comprehensive draft report was submitted for LAPD review on April 18, 2002. LAPD
7 provided comments on May 13, 2002. The draft report was provided to the Independent Monitor and the
8 DOJ. A meeting with the Contractor to discuss LAPD's comments was held on May 4, 2002. Again,
9 City, Independent Monitor, and DOJ representatives participated in that meeting. A final report was
10 submitted by the Contractor to LAPD on May 28, 2002.

11 The LAPD evaluated the Lodestar report and recommendations within the context of existing
12 LAPD programs, current and on-going LAPD efforts, previous experience, long-term sustainability, and the
13 ability to implement. Based upon that review, the Chief of Police provided "*Consent Decree Mental*
14 *Illness Project Recommendations*" to the Police Commission on July 15, 2002, consistent with the
15 requirements of Consent Decree Paragraph 112. The major recommendations made by LAPD included
16 expansion of the existing SMART program, implementation of a new Crisis Intervention Team (CIT),
17 centralization of review of all use of force incidents involving potentially mentally ill persons, and
18 enhancements to computer systems for tracking purposes. Subsequent reports and information were
19 generated pursuant to requests from the Police Commission (see Paragraph 112).

20 The LAPD initiated a pilot program, Crisis Intervention Team (CIT), for first responders to better
21 deal with people who may be mentally ill in June 2001. That program was maintained during the mental
22 illness program review required pursuant to Paragraph 111. The CIT pilot program was expanded to four
23 Areas (Central, Van Nuys, West Los Angeles and Harbor) by the Police Commission in November 2002
24 (see Paragraph 112). Training of CIT officers for the pilot program was completed in March 2003.

25 The Independent Monitor's review of Paragraphs 111 in June 2002 found compliance with
26 Paragraph 111.
27
28

1 **Decree ¶112**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “112. Within 13 months of the effective date of this Agreement, the LAPD, based
4 upon its analysis required by the preceding paragraph, shall prepare a report for the Police
5 Commission detailing the results of its analysis and recommending appropriate changes in
6 policies, procedures, and training methods regarding police contact with the persons who
7 may be mentally ill with the goal of de-escalating the potential for violent encounters with
8 mentally ill persons. The recommendation shall include a proposal on potential methods for
9 tracking calls and incidents dealing with persons who may appear to be mentally ill. The
10 Police Commission shall forward its reports and actions regarding any appropriate new or
11 modifications to existing policies, practices, or training methods regarding police contact
12 with persons who may be mentally ill to the City Council and Mayor.”

13
14 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

15 **Due Date:** July 15, 2002

16 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

17 **Policy/Action:** Chief Of Police Correspondence, “*Consent Decree Mental Illness Project*
18 *Recommendations*,” July 3, 2002, and subsequent reports submitted to the Police Commission.

19 **Activities:**

20 The Chief of Police provided “*Consent Decree Mental Illness Project Recommendations*,”
21 dated July 3, 2002, to the Police Commission on July 15, 2002, as required by Consent Decree paragraph
22 112. On July 29, 2002, the Department of Justice (DOJ) sent a letter to the City citing concerns with those
23 recommendations stating that it did not fulfill the requirements specified in Paragraphs 111 and 112.
24 Pursuant to the concerns expressed by the DOJ, the Police Commission requested additional information
25 from the LAPD. On September 24, 2002, the Consent Decree Mental Illness Project – Supplemental
26 Report was completed and subsequently submitted to the Police Commission on September 30, 2002. On
27 September 26, 2002, the Summary of Department Response to Lodestar Recommendations/Consent
28 Decree Mental Illness Project was completed and subsequently submitted to the Police Commission on

1 October 2, 2002. On October 7, 2002, the Consent Decree Mental Illness Project – Revised
2 Supplemental Report and the Revised Summary of Department Response to Lodestar Recommendations
3 were completed.

4 On October 24, 2002, the DOJ sent a letter to the City stating that it had received the
5 Supplemental Report dated October 7, 2002. The letter stated that the Supplemental Report addressed
6 some but not all of the concerns identified in the July 29 letter. On October 24, 2002, the Consent Decree
7 Mental Illness Project - Second Supplemental Report was completed. On November 2, 2002, the Police
8 Commission approved the report. On November 6, 2002, the Consent Decree Mental Illness Project -
9 Third Supplemental Report was completed. On November 19, 2002, the Police Commission approved
10 the report.

11 The City Council directed the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA) and the Chief Administrative Officer
12 (CAO) to prepare a report on the Police Commissions recommendations and funding sources as
13 appropriate. That report was presented to the City Council Public Safety Committee on April 7, 2003.

14 The City Council made several recommendations to the Police Commission for consideration.

15 Program Implementation

16 In spring 2001, LAPD initiated a Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) Pilot Program in the Central Area.
17 In January 2002, LAPD prepared a report on the program, which presented various findings. There were
18 several concerns regarding the potential for the CIT program's success in Los Angeles at that time,
19 however, LAPD chose to move forward and further test this program, with some success in some smaller
20 jurisdictions (Memphis and Portland). In February 2003, the CIT Pilot Program was expanded to Van
21 Nuys, Harbor, and West Los Angeles Areas.

22 On February 10, 2004, the LAPD Detective Support Division (DSD) completed an evaluation of
23 the CIT program implemented in Harbor, West Los Angeles, Central, and Van Nuys Areas. The
24 evaluation indicated that:

- 25 • CIT officers and other patrol officers respond to mental illness related calls for service at
- 26 approximately the same rate.
- 27 • The average time required for both CIT officers and other patrol officers to clear a mentally ill
- 28 related crisis call is 2.5 hours.
- CIT training does not reduce use of Force incidents involving potentially mentally ill persons.

- CIT training does not reduce the type and level of force used.
- CIT trained officers found the training to be beneficial and helpful in their duties.

Based upon the DSD evaluation and the then in-progress audit results of the mental illness audit undertaken pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 113, LAPD concluded that it is impractical to implement the CIT program in LAPD. The audit of "Police Contact with Persons Who May Be Mentally Ill," dated on July 9, 2004, supported the conclusions of the February 2004 DSD evaluation of the CIT pilot program.

Although the LAPD had hoped the CIT program would be successful, clearly the CIT program did not result in benefits significant enough to continue this expensive, resource-intensive program. Therefore, it was important for LAPD to change gears and develop a new approach to address this very important issue.

The LAPD therefore proposed replacing the CIT pilot program with expansion of System-wide Mental Assessment Response Teams (SMART) by 80% (from 11 teams to 19 teams) and the expansion of the Mental Evaluation Unit (MEU) to provide 7-day a week, 20-hour a day coverage. Further, the LAPD recommended enhancing existing training for all LAPD officers to include mental illness issues addressed in the CIT training program, as appropriate. The Police Commission approved the proposed revisions to the LAPD Metal Illness Program on May 18, 2004.

The LAPD expansion of SMART and MEU was completed in June 2004. However, SMART expansion includes additional resources being required from the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health (LACDMH), as SMART teams consist of one LAPD officer and one mental health professional. The LACDHM received funding for six additional clinicians in their FY 04-05 budget. Two LACDMH staff completed required training and were deployed in fall 2004. LACDMH requested two additional staff for the SMART program in October 2004 which were approved. In fall 2004, the SMART program reached full strength with a staffing of 18 mental health professionals.

Due to budget constraints, LACDHM initiated a "hospital rotation," providing for only one available hospital to accept mentally ill persons for evaluation. This will significantly impact the effectiveness of SMART teams, as a majority of their time could now be spent transporting of individuals from one end

1 of the City to another, rather than responding to incidents. The City and other jurisdictions are working
2 with LACDHM to minimize impacts to the extent feasible.

3 LAPD is currently working to modify training curriculum as appropriate and to develop special
4 training for Field Training Officers regarding mental illness-related issues. Training of patrol officers is
5 currently planned for fall 2004.

6 In December 2003, the City Council authorized additional funding to enhance the Mental Illness
7 Program MEU computer tracking system. LAPD reports that this computer program is now operational
8 and has substantially improved the LAPD's ability to document and track encounters with potentially
9 mentally ill persons.

10 On July 9, 2004, the LAPD completed an audit of the implementation of the mental illness program
11 recommendations, pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 113. The audit identified the need to further
12 improve methods of tracking calls for service involving potentially mentally ill persons. The LAPD is
13 working to address the issues identified in the audit.

14 Training

15 Curriculum enhancements were initiated in October 2004 which will provide additional training for
16 patrol officers. The revised curriculum was submitted to California POST in December 2004. It is
17 anticipated that the training will be delivered beginning in March 2005.

18 Training of CIT officers for the pilot program was completed in March 2003.

19 CIT trained offers were provided 8 hours of updated training in early 2004.

20 A 4-hour mental illness training program was provided to all officers in early 2003.

24 Audit

25 The LAPD Detective Support Division (DSD) completed an evaluation of the CIT program
26 implemented in Harbor, West Los Angeles, Central, and Van Nuys Areas, dated February 10, 2004.

27 The audit of "Police Contact with Persons Who May Be Mentally Ill," dated July 9, 2004.

1 **Decree ¶113**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “113. Within one year of the date of receipt by the Police Commission of the
4 report required in the preceding paragraph, but in no case more than 32 months after the
5 effective date of this Agreement, the Department shall complete an audit to evaluate LAPD
6 handling of calls and incidents over the previous one year period involving persons who
7 appear to be mentally ill. The audit and evaluation shall include any new policies,
8 procedures and training methods implemented pursuant to the preceding Paragraph and
9 shall specify any additional modifications necessary in the Department’s policies,
10 procedures or training to meet the objectives specified in the preceding paragraph.”

11
12 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

13 **Due Date:** February 15, 2004

14 **Compliance Status:** Compliance

15 **Compliance Action:** Pending completion of audit

16 **Activities:**

17 As reported in February 2004, City did not complete an audit of the implementation of the mental
18 illness program recommendations by February 15, 2004, as mandated by Paragraph 113. A review of the
19 status of the implementation of the mental illness program enhancements in fall 2003 identified several
20 implementation deficiencies and potential implementation concerns. Therefore, the LAPD focused its
21 efforts on implementing enhancements to the mental illness program and reporting to the Police Commission
22 regarding implementation concerns, with recommended modifications to the program. As discussed in
23 Paragraph 112, this was completed in spring 2004.

24 The LAPD Detective Support Division (DSD) completed an evaluation of the CIT program
25 implemented in Harbor, West Los Angeles, Central, and Van Nuys Areas, dated February 10, 2004. This
26 evaluation provided insight into the effectiveness of the revised procedures and where additional
27 implementation efforts could best be focused.

1 The audit of "Police Contact with Persons Who May Be Mentally Ill," was completed pursuant to
2 Paragraph 113 on July 9, 2004. The Audit supported the conclusions of the February 2004 DSD
3 evaluation of the CIT pilot program. The audit also identified the need to further improve methods of
4 tracking calls for service involving potentially mentally ill persons. The audit findings and recommendations
5 were reviewed by the Police Commission and the City.

6 The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) review of the audit was completed on December 29,
7 2004 and approved by the Police Commission on January 11, 2005. The OIG review found the audit
8 research to be extensive and found the report was well-written and insightful. The OIG recommended that
9 SMART/MEU be expanded by three additional detective supervisor positions and that new incident
10 disposition codes to enhance the tracking of contacts with the mentally ill be implemented. These
11 recommendations are under review by the LAPD and City.

12 The Independent Monitor reviewed the Mental Illness Audit and determined that it was non-
13 compliant in the 13th Quarterly Report because the audit did not utilize worksheets which afforded the
14 Monitor staff the ability to review each individual item reviewed by the LAPD auditors (e.g. "forensic audit"
15 working papers). However, all working papers completed and documents reviewed by auditors are
16 available for review and evaluation by the Monitor to evaluate the audit and its extensive conclusions and
17 recommendations. It is noted that the OIG used these documents to complete its review of the audit.
18 Paragraph 113 does not require the mental illness audit to be a forensic audit completed by the LAPD
19 Audit Division. As detailed in the Paragraph 112 discussion, and the OIG's review, the audit fully reviewed
20 the issues of concern, identified areas of concern, and developed thoughtful recommendations to remedy
21 identified deficiencies. The Monitor supported the findings and recommendations of the audit.

22 Although not required by the Consent Decree, a follow-up audit is being planned for Fiscal Year
23 2005/2006 to evaluate the effectiveness of the mental illness program as revised.

24 **Training**

25 See Paragraph 112.
26
27
28

Audit

The LAPD Detective Support Division (DSD) completed an evaluation of the CIT program implemented in Harbor, West Los Angeles, Central, and Van Nuys Areas, dated February 10, 2004.

The audit of "Police Contact with Persons Who May Be Mentally Ill," dated on July 9, 2004.

VII. TRAINING

A. FTO Program

Decree ¶114

Decree Language:

“114. The Department shall continue to implement formal eligibility criteria for Field Training Officers (“FTO”). The criteria require, *inter alia*, demonstrated analytical skills, demonstrated interpersonal and communication skills, cultural and community sensitivity, diversity, and commitment to police integrity. The criteria shall be expanded to require a positive evaluation of the officer based upon the officer’s TEAMS II record. Managers shall comply with paragraphs 47(g) or 51, as appropriate, in selecting officers to serve as FTOs.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2001/July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Partial Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Employee Selection Manual (Pages 3-5, 7-9); Department Manual Section 3/763; Police Officer III, Field Training Officer Task List, October 1999, Employee Opportunity and Development Division; Police Officer III Eligibility Requirements, Personnel Group, March 1, 2002; Police Officer III Examination, June 8, 2002; Special Order 25, 2003, “*Field Training Officer Selection and De-selection*,” published July 10, 2003, approved by the Police Commission June 24, 2003.

Activities:

The provisions of Paragraph 114, with the exceptions of the use of TEAMS II and compliance with Paragraph 51, were existing LAPD practices.

Field Training Officers (FTO) positions are a sub-classification of the Police Officer III rank. Police Officer III eligibility criteria conform to the eligibility criteria established in Paragraph 114. Compliance with such eligibility criteria are again evaluated during the FTO selection review process.

The last part of Paragraph 114 was subject to meet and confer. In June 2003, the meet and confer process was completed for FTO selection and deselection, with implementing Special Order No. 25 being

1 issued by LAPD on July 10, 2003. The selection criteria modifications are not retroactive and therefore
2 are not applicable to FTOs selected prior to July 10, 2003.

3 Special Order No. 25 published in July 2003, exceeds the requirements of the Paragraph 114 in
4 some instances. FTO selection criteria was expanded to include review of PSB Form 1.80s, as well as
5 adverse judicial findings. In addition, TEAMS 1.5, designed to provide greater access to TEAMS I
6 information, is making it easier for supervisors to review employee TEAMS I records as appropriate (see
7 Paragraph 39).

8 The LAPD Personnel Division Third Quarterly Progress Report for 2004 revealed that 18 FTO
9 positions were filled between June 27, 2004 and September 18, 2004. The 18 positions that were filled
10 were the result of the Department's reorganization, not as the result of competitive selection processes.
11 During the fourth quarter 2004, nine FTO positions were filled; one was filled as a result of the
12 reorganization within the Police Department; one was filled via an administrative transfer; three were filled
13 when current FTOs requested transfers to new assignments of their choice; and four were filled through the
14 use of competitive selection processes.

