

Attachment 1

City of Santa Rosa

Independent Police Auditor's Second Report re: Santa Rosa Police Department

June 2024



Michael Gennaco
Stephen Connolly
Teresa Magula
Brian Corr



OIRGroup.com

Table of Contents

Introduction3

Complaints and Allegations of Misconduct9

Overview9

Department-Initiated Investigations..... 11

Investigations into Public Complaints..... 12

 IPA and the Complaint Process..... 16

SRPD Force Review Process.....20

IPA Review of Sample Cases.....22

Subject Interviews.....23

"Holistic" Reviews24

Major Incident Review Board.....27

IPA Visits to Santa Rosa.....29

Conclusion.....33

2023 SRPD Personnel Investigations: IPA Monitoring.....34

Introduction

At the end of 2023, OIR Group completed its second full year as the Independent Police Auditor (“IPA”) for the City of Santa Rosa. This Report covers the events of the year from our perspective as an outside monitor of the Santa Rosa Police Department (“SRPD”). Our particular focus is on the Department's effectiveness with regard to its internal review systems: the ways in which it addresses allegations of officer misconduct and evaluates uses of force and critical incidents to ensure compliance with policy and agency expectations.

We begin this second annual public Report by reiterating the specific features of the City's oversight model. Recent years have seen a significant shift in public expectations with regard to police accountability. Instead of a "default setting" of deference to law enforcement, and a blanket acceptance of the insularity with which agencies historically operated, the current trends are in the direction of greater transparency and accountability. To a greater extent than ever, the public seeks ways to have more insight into – and potential influence on – law enforcement's operational standards. This includes the mechanisms by which agencies evaluate and address performance issues involving their personnel.

In some jurisdictions, this movement has extended as far as a push toward removing the standard Internal Affairs process from police control. Instead, the idea is to empower outside entities to investigate misconduct allegations and make decisions, not only about outcomes but also about consequences. And it is a response to community skepticism about a law enforcement agency's ability or willingness to "investigate itself" with appropriate objectivity and rigor.

Although such an approach continues to have supporters, there are drawbacks as well. These can be financial, logistical, or even legal (in terms

of potential clashes with officer confidentiality rights). Just as importantly, though, it overlooks the importance of a police agency's own proper investment in (and responsibility for) maintaining its standards through a fair and meaningful system of discipline. On a day-to-day basis, an internal culture of accountability is foundational to effective operations.

The structure created by the City of Santa Rosa navigates this dynamic with what is intended to be a "best of both worlds" approach. It supplements the Police Department's leadership, investigative resources, and subject matter expertise with the scrutiny, objectivity, and outside perspective of an independent oversight entity.

OIR Group is a team of police practices experts that operates out of Southern California, and has worked in the field of oversight of law enforcement since 2001.¹ Our roles have varied in our different assignments over the years, and often entail "after the fact" assessments of completed investigations in an effort to add a layer of transparency and, where relevant, promote systemic reforms.

Transparency and the offering of recommendations are certainly features of our work in Santa Rosa. But the model is also unique in some important ways. Perhaps most significantly, it provides for "real time," active participation in SRPD's investigations into all public complaints and internally generated allegations of officer misconduct.

This involvement has several features. As a starting point, we have direct, autonomous, and unfettered access to the Department's own database in which relevant materials are assembled and tracked. We receive notification whenever a new misconduct investigation is opened. We work with the Department's lead investigator in framing allegations and shaping the course of the evidence-gathering. We have the opportunity to participate in the interview process when officers are questioned. We independently review the

¹ OIR Group was founded by Michael Gennaco, a former federal prosecutor and nationally recognized authority on police oversight. It specializes in audits of law enforcement agencies' internal mechanisms for review of misconduct allegations, critical incidents, and uses of force. OIR Group currently serves a number of jurisdictions throughout California and in other states.

case materials, including body-worn camera recordings, and can provide feedback at all stages of the process.

Finally, when the investigations are complete, we have the opportunity to share our views with the Department's decision-makers in an effort to ensure that outcomes have legitimacy. Although SRPD maintains final authority over the resolution of cases, the model is designed to ensure that our input is considered and that any of our concerns are appropriately addressed. This includes direct opportunities to consult with the Chief and his command staff about individual cases and larger trends. Our regular meetings with the City Manager also help contribute to our influence and our awareness of key issues within the community.

As with our first year in Santa Rosa, we found our 2023 interactions with SRPD to be positive in several respects. This began with the Department's continued cooperation with its obligations under the City's protocol: we have consistently experienced timely notification, effective collaboration, and respectful engagement. To be sure, our perspectives and specific assessments do not always align completely with those of the Department. But the dialogue has always been constructive – and has influenced views beneficially in both directions.

We feel confident in saying that there is genuine legitimacy to SRPD's accountability mechanisms. The Internal Affairs personnel we have worked with are skilled and conscientious. As a result, the individual investigations into allegations of misconduct are thorough, fair, and objective. And they have been enhanced in this most recent cycle by the Department's greater willingness to conduct formal interviews of involved personnel (rather than relying exclusively on body-worn camera evidence). As we discuss below, we found outcomes to be reasonable, based on the available evidence, and we appreciate SRPD's efforts to use the cases as an impetus for influencing officer performance through counseling or training – even when the formal allegations of policy violations were not sustained.

Several of this year's complaints revolved around the Department's interactions with homeless individuals. As in many jurisdictions, balancing the rights and needs of the homeless with other public safety priorities has been an ongoing challenge. We spent some time on one of our visits to the City

with the members of the "Downtown Enforcement Team," a cadre of officers whose assignment is based on engagement with the homeless