

Biased Policing Update – 3rd Quarter 2015

December 7, 2015

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC) with an update on the Los Angeles Police Department’s activities related to the investigation of Biased Policing allegations.¹ It includes data on complaints of Biased Policing and adjudications.

This report summarizes the types of contact resulting in Biased Policing complaints as well as the alleged discriminatory conduct and biases, and provides demographic data on the accused employees. It covers Biased Policing complaints initiated through the third quarter of 2015 and provides comparison data for 2013 and 2014.

This report includes information on Biased Policing complaints that have been referred to the Office of Operations (OO) to determine the final disposition when Internal Affairs Group (IAG) disagrees with the adjudication made by the employee’s chain-of-command.

Also included is an update on the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation 36-Month Pilot Program.

In order to provide timely, meaningful information, this report is based mainly on preliminary complaint information rather than complaints completed a year or more after initiation. As a result, the tables from the Complaint Management System based on closed complaints are not attached, though selected information is included herein.

Data

Biased Policing Complaints Initiated

Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2010 through the third quarter of 2015 are shown below. The numbers for 2010 through 2012 are closed cases with Biased Policing allegations.² The data for 2013 represent Biased Policing cases identified at intake or at closing.³ Biased Policing complaints for 2014 through 2015 were identified manually based primarily on preliminary investigation at the time of intake.

2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015 YTD
281	263	224	272 ⁴	217	141

¹ On August 19, 2008, the Board of Police Commissioners requested quarterly update reports.

² Generally, complaints are not classified by specific allegation types until the investigations are completed. Consequently, the numbers for 2010 through 2012 are based on Biased Policing allegations identified at closing.

³ The transition to identifying Biased Policing allegations at intake took place in 2013, so Biased Policing complaints in 2013 were identified both at intake and at closing.

⁴ Because some complainants do not make Biased Policing allegations at intake but raise them later during the investigation, some Biased Policing complaints are not identified until closing. As a result, the number of Biased Policing complaints reported has been adjusted. Since 2013 was the transition year and complaints from that year should now be closed, complaints from 2013 were reviewed again to ensure that all Biased Policing complaints were identified. This review found 80 complaints not counted previously for 2013, resulting in upward adjustment from

During the third quarter of 2015, 54 additional complaints were identified at intake as containing allegations of Biased Policing, bringing the year-to-date total for 2015 to 141, with a projected annual total of 188.

The number of Biased Policing complaints reported by geographic bureau of occurrence for 2012 through 2015 year-to-date is shown below.

Bureau	2012 (%)	2013 (%)	2014 (%)	2015 YTD (%)
Central	53 (23.5)	66 (24.3)	49 (22.6)	29 (20.6)
South	31 (14.6)	58 (21.3)	52 (24.0)	38 (27.0)
Valley	71 (31.4)	85 (31.3)	60 (27.6)	42 (29.8)
West	67 (29.6)	61 (22.4)	55 (25.3)	29 (20.6)
Outside City/Unknown	2 (0.9)	2 (0.7)	1 (0.5)	3 (2.1)
Total	224	272	217	141

Some complaints involved multiple complainants and/or accused employees, and some complainants alleged multiple discriminatory actions and/or types of bias. As a result, many total counts discussed below exceed the number of complaints initiated.⁵

Tables 1 through 6 discussed below are attached as separate pages. They each provide information about Biased Policing complaints initiated from 2013 through 2015 year-to-date.

Table 1 shows a breakdown of the accused employees by gender/ethnicity, age, and length of service to the Department. The gender and ethnicity of accused employees could not always be determined based on information provided by complainants.

- Gender representation: Of the 195 accused employees for whom gender was known through the third quarter of 2015, female employees continue to form a smaller proportion of those accused in Biased Policing complaints (10.8%) compared to their representation among sworn employees in the Department Deployment Roster (18.9%).⁶
- Ethnic representation: Based on the year-to-date data for 2015, the ethnic composition of accused employees was roughly similar to that of all sworn personnel. In the last report, Black employees formed a smaller proportion of the accused in Biased Policing complaints (11.1 percent of the sworn workforce but only 5.1 percent of the accused). Of the 187 accused employees for whom ethnicity was known in the third quarter of 2015,

192 to 272. The additional complaints had minimal effect on the distribution of complaint statistics in Tables 1 through 5.

⁵ Because of rounding, percentages do not always equal 100.