15 An Audit of Supervisor and FTO Training was completed on December 6, 2004 by Police Training
16 and Education (PTE). The audit identified 27 PO-3 lateral transfers between May 2, 2004 and August 21,
17 2004. Of those 27 nine were identified as FTO positions via the Divisional FTO Reports. The audit
18 revealed that none of the 9 lateral transfers selected adhered to all of the mandates required by Special
19 Order No. 25 (2003) or the Human Resource Notice, dated August 16, 2004. LAPD is in the process of
20 taking action to remedy deficiencies identified.

21 Training

22 Results of the FTO audit were communicated.

23 Training on the Special Order for the selection of Field Training Officers (FTOs) was held on
24 February 12, 2004.

25 Audits

26 An Audit of Supervisor and FTO Training was completed on December 6, 2004 by Police Training
27 and Education (PTE). The audit found that FTO selection procedures established for FTO transfers were
28 not being followed. LAPD is taking remedial action as appropriate.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Personnel Division Quarterly Reports.

1 **Decree ¶115**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “115. Without limiting any other personnel authority available to the Department,
4 FTOs may be removed during their tenure for acts or behaviors that would disqualify the
5 officer from selection as an FTO.”

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

9 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

10 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 3/763.55, 3/763.60, and 3/763.65; Special Order 25, “*Field*
11 *Training Officer Selection and Deselection*,” published July 10, 2003, approved by the Police
12 Commission June 24, 2003.

13 **Activities:**

14 As discussed in Paragraph 114 above, Special Order No. 25 was issued on July 10, 2003. The
15 management review for potential de-selection established in Paragraph 115 requires consideration of those
16 items listed in Paragraph 51. Due to civil service requirements, employees in the position at the time of the
17 change cannot be de-selected based upon past actions. This criteria will therefore be utilized prospectively.

18 The LAPD has the ability to remove FTOs due to sustained misconduct allegations, as appropriate.

19 Civil Rights Integrity Division completed an inspection of Paragraph 115 on December 30, 2004.
20 The inspection found the Department to be in compliance with the provisions of the Consent Decree.

21 In the Monitor’s 9th Quarterly Report, the Monitor considered all sustained complaints, as opposed
22 to those specified by Paragraph 51(d), overreaching the provisions of the Consent Decree. However, the
23 Police Commission and the Chief of Police reviewed this issue, and although not required by the Consent
24 Decree, review of an officer’s entire complaint history for selection to an FTO was determined to be a best
25 management practice. The Police Commission and Chief of Police have directed the LAPD to revise
26 Special Order No. 25. The revision will direct Commanding Officers to consider an officer’s past
27 complaint history, the severity of all allegations, and the behavioral impact on the officer’s ability to function
28 as an FTO. The revised procedures will be subject to meet and confer.

1 **Training**

2 See Paragraph 114.

3 **Audits**

4 Civil Rights Integrity Division inspections.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 **Decree ¶116**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “116. The LAPD shall continue to implement a plan to ensure that FTOs receive
4 adequate training, including training to be an instructor and training in LAPD policies and
5 procedures, to enable them to carry out their duties. FTOs’ annual personnel performance
6 evaluations shall include their competency in successfully completing and implementing their
7 FTO training. The LAPD shall provide regular and periodic re-training on these topics.”
8

9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001/July 1, 2001

11 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

12 **Policy/Procedure:** FTO Training Manual; LAPD Employee Evaluation Guide; Human Resources Bureau
13 Notice, “*Attendance at Field Training Officer Update School*,” approved by the Commission June 21,
14 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Revised Guidelines For Deployment and Training of*
15 *Probationary Police Officers*,” approved by the Police Commission, June 26, 2001.

16 **Activities:**

17 The LAPD 40 hour Basic Field Training Officer School meets the provisions of Paragraph 116 and
18 was certified by the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). Further, on
19 January 2, 2002, the California Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Practices (POST)
20 determined that the Department Continuing Education Development Program (CEDP) fulfills 16 of the 24
21 State mandated FTO Update hours. The planned FTO Update Course was subsequently revised from a
22 3-day course to the 16-hour CDEP plus an 8-hour FTO update. Four FTO classes per month were for
23 January through May 2004, to process the remaining FTO population that required training. The LAPD
24 Training Group reported compliance with FTO training of Paragraph 116.

25 A CRID Inspection completed May 10, 2004, reviewed the training records of the 600 P-IIIs who
26 functioned as FTOs in Deployment Period 4, 2004. The inspection found that 574 of the 600 (96%) had
27 satisfied both the FTO School requirement and the regular and periodic requirement of Paragraph 116.
28

1 The LAPD has implemented training attendance tracking procedures to assist in identifying
2 employees who need to attend training, as well as to monitor Commands to ensure that training attendance
3 is provided the appropriate level of priority.

4 POST has recently developed new criteria for FTO training and has therefore decertified previously
5 approved FTO training until it has been revised to reflect the new POST criteria. The LAPD has
6 redesigned the FTO course to address POST changes and will be forwarding the revised curriculum to
7 POST in January/February 2005 for review and certification. Accounting for POST review and approval,
8 the revised 40 hour Basic Field Training Officer School, could start as early as April 2005.

9 The POST FTO training recertification process could impact the number of FTOs that can be
10 trained in the next quarter. However, the LAPD will be able to address any "backlog" in FTO training
11 needed to maintain the 2-year year "periodic" training requirement over the course of the next year and a
12 half.

13 The last sentence of Paragraph 116 was identified as a meet and confer item. The meet and confer
14 process has been completed and those provisions of Paragraph 116 are incorporated into Special Orders
15 47 and 51 regarding annual performance evaluations (see Paragraph 54).

16 **Training**

17 Field Training Officer Basic School (40 hrs).

18 Continuing Education Delivery Plan (CEDP).

19 FTO Update School (8 hrs).

20 **Audit**

21 CRID inspections.

22 LAPD Training Group training attendance tracking procedures.

23 The Training Delivery Plan includes an audit component.

B. Training Content

Decree ¶117

Decree Language:

“117. The LAPD shall continue to provide all LAPD recruits, officers, supervisors and managers with regular and periodic training on police integrity. Such training shall include and address, *inter alia*:

- a. the duty to report misconduct and facts relevant to such misconduct;
- b. what constitutes retaliation for reporting misconduct, the prohibition against retaliation for reporting misconduct and the protections available to officers from retaliation;
- c. cultural diversity, which shall include training on interactions with persons of different races, ethnicities, religious groups, sexual orientations, persons of the opposite sex, and persons with disabilities, and also community policing;
- d. the roll of accurately completing written reports in assuring police integrity, and the proper completion of such reports;
- e. Fourth Amendment and other constitutional requirements, and the policy requirements set forth in paragraphs 102- 103, governing police actions in conducting stops, searches, seizures, making arrests and using force; and
- f. examples of ethical dilemmas faced by LAPD officers and, where practicable given the location, type, and duration of the training, interactive exercises for resolving ethical dilemmas shall be utilized.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2001/July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: LAPD Employee Evaluation Guide; Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Revised Guidelines For Deployment and Training of Probationary Police Officers*,” approved by the Police Commission, June 26, 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Department Course Content Revisions*,” approved by the Police Commission July 24, 2001.

Activities:

The Department Training Plan has been revised (through 2005) by the Director of Police Training and Education. The revision was made necessary by modifications to courses, schools mandated by POST, and the addition of courses. The training mandates of Paragraph 117 are incorporated into the seven "core" Department schools: Recruit Training, Field Training Officer School, Basic Detective School, Detective Supervisor School, Watch Commander School, Supervisor Development School, and Command Development School. Paragraph 117 components also exist in the CEDP in-service training modules. The Detective Supervisor School has been consolidated into the Basic Supervisor School. All patrol and detective supervisors will be required to complete this class. The placement of the training elements is detailed in the Department Training Plan Matrix prepared by the Director of Police Training and Education.

In June 2003, RAND Corporation submitted the final report on LAPD training programs as required by Paragraph 133. The Curriculum Design Task Force considered the RAND recommendations during the curricula revision process.

CEDP #7 training, which included integrity issues and ethical decision making components, was completed in January 2004. The Monitor, whose staff attended the training, indicated that the CEDP #7 training is "terrific." The LAPD has a 97% attendance rate for CDEP #7 training.

The curriculum of the following classes includes laws of arrest, ethics and integrity, diversity and community policing.

- Recruit Academy
- Field Training Officer
- Supervisory Development
- Watch Commander
- Command Development

1 Additionally, other curriculum has been revised to integrate components of police integrity; these
2 include:

- 3 • Narcotics 11550 School
- 4 • Pedestrian Stop Lesson Plans
- 5 • Vehicle Stop Lesson Plans
- 6 • Building Search Curriculum
- 7 • Warrant Service Tactics Curriculum
- 8 • Administrative Investigations

9 Enhancements to Standardized Roll Call Training continue and components of Paragraph 117 and
10 other Consent Decree mandates are communicated via the Quarterly Supervisor Training program. During
11 this period, the Quarterly Supervisor Training delivered training on arrest report content/quality, laws of
12 search and seizure, and completion of Performance Evaluations.

13 **Audit**

14 The Training Delivery Plan includes an audit component.

15 LAPD Training Group training attendance tracking procedures.

16 BGC Inspection regarding training raining dated May 26, 2004 found that 96% of officers assigned
17 to GED duties had attended CEDP 7.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶118**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “118. The Department shall train all members of the public scheduled to serve on
4 the Board of Rights in police practices and procedures.”

6 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

7 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

8 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

9 **Policy/Procedure:** Hearing Examiner Training/Training Manual approved by Police Commission July 31,
10 2001

11 **Activities:**

12 Training regarding police practices and procedures was conducted on June 23 and 26, 2003, for
13 public members appointed as hearing examiners to serve on the BOR. New appointees are trained as
14 appropriate. Additional training for Hearing Examiners is provided on an annual basis, as well as on an as
15 needed basis when significant issues arise or new Board members are appointed.

16 Hearing examiners were requested to attend the January 15, 2004, LAPD training regarding
17 administrative investigations and discipline. Of the 48 hearing examiners participating in the Board of Rights
18 process, 36 attended this training. The Police Commission initially planned to provide individual training to
19 the 12 that were unable to attend the January 2004 training. However, after a review of the training by the
20 Independent Monitor and after consultation with the Police Commission Executive Director and the Office
21 of the City Attorney, it was determined that the proposed individual training sessions would be of limited
22 value. As a result, this follow up training was not provided.

23 The Police Commission is developing another training session for hearing examiners that serve as
24 members of Board of Rights Hearings. This training will consist of presentations made by the Police
25 Commission, the LAPD, and the Office of the City Attorney. It is anticipated that this training will be
26 delivered during the summer of 2005.

27 The Board of Police Commissioners made no Hearing Examiner appointments in 2004.

1 **Decree ¶119**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “119. The City may establish a plan to annually provide tuition reimbursement for
4 continuing education for a reasonable number of officers in subjects relevant to this
5 Agreement, including subjects which will promote police integrity and professionalism.
6 Such educational programs shall be attended while officers are off-duty.”

8 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

9 **Due Date:** None

10 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

11 **Policy/Procedure:** Human Resources Bureau Notice, “Tuition Reimbursement Program,” approved by the
12 Police Commission October 9, 2001

13 **Activities:**

14 A tuition reimbursement program for courses related to job responsibilities was implemented July 1,
15 2001. Between July 1 and December 31, 2004, the Department received 323 tuition reimbursement
16 requests, 198 of which were approved. The approved requests amounted to \$122,000 which was
17 expended from the Revolving Training Fund.

18 The Tuition Reimbursement Program is now advertised on the web site maintained by Continuing
19 Education Division.

1 **Decree ¶120**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “120. The LAPD shall establish procedures for supervisors and officers of the
4 LAPD to communicate to the LAPD Training Group any suggestions they may have for
5 improving the standardized training provided to LAPD officers, and to make written
6 referrals to the appropriate LAPD official regarding suggestions about LAPD policies or
7 tactics.”

8
9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

11 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

12 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Manual Section 3/750; Human Resources Bureau (HRB) Notice, “*Training*
13 *Suggestion Program*,” approved by the Police Commission July 10, 2001.

14 **Activities:**

15 Between July 1 and December 31, 2004, Continuing Education Division received six suggestions
16 via the Employee Suggestion Program format, five of which related to training.

17 The Training Suggestion Program will be placed on the web site maintained by Continuing
18 Education Division in the near future and will be included on all Department Course Evaluation Forms.

19 **Audits**

20 CED Quarterly Status Reports

1 C. Supervisor Training

2 **Decree ¶121**

3 **Decree Language:**

4 “121. The LAPD shall provide all officers promoted to supervisory positions, up to
5 and including the rank of Captain, with training to perform the duties and responsibilities of
6 such positions. Such LAPD officers and supervisors shall be provided with such training
7 before they assume their new supervisory positions, except for those officers promoted to
8 the rank of Captain, who shall have at least commenced their Command Development
9 training before they assume their new positions.”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

13 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

14 **Policy/Procedure:** Human Resources Bureau Notice, June 22, 2001, “*Attendance at Basic Supervisor*
15 *School, Watch Commander School and Command Development Program-Revised*,” approved by the
16 Police Commission July 10, 2001; Administrative Order No. 1, “*Training Requirements for Detective*
17 *Supervisors*.”

18 **Activities:**

19 The Department Training Plan has been revised (through 2005) by the Director of Police Training
20 and Education. The revision was made necessary by modifications made to courses, schools by POST,
21 and the addition of courses designed by the LAPD. The training mandates of Paragraph 121 are
22 incorporated into the “core” supervisory Department schools: Detective Supervisor School, Watch
23 Commander School, Supervisor Development School, and Command Development School.

24 LAPD implemented procedures to better ensure promoted employees are trained prior to assuming
25 their new positions. For Detective pay grade advancements, procedures requiring that individuals refrain
26 from performing supervisory duties until they have received training have been implemented. The LAPD
27 has worked with the DOJ to develop an alternative, more appropriate approach to training for Detectives
28

1 who are advanced via the pay grade advancement process. The City anticipates that changes to the
2 Consent Decree in this regard will be submitted to the Court in the near future.

3 An Audit of Supervisor and Field Training Officer Training conducted by Police Training and
4 Education (PTE) reviewed promotions made between May 2, 2004 and August 21, 2004. During the
5 audit period one Captain promotion took place and ten detectives were promoted to Detective II. The
6 audit found that the promoted captain started Command Development Training on January 13, 2003, prior
7 to being promoted. Of the 10 newly promoted Detective IIs, one had previously attended Supervisory
8 School. Seven of the ten attended the first available Supervisory School in September 2004. Two of the
9 10 detectives who were promoted have not attended Supervisory School due to vacation or military leave.
10 The detective who was on vacation has been scheduled to attend the next Supervisory School, which is
11 scheduled to be held in February 2005. The City is therefore in compliance with the provisions of
12 Paragraph 121.

13 Due to the Department's hiring and promotional freeze, there were no Supervisory Schools
14 between February and August 2004. The first such school of 2004 began on September 20, 2004.

15 **Audit**

16 An Audit of Supervisor and Field Training Officer Training conducted by Police Training and
17 Education (PTE) reviewed promotions made between May 2, 2004 and August 21, 2004, and found
18 compliance.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶122**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “122. The LAPD shall provide regular and periodic supervisory training on
4 reviewing the reports addressed in this Agreement, incident control, and ethical decision
5 making.”

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

9 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

10 **Policy/Procedure:** Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Attendance at Basic Supervisor School, Watch*
11 *Commander School and Command Development Program-Revised*,” approved by the Police
12 Commission July 10, 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Department Course Content Revisions*,”
13 approved by the Police Commission July 24, 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Administrative*
14 *Investigation Training Requirements-Revised*” approved by the Police Commission September 18,
15 2001

16 **Activities:**

17 Training regarding reviewing reports, incident control, and ethical decision-making are contained
18 within the curriculum of LAPD’s Watch Commander, Basic Supervisor, and Detective Supervisor Schools
19 (see also Paragraph 117). These schools are, or have been, revised to ensure that all curricula is consistent
20 with Consent Decree mandates.

21 Regular and periodic training on the requirements of Paragraph 122 are delivered via the CEDP
22 Modules and the Quarterly Supervisor Training that has been in place since the 4th Quarter 2003. Training
23 related to arrest and detention issues was delivered in the Quarterly Supervisor Training sessions. CEDP
24 7.5 which was conducted between May and June 2004 addressed administrative investigation protocols
25 (see Paragraph 123). The CEDP Modules will continue in 2005.

26 Also see Paragraph 117 training.

27 **Audit**

28 Continuing Education Division quarterly reviews of training.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

See also Paragraph 117.

1 **Decree ¶123**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “123. The LAPD shall ensure that any supervisor who performs, or is expected to
4 perform administrative investigations, including chain of command investigations of uses of
5 force and complaints, receives training on conducting such investigations.”

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

9 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

10 **Policy/Procedure:** Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Attendance at Basic Supervisor School, Watch*
11 *Commander School and Command Development Program-Revised*,” approved by the Police
12 Commission July 10, 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Department Course Content Revisions*,”
13 approved by the Police Commission July 24, 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice, “*Administrative*
14 *Investigation Training Requirements-Revised*,” approved by the Police Commission September 18,
15 2001.

16 **Activities:**

17 Chain of command personnel receive training on administrative investigations from Department
18 Supervisor schools and through the Continuing Education Delivery Plan (CEDP). Training regarding
19 administrative investigations (also see Paragraphs 55, 80, 81, and 100) are contained within the curriculum
20 of LAPD’s Watch Commander, Basic Supervisor, and Detective Supervisor Schools. These schools are
21 being, or have been, revised to ensure that the required administrative investigation procedures are
22 addressed in the training. Periodic training on these topics will be accomplished through quarterly
23 supervisor meetings held throughout the Department. Continuing Education Division will be responsible for
24 the development of lesson plans and will establish tracking systems to account for the delivery of training to
25 employees.

26 Supervisors transferred into Professional Standards Bureau either had prior administrative
27 investigation training or attended the three-day PSB school. PSB continues to conduct quarterly training for
28 all personnel assigned to the Internal Affairs Group.

1 The annual Force Investigation Division (FID) training session took place on December 3, 2004.
2 Force Investigation Division investigators received a four hour block of instruction from Professional
3 Standards Bureau on personnel complaint investigation protocols, and a 4 hour block of instruction from
4 FID personnel on Use of Force investigations. Issues related to the CIID/FID transition were also
5 addressed at this training session. In addition, although not required by the Consent Decree, Homicide
6 School is required for FID investigators.

7 The Basic Supervisory course has been revised to incorporate Detectives II and III. The new
8 course commenced February 2003.

9 Training regarding investigative procedures is provided in the curriculum for Watch Commander
10 School, Detective Supervisor School, and Basic Supervisor School. The curriculum has been enhanced to
11 further highlight these investigative procedures consistent with the Consent Decree (also see Paragraphs 55,
12 100, and 123).

13 On January 15, 2004, LAPD provided chain-of-command administrative investigation training.

14 Chain of Command personnel receive training on administrative investigations from Department
15 Supervisor schools and through the Continuing Education Delivery Plan (CEDP) Modules, which are
16 conducted quarterly. CEDP 7.5 provided training to 2,290 Department supervisors and managers on the
17 revised non-categorical use of force investigative procedures and administrative investigations between May
18 and June 2004.

19 **Audit**

20 The Training Delivery Plan includes an audit component.

21 LAPD Training Group training attendance tracking procedures.

22 PSB and CIID monitoring.
23
24
25
26
27
28

VII. INTEGRITY AUDITS

Decree ¶124

Decree Language:

“124. By June 1, 2001, and prior to the beginning of each fiscal year thereafter, the Chief of Police shall submit to the Police Commission, with a copy to the Inspector General, a listing of all scheduled audits of the LAPD to be conducted by the LAPD in the upcoming fiscal year, other than sting audits (the “Annual Audit Plan”). The Annual Audit Plan shall include all specified audits required to be conducted by the LAPD, and any other audits required by this Agreement, including the audits required by Paragraphs 111,113,133 and 134. The Police Commission shall review this Annual Audit Plan, and following consultation with the Chief of Police, shall make appropriate modifications, and approve it. The Chief of Police shall report to the Commission quarterly, with a copy to the Inspector General, on the status of audits listed in the Annual Audit Plan, including any significant results of such audits conducted by the LAPD (“Quarterly Audit Report”). The Department shall create and continue to have an audit unit within the office of the Chief of Police (the “Audit Unit”) with centralized responsibility for developing the Annual Audit Plan; coordinating and scheduling audits contemplated by the annual Audit Plan and ensuring timely completion of audits, and conducting audits as directed by the Chief of Police. The Audit Unit shall be established effective July 1, 2001, in connection with the adoption of the City’s 2001-2002 Budget, with positions to be filled as quickly as reasonably possible in accordance with applicable civil service provisions. Audits contemplated by the annual Audit Plan may be conducted by the Audit Unit or by other LAPD units, as appropriate, provided, however, that the Audit Unit shall take over responsibility for conducting those audits contemplated by Paragraphs 128 and 129 once that Unit is established. The Audit Unit shall serve as a resource to other LAPD units in the conduct of audits and shall also periodically assess the quality of audits performed by other LAPD units. In the event the LAPD desires to amend the Annual Audit Plan, it may do so in the Quarterly Audit Report; provided, however, that the Annual Audit Plan shall include the specified audits to be conducted by the LAPD. Each audit conducted by the Department shall be documented in a report that provides the audit’s methodology, data sources, analysis of the data and conclusions.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 1, 2001/July 1, 2001/annually thereafter with quarterly reports

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Special Order 16, "*Audit Division Established*," approved by Police Commission July 31, 2001; FY 01-02 Audit Plan, adopted by the Police Commission June 5, 2002; FY 02-03 Audit Plan adopted by the Police Commission on July 16, 2002; FY 03-04 Annual Audit Plan approved by the Police Commission May 23, 2003; FY 04-05 Annual Audit Plan approved by the Police Commission on July 13, 2004; FY 04-05 Annual Audit Plan adopted by the Police Commission on July 13, 2004. A revised Annual Audit Plan for FY 2004/05 was submitted to the Police Commission on September 17, 2004 and approved by the Board on October 5, 2004; OIG review and Police Commission action on audit related issues.

Activities:

The Annual Audit Plan for FY 2004/05 was forwarded to the Police Commission on June 15, 2004, and approved by the Board on July 13, 2004. A revised Annual Audit Plan for FY 2004/05 was submitted to the Police Commission on September 17, 2004 and approved by the Board on October 5, 2004.

A Quarterly Audit Plan report was submitted to the Police Commission and approved by the Board on November 9, 2004.

The following Audits were completed as per the schedule in the Annual Audit Plan and are of high quality:

- Complaint Forms Investigation
- Supervisor and FTO Training
- Documentation of Community Outreach

The Audit of Warrant Applications was not completed prior to December 31, 2004, and is pending. The delay was due to a revision in sampling methodology.

Audit Division is on track to complete all Consent Decree mandated audits in FY 2004/2005.

Staffing

1 Audit Division is authorized for a total of 43 personnel. Thirty-five of those positions are currently
2 filled, 6 positions are vacant, and 2 positions are on loan to other commands.

3 The process of replacing vacant positions in Audit Division with Police Performance Auditors
4 (PPA) continues. Two vacant PPA II positions are in the process of being filled. Six candidates were
5 interviewed on December 2 and 3, 2004. Two individuals were selected and will begin their assignments at
6 Audit Division on January 31, and February 7, 2005, respectively.

7 **Certifications:**

8 Two Audit Division personnel have attained the Certified Fraud Examiner (CFE) certification. Four
9 Audit Division personnel have attained the Certified Government Auditing Professional (CGAP)
10 certification.

11 **Training**

12 Between July 13 and 15, 2004, Audit Division taught the Basic Law Enforcement Auditor
13 Instructors Final Workshop to LAPD employees.

14 Between September 15 and 17, 2004, Audit Division taught the Basic Law Enforcement
15 Performance Auditor Course. The LAPD employees in attendance received credit for 24 hours of
16 instruction.

17 Audit Division provides training, both on auditing and on audit findings, on a continual basis as
18 needed.

19 During Fiscal Year 2002/2003, Audit Division provided audit related training to 421 Department
20 personnel.

21 In December 2002, four Audit Division employees completed the *Tools and Techniques for the*
22 *Beginning Auditor* course conducted by the Institute of Internal Auditors. Funding for similar such training
23 was provided in the FY 03-04 and FY 04-05 budgets.

24 In December 2002, the Audit Division commanding officer and 3 additional personnel attended a
25 three-day seminar entitled *Managing the Internal Audit Department*, presented by the MIS Training
26 Institute.

27 **Audit**

28 OIG and Police Commission review of audits.

1 **Decree ¶125**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “125. Prior to July 1, 2001, the LAPD shall conduct the following audits:

4 a. a stratified random sample of warrant applications and affidavits used to
5 support warrant applications, consistent with paragraph 128;

6 b. a stratified random sample of arrest, booking, and charging reports;
7 consistent with paragraph 128;

8 c. a stratified random sample of confidential informant control packages,
9 consistent with paragraph 128; and

10 d. the work product of all LAPD units covered by paragraph 106 consistent
11 with paragraph 131.”

12 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

13
14 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

15 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

16 **Policy/Procedure:** Special Order 16, “*Audit Division Established*,” approved by Police Commission
17 July 31, 2001.

18 **Activities:**

19 A search warrant application audit (Paragraph 125 (a)) was completed on June 21, 2001, and
20 submitted to the Police Commission on June 29, 2001. The Inspector General reported to the Police
21 Commission regarding review of the audit on August 2, 2001 and October 26, 2001. The Commission
22 approved the audit on November 13, 2001.

23 An audit of arrest and booking reports (Paragraph 125(b)) was completed on June 14, 2001, and
24 submitted to the Police Commission on June 29, 2001. The Inspector General reported to the Police
25 Commission regarding review of the audit on August 2, 2001 and October 26, 2001. The Commission
26 approved the audit on November 13, 2001.

27 An audit of confidential informant packages (Paragraph 125(c)) was completed on June 21, 2001,
28 and submitted to the Police Commission on June 29, 2001. The Inspector General reported to the Police

1 Commission regarding review of the audit on August 2, 2001 and October 26, 2001. The Commission
2 approved the audit on November 13, 2001.

3 Consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 131, an audit of Special Enforcement Units
4 (Paragraph 125(d)) was completed on June 22, 2001, and submitted to the Police Commission on June
5 29, 2001. The Inspector General reported to the Police Commission regarding review of the audit on
6 August 2, 2001 and October 26, 2001. The Commission approved the audit on November 13, 2001.

7 Regular and periodic audits of the various activities covered by Paragraph 125 will be undertaken
8 pursuant to Paragraphs 128 and 131.

1 **Decree ¶126**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 "126. By November 1, 2001, the LAPD shall conduct an audit of a stratified
4 random sample of all use of force reports consistent with paragraph 128."

6 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

7 **Due Date:** November 1, 2001

8 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

9 **Policy/Procedure:** Special Order 16, "*Audit Division Established*," approved by Police Commission
10 July 31, 2001.

11 **Activities:**

12 An audit of non-categorical use office investigations was completed on October 29, 2001, and
13 submitted to the Commission on October 29, 2001. The Inspector General reported to the Police
14 Commission regarding review of the audit on December 20, 2001. The Commission approved the audit on
15 January 8, 2002.

16 Regular and periodic audits of the various activities covered by Paragraph 126 will be undertaken
17 pursuant to Paragraphs 129 and 131.

B. Audits by the LAPD

Decree ¶127

Decree Language:

“127. Sting audits shall not be reported in the Quarterly Audit Report, rather the results of all sting audits shall be reported to the Police Commission and the Inspector General by the Chief of Police within two weeks of the Chief’s receipt of each sting audit report.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Special Order 22, “*Ethics Enforcement Section-Established*,” approved by the Commission September 18, 2001.

Activities:

Quarterly Integrity Audit reports are approved by the Chief of Police and forwarded to the Police Commission pursuant to Paragraph 127. Reports have been forwarded to the Police Commission within the two week time frame established in Paragraph 127.

The Ethics Enforcement Section Report for the 2nd Quarter 2004 was submitted to the Police Commission on August 10, 2004. The report was returned for formatting revisions after the City Attorney expressed concerns regarding confidentiality of certain aspects. Meetings with the City Attorney took place over several weeks, and the 2nd Quarter Report was submitted to the Chief of Police on December 8, 2004 along with the report for the 3rd Quarter 2004. Both reports were forwarded to the Police Commission on December 13, 2004 and copies were provided to the Independent Monitor on December 16, 2004.

The Board reviewed and approved the 2nd Quarter 2004 Report at the January 11, 2005 meeting of the Police Commission. Approval of the 3rd Quarter report is pending.

See also Paragraph 97.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Audit

OIG and Police Commission review Quarterly Reports.

1 **Decree ¶128**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “128. LAPD shall conduct regular, periodic audits of stratified random samples of
4 1) warrant applications and affidavits used to support warrant applications; 2) arrest,
5 booking, and charging reports; 3) use of force reports; 4) all motor vehicle stops and
6 pedestrian stops that are required to be documented in the manner specified in paragraphs
7 104 and 105; and 5) confidential informant control packages. The review of these
8 documents shall entail, at a minimum, a review for completeness of the information
9 contained and an authenticity review to include an examination for “canned” language,
10 inconsistent information, lack of articulation of the legal basis for the applicable action or
11 other indicia that the information is the document is not authentic or correct. The review
12 shall also assess the information in the documents to determine whether the underlying
13 action was appropriate, legal, and in conformance with LAPD procedures. To the extent
14 possible from a review of such samples, the audit shall also evaluate the supervisory
15 oversight of the applicable incident and any post-incident review.”