⁶ Sworn Department employee makeup - Gender: Male 81.1% and Female 18.9%; Ethnicity: American Indian 0.3%; Asian 7.3%; Black 11.0%; Filipino 2.3%; Hispanic 45.1%; White 33.8%; and Other 0.2% (Source: Sworn and Civilian Personnel by Sex and Descent, September 6, 2015).

Black employees made up 9.1 percent of the accused, still slightly lower than their 11 percent representation among sworn employees.

- The underrepresentation of female and Black employees among the accused was also present in complaints initiated in 2013 and 2014.
- Age and length of service: Since summarized information on employee age and length of service is not available in the Department rosters, 3,480 police officers in positions likely to have public contact were chosen as a comparison group (See Table 1, Part 2)⁷. In the first three quarters of 2015, the distribution of the accused employees among the age and tenure categories reported remains relatively similar to that of the comparison group. Most frequently, accused employees were in their thirties and had less than ten years of service.

Table 2 shows the types of contact or police encounter that resulted in Biased Policing complaints along with a breakdown of the complainants by gender and ethnicity.

- Through the third quarter of 2015, traffic stops led to 65 of the 141 Biased Policing complaints (46.1%), while the remainder resulted from 32 pedestrian stops (22.7%), 23 radio calls (16.3%) and 21 “Other” types of contact (14.9%).⁸
- Based on the year-to-date data for 2015, the types of contacts or police encounters that result in Biased Policing complaints are roughly similar to prior years.

Table 3 shows the distribution of discriminatory conduct reported. This refers to the law enforcement actions or conduct alleged to have been based on bias. Also included is a breakdown of complainants by gender and ethnicity.

- Stops/Detentions: The most commonly complained of conduct continues to be the stop or detention itself. It appeared in 88 of the 141 Biased Policing complaints (62.4%) initiated during the first three quarters of 2015 (and accounted for 44.9 percent of all discriminatory conduct alleged).⁹ In 2014, it appeared in 116 of the 217 complaints (53.5%); and 158 of the 272 (58.1%) in 2013.

⁷ Data obtained in March 2015 from the Deployment Planning System (DPS).

⁸ “Other” types of contact in the third quarter included complainants coming to a police station to file a report, officers serving a warrant, officers accompanying the Housing Authority on an inspection, a complainant who said he overheard an officer make a racial remark, a complainant asking to be allowed through a barricaded street, and one unknown circumstance in which the complainant would not discuss how he came into contact with officers.

⁹ In complaints of Biased Policing, complainants often make allegations of more than one type of discriminatory conduct. For example, in addition to being stopped because of his race, a complainant may also contend the officer searched and handcuffed him because of his race. In these types of cases, the percentage of total complaints would be different from the percentage of all discriminatory conduct alleged.

- **Discourtesy:** The allegation that an employee was discourteous or rude because of bias continues to be the second most frequently reported discriminatory conduct. Of the 141 biased policing complaints in 2015, discourtesy was alleged in 26 complaints (18.4%) during the first three quarters of 2015.
- **Objectionable Remarks:** Prior to 2015, ethnic or otherwise objectionable remarks were included in the “Was Discourteous” category. In 2015, “Objectionable Remark” was distinguished as a separate category of discriminatory conduct to isolate ethnic, racial and otherwise derogatory or discriminatory remarks. There was one additional complaint alleging objectionable remarks in the third quarter, bringing the year-to-date total to eight (5.7 percent of the 141 complaints).
- Over the last three years, the three most commonly complained of discriminatory actions or types of conduct were detentions, discourtesy, and arrests. With the exception of the generic “Other” category, the remaining types of allegedly biased conduct appeared less frequently,¹⁰ or not at all. So far in 2015, no complainants have alleged officers refused to provide service because of bias.

Table 4 shows the types of bias alleged along with a breakdown of complainants by gender and ethnicity. The types of bias alleged have remained fairly consistent since 2013.