16
17 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

18 **Due Date :** Per Audit Plan (see Paragraph 124)

19 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

20 **Policy/Procedure:** FY 02-03 Annual Audit Plan adopted by the Police Commission on July 16, 2002; FY
21 2003/2004 Annual Audit Plan adopted by the Police Commission May 27, 2003; FY 03-04 Annual Audit
22 Plan approved by the Police Commission May 23, 2003; FY 04-05 Annual Audit Plan approved by the
23 Police Commission on July 13, 2004; FY 04-05 Annual Audit Plan adopted by the Police Commission on
24 July 13, 2004. A revised Annual Audit Plan for FY 2004/05 was submitted to the Police Commission on
25 September 17, 2004 and approved by the Board on October 5, 2004; OIG review and Police
26 Commission action on the Paragraph 128 audits.

1 **Activities:**

2 Audit Division is largely on schedule with the FY 2004/2005 Audit Plan (See Paragraph 124)
3 developed for Consent Decree related audits.

4 The audit of Search Warrant Applications completed on March 30, 2004 was reviewed by the
5 Inspector General and approved by the Police Commission on September 14, 2004.

6 The audit of Search Warrant Applications for Fiscal Year 2004/2005 is currently under
7 Department review, with sampling methodology issues being addressed.

8 Audit Division completed an Arrest Booking and Charging Reports Audit on October 8, 2004.
9 Inspector General review of the audit is pending.

10 Audit Division completed a Categorical Use of Force Interim Report on May 27, 2004. The
11 Inspector General review of that audit was completed on December 21, 2004 and approved by the Police
12 Commission on January 4, 2004.

13 An audit of Non-categorical Use of Force Investigations is scheduled to be conducted during the
14 4th Quarter FY 2004/2005.

15 Audits of Categorical Use of Force Investigations will be conducted in the 3rd and 4th Quarters FY
16 2004/2005.

17 Audit Division completed an audit of Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stop Data on June 30, 2004.
18 The Inspector General Review is in progress.

19 Audit Division completed an audit of Confidential Informant Files on June 28, 2004. The Inspector
20 General Review was completed on November 23, 2004 and approved by the Police Commission on
21 December 7, 2004.

22 **Audit**

23 OIG and Police Commission review.
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶129**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 129. The LAPD shall conduct regular, periodic audits of random samples of (i) all
4 Categorical Use of Force investigations; (ii) all Non-Categorical Use of Force
5 investigations; and (iii) all Complaint Form 1.28 investigations. These audits shall assess:

- 6 a. the timeliness of completing the investigations, and satisfying the
7 requirements of paragraphs 67, 69 and 87 where applicable;
8 b. the completeness of the investigation file, including whether the file contains
9 all appropriate evidence and documentation, or, if evidence is missing, as explanation of
10 why the evidence is missing;
11 c. a comparison of the officer, complainant, and witness statements with the
12 investigator's summaries thereof where applicable;
13 d. the adequacy of the investigation, including the application of the standards
14 set forth in paragraphs 80-86; and
15 e. the appropriateness of IAG's determinations under paragraph 79."

17 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

18 **Due Date:** Per Audit Plan (see Paragraph 124)

19 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

20 **Policy/Procedure:** See Paragraph 124 and 128.

21 **Activities:**

22 Audit Division is largely on schedule with the FY 2004/2005 Audit Plan (See Paragraph 124)
23 developed for Consent Decree related audits. The provisions of Paragraph 129 are addressed in the audits
24 conducted pursuant to Paragraph 128. See Paragraph 128.

1 **Decree ¶130**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “130. The LAPD shall annually report to the Commission, with a copy to the
4 Inspector General, the type of complaint allegations it receives and the disposition (including
5 sustained rate) and discipline or lack of discipline resulting from each type of allegation.
6 This report shall include both the allegations received and any collateral misconduct
7 discovered during the investigation. This report shall list the above information for each
8 type of allegation as well as summarize aggregate information by geographic division
9 (department, bureau, area, and district), officer rank and type of assignment.”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Date:** February 15, 2003/annually thereafter

13 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

14 **Policy/Procedure:** February 27, 2001, Commission Motion regarding Creation and Review of Disciplinary
15 Reports and Disciplinary Investigations.

16 **Activities:**

17 The LAPD submitted the Annual Discipline Report for the year 2003 to the Police Commission on
18 February 17, 2004. The Inspector General did not conduct a review of the 2003 Annual Discipline Re port,
19 as the report is a compilation of the quarterly discipline reports. The Annual Discipline Report was acted
20 on by the Police Commission on March 2, 2004.

21 The Annual Discipline Report for the year 2004 is scheduled to be submitted to the Police
22 Commission by February 15, 2005.

23 **Audit**

24 Police Commission review.
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶131**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “131. The LAPD shall conduct regular periodic audits of the work product of all
4 LAPD units covered by paragraph 106. These audits shall be conducted by OHB
5 Detective Support Division. Each such audit shall include:

- 6 a. auditing a random sample of the work of the unit as a whole and further
7 auditing the work of any individual officers whose work product the auditor has observed
8 contains indicia of untruthfulness, other forms of misconduct, or otherwise merits further
9 review;
- 10 b. assessing compliance with the selection criteria set forth in paragraphs 106
11 and 107;
- 12 c. an audit of the type set forth in paragraph 128;
- 13 d. auditing the use of confidential informants by such units to assess
14 compliance with paragraph 108; .
- 15 e. auditing the roles and conduct of supervisors of these units;
- 16 f. reviewing the incidents requiring supervisory review pursuant to paragraphs
17 62, 64, 68, 70 and 71, assessing the supervisor’s response, and examining the relationships
18 of particular officers working together or under particular supervisors in such incidents to
19 determine whether additional investigation is needed to identify at-risk practices; and
- 20 g. the audit shall draw conclusions regarding the adherence of the unit to the
21 law, LAPD policies and procedures, and this Agreement, and shall recommend a course of
22 action to correct any deficiencies found.”
- 23
24
25
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: Per Audit Plan (see Paragraph 124)

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure FY 02-03 Annual Audit Plan adopted by the Police Commission on July 16, 2002; FY 2003/2004 Annual Audit Plan adopted by the Police Commission May 27, 2003; FY 03-04 Annual Audit Plan approved by the Police Commission May 23, 2003; FY 04-05 Annual Audit Plan approved by the Police Commission on July 13, 2004; FY 04-05 Annual Audit Plan adopted by the Police Commission on July 13, 2004. A revised Annual Audit Plan for FY 2004/05 was submitted to the Police Commission on September 17, 2004 and approved by the Board on October 5, 2004; OIG review and Police Commission action on the Paragraph 128 audits.

Activities:

Paragraph 131 requires GED audits to be completed by Detective Support Division (DSD). The LAPD assigned these audits to Audit Division due to the auditing capabilities and the independence of Audit Division. The City, Monitor, and DOJ support this move. Consent Decree modifications to formally change auditing responsibilities pursuant to Paragraph 131 are anticipated to be submitted to the Court in the near future.

Many of the requirements of Paragraph 131 will be accomplished through the completion of the Department-wide audits, pursuant to Paragraph 128. In doing so, a separate gang unit strata and analysis will be included in the audit reports.

The Arrest, Booking and Charging Reports Audit completed on October 8, 2004, included a separate gang strata and review. A sampling of 116 gang unit arrest reports and associated documentation were reviewed for completeness, authenticity, underlying actions and supervisory oversight.

The Audit of Complaint Form Investigations did not include a separate gang unit strata. The Complaint Investigation Audit is a Department-wide audit required by Paragraph 129.

The following GED Specific Audits were submitted in June 2004:

- GED Non-Categorical Use of Force (§128.3, 131a and 131e)
- GED Work Product (§131a and 131e)
- GED Warrant Applications (§131a, 131f and 128.3)
- GED Selection Criteria (131b)
- GED Training (131a)

GED specific audits will be completed during the 4th Quarter FY 2004/2005.

Audit

Police Commission and OIG review.

1 **Decree ¶132**

2 | **Decree Language:**

3 “132. The LAPD shall require regular and periodic financial disclosures by all
4 LAPD officers and other LAPD employees who routinely handle valuable contraband or
5 cash. The LAPD shall periodically audit a random sample of such disclosures to ensure
6 their accuracy. When necessary, the LAPD shall require the necessary waivers from such
7 officers.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

10 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

11 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance/ Paragraphs 8 and 184

12 **Policy/Procedure:** Pending Meet and Confer

13 **Activities:**

Paragraph 132 has been identified as a meet and confer item. The meet and confer process for this Paragraph affects both sworn and civilian bargaining units. See also Paragraph 8.

1 **Decree ¶133**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “133. Within 18 months of the effective date of this Agreement, the Department
4 shall audit police officer and supervisory officer training, using independent consultants who
5 have substantial experience in the area of police training. The audit shall assess: ways in
6 which LAPD training could be improved (i) to reduce incidents of excessive use of force,
7 false arrests, and illegal searches and seizures and (ii) by making greater use of
8 community-oriented-policing training models that take into account factors including
9 paragraph 117(c).”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Date:** December 15, 2002

13 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

14 **Policy/Procedure:** RAND Contract Execution, July 3, 2002; “*Training the 21st Century Police Officer*,”
15 2003.

16 **Activities:**

17 A Request for Proposal (RFP) for professional services to review LAPD training programs was
18 released on December 18, 2001. A pre-bid conference was held on January 10, 2002. Proposals were
19 due January 29, 2002. The City received two proposals. Interviews were held February 8, 2002. In
20 February, the Police Commission approved the selection of RAND to perform the training audit. In late
21 February, the City Council and Mayor authorized increased funding for the RAND contract, for a total
22 amount not to exceed \$400,000.

23 Subsequent to selection, RAND modified the project manager for the project. This required
24 additional review by the City. During contract negotiations, it became apparent that due to LAPD training
25 course schedules and the time needed to complete the study, the study would not be completed by the
26 Paragraph 133, December 15, 2002, implementation date.

27 On May 28, 2002, the City Council authorized execution of a contract with RAND, with the most
28 expeditious implementation schedule, while ensuring a quality product, which extended beyond the

1 December 15, 2002 Consent Decree implementation date of Paragraph 133. Also, on May 28, 2002,
2 Police Commissioners authorized the execution of the RAND contract, with an implementation schedule
3 that extended beyond the Paragraph 133 due date. The DOJ and Independent Monitor were notified of
4 the impact to the Paragraph 133 compliance schedules.

5 The RAND contract was executed on July 3, 2002, and work on the project was initiated. The
6 contract included the submittal of a preliminary findings report by December 10, 2002, however, the draft
7 report was not submitted until March 31, 2003.

8 The RAND draft report was submitted to the City on March 31, 2003, and RAND staff provided
9 a verbal report to the City Consent Decree Work Group at that time as well. The City reply to the draft
10 report was submitted to RAND on May 1, 2003.

11 RAND submitted the camera-ready report to the City on July 1, 2003. The report was finalized in
12 July 2003 and published. The title of the report is "*Training the 21st Century Police Officer.*" LAPD
13 posted the report on the LAPD web site.

14 The LAPD Curriculum Design Task Force has and will continue to consider the recommendations
15 of RAND during its curricula revision processes and the on-going development of a Training Master Plan.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶134**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “134. Eighteen months after the effective date of this Agreement, the Department
4 shall complete a review and audit of all uses of force resulting in skeletal fractures known to
5 the LAPD. The audit shall review and evaluate: 1) the frequency of occurrence of skeletal
6 fractures, by officers and groups of officers, and the types of force that produced the
7 fractures; 2) medical care provided to persons who sustain such a fracture where the
8 medical care is provided while the person is in the custody of the Department, or provided
9 at another time and the Department knows of the fracture; 3) the quality, thoroughness,
10 disposition, and timeliness of the chain of command investigation and review of uses of
11 force resulting in fractures, pursuant to paragraph 68; and 4) frequency and outcome of
12 complaints where the complainant allegedly received such a fracture. Such audit shall
13 analyze the circumstances giving rise to the use of force and resulting fracture, and the
14 Department’s response to such injuries. The audit shall recommend potential reforms to
15 Department policies and procedures with the goal of minimizing and promptly treating such
16 fractures, including the feasibility and desirability of including uses of force resulting in
17 fractures within the definition of a Categorical Use of Force, as appropriate.”

18
19 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

20 **Due Date:** December 15, 2002

21 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

22 **Policy/Procedure:** FY 02-03 Annual Audit Plan, adopted by the Police Commission on July 9, 2002.

23 **Activities:**

24 During the development of the audit work plan for the Skeletal Fracture Audit, the City provided
25 the DOJ with a copy of the audit methodology for review and comment. The DOJ reviewed the
26 methodology for the skeletal fracture audit and subsequently provided comments to the City. Although
27 many items commented on by the DOJ are not required by the Consent Decree, the City agreed to
28 incorporate several of their concerns/suggestions. As these items were not in the original audit

1 methodology, time was required to revise the methodology and evaluate the new areas. The audit was
2 completed on January 13, 2003, 28 days beyond the Consent Decree due date. The non-categorical use
3 of force audit, completed December 30, 2003, was intended to continue the review of skeletal fractures.
4 However, no skeletal fractures occurred within the audit sample. The LAPD will review all skeletal fracture
5 incidents in all future non-categorical use of force audits. The next audit of this type is scheduled for the 4th
6 Quarter FY 2004/2005.

7 **Audit**

8 OIG and Police Commission review.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 C. Inspector General Audits

2 Decree ¶135

3 Decree Language:

4 “135. The Inspector General shall be provided with copies of all reports of
5 specified audits prepared by the LAPD and audits prepared in compliance with paragraphs
6 111, 113, 125, 126, 133 and 134 within one week of the completion thereof and with
7 copies of all sting audits as required by paragraph 127. The Inspector General shall
8 evaluate all such audits to assess their quality, completeness and findings. Upon request
9 from the Inspector General, the LAPD shall forward any other LAPD audit report
10 requested to the Inspector General within one week of such request, and the Inspector
11 General, at his or her discretion where he or she deems appropriate, or upon direction from
12 the Commission, may evaluate these audits. The Inspector General shall deliver its
13 evaluations in writing to the Police Commission.”

14 PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

15
16 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

17 **Current Compliance Status :** Partial Compliance

18 **Policy/Procedure:** “*Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation Plan,*”
19 approved by the Police Commission June 29, 2001; “*Revised Office of the Inspector General Consent*
20 *Decree Implementation Plan,*” approved by the Commission on February 5, 2002.

21 **Activities:**

22 The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) has reviewed, or is in the process of reviewing, LAPD
23 audits prepared in compliance with Paragraphs 128, 129, and 131 and has provided written evaluations of
24 some of these audits to the Police Commission. See Paragraph 128. All LAPD audit reports were
25 submitted to the OIG within substantially one-week of completion of the audit, consistent with the
26 requirements of Paragraph 135. Some documentation issues regarding tracking of the dates of OIG receipt
27 of audits were recently identified and have been remedied.

1 A number of audits were released by Audit Division pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraphs 128,
2 129 and 131 in July and October 2004. Due to staffing resources, the OIG was unable to complete a
3 detailed review of the audits within a three month period. However an executive summary of each audit
4 reviewed was submitted to the Board of Police Commissioners providing them with information necessary
5 to facilitate management decisions and to further enhance the public accountability of the LAPD.

6 As previously reported, the OIG is diligently working to remedy the Inspector General's auditing
7 deficiencies by hiring personnel with a specialized skill set to perform the auditing function. An office
8 reorganization has commenced. Management Analyst II positions have been reallocated to Special
9 Investigator II and Police Performance Auditor positions. These new positions will include personnel with
10 appropriate auditing, legal, public policy and law enforcement backgrounds to assist the OIG in achieving
11 compliance with this provision. The transfer of a number of Management Analysts has been delayed until
12 March 6, 2005, to allow the OIG the opportunity to fill the new positions and facilitate a smooth transition.
13 Interviews of Special Investigator II applicants are in progress, and the job specifications for the Police
14 Performance Auditor positions are being modified.

15 In addition, the FY 04-05 budget includes an additional Assistant Inspector General position. With
16 three Assistant Inspectors General, one position will now be focused on audits (previously one Assistant
17 Inspector General had oversight over both use of force issues/investigations and audits). These staffing
18 changes are anticipated to ensure the OIG's ability to timely review audits and comply with the Office's
19 other responsibilities.

20 The OIG review of the LAPD audits found that the overall quality, completeness and findings were
21 sufficient. The audit deficiencies identified by the OIG, particularly as it relates to the work product of gang
22 unit officers were appropriately addressed by the LAPD.

23 The Consent Decree Work Group and Public Safety Committee continue to monitor OIG staffing
24 issues. See also Paragraph 11.

25 **Training**

26 Training regarding auditing procedures.

27 **Audit**

28 Police Commission review.

1 **Decree ¶136**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “136. The Inspector General shall continue to review all Categorical Use of Force
4 investigations. The Inspector General also shall conduct a regular, periodic audit and
5 review of a stratified random sample of: (i) all Non-Categorical Uses of Force; and (ii)
6 Complaint Form 1.28 investigations. Both of these types of reviews shall assess the quality,
7 completeness, and findings of the investigations and shall include determinations of whether
8 the investigations were completed in a timely manner, summarized and transcribed
9 statements accurately match the recorded statements, all available evidence was collected
10 and analyzed, and the investigation was properly adjudicated. The Inspector General shall
11 promptly report its findings from these reviews in writing to the Police Commission.”

12
13 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

14 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

15 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

16 **Policy/Procedure:** City Charter Section 573; Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners

17 Policies and Authority Relative to the Inspector General, approved by the Commission November 21,
18 2000; Special Order No. 5, “*Policies and Authority Relative to the Inspector General*,” approved by
19 the Police Commission February 9, 2001; “*Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree*
20 *Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Police Commission June 29, 2001; “*Revised Office of the*
21 *Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Commission on February
22 5, 2002; Use of Force Review Section Staff Report on Categorical Use of Force Reports, June 15, 2001,
23 approved by the Police Commission February 26, 2002.

24 **Activities:**

25 It is the current policy and practice of the Commission that the Inspector General and the
26 Commission review all Categorical Uses of Force consistent with requirements of Paragraph 136 (see also
27 Paragraph 67 and 142). From July 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004, 52 cases were submitted to the OIG
28

1 and Police Commission for review. All but five were acted upon by the Police Commission within the past
2 six month period.

3 The OIG completed an audit of Complaint Form 1.28 Investigations and Non-Categorical Use of
4 Force Investigations during the 3rd and 4th quarters FY 2003/2004. The OIG audits contained significant
5 findings. The OIG postponed an audit of Non-Categorical Use of Force Investigations until the 4th Quarter
6 FY 2004/2005, in order to allow the LAPD sufficient time to implement the new procedures in Special
7 Order 13, 2004. An audit of Complaint Investigations is scheduled for completion during the 4th Quarter
8 FY 2004/2005. Therefore, the OIG is on track for compliance with the non-categorical use of force and
9 complaint audit provisions of Paragraph 136 for FY 2004/2005.

10 The OIG Categorical Use of Force reviews were significantly modified in 2004. The OIG now
11 utilizes a review matrix. The matrix ensures that every case is subject to a systematic, comprehensive
12 review, and that a broad range of data is collected in every case (see Paragraph 142).

13 As previously reported, the OIG is diligently working to remedy the Inspector General's auditing
14 deficiencies by hiring personnel with a specialized skill set to perform the auditing function. An office
15 reorganization has commenced. Management Analyst II positions have been reallocated to Special
16 Investigator II and Police Performance Auditor positions. These new positions will include personnel with
17 appropriate auditing, legal, public policy and law enforcement backgrounds to assist the OIG in achieving
18 compliance with this provision. The transfer of a number of Management Analysts has been delayed until
19 March 6, 2005 to allow the OIG the opportunity to fill the new positions and facilitate a smooth transition.
20 Interviews of Special Investigator II applicants are in progress, and the job specifications for the Police
21 Performance Auditor positions are being modified.

22 In addition, the FY 04-05 budget includes an additional Assistant Inspector General position. With
23 three Assistant Inspector Generals, one position will now be focused on audits (previously one Assistant
24 Inspector General had oversight over both use of force issues/investigations and audits). These staffing
25 changes are anticipated to ensure the OIG's ability to timely review audits and comply with the Office's
26 other responsibilities.

27 The Consent Decree Work Group and Public Safety Committee continue to monitor OIG staffing
28 issues. See also Paragraph 11.

1 Training

2 Training regarding auditing procedures.

3 Audit

4 Police Commission review.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 **Decree ¶137**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “ 137. The Inspector General, between 6- 12 months following implementation of
4 TEAMS II and on a regular basis thereafter, shall audit the quality and timeliness of the
5 LAPD’s use of TEAMS II to perform the tasks identified in the protocol described in
6 paragraph 47 above.”

7
8 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

9 **Due Date:** Post TEAMS II

10 **Current Compliance Status :** Pending

11 **Policy/Procedure:** Pending

12 **Activities:**

13 Protocols for use of TEAMS II are being developed (see Paragraphs 39 and 46).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶138**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “138. The Inspector General shall periodically use TEAMS II to conduct audits of
4 the LAPD and to review LAPD unit specific and officer specific audits conducted by the
5 LAPD. Such audits and reviews shall include procedures that:

6 a. examine and identify officers demonstrating at-risk behavior as determined
7 by their history of (i) administrative investigations, (ii) misconduct complaints, (iii) discipline,
8 (iv) uses of lethal and non-lethal force, (v) criminal or civil charges or lawsuits, (vi) searches
9 and seizures, (vii) racial bias, (viii) improper arrests or (ix) any other matter requested by
10 the Police Commission or, subject to Charter section 573, any other improper conduct or
11 at-risk behavior the Inspector General has reason to believe exists;

12 b. examine and identify at-risk practices or procedures as determined by
13 trends within a unit or between and among units using, at a minimum, the criteria in
14 subsection (a) above.”

15
16 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

17 **Due Date:** Post TEAMS II

18 **Current Compliance Status :** Pending

19 **Policy/Procedure:** Pending

20 **Activities:**

21 Protocols for use of TEAMS II are being developed (see Paragraphs 39 and 46).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶139**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “139. The Inspector General may receive complaints from LAPD employees
4 alleging retaliation for reporting possible misconduct or at-risk behavior. The Inspector
5 General shall record and track the allegations in such complaints. If the Inspector General
6 determines that such complains indicate possible retaliation in the Police Department’s
7 handling of complaints, the Inspector General shall conduct an investigation and forward its
8 findings to the Police Commission. The Police Commission shall work with the Inspector
9 General to develop and implement retaliation complaint investigation protocols that will
10 protect, to the maximum extent permitted by law, the confidentiality of the identity of the
11 person reporting retaliation to the Inspector General.

12
13 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

14 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

15 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

16 **Policy/Procedure:** City Charter Section 573; Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners
17 Policies and Authority Relative to the Inspector General, approved by the Commission November 21,
18 2000; “*Office of the Inspector General Retaliation Complaint Protocol*,” approved by the Police
19 Commission June 26, 2001; Special Order No. 5, “*Policies and Authority Relative to the Inspector*
20 *General*,” approved by the Police Commission February 9, 2001; “*Office of the Inspector General*
21 *Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Police Commission June 29, 2001; “*Revised*
22 *Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Commission
23 on February 5, 2002.

24 **Activities:**

25 The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) receives complaints, reviews the facts and
26 circumstances of the complaints and, where appropriate, conducts independent investigations pursuant to
27 the policies established by the Police Commission, which are consistent with the requirements of Paragraph
28 139. The OIG Consent Decree Implementation Plan includes confidentiality procedures. A summary of

1 the complaints received by the OIG is provided in the Office of the Inspector General's monthly activity
2 report provided to the Police Commission. The summaries are placed upon the Commission's agenda for
3 consideration. See also Paragraphs 136 and 150.

1 **Decree ¶140**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “140. The Police Commission may identify subjects for audits and direct either the
4 LAPD or the Inspector General to conduct such audits. The LAPD and Inspector General
5 shall conduct such audits as directed by the Commission and shall report the audit results to
6 the Commission within the time frames established by the Commission. Subject to Charter
7 Section 573, the Inspector General shall continue to have the authority to initiate other
8 audits.”

10 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

11 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

12 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

13 **Policy/Procedure:** City Charter Section 573; Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners Policies and
14 Authority Relative to the Inspector General, approved by the Commission November 21, 2000; Special
15 Order No. 5, “*Policies and Authority Relative to the Inspector General*,” approved by the Police
16 Commission February 9, 2001; “*Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation*
17 *Plan*,” approved by the Police Commission June 29, 2001; “*Revised Office of the Inspector General*
18 *Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Commission on February 5, 2002.

19 **Activities:**

20 It is the current practice of the Police Commission to identify audits to be completed by the
21 Inspector General and for the Inspector General to keep the Commission informed as to activities and audit
22 results.

1 **IX. OPERATIONS OF THE POLICE COMMISSION AND INSPECTOR GENERAL**

2 A. *Police Commission*

3 **Decree ¶141**

4 **Decree Language:**

5 “141. This Agreement sets forth obligations of the Commission, Inspector General
6 and Chief of Police; however, it in no way constrains them from exercising their powers and
7 satisfying their duties set forth in the Charter and other applicable law.”

9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** NA

11 No Mandate.

1 **Decree ¶142**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “142. The Commission and Inspector General shall continue to review and
4 evaluate all Categorical Uses of Force. The Commission shall determine whether the
5 officer’s conduct conforms with LAPD policies, procedures, and the requirements of this
6 Agreement, and so inform the Chief of Police. The Commission shall annually issue a
7 publicly available report detailing its findings regarding these incidents.”

8
9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

11 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

12 **Policy/Procedure:** City Charter Section 573; Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners Policies and
13 Authority Relative to the Inspector General, approved by the Commission November 21, 2000; March 6,
14 2001, Commission Motion regarding Categorical Use of Force; Human Resources Bureau (HRB) Notice
15 “*Categorical Use of Force Classifications and Investigative Responsibility*,” distributed July 30, 2001
16 pursuant to March 6, 2001 Police Commission Motion; Use of Force Review Section process re-affirmed
17 by the Police Commission July 17, 2001; Special Order No. 5, “*Policies and Authority Relative to the*
18 *Inspector General*,” approved by the Police Commission February 9, 2001; “*Office of the Inspector*
19 *General Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Police Commission June 29, 2001;
20 “*Revised Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the
21 Commission on February 5, 2002; Use of Force Review Section Staff Report on Categorical Use of Force
22 Reports, June 15, 2001, approved by the Police Commission, February 26, 2002.

23 **Activities:**

24 The Police Commission and Inspector General continue to review Categorical Uses of Force
25 (CUOF) investigations and are in compliance with the CUOF review requirement established in Paragraph
26 142. See also Paragraphs 67, 69, and 136.

27 At its February 26, 2002 meeting, the Police Commission approved modifications to the existing
28 Commission policy concerning the timeline for submission of Categorical Use of Force Reports to reflect

1 that the reports shall be provided to the Commission at least 90-days prior to the running of the statute of
2 limitations. This is more restrictive than the Consent Decree requirement. If LAPD fails to submit such a
3 report, the Inspector General will notify the Police Commission, ensuring back-up monitoring. Although not
4 required by the Consent Decree, the Inspector General has implemented an informal procedure to notify
5 the Police Commission 30-days prior to the running of the statute of limitations.

6 The Use of Force Review Section implemented a computer tracking system to monitor the statute
7 of limitations dates and the 60-day notice period established in Paragraph 67.

8 The OIG Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) review was subject to significant modification in 2004.
9 The OIG now reviews all CUOF using a matrix. The matrix ensures that every case is subject to a
10 systematic, comprehensive review, and that a broad range of data is collected in every case. Issues
11 addressed in the matrix include notifications, investigative response, tactics, equipment, training,
12 investigation quality, officer conduct and incident review. All relevant Consent Decree Paragraphs are
13 addressed in the matrix. Information gathered in the matrix provides the basis for the OIG's reports to the
14 Police Commission.

15 The Inspector General Categorical Use of Force investigation reviews and appropriate information
16 were submitted to the Police Commission by the OIG. The Categorical Use of Force incidents were
17 appropriately categorized by the Commission and were acted upon within the statute of limitations period.

18 The OIG issued its first annual report regarding Categorical Uses of Force incidents in May 2002,
19 which was approved by the Commission on May 28, 2002. The second annual report was submitted to
20 the Police Commission on February 24, 2004. The third annual report was submitted to the Police
21 Commission in December 2004. With submittal of the third annual report, the OIG is in compliance with
22 the annual reporting provision for 2004. The next annual report is scheduled to be completed by May
23 2005.

1 **Decree ¶143**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “143. The Commission shall review the specified audit reports, the sting audit
4 reports, and the audits required by paragraphs 111, 113, 125, 126, 133, and 134 to
5 determine whether any changes or modifications in LAPD policies are necessary. In
6 addition, the Police Commission shall consider the results of such audits in its annual
7 evaluation of the Chief of Police. The Police Commission shall exercise its authority to
8 review and approve all new LAPD policies and procedures or changes to existing LAPD
9 policies and procedures that are made to address the requirements of this Agreement.
10 Review and approval of procedures, or changes to existing procedures that are made to
11 address the requirements of this Agreement, by the Chief of Police (or his or her designee)
12 affecting only procedure (and not policy) may be obtained on a ratification basis by
13 placement of such item on the Commission agenda within 14 days of the date of the action
14 by the Chief or designee, and the Commission must approve, disapprove, or require
15 modification of such item within 14 days of receipt. All new policies, or changes to existing
16 policies, must be reviewed and approved by the Commission prior to implementation.”

17
18 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

19 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

20 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

21 **Policy/Procedure:** Review and approval of LAPD Policies and Procedures; review of LAPD Audits

22 **Activities:**

23 During this period, only one policy/procedure document required a review by the Police
24 Commission. Special Order 17, “Complaint Advisory Form-Activated,” was approved by the Board on
25 August 3, 2004, three days prior to the publication of the Order.

26 The Police Commission has revised its procedures relative to audit reviews. The previous process
27 only provided for a review by the Board after the completion of the Inspector General’s report. The
28 intensive OIG review process often resulted in the Board considering the audit 60 days following audit

1 publication. Now, upon receipt of a Department Audit, the Commission places the matter on the agenda
2 and provides the Board with copies for review. When the matter is addressed at the Commission meeting,
3 the Board will direct the Inspector General to conduct an in-depth review and may provide additional
4 insights to the OIG at this time. The audit will be subsequently reviewed in detail upon completion of the
5 OIG review. This process ensures a more timely initial review by the Board.