- **Ethnic Bias:** Complaints of discriminatory conduct based on ethnic bias are overwhelmingly the most frequent. During the first three quarters of 2015, 128 of the 141 Biased Policing complaints (90.8%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on ethnicity. In 2014, 194 of the 217 Biased Policing complaints (89.4%) involved at least one allegation of discriminatory conduct based on ethnicity. This accounted for 84.3 percent of all biases alleged. In 2013, 245 of the 272 complaints (90.1%) involved at least one allegation of ethnic bias, accounting for 86.3 percent of all biases alleged. Few complaints fell within the remaining categories.
- “Other” biases are included in Biased Policing complaints only if alleged in combination with ethnic or another categorized bias.¹¹ In the third quarter of 2015, no additional complaints were categorized as “Other” so the year-to-date number of complaints in this bias category remains at one complaint.
- For the first three quarters of 2015, there have been no allegations of bias based on gender.

¹⁰ “Other” alleged discriminatory conduct reported in the third quarter included complaints of officers being dispatched selectively based on bias, officers showing bias in not handling investigations properly, kidnapping, theft, the use of pepper spray, and the issuing of citations.

¹¹ In the past, “Other” biases included age, homelessness, appearing to be a criminal street gang member, political affiliation, prior arrests, prior lawsuits against the Department, size or stature, and location of residence.

Ethnic Representation of Complainants: Tables 2, 3 and 4 all show that Black males were the most numerous demographic group among the complainants, making up 70 of the 144 complainants (48.6%) in the first three quarters of 2015; 111 of the 224 complainants (49.6%) in 2014; and 132 of the 289 (45.7%) in 2013. Most of their complaints resulted from traffic and pedestrian stops and predominantly involved allegations that the stop or arrest itself was based on ethnic bias.

Table 5 provides a comparison of the ethnicities of accused employees and complainants only for cases involving alleged ethnic bias. As noted previously, in the majority of cases, Black complainants accused Hispanic or White employees. This has remained constant since 2013.

Adjudication

To adjudicate complaints, Department managers must determine by a preponderance of evidence whether misconduct occurred. The findings must be based on factual, reasonable consideration of the evidence and statements presented in the investigation. The adjudication disposition terms used in the following discussion are defined below.

An allegation is “Sustained” when the investigation discloses that the act complained of did occur and constitutes misconduct. When the investigation indicates the act complained of did not occur, the allegation is “Unfounded.” “Not Resolved” is used when the evidence disclosed by the investigation does not clearly prove or disprove the allegations made. Not Resolved allegations were fully investigated, but without resolution. An allegation is designated “Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate” when it could not be thoroughly or properly investigated. This may be caused by a lack of cooperation by the complainant or witnesses, or the absence of a critical interview that was necessary to proceed with the investigation, or the available physical evidence or witnesses’ statements being insufficient to adjudicate the complaint.

“Guilty” and “Not Guilty” are only used subsequent to a Board of Rights tribunal. The full range of adjudication dispositions is outlined in Department Manual Section 3/820.25.

Biased Policing Complaints Closed

In contrast to the section on Biased Policing complaints initiated, which was based on preliminary complaint information, this section presents information on closed complaints drawn from the Complaint Management System.

Table 6 shows how the adjudication Biased Policing allegations from the first three quarters of 2015 compared to those of the last three years. In the first three quarters of 2015, 323 allegations of Biased Policing involving 193 complaints were adjudicated.

- A total of 246 allegations (76.2%) of Biased Policing allegations were adjudicated as Unfounded during the first three quarters of 2015, a decrease in comparison to the prior three-year average of 85.7 percent.

- In the third quarter of 2015, an additional four cases involving seven Biased Policing allegations closed with the Mediated disposition, bringing the year-to-date total to 36, or 11.1 percent of all Biased Policing dispositions during the first three quarters of 2015.
- The first three quarters of 2015 saw 28 allegations closed with the disposition Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate, a slightly higher rate (8.7%) when compared to the three-year average (6.6%). The use of Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate has fluctuated since 2012.
- Two allegations of Biased Policing were adjudicated as Not Resolved in the third quarter of 2015, bringing the year-to-date total for 2015 to 11 (3.4%). The current rate of Not Resolved dispositions is slightly lower than the three-year average of 5.0 percent, but since 2012, the rate of Not Resolved dispositions has declined.
- While the first quarter of 2015 saw two allegations (from the same complaint) closed with the Out of Statute disposition, no complaints involving allegations of Biased Policing were closed with the Out of Statute disposition in the second or third quarter.