6 The results of audits are considered in the Chief of Police annual review (see also Paragraph 144).
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶144**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “144. Under the Charter, the Commission is required to conduct an annual review
4 of the Chief of Police. Such a review is intended to be an overall assessment of the Police
5 Chief’s performance as the chief administrative officer of the LAPD, including as it relates
6 to satisfaction of universal performance goals applicable to chief administrative officers,
7 budgeting goals and other goals determined by the Commission. In conducting such
8 review, the Commission shall also consider the Police Chief’s responses to use of force
9 incidents and complaints of officer misconduct, assessment and imposition of discipline and
10 those matters described in paragraphs 67, 88, 89, 106, 124, 127, and 143.”

12 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

13 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

14 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

15 **Policy/Procedure:** City Charter Section 571 and 575(c); Revision of Chief of Police Evaluation Form,
16 October 9, 2001.

17 **Activities:**

18 The Police Commission, at its October 9, 2001 meeting, acted to modify the Chief of Police
19 evaluation form to include consideration of the implementation of the Consent Decree and the Chief’s
20 responses to use of force incidents and complaints of officer misconduct, assessment and imposition of
21 discipline and those matters described in Paragraphs 67, 88, 89, 106, 124, 127, and 143. Procedures to
22 track Police Commission assessments of Chief of Police actions required by the Consent Decree have been
23 implemented.

24 The Police Commission has met in closed session to discuss and prepare the 2004 annual
25 evaluation of the Chief of Police on the following dates:

26 August 3, 2004
27 September 14, 2004
28 September 21, 2004
 October 5, 2004

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

October 19, 2004
October 26, 2004
November 9, 2004

On December 7, 2004, the completed evaluation was presented by the Police Commission to the Chief of Police and discussed with him. As per the City Charter, Chief of Police evaluations are completed on a Fiscal Year calendar.

1 **Decree ¶145**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “145. The Commission shall investigate all misconduct complaints against the Chief
4 of Police and may use its staff, the Inspector General, or authorized contractors to conduct
5 such investigations.”

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

9 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

10 **Policy/Procedure:** City Charter Section 571; Special Order 17, “*Complaint Investigation Procedures -*
11 *Revised*,” approved by the Commission September 18, 2001.

12 **Activities:**

13 It is the current practice of the Police Commission to investigate misconduct complaints lodged
14 against the Chief of Police. See also Paragraph 96.

15 The OIG and the PSB have established protocols to ensure that all complaints against the Chief of
16 Police, regardless of their intake location, are assigned a complaint file number for tracking purposes. This
17 provides the OIG and Police Commission the ability to monitor the status of all complaints against the Chief
18 of Police and their disposition, as appropriate.

1 **Decree ¶146**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “146. The Commission shall continue to review and approve the LAPD’s budget
4 requests.”

6 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

7 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

8 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

9 **Policy/Procedure:** Commission approval of LAPD budget requests.

10 **Activities:**

11 The Police Commission approved the requested LAPD FY 05-06 LAPD budget on October 26,
12 2004. In addition, the Police Commission has acted on budget issues as such issues have arisen. Status
13 updates were provided to the Commission on August 3 and August 31, 2004.

14 In addition, Police Commission staff participates in the Consent Decree Work Group where
15 Consent Decree related financial issues are discussed.

B. Inspector General

Decree ¶147

Decree Language:

“147. The Inspector General shall be notified in a timely manner of all Categorical Uses of Force and be entitled to be present, at his or her discretion, as an observer on all Categorical Use of Force “roll outs”. The Inspector General shall report to the Commission in the event that the Inspector General’s observations at the scene of an incident raise issues regarding conformance with LAPD policies, procedures, and the requirements of this Agreement.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: October 15, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Department Command Post Procedures; Special Order 39, “*Critical Incident Investigation Division – Established*,” approved by the Commission December 11, 2001; Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners Policies and Authority Relative to the Inspector General, approved by the Commission November 21, 2000; Use of Force Review Section process reaffirmed by the Police Commission July 17, 2001; “*Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Police Commission June 29, 2001; “*Revised Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Commission on February 5, 2002; Use of Force Review Section Staff Report on Categorical Use of Force Reports, June 15, 2001, approved by the Police Commission February 26, 2002; “*OIG Rollout Protocol*,” approved by the Police Commission February 5, 2002.

Activities:

The Department Command Post is responsible for notifying appropriate entities regarding Categorical Use of Force incidents. The Inspector General has been notified of such incidents as required. See Paragraph 56.

1 The OIG rolled out on 39 Categorical Use of Force Incidents that occurred between July and
2 December 2004. This included 25 Officer Involved Shootings, 9 Law Enforcement Related Injuries, 3 In-
3 Custody Deaths, 1 upper body control hold, and 1 canine bite.

4 **Audits**

5 The Department completed its Categorical Use of Force Final Audit Report for the 4th Quarter FY
6 2003/2004 on August 13, 2004.

7 The Inspector General conducts periodic audits to verify notification of all Categorical Use of Force
8 incidents. Such audits have found continued compliance.

1 **Decree ¶148**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “148. The Inspector General may attend any Use Of Force Review Board meeting. The
4 Inspector General may interview any participant in such hearing after the conclusion of the
5 hearing.”

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

9 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

10 **Policy/Procedure:** City Charter Section 573; Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners Policies and
11 Authority Relative to the Inspector General, approved by the Commission November 21, 2000; Special
12 Order No. 5, “*Policies and Authority Relative to Inspector General*,” approved by the Police
13 Commission February 9, 2001; “*Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation*
14 *Plan*,” approved by the Police Commission June 29, 2001; “*Revised Office of the Inspector General*
15 *Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Commission on February 5, 2002. **Activities:**

16 The policies established by the Police Commission provide access to the Inspector General
17 consistent with the provisions of Paragraph 148. Procedures have been modified to permit the OIG to ask
18 questions at Use of Force Review Board proceedings. The OIG enjoys a cooperative relationship with the
19 LAPD regarding access to information.

1 **Decree ¶149**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “149. The LAPD shall promptly provide the Inspector General with any documents or
4 other information requested by the Inspector General related to the Inspector General’s
5 responsibilities under this Agreement. The Inspector General shall develop and provide the
6 LAPD with a list of reports, complete with time-frames and frequency of their production,
7 that the LAPD shall provide to the Inspector General on a specified schedule in order for the
8 Inspector General to fulfill his or her responsibilities under this Agreement, which list may be
9 updated from time to time by the Inspector General.”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

13 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

14 **Policy/Procedure:** City Charter Section 573; Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners Policies and
15 Authority Relative to the Inspector General, approved by the Commission November 21, 2000; Special
16 Order No. 5, “*Policies and Authority Relative to Inspector General*,” approved by the Police
17 Commission February 9, 2001; “*Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation*
18 *Plan*,” approved by the Police Commission June 29, 2001; “*Revised Office of the Inspector General*
19 *Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Commission on February 5, 2002.

20 **Activities:**

21 The policies established by the Commission provide access to the Inspector General consistent with
22 the provisions of Paragraph 149. The Inspector General has provided LAPD with a list of requested audits
23 that should be forwarded to the Inspector General upon completion by LAPD. LAPD forwards audits as
24 requested by the Inspector General and as required by Paragraph 149. See also Paragraphs 124 and 135.
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶150**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “150. The Inspector General shall accept complaints from LAPD officers regarding
4 matters which the Inspector General has authority to investigate, and the Inspector General
5 shall not disclose the identity of an individual without the consent of the employee from whom
6 a complaint or information has been received, unless such disclosure is unavoidable in order
7 to effectively investigate an allegation or is otherwise required by law or the Los Angeles
8 Office of the City Attorney; provided, however, that the Inspector General shall disclose the
9 identity of such individual to the Police Commission, upon request.”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

13 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

14 **Policy/Procedure:** City Charter Section 573; Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners Policies and
15 Authority Relative to the Inspector General, approved by the Commission November 21, 2000; Special
16 Order No. 5, “*Policies and Authority Relative to Inspector General*,” approved by the Police
17 Commission February 9, 2001; “*Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation*
18 *Plan*,” approved by the Police Commission June 29, 2001; “*Revised Office of the Inspector General*
19 *Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Commission on February 5, 2002.

20 **Activities:**

21 The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) receives complaints, reviews the facts and
22 circumstances of the complaints and, where appropriate, conducts independent investigations pursuant to
23 the policies established by the Police Commission, which are consistent with the requirements of Paragraph
24 139. The OIG Consent Decree Implementation Plan includes confidentiality procedures. A summary of
25 the complaints received by the OIG is provided in the Office of the Inspector General’s monthly activity
26 report provided to the Police Commission.

1 **Decree ¶151**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “151. Paragraphs 139 and 150 do not relieve officers of their obligations described in
4 paragraphs 65, 77, 78 and 82.”

6 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

7 **Due Date:** NA

8 No Mandate

1 **Decree ¶152**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “152. The LAPD shall continue to provide the Inspector General with all complaint intake
4 information, including the assignment for investigation, within one week after its receipt by
5 IAG. The Inspector General shall review such information to ensure that complaints are being
6 received in a manner that complies with LAPD policies and procedures, and the terms of this
7 Agreement.”

9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

11 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

12 **Policy/Procedure:** City Charter Section 573; Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners Policies and
13 Authority Relative to the Inspector General, approved by the Commission November 21, 2000; Special
14 Order No. 5, “*Policies and Authority Relative to Inspector General*,” approved by the Police
15 Commission February 9, 2001; “*Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation*
16 *Plan*,” approved by the Police Commission June 29, 2001; “*Revised Office of the Inspector General*
17 *Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Commission on February 5, 2002; Special
18 Order 17, “*Complaint Investigation Procedures – Established*,” approved by the Police Commission
19 September 18, 2001.

20 **Activities:**

21 The procedure of LAPD providing the Inspector General with all complaint information and the
22 Inspector General reviewing such information is current practice (City Charter Section 573).

23 The City has continued compliance with the 7-day time frame for PSB to provide complaints to the
24 Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The OIG and LAPD track compliance with this provision monthly.
25 Monthly reviews establish a 97.5% compliance rate during the past 6-month period. The Audit Division
26 “Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit,” completed in December 2004, also found compliance with
27 Paragraph 152.

Audit

Monthly review by OIG and LAPD.

The Audit Division "Complaint, Form 1.28, Investigations Audit," completed in December 2004, found compliance with Paragraph 152.

1 **Decree ¶153**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “153. The Inspector General shall keep the Commission informed of the status of all
4 pending investigations and audits to be performed by the Inspector General hereunder.

5
6 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

7 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001

8 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

9 **Policy/Procedure:** City Charter Section 573; Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners Policies and
10 Authority Relative to the Inspector General, approved by the Commission November 21, 2000; Special
11 Order No. 5, “*Policies and Authority Relative to Inspector General*,” approved by the Police
12 Commission February 9, 2001; “*Office of the Inspector General Consent Decree Implementation*
13 *Plan*,” approved by the Police Commission June 29, 2001; “*Revised Office of the Inspector General*
14 *Consent Decree Implementation Plan*,” approved by the Commission on February 5, 2002.

15 **Activities:**

16 The policies established by the Police Commission regarding Inspector General communication and
17 reporting responsibilities to the Commission are current practice and have been adhered to by the Inspector
18 General.

1 C. General

2 Decree ¶154

3 Decree Language:

4 “154. Reviews, audits and reports required hereunder to be made by the Commission, the
5 Inspector General or the Department may contain recommendations to correct deficiencies.
6 The identification of deficiencies in such reviews, audits or reports shall not be a breach of this
7 Agreement, rather the City, including the Department, shall take appropriate, timely and
8 reasonable steps to remedy such deficiencies.”

10 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

11 **Due Date:**

12 Paragraph 154 does not require any action on behalf of the City. However, in March 2003, the
13 LAPD established a system to track recommendations from audits, discipline reports, the RAND report
14 and Inspector General reviews. Reports on actions taken are forwarded to the Police Commission
15 periodically.

16 The Audit Recommendation Status Report for the 1st and 2nd Quarters was submitted to the Police
17 Commission on June 1, 2004. The report was approved by the Board on November 9, 2004.

18 The Audit Recommendation Status Report for the 3rd Quarter was submitted to the Police
19 Commission on December 23, 2004. The report was approved by the Board on January 11, 2005.

X. COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND PUBLIC INFORMATION

Decree ¶155

Decree Language:

“155. For the term of this Agreement, the Department shall conduct a Community outreach and Public Information program for each LAPD geographic area. The program shall require the following:

- a. at least one open meeting per quarter in each of the 18 geographic Areas for the first year of the Agreement, and one meeting in each Area annually thereafter, to inform the public about the provisions of this Agreement, and the various methods of filing a complaint against an officer. At least one week before such meetings the City shall publish notice of the meeting (i) in public areas; (ii) in at least one newspaper covering the City of Los Angeles; (iii) in one or more local community newspaper(s) that services the Area, taking into account the diversity in language and ethnicity of the area’s residents; (iv) on the City and LAPD website; and (v) in the primary languages spoken by the communities located in such area.
- b. the open public meetings described above shall include presentations and information on the LAPD and LAPD operations, which presentations and information are designed to enhance interaction between officers and community members in daily policing activities.”

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date : September 30, 2001

Current Compliance Status : Compliance

Policy/Procedure : Administrative Order 8, “*Consent Decree Required Community Meetings*,” approved by the Police Commission August 23, 2001.

Activities:

An audit of the FY 2003/2004 Community Meetings was completed on December 29, 2004. The audit revealed 100% compliance with the requirements to advertise and conduct community meetings.

No meetings were conducted during this period. The Community meetings for Fiscal Year 2004/2005 will be conducted between January and June 2005.

Audit

An audit of the FY 2003/2004 Community Meetings was completed on December 29, 2004. The audit revealed 100% compliance with the requirements to advertise and conduct community meetings.

1 **Decree ¶156**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “156. The LAPD shall prepare and publish on its website semiannual public reports
4 required by this paragraph. Such reports shall include aggregate statistics broken down by
5 each LAPD geographic area and for the Operations Headquarters Bureau, and broken down
6 by the race/ethnicity/national origin of the citizens involved, for arrests, information required to
7 be maintained pursuant to paragraphs 104 and 105, and uses of force. Such reports shall
8 include a brief description of each of the following that was completed during that period: (i)
9 report of a specified audit completed, audits completed pursuant to paragraphs 111, 113,
10 125, 126, 130, 133 and 134, and any significant actions taken as a result of such audits or
11 reports, (ii) a summary of all discipline imposed during the period reported by type of
12 misconduct, broken down by type of discipline, bureau and rank, and (iii) any new policies or
13 changes in policies made by the Department to address the requirements of this Agreement.
14 Such reports shall also include the reports prepared pursuant to paragraphs 173 and 175.”

16 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

17 **Due Date:** January 1, 2002

18 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

19 **Policy/Procedure:** LAPD Web Site Posting Plan, approved by the Commission on July 31, 2001.