Biased Policing Complaints Referred to the Office of Operations

As detailed in previous reports, Internal Affairs Group continues to forward Biased Policing complaints to the Director, OO, when it disagrees with a chain-of-command adjudication. In the third quarter of 2015, IAG referred one complaint in which IAG disagreed with the chain-of-command adjudication of Unfounded for the Biased Policing allegations. The Director concurred with IAG’s recommendation that the allegations be adjudicated as Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate. So far, in 2015, IAG has referred four Biased Policing complaints to the Director for final disposition; a summary of the four complaints appears below.

BIASED POLICING COMPLAINTS REFERRED TO OFFICE OF OPERATIONS FOR FINAL DISPOSITION			
2015 Quarter	Bureau Recommendation	Internal Affairs Group Recommendation	Office of Operations Adjudication
Qtr. 1	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate
	Unfounded	Not Resolved	Not reviewed prior to 1-year-statute
Qtr. 2	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Unfounded
Qtr. 3	Unfounded	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate

Also in the third quarter, IAG disagreed with a chain-of-command adjudication of Unfounded for a Biased Policing complaint but did not refer it to the Director because the complaint was too close to the statute date. For training purposes, IAG sent correspondence to the chain-of-command explaining the rationale. To date, for 2015, there have been two such Biased Policing complaints not referred to the Director because of the statute date.

In total, for the first three quarters of 2015, IAG recommended a different adjudication for six Biased Policing complaints (3.1 percent of the 193 complaints adjudicated to date). In 2014, IAG recommended a different adjudication for 16 Biased Policing complaints (5.7 percent of the 283 Biased Policing complaints adjudicated that year).

Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program

The Department is currently in the second year of the 36-month Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program (Program). In conjunction with the Los Angeles City Attorney’s Office (LACA), selected complaints of Biased Policing are being mediated as an alternative to the traditional complaint investigation procedure. As of September 9, 2015, Discourtesy complaints are also eligible for mediation if they meet the criteria for Alternative Complaint Resolution: the discourtesy alleged is minor in nature and the employee has no apparent pattern of similar behavior.

Of the 56 cases referred to the Program during the third quarter of 2015, one involved Discourtesy and the rest were Biased Policing complaints. Of the 56 referred cases, 30 were eligible for mediation, a 53.6 percent eligibility rate. Twenty of the 30 eligible complaints (66.7%) were reassigned for investigation: seven were reassigned because the involved officers declined participation; one was reassigned because the officer was out on long-term leave; and 12 were reassigned because the complainant either declined or could not be reached.

Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program	2015 3rd Quarter	Total 2015 Year-to-Date	2014 Total
Total Complaints Referred	56	143	219
Not Eligible	26	74	106
Eligible	30	69	113
Mediated ¹²	10	22	25

Ten complaints involving 15 employees closed as Mediated during the third quarter. One of the complaints (involving one employee) closed as Mediated because the Complainant did not attend the scheduled mediation sessions twice.¹³ Additionally, at the end of the third quarter, the parties to two eligible cases had agreed to mediation and were awaiting scheduling.

In the third quarter, satisfaction surveys for nine mediation sessions involving 10 complainants and 15 officers were received.¹⁴ Because Discourtesy complaints can now be mediated under the Program, the satisfaction survey was modified slightly to reflect the inclusion of Discourtesy complaints. Additionally, a section for respondents to provide comments was added to the survey. The table below summarizes the 25 participants’ responses to four of the survey questions relating to: satisfaction with the process; whether the process was fair; whether it had increased understanding of the other party; and whether participants would recommend mediation to others.

¹² These complaints could be from the current quarter or a prior quarter.

¹³ Under the Program guidelines, when a complainant does not appear for scheduled mediation twice without good cause, the complaint closes as Mediated.

¹⁴ While 10 complaints closed as Mediated in the third quarter, one of the ten complaints closed as Mediated because the complainant twice failed to show up for the mediation session.

	Complainants (10)	Officers (15)
Satisfaction with Complaint Mediation Process	6 Very Satisfied	6 Very Satisfied
	2 Somewhat Satisfied	9 Somewhat Satisfied
	1 Somewhat Dissatisfied	
	1 Not Satisfied At All	
Fairness of Outcome of Complaint Mediation Process	7 Completely Fair	13 Completely Fair
	1 Somewhat Fair	2 Somewhat Fair
	2 Not Very Fair	
Increased Understanding of Police Work/Community Member	3 Increased a Great Deal	4 Increased a Great Deal
	2 Increased Somewhat	7 Increased Somewhat
	2 Increased a Little	2 Increased a Little
	3 Did not Increase	2 Did Not Increase
Likelihood of Recommending Complaint Mediation Process	6 Very Likely	11 Very Likely
	2 Somewhat Likely	4 Somewhat Likely
	2 Did Not Answer	

Satisfaction with the process: Overall, 23 of the 25 participants (92%) were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the mediation process. All the officers involved were satisfied with the mediation process, but two complainants were not.

- One complainant indicated he was “not satisfied at all,” his understanding of police work did not increase, and he declined to indicate whether he would recommend the mediation process to others. At the same time, he wrote on his survey, “However, it was helpful.”
- The second complainant indicated he was “somewhat dissatisfied” with the process but his understanding of police work “increased somewhat,” and he was “somewhat likely” to recommend the mediation process to others. His co-complainant in the same mediation session reported being “very satisfied” and “very likely” to recommend mediation to others, though his understanding of police work “did not increase” at all.

Fairness of the process: Of the 25 participants, 23 (92%) found the outcome of the mediation process to be “somewhat fair” or “completely fair.” While all the participating officers found the process to be fair, two complainants from two separate mediation sessions thought it was “not very fair.”

- One complainant who thought the process was “not very fair” indicated he was “somewhat satisfied,” his understanding of police work “increased somewhat,” and he was “very likely” to recommend the process to others.
- The second complainant who thought the process was “not very fair” was also “somewhat dissatisfied” with the process though his understanding of police work “increased somewhat,” and he was “somewhat likely” to recommend the process to others. In contrast, his co-complainant in the same mediation session thought the process was “completely fair.”

Understanding of the Other Party: Of the 25 participants who completed surveys, 20 (80%) indicated their understanding of the other party increased, while three complainants and two officers found that it “did not increase” at all. Of the three complainants who stated their understanding of police work “did not increase,” two stated they were “very likely” to recommend the mediation process to others. The third complainant did not respond to the question about whether he would recommend the process to others, but he indicated the mediation was “helpful.” Similarly, the two officers who indicated that their understanding of the community member “did not increase” were also either “very likely” or “somewhat likely” to recommend the process to others.

Likelihood of Recommending to Others: In total, 23 of 25 participants (92%) indicated they were either “somewhat likely” or “very likely” to recommend the mediation process to others. The two remaining participants, both complainants, did not respond to this question. However, as described previously, one of the complainants who did not respond to this question wrote that the mediation was “helpful.” The other complainant who did not respond to this question indicated in other parts of the survey that he was “very satisfied” with the process, thought it was “completely fair,” and indicated his understanding of police work “increased a great deal.”

Below are brief summaries of one Discourtesy and three Biased Policing complaints that were mediated recently, though the mediation sessions did not necessarily occur during the third quarter.

- In a Discourtesy mediation session, the complainant believed officers had been rude to her during a traffic stop. While the complainant was still angry at the end of the session, the mediators thought it was a successful mediation. The mediators noted that at the beginning, the complainant was very angry at the officer, describing it as “a seething type of anger” that made it difficult to convince the complainant the mediators were neutral. During mediation, the officer offered different procedural choices that he would be willing to consider for future situations. The mediators noted that by the end of the mediation, the complainant's anger was greatly reduced by the opportunity to explain her experience to the officer, and the complainant wished the officer well as she left.
- In a Biased Policing mediation session, the complainant believed officers targeted him for a traffic stop because he was a young, black male driving in the Watts area of Los Angeles. His complaint indicated he feared for his safety during the stop because of past negative interactions with the police. During mediation, the complainant explained why he was reluctant in following directions during the traffic stop, and the officers explained that they escalated their tactics because the complainant was not cooperating. At the end of the mediation, the complainant said he had a greater understanding of police work and apologized to the officers. The complainant told the Mediation Coordinator afterwards that he would be interested in working with the LAPD to promote the program.
- In a second Biased Policing complaint, the complainant believed he had been cited because of his Middle Eastern descent and explained during mediation that the incident humiliated him and affected his personal life. The officer explained how community concerns led to enactment of a zero-tolerance policy intended to eliminate traffic problems in the area. At

the end of the mediation session, the complainant was still upset about receiving an expensive citation, but he no longer believed the citation was issued based on his ethnicity.