20 **Activities:**

21 The Semi-annual Web Site Report for the period between January and June 2004 was posted on
22 August 26, 2004.

23 The posting contained all of the data required by Paragraph 156. Additionally, links were
24 established in the table of contents portion of the report to allow users to access data without scrolling
25 through dozens of pages. In addition to the required statistical data, both the Monitor and City Consent
26 Decree Status Reports are posted on www.LAPDonline.org.

27
28 The report for the period between July and December 2004 will be posted by March 1, 2005.

1 The City and Independent Monitor reports to the Court are posted on the web site as they are
2 released.

3 **Audit**

4 An audit of Consent Decree web-posting compliance was completed by LAPD on December 31,
5 2003. The audit found 100% compliance.

1 **Decree ¶157**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “157. The LAPD shall continue to utilize community advisory groups in each geographic
4 Area and to meet quarterly with the community they serve. The Department shall establish a
5 media advisory working group to facilitate information dissemination to the predominant
6 ethnicities and cultures in Los Angeles.”

8 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

9 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

10 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

11 **Policy/Procedure:** Administrative Order 8, “*Consent Decree Required Community Meetings*,”
12 approved by the Police Commission August 23, 2001; Administrative Order No. 6, “*Structure and*
13 *Responsibility of Community-Police Advisory Boards-Revised*,” approved by the Police Commission
14 August 23, 2001.

15 **Activities:**

16 The LAPD continues to utilize Community Police Advisory Boards in each geographic Area and
17 meets with these groups monthly.

18 Administrative Order 8, published July 30, 2001, established the media advisory group. The
19 Officer In Charge, Public Affairs Section, chairs the Media Advisory Group. Membership includes the
20 LAPD Public Information Director, Office of the Mayor, City Council representatives and Community
21 Affairs Group. The Media Advisory Group initially met quarterly and focused its efforts on advertising and
22 themes for the quarterly public meetings held pursuant to Paragraph 155. Media participation in these
23 meetings has been minimal, as there are many more convenient avenues to obtain information about the
24 LAPD.

25 The Media Advisory Group was appropriate during the first years of the Consent Decree to assist
26 in explaining the Consent Decree and establishing relationships with media representatives from across the
27 City and all media types. The success of this Group is evidenced by the fact that the media feels that it no
28 longer needs to attend such meetings. However, due to the lack of media participation, the LAPD has not

1 attempted to schedule a Media Advisory Group meeting since fall 2003. The City has worked with DOJ
2 to modify this requirement to reflect current realities. It is anticipated that changes to this provision of the
3 Consent Decree will be submitted to the Court in the near future.

1 **XI. INDEPENDENT MONITOR**

2 **Decree ¶158**

3 **Decree Language:**

4 “158. By March 1, 2001, the City and the DOJ shall together select an Independent
5 Monitor, acceptable to both, who shall monitor and report on the City’s implementation of
6 this Agreement. The selection of the Monitor shall be pursuant to a method jointly established
7 by the DOJ and the City. If the DOJ and City are unable to agree on a Monitor or an
8 alternative method of selection, the DOJ and the City each shall submit two names of persons
9 to the Court who shall have the following attributes: (i) a reputation for integrity,
10 evenhandedness, and independence; (ii) experience as a law enforcement officer, expertise in
11 law enforcement practices, or experience as a law enforcement practices monitor, (iii) an
12 absence of bias, including any appearance of bias, for or against the DOJ, the City, the
13 Department, or their officers or employees; and (iv) no personal involvement, in the last eight
14 years, whether paid or unpaid, with a claim or lawsuit against the City or the Department or
15 any of their officers, agents or employees, unless waived by the parties. The DOJ and the
16 City shall also submit to the Court the resumes, cost proposals, and other relevant information
17 for such persons demonstrating the above qualifications, and the Court shall appoint the
18 Monitor from among the names of qualified persons so submitted; provided, however, that if
19 the Court so selects the Monitor, then the maximum sum to be paid the Monitor, including
20 any additional persons he or she may associate pursuant to paragraph 159 (excluding
21 reasonable costs or fees associated with non-compliance or breach of the Agreement by the
22 City or the Department), shall not exceed \$10 million, plus out-of-pocket costs for travel and
23 incidentals, for the first five years after the effective date of this Agreement.”
24
25
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: June 15, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

Activities:

The Court concurred with the City's and DOJ's selection of Michael Cherkasky as Independent Monitor on June 15, 2001. The City executed a contract with Kroll Associates, Inc., on June 26, 2001, for an amount not to exceed the amount of \$11,010,000 for a five -year period. The contract was amended on July 16, 2004, to allocate funding for FY 04-05.

The City has timely paid Kroll's invoices.

1 **Decree ¶159**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “159. The Monitor, at any time, may associate such additional persons or entities as are
4 reasonably necessary to perform the monitoring tasks specified by this Agreement. Any
5 additional persons or entities associated by the Monitor shall possess the following attributes:
6 a reputation for integrity, evenhandedness, and independence; absence of bias, including any
7 appearance of bias for or against the DOJ, the City, the Department or the officers or
8 employees; and no personal involvement in the last five years, whether paid or unpaid, with a
9 claim or lawsuit against the City or the Department or any of their officers, agents or
10 employees unless waived by the parties, which waiver shall not be unreasonably withheld.
11 The Monitor shall notify in writing the DOJ and the City if and when such additional persons
12 or entities are selected for association by the Monitor. The notice shall identify the person or
13 entity to be associated and the monitoring task to be performed, and if a waiver is being
14 requested, the notice shall indicate if the person had any such involvement in the last five
15 years, whether paid or unpaid, with a claim or lawsuit against the City or the Department or
16 any of their officers, agents, or employees. Either the DOJ or the City may notify in writing
17 the Monitor within 10 days (excluding weekends, and federal or state holidays) of any
18 objection either may have to the selection. If the parties and the Monitor are unable to
19 resolve any such objection, and the Monitor believes that the specific person or entity in
20 question is needed to assist the Monitor and such person or entity satisfies the qualifications
21 and requirements in this paragraph, the Monitor may seek Court authorization to hire such
22 person. For purposes of all paragraphs of this Agreement other than the preceding
23 paragraph, the term Monitor shall include any and all persons or entities that the Monitor
24 associates to perform monitoring tasks and such persons shall be subject to the same
25 provisions applicable to the Monitor under this Agreement.”
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Review of additional Kroll staff

Activities:

Kroll has added staff over the past six-month period. The City reviews the additional staff proposed by Kroll as information is received.

1 **Decree ¶160**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “160. The City shall bear all reasonable fees and costs of the Monitor. The Court retains
4 the authority to resolve any dispute that may arise regarding the reasonableness of fees and
5 costs charged by the Monitor. In selecting the Monitor, DOJ and the City recognize the
6 importance of ensuring that the fees and costs borne by the City are reasonable, and
7 accordingly fees and costs shall be one factor considered in selecting the Monitor. In the
8 event that any dispute arises regarding the payment of the Monitor’s fees and costs, the City,
9 DOJ and the Monitor shall attempt to resolve such dispute cooperatively prior to seeking the
10 Court’s assistance.”

11
12 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

13 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

14 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

15 **Policy/Procedure:** Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

16 **Activities:**

17 The City has paid Kroll’s invoices in a timely manner. (See also Paragraph 158.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶161**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “161. The Monitor shall be an agent of the Court and shall be subject to the supervision
4 and orders of this Court, consistent with this Agreement. The Monitor shall only have the
5 duties, responsibilities and authority conferred by this Agreement. The Monitor shall not, and
6 is not intended to, replace or take over the role and duties of the Mayor, City Council,
7 Commission, Chief of Police or the Inspector General. In order to monitor and report on the
8 City’s and the Department’s implementation of each substantive provision of this Agreement,
9 the Monitor shall conduct the reviews specified is paragraph 162 and such additional reviews
10 as the Monitor deems appropriate. At the request of the DOJ or the City, based on the
11 Monitor’s reviews, the Monitor may make recommendations to the parties regarding
12 measures necessary to ensure full and timely implementation of this Agreement.”

14 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

15 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

16 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

17 **Policy/Procedure:** Consent Decree; Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

18 **Activities:**

19 The City is generally processing Kroll requests within an approximately two-week period. The
20 City and Kroll have implemented a monthly informal document request tracking and communication
21 process to ensure that discrepancies between documents requested and delivered are resolved
22 expeditiously.

1 **Decree ¶162**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “162. In order to monitor and report on the City and Department’s implementation of this
4 Agreement, the Monitor shall, subject to paragraph 163 and paragraphs 165 through 171:

- 5 a. between six and twelve months following implementation of TEAMS II and at
6 least annually thereafter, conduct a review of the use of TEAMS II by the LAPD,
7 the Inspector General, and the Police Commission and its staff;
8 b. regularly review and evaluate the quality and timeliness of the specified audits,
9 sting audits, and audits conducted by LAPD or the Inspector General under
10 paragraphs 125, 126, 133, 134, and 140; and
11 c. regularly review appropriate samples of (i) Categorical and Non-Categorical
12 Use of Force investigations, adjudications and related disciplinary and non-
13 disciplinary actions; and (ii) Complaint Form 1.28 investigations, adjudications and
14 related disciplinary and non-disciplinary actions (focusing, in particular, on those
15 involving alleged uses of excessive force, false arrests or improper stops, improper
16 searches or seizures, discrimination or retaliation); and motor vehicle and pedestrian
17 stop data collected pursuant to paragraphs 104 and 105.

18 In performing its obligations under this Agreement, the Monitor shall, where appropriate,
19 utilize audits conducted by the City or Department for this purpose, and employ appropriate
20 sampling techniques.”

21
22 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

23 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

24 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

25 **Policy/Procedure:** Consent Decree; Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

26
27 **Activities:**
28

1 The City is generally processing Kroll requests within an approximately two-week period. The
2 City and Kroll have implemented a monthly informal document request tracking and communication
3 process to ensure that discrepancies between documents requested and delivered are resolved
4 expeditiously.

1 **Decree ¶163**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “163. The Monitor may review completed portions of administrative investigations and
4 resulting internal proceedings while they are pending, provided, however, that in such
5 instances the Monitor may review only those parts of such investigations and proceedings that
6 have been completed (such as the completed use of force report, completed Use of Force
7 Review Board Proceedings, or completed Board of Rights proceedings). If the Monitor
8 determines that any administrative use of force or Complaint Form 1.28 investigation, which
9 has been adjudicated or otherwise disposed or completed, is inadequate under this
10 Agreement, the Monitor shall confer with the Commission, Chief of Police and the Inspector
11 General, and provide a confidential written evaluation to the Department, the Inspector
12 General, and the DOJ containing the additional measures that should be taken with respect to
13 future investigations in order to satisfy this Agreement. Such evaluation shall be for the
14 purpose of assisting the Commission, the Chief of Police and the Inspector General in
15 conducting future investigations, and shall not obligate the Department to reopen or
16 re-adjudicate any investigation.”

17
18 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

19 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

20 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

21 **Policy/Procedure:** Consent Decree; Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

22 **Activities:**

23 The City is generally processing Kroll requests within an approximately two-week period. The
24 City and Kroll have implemented a monthly informal document request tracking and communication
25 process to ensure that discrepancies between documents requested and delivered are resolved
26 expeditiously.
27
28

1 **Decree ¶164**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “164. In monitoring the implementation of this Agreement, the Monitor shall maintain
4 regular contact with the City, the Commission, the Chief of Police, the Inspector General as
5 well as the DOJ.”

7 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

8 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

9 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

10 **Policy/Procedure:** Consent Decree; Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

11 **Activities:**

12 The City is generally processing Kroll requests within an approximately two-week period. The
13 City and Kroll have implemented a monthly informal document request tracking and communication
14 process to ensure that discrepancies between documents requested and delivered are resolved
15 expeditiously.

1 **Decree ¶165**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “165. The Monitor shall have full and direct access to: (a) all Department employees,
4 including the Inspector General, and all Department facilities (except facilities used solely for
5 ATD activities) that the Monitor reasonably deems necessary to carry out the duties assigned
6 to the Monitor by this Agreement; however, access to ATD personnel shall be for the sole
7 purpose of monitoring administrative investigations, including of complaints, involving such
8 personnel; and (b) within a reasonable time following notice to the City, or the Department
9 (solely in the case of individual Police Commissioners) all other City officers, employees and
10 facilities, and the individual Police Commissioners. The Monitor shall cooperate with the City
11 and the Department to access people and facilities in a reasonable manner that, consistent
12 with the Monitor’s responsibilities, minimizes interference with daily operations.”

14 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

15 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

16 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

17 **Policy/Procedure:** Consent Decree; Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

18 **Activities:**

19 The City is generally processing Kroll requests within an approximately two-week period. The
20 City and Kroll have implemented a monthly informal document request tracking and communication
21 process to ensure that discrepancies between documents requested and delivered are resolved
22 expeditiously.

1 **Decree ¶166**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “166. The Monitor shall have full and direct access to all City and Department documents,
4 including TEAMS II data and information, that the Monitor reasonably deems necessary to
5 carry out the duties assigned to the Monitor by this Agreement, except as access is limited in
6 paragraphs 167, 168, 169,170 and 171 or as to any such documents protected by the
7 attorney-client privilege. Should the City or the Department decline to provide the Monitor
8 with access to a document based on attorney-client privilege, the City shall provide the
9 Monitor and DOJ with a log describing the document.”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

13 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

14 **Policy/Procedure:** Consent Decree; Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

15 **Activities :**

16 The City is generally processing Kroll requests within an approximately two-week period. The
17 City and Kroll have implemented a monthly informal document request tracking and communication
18 process to ensure that discrepancies between documents requested and delivered are resolved
19 expeditiously.

1 **Decree ¶167**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “167. The Monitor shall provide the City or Department with reasonable notice of a
4 request for copies of documents. Upon such request the City and the Department shall
5 provide the Monitor with copies (electronic, where readily available, or hardcopy) of any
6 documents that the Monitor is entitled to access under this Agreement, including TEAMS II
7 information and data except for Sensitive Data. The term “Sensitive Data” shall include
8 confidential informant files, personnel files, and other documents or data specifically
9 designated as “Sensitive Data” in this Agreement. The City shall cooperate with the Monitor
10 to allow access to Sensitive Data for review in a reasonable manner that is consistent with the
11 Monitor’s responsibilities and schedule. The Monitor shall treat copies of TEAMS II
12 information and data as “non-public information” as defined in paragraph 168(a).”

14 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

15 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

16 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

17 **Policy/Procedure:** Consent Decree; Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

18 **Activities:**

19 The City is generally processing Kroll requests within an approximately two-week period. The
20 City and Kroll have implemented a monthly informal document request tracking and communication
21 process to ensure that discrepancies between documents requested and delivered are resolved
22 expeditiously.

1 **Decree ¶168**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “168. All documents provided to the Monitor, whether by the City, Department, or DOJ,
4 shall be maintained in a confidential manner. Sensitive Data, and “non-public information” as
5 defined in subpart (a) of this paragraph, whether obtained from the City, Department or DOJ,
6 shall not be disclosed by the Monitor to any person or entity, other than (i) to the DOJ, (ii) to
7 the Court either under Seal or consistent with paragraphs 169, 170 or 173 or (iii) as
8 consistent with subpart (a) of this paragraph.