- In the third Biased Policing mediation session, the complainant believed he had been given a citation instead of a warning because of his ethnicity. During mediation, the complainant came to realize the decision to issue the citation was not based on bias and acknowledged he could have been more respectful to the officer. The officer wrote in his comment, “I do prefer the mediation process for cases like this because it actually proves there was no bias. I would recommend to keep the program.”

The Department continues its internal effort to boost program awareness and understanding among employees in the third quarter of 2015, including outreach efforts at Department training sessions such as Basic Supervisor Schools, Supervisory Update Schools, and Training Days at various divisions. Also, because of the unique nature of this type of mediation, the Mediation Coordinator, in conjunction with the LACA, has begun work on creating a standardized training program for mediators which will include training videos and LAPD ride-alongs.

As reported in the prior quarter, researchers from the University of Southern California recently completed an implementation study of the mediation program. While the mediation program currently has federal grant funding, the grant primarily funds a program facilitator in the LACA. As there is not enough funding to complete a more comprehensive evaluation study, the Department and the LACA continue to research possible grant sources for a broader evaluation of the mediation program.

Addenda

1. Table 1 - Accused Employee Demographics: Ethnicity and Gender; Age at Date of Incident; Length of Service at Date of Incident; and Age and Length of Service Comparisons
2. Table 2 - Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter
3. Table 3 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged
4. Table 4 - Type of Bias Alleged
5. Table 5 - Accused and Complainant Ethnicities for Ethnic Bias Complaints Only
6. Table 6 - Biased Policing Allegation Dispositions for Closed Complaints

Table 1 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 1)

Ethnicity and Gender

Year	Gender	Ethnicity								Gender Total
		American Indian	Asian	Black	Filipino	Hispanic	White	Other	Unknown	
2015 YTD	Female		1	3		9	8			21
	Male	1	17	14		77	57		8	174
	Unknown								19	19
	Ethnicity Total	1	18	17	0	86	65	0	27	214
2014	Female		4			18	10		1	33
	Male	1	19	19		128	99	1		267
	Unknown								27	27
	Ethnicity Total	1	23	19	0	146	109	1	28	327
2013	Female		5	2		29	15			51
	Male	3	34	27	1	164	133		1	363
	Unknown								19	19
	Ethnicity Total	3	39	29	1	193	148	0	20	433

(Upd. 10/1/2015)

Age at Date of Incident

Year	Age in Years				
	20-30	30-40	40-50	50+	Unknown
2015 YTD	41	78	49	14	32
2014	73	110	84	25	35
2013	122	170	89	31	21

(Upd. 10/1/2015)

Length of Service at Date of Incident

Year	Years of Service					
	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20+	Unknown
2015 YTD	30	79	27	25	23	30
2014	53	116	36	57	34	31
2013	138	133	53	56	33	20

(Upd. 10/1/2015)

Table 1 - Accused Employee Demographics (Part 2)

Age and Length of Service Comparisons

Age in Years	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2015 YTD	2014	2013
20-30	757	21.8%	22.5%	25.0%	29.6%
30-40	1501	43.1%	42.9%	37.7%	41.3%
40-50	954	27.4%	26.9%	28.8%	21.6%
50+	268	7.7%	7.7%	8.6%	7.5%

(Upd. 10/1/2015)

Years of Service	Comparison Group		Accused Employee Percentage		
	Officers	Percentage	2015 YTD	2014	2013
0-5	799	23.0%	16.3%	17.9%	33.4%
5-10	1348	38.7%	42.9%	39.2%	32.2%
10-15	454	13.0%	14.7%	12.2%	12.85%
15-20	553	15.9%	13.6%	19.3%	13.6%
20+	326	9.4%	12.5%	11.5%	8.0%

(Upd. 10/1/2015)

Accused having unknown Age or Years of Service are excluded from the percentage calculations.