9 a. “Non-public information” means any information that is exempt from public
10 disclosure or inspection under the California Public Records Act and that has not been
11 released to a member of the public by the City or the Department or any of their officers or
12 employees, and for which the exemption has not otherwise been waived by the City.
13 Non-public information may be used in statistical analysis, unit analysis or other analysis that
14 does not identify particular individuals and such analysis may be disclosed to the public
15 solely as provided in paragraphs 173 and 174.

16 b. Other than as expressly provided in this Agreement, this Agreement shall not be
17 deemed a waiver of any privilege or right the City or the Department may assert, including
18 those recognized at common law or created by statute, rule or regulation against any other
19 person or entity with respect to the disclosure of any document.”

21 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

22 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

23 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

24 **Policy/Procedure:** Consent Decree; Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

25 **Activities:**

26 The City is generally processing Kroll requests within an approximately two-week period. The
27 City and Kroll have implemented a monthly informal document request tracking and communication
28

1 process to ensure that discrepancies between documents requested and delivered are resolved
2 expeditiously.
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶169**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “169. The Monitor shall have access to any City employee medical or BSS records only
4 under the following circumstances:

5 a. The Monitor shall have direct access to City employee medical or BSS records, if
6 permission for such access is granted by the applicable employee or the information from
7 such records is otherwise contained in investigative files.

8 b. For any other City employee medical or BSS records reasonably necessary to carry
9 out the duties assigned to the Monitor by this Agreement, the Monitor shall notify in writing
10 the DOJ and the City of the need for such documents, and the City shall so notify the
11 affected employee. Either the DOJ, the City, or the affected employee may, and the City
12 shall if requested by the affected employee notify in writing the Monitor within ten days
13 (excluding weekends, and federal or state holidays) of any objection they may have to such
14 access. If the parties, the Monitor, and where applicable, the affected employee are unable
15 to resolve any such objection and the Monitor continues to believe that the documents in
16 question are reasonably necessary to assist the Monitor, the Monitor may seek Court
17 authorization for access to such documents, subject to any appropriate protective orders.
18 The City shall assert applicable defenses and privileges from disclosure and protections of
19 such records for the City and the affected employee. Any documents obtained by this
20 procedure shall be treated as “Sensitive Data.”
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY

Due Date: July 1, 2001

Current Compliance Status: Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Consent Decree; Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

Activities:

The City is generally processing Kroll requests within an approximately two-week period. The City and Kroll have implemented a monthly informal document request tracking and communication process to ensure that discrepancies between documents requested and delivered are resolved expeditiously.

1 **Decree ¶170**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “170. The Monitor shall have direct access to all documents in criminal investigation files
4 that have been closed by the LAPD. The Monitor shall also have direct access to all arrest
5 reports, warrants, and warrant applications whether or not contained in open criminal
6 investigation files; where practicable arrest reports, warrants and warrant applications shall be
7 obtained from sources other than open criminal investigation files.

8 a. The Monitor shall have access as Sensitive Data to documents prepared for and
9 contained solely in open criminal investigations of LAPD employees reasonably necessary to
10 monitor compliance with paragraph 67 (other than arrest reports, warrants and warrant
11 applications, which shall be subject to the general access provisions). Except as provided
12 in subpart (b) of this paragraph, the Monitor shall not have access to any other documents in
13 criminal investigations files that have been open for less than ten months.

14 b. If the Monitor reasonably deems that access to documents contained solely in either
15 (i) open criminal investigation files, which investigations have been open for more than ten
16 months, or (ii) open criminal investigation files of LAPD employees, which investigations
17 have been open for less than ten months, is necessary to carry out the duties assigned to the
18 Monitor by this Agreement, the Monitor shall notify in writing the DOJ and the City of the
19 need for such documents. After notification by the Monitor, either the DOJ or the City may
20 respond in writing to the Monitor within ten days (excluding weekends, and federal or state
21 holidays) if either have any objection to such access. If the parties and the Monitor are
22 unable to resolve any such objection, and the Monitor continues to believe that the
23 documents in question are reasonably necessary to assist the Monitor, the Monitor may seek
24 Court authorization for access to such documents, subject to any appropriate protective
25 orders. Any documents obtained by this procedure shall be treated as “Sensitive Data.”“

26
27 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

28 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Current Compliance Status : Compliance

Policy/Procedure: Consent Decree; Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

Activities:

 The City is generally processing Kroll requests within an approximately two-week period. The City and Kroll have implemented a monthly informal document request tracking and communication process to ensure that discrepancies between documents requested and delivered are resolved expeditiously.

1 **Decree ¶171**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “171. The access provisions of the previous paragraphs do not apply to documents
4 contained solely in Anti-Terrorist Division (ATD) files, or solely in intelligence files or
5 investigative notes files or similar files of joint task forces with other law enforcement
6 agencies.”

8 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

9 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

10 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

11 **Policy/Procedure:** Consent Decree; Contract with Kroll Associates, Inc.

12 **Activities:**

13 The City is generally processing Kroll requests within an approximately two-week period. The
14 City and Kroll have implemented a monthly informal document request tracking and communication
15 process to ensure that discrepancies between documents requested and delivered are resolved
16 expeditiously.

1 **Decree ¶172**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “172. The Department shall provide the Monitor with (i) copies of all reports of specifies
4 audits, sting audits, audits or reports pursuant to paragraphs 88, 89 (including Police
5 Commission documentation), 111, 113, 125, 126, 133, 134 and the Quarterly Audit Reports
6 required by paragraph 124, within ten days after receipt by the Commission, and (ii) copies
7 of the Annual Audit Plan, within ten days after approval by the Commission.”
8

9 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

10 **Due Date:** July 1, 2001

11 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

12 **Policy/Procedure:** Consent Decree

13 **Activities:**

14 The LAPD provided the documents listed in Paragraph 172 to the Independent Monitor generally
15 within the ten-day time frame established in Paragraph 172. See also Paragraphs 161 through 171.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **XII. TERM OF AGREEMENT AND HOUSEKEEPING PROVISIONS**

2 A. *City Reports and Records*

3 **Decree ¶175**

4 **Decree Language:**

5 “175. Between 90 and 120 days following entry of this Agreement and no later than every
6 August 1st and February 1st thereafter until this Agreement is terminated, the City shall file
7 with the Court, with a copy to the Monitor and to DOJ, a status report delineating the steps
8 taken by the City and the Department during the reporting period to comply with each
9 provision of this Agreement. The City shall also file such a report documenting the steps taken
10 to comply with each provision of this Agreement during the term of this Agreement 120 days
11 before five years from the effective date of this Agreement.”

12 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

13 **Due Date:** October 15, 2001; Semi-annually thereafter

14 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

15 **Policy/Procedure:** Submittal of Status Report to the Court.

16 **Activities:** This status report is the eighth status report on implementation of the Consent Decree submitted
17 to the Court, consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 175.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Decree ¶176**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “176. During the term of this Agreement, the City and the Department shall maintain all
4 records necessary to document its compliance with the terms of this Agreement and all
5 documents expressly required by this Agreement. The Department shall maintain all
6 Complaint Form 1.28 investigation files for at least ten years from the date of the incident.
7 The City and the Department shall maintain an officer’s training records during the officer’s
8 employment with the LAPD and for three years thereafter (unless required to be maintained
9 for a longer period of applicable law).”

11 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

12 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

13 **Current Compliance Status :** Compliance

14 **Policy/Procedure:** Record retention

15 **Activities:**

16 The City is maintaining records as appropriate.

17 The City implemented a document imaging system to more efficiently maintain and retrieve all
18 records necessary pursuant to Paragraph 176. CRID is managing the records retention effort and is
19 currently functioning as the City Consent Decree Archive. All appropriate documents are being maintained.

1 **Decree ¶177**

2 **Decree Language:**

3 “177. Within a reasonable time following notice to the City or the Department, as
4 applicable the DOJ shall have access to all City staff, facilities and documents reasonably
5 necessary to enable the DOJ to evaluate compliance with the Agreement, except that, absent
6 Court order, access to any such staff, facilities and documents shall be limited to the same
7 extent the Monitor’s access is limited under paragraphs 163, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170,
8 and 171 and as to any such documents protected by the attorney-client privilege shall be
9 consistent with the requirements of those paragraphs. DOJ shall retain any Sensitive Data
10 and non-public information in a confidential manner and shall not disclose any Sensitive Data
11 or non-public information to any person or entity, other than the Court or the Monitor, absent
12 written notice to the City and either written consent by the City or a court order authorizing
13 disclosure. In the event that DOJ intends to introduce Sensitive Data or non-public
14 information to the Court, DOJ shall provide reasonable notice to the City.
15

16 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

17 **Due Date:** June 15, 2001

18 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance

19 **Policy/Procedures:** Consent Decree

20 **Activities:**

21 The City has responded to DOJ requests for documents in a timely fashion.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

B. Implementation

Decree ¶184

Decree Language:

“184. The following shall be the implementation of paragraph 8:

a. As part of any meet and confer or consulting process demanded by an employee bargaining unit (as described in paragraph 8), the City shall discuss and seek to resolve with such bargaining unit any disputes or uncertainties regarding which provisions are subject to such process. The City will identify and provide to such bargaining unit, with a copy to the DOJ, the provisions of this Agreement that it believes are subject to the process being demanded. The City shall report to the Court and the DOJ on the results of any such discussion on this question within 30 days of the date the Complaint in this action is filed. In the event that the City and such bargaining unit are unable to resolve the list of the provisions of the Agreement that are subject to that process, the City shall seek declaratory relief from this Court to resolve such issue, provided that such bargaining unit shall receive notice and an opportunity to be heard by the Court on this issue.

b. Following the resolution of any dispute or uncertainty regarding the issues subject to a demanded process, the City shall continue with that process and shall report to the Court and DOJ on the progress every 30 days, and (i) shall attach proposed agreements with the applicable bargaining unit relating to provisions of this Agreement as they are resolved or unilateral actions (as defined by subpart (f) of this paragraph) by the City arising from the meet and confer process as they are determined and (ii) shall identify provisions identified pursuant to subpart (a) of this paragraph that are scheduled for implementation within 45 days. With regard to a matter that is not a subject of mandatory bargaining, the City shall not propose or enter into any such agreement with a bargaining unit that will adversely affect the City's timely implementation of this Agreement. With regard to all such agreements with a bargaining unit and all such unilateral actions, the City shall not make them effective before the expiration of 45 days after such proposed agreement or unilateral action is reported to the Court and DOJ. The time for implementation of any provisions of this Agreement

1 affected by such agreement with a bargaining unit concerning a mandatory subject of
2 bargaining or such unilateral action shall be extended for such 45-day period. Upon receipt
3 by DOJ of any such proposed agreement or unilateral action, the parties shall consult to
4 determine whether, and if so to what extent, such proposed agreement or unilateral action
5 would adversely affect the City's ability timely to implement any provision(s) of this
6 Agreement. If the parties determine that implementation of such proposed agreement or
7 unilateral action would not significantly impact the City's ability to implement the affected
8 provision(s) of this Agreement, DOJ shall waive some or all of such 45-day period, and the
9 City shall initiate such implementation. If such determination is not made, the parties shall
10 discuss appropriate clarifications or modifications to this Agreement. Where the parties
11 believe that a modification of this Agreement is appropriate, they shall present such
12 modification to the Court for its consideration pursuant to paragraph 180, and the
13 implementation date for the affected provision(s) of this Agreement shall be extended while
14 the matter is before the Court unless the Court orders earlier implementation. Any motion
15 concerning a proposed bargaining agreement or unilateral action shall be brought during the
16 45-day period and shall not be governed by the notice requirements of paragraph 186.

17 c. In the event that the City believes the meet and confer process, consultation, or any
18 such proposed agreements with the applicable bargaining units or such proposed unilateral
19 actions resulting from the meet and confer process, will impair the City's ability timely to
20 implement one or more provisions of this Agreement, and the DOJ and the City are unable
21 to agree on an appropriate resolution, then the City shall so report to the Court and shall
22 seek appropriate declaratory or injunctive relief (including specific performance) on such
23 provision(s). The DOJ also may seek relief from the Court in the event that DOJ believes
24 the meet and confer process, consultation, or any such proposed agreements with the
25 applicable bargaining units or such proposed unilateral actions will impair the City's ability
26 timely to implement one or more provisions of this Agreement, and the DOJ and the City are
27 unable to agree on an appropriate resolution. Any such motion shall demonstrate how the
28 City would be so impaired.

1 d. In ruling on a motion under this paragraph, paragraph 8, or in regard to any meet
2 and confer issue identified pursuant to subpart (a) of this paragraph, the Court shall consider,
3 *inter alia*, whether the City's proposed agreements with the applicable bargaining units or
4 proposed unilateral actions that address provision(s) of this Agreement are consistent with
5 the objectives underlying such provision(s) and whether the City has satisfied its labor
6 relations obligations under state and local law. On any such motion, if the City has engaged
7 in good faith efforts (including consideration of the manner in which the City carried out any
8 applicable meet and confer or consulting obligations) to be able to implement this Agreement
9 in a timely manner, the City (i) shall not be in contempt or liable for any other penalties, and
10 (ii) may be potentially held in breach for such provision(s) only for the limited purpose of the
11 issuance of declaratory or injunctive remedies (including specific performance), but may not
12 be regarded as in breach for any other purpose.

13 e. In the event that DOJ believes the meet and confer process, consultation, or any
14 such proposed agreements with the applicable bargaining units or unilateral actions resulting
15 from the meet and confer process, will impair the City's ability to implement one or more
16 material provision of this Agreement, the DOJ may alternatively file a motion seeking to
17 dissolve this Agreement, which motion shall be granted if the Court finds that the meet and
18 confer process, consultation, or such proposed bargaining agreements with the applicable
19 bargaining units or such proposed unilateral actions will preclude meaningful implementation
20 of one or more material provisions of this Agreement as contemplated on the date the DOJ's
21 Complaint was filed. Should the Court grant a motion by the DOJ to dissolve this
22 Agreement, the DOJ may commence litigation in this case to seek relief based on its
23 Complaint.

24 f. The term "unilateral action" shall mean an action taken by the City as management at
25 the conclusion of the meet and confer process on a mandatory subject of bargaining to
26 implement its last, best, and final offer where (i) agreement could not be reached in the
27 negotiations, (ii) any required impasse resolution procedure has been followed, and (iii)
28

1 management has decided to make a unilateral implementation at the point of ultimate
2 impasse.”
3
4

5 **PROGRESS/STATUS SUMMARY**

6 **Due Date:** July 15, 2001

7 **Current Compliance Status:** Compliance/In-Progress

8 **Policy/Procedure:** Meet and Confer

9 **Activities:**

10 The City submits monthly Status Reports to the Court regarding the meet and confer process
11 consistent with the requirements of Paragraph 184. See Paragraph 8.
12

13
14 Dated: February 1, 2005

CHRISTENSEN, MILLER, FINK, JACOBS,
GLASER, WEIL & SHAPIRO, LLP

15
16 By: _____

17 PATRICIA L. GLASER
18 Attorneys for defendants, CITY OF LOS ANGELES, THE
19 BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF
20 LOS ANGELES, and THE LOS ANGELES POLICE
21 DEPARTMENT
22
23
24
25
26
27
28