Comparison Group – 3480 Police Officers

Rank	Officers	Percentage
PO 1	250	7.2%
PO 2	2519	72.4%
PO 3	711	20.4%

Function	Officers	Percentage
Patrol	2829	81.3%
Specialized Enforcement	261	7.5%
Traffic	390	11.2%

Biased Policing Update
3rd Quarter Report 2015

Table 2 - Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter (Part 1)

Year	Total Biased Policing Complaints Initiated	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
2015 YTD	141	32 (22.7%)	23 (16.3%)	65 (46.1%)	21 (14.9%)
2014	217	42 (19.4%)	45 (20.7%)	95 (43.8%)	35 (16.1%)
2013	272	56 (20.6%)	46 (16.9%)	133 (48.9%)	37 (11.4%)

(Upd. 10/1/2015)

2015 YTD Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
American Indian	M	1			1	
Black	F	86	3	3	8	2
	M		13	10	37	10
Filipino	F	2			1	
	M		1			
Hispanic	F	27	2	2	3	
	M		6	2	10	2
White	F	8		1	2	1
	M		1	2	1	
Other	F	7	1	1		
	M		2	1	1	1
Unknown	F	13	1	1		2
	M		3		2	4

(Upd. 10/1/2015)

Biased Policing Update
3rd Quarter Report 2015

Table 2 - Type of Law Enforcement Contact or Encounter (Part 2)

2014		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender						
American Indian	M	1	1			
Asian	F	6		3		
	M			1	2	
Black	F	147	4	8	18	6
	M		26	14	55	16
Hispanic	F	30	1	6	3	2
	M		3	3	11	1
White	F	15	3	3	1	
	M		1	4	1	2
Other	F	8		3	3	1
	M					1
Unknown	F	17	2		1	2
	M		3	2	1	5
	Unk			1		

2013		Ethnicity Total	Pedestrian Stop	Radio Call	Traffic Stop	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender						
Asian	F	4	1	1		
	M				2	
Black	F	172	3	9	20	8
	M		37	13	71	11
Filipino	F	1				
	M					1
Hispanic	F	52	1	4	4	
	M		7	7	23	4
	Unk		1			1
White	F	26	3	5	2	3
	M		1	5	5	2
Other	F	11		2		2
	M			3	3	1
Unknown	F	23	1	1	2	2
	M		3	2	8	1
	Unk			1		

(Upd. 9/21/2015)

Biased Policing Update
3rd Quarter Report 2015

Table 3 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 1)

Year	Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
2015 YTD	23 (11.7%)	88 (44.9%)	7 (3.6%)	3 (1.5%)	8 (4.1%)		7 (3.6%)	26 (13.3%)	34 (17.3%)
2014	36 (12.2%)	116 (39.5%)	17 (5.8%)	9 (3.1%)	n/a	7 (2.4%)	15 (5.1%)	49 (16.7%)	45 (15.3%)
2013	24 (7.4%)	158 (48.6%)	16 (4.9%)	15 (4.6%)	n/a	11 (3.4%)	12 (3.7%)	34 (10.5%)	55 (16.9%)

(Upd. 10/28/2015)

2015 YTD		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Objectionable Remark	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender										
American Indian	M		1		1					
Black	F	4	11			1		1	4	5
	M	13	49	4	1	3		5	6	16
Filipino	F		1							
	M		1							
Hispanic	F		4	2		3			3	3
	M	3	13	1	1	1		1	4	2
White	F		2						1	1
	M	1	1						1	2
Other	F	1	1						1	1
	M	1	1						3	
Unknown	F		2	1	1				2	
	M		4			2			1	4

(Upd. 10/1/2015)

Biased Policing Update
3rd Quarter Report 2015

Table 3 - Discriminatory Conduct Alleged (Part 2)

2014		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender									
American Indian	M		1					1	
	F	1						1	2
Asian	M		2						1
	F	7	17	2	1		4	7	10
Black	M	20	72	10	6	5	4	20	13
	F	2	6					6	3
Hispanic	M	3	8	4	1		6	5	4
	F	3	1					2	2
White	M	1	2	1			1	3	2
	F		3					3	2
Other	M							1	1
	F		2		1			1	2
Unknown	M		4			2			5
	Unk		1					1	
	F								

2013		Arrested	Detained	Handcuffed	Impounded Vehicle	Refused to Provide Service	Searched	Was Discourteous	Other
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender									
Asian	F		1					1	
	M		2						
Black	F	4	20	3	2	1		4	10
	M	12	93	8	9	2	10	10	14
Filipino	F								
	M								1
Hispanic	F		5			1		1	2
	M	3	26	2	1		1	7	9
	Unk					1		1	
White	F		4	2		3	1	1	5
	M	2	4			1		5	5
Other	F								4
	M	2	4	1	2	1			
Unknown	F		1			1			4
	M	3	7		2	1		7	1
	Unk							1	2

(Upd. 9/22/2015)

Biased Policing Update
3rd Quarter Report 2015

Table 4 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 1)

Year	Disability	Ethnic*	Gender	LGBTQ**	National Origin	Other	Unspecified	* Ethnic bias includes race & religion. ** LGBTQ includes lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender & questioning.
2015 YTD	3 (2.1%)	128 (90.8%)		2 (1.4%)		1 (0.7%)	7 (5.0%)	
2014	5 (2.2%)	194 (84.3%)	6 (2.6%)	5 (2.2%)		8 (3.5%)	12 (5.2%)	
2013	2 (0.7%)	245 (86.3%)	10 (3.5%)	7 (2.5%)	2 (0.7%)	9 (3.2%)	9 (3.2%)	

(Upd. 10/1/2015)

2015 YTD		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender								
American Indian	M		1					
Black	F		16					
	M		68		1			1
Filipino	F		1					
	M		1					
Hispanic	F		6		1			
	M		17			1	2	
White	F		3					1
	M	1	3					
Other	F		2					
	M		5					
Unknown	F	1	3					
	M	1	5					3

(Upd. 10/1/2015)

Biased Policing Update
3rd Quarter Report 2015

Table 4 - Type of Bias Alleged (Part 2)

2014		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender								
American Indian	M		1					
Asian	F		3	1				
	M		3					
Black	F		34					2
	M	3	104	1			5	5
Hispanic	F		10		1			1
	M		17		2		1	
White	F		4	1	1			1
	M	2	5				1	1
Other	F		5					2
	M		1					
Unknown	F		4	2	1			
	M		9	1			1	
	Unk		1					

2013		Disability	Ethnic	Gender	LGBTQ	National Origin	Other	Unspecified
Complainants by Ethnicity and Gender								
Asian	F		2	1				
	M		2					
Black	F		38		1			1
	M		128	1	1		4	3
Filipino	F							
	M							1
Hispanic	F		6		2	1		
	M		37		1			2
	Unk		1				1	
White	F	2	8	3	1		1	
	M		10	2	2		1	
Other	F		2	1	1			
	M		6			1	1	
Unknown	F		5	2				
	M	1	11				1	2
	Unk		3					

(Upd. 9/22/2015)

Table 5 - Accused & Complainant Ethnicities for Ethnic Bias Complaints Only

Year	Accused Ethnicity	Complainant Ethnicity							
		American Indian	Asian	Black	Filipino	Hispanic	White	Other	Unknown
2015 YTD	American Indian			1					
	Asian	1		10		3			2
	Black			8		4	3	1	1
	Filipino								
	Hispanic			55		11	4	5	6
	White	2		46	2	9		3	1
	Other								
	Unknown			19		3			4
2014	American Indian			1					
	Asian			15		4	4		
	Black			10		3	2	1	
	Filipino								
	Hispanic	2	4	103		13	5	3	9
	White		3	72		15	1	2	6
	Other			1					
	Unknown			16		3	1		6
2013	American Indian			2			1		
	Asian		1	22		7	3	1	5
	Black			9		4	8		4
	Filipino			1					
	Hispanic		3	142		25	5	5	15
	White		3	93		27	10	3	7
	Other								
	Unknown			8		4		1	4

(Upd. 10/1/2015)

Table 6 - Biased Policing Allegation Dispositions for Closed Complaints

Disposition	2015 YTD				3-Year Average
		2014	2013	2012	
Demonstrably False					
Exonerated					
Guilty					
Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate	28 (8.7%)	25 (5.1%)	32 (8.4%)	32 (6.6%)	29.7 (6.6%)
Mediated	36 (11.1%)	27 (5.5%)			9.0 (2.0%)
No Department Employee				2 (0.4%)	0.7 (0.2%)
No Misconduct			1 (0.3%)		0.3 (0.1%)
Not Guilty			2 (0.5%)		0.7 (0.2%)
Not Resolved	11 (3.4%)	14 (2.8%)	15 (3.9%)	39 (8.0%)	22.7 (5.0%)
Out of Statute	2 (1.0%)		5 (1.3%)	1 (0.2%)	2.0 (0.4%)
Sustained					
Sustained - No Penalty					
Unfounded	246 (76.2%)	427 (86.6%)	326 (85.6%)	412 (84.8%)	388.3 (85.7%)
Total Allegations	323	493	381	486	453.3

(Upd. 10/5/2015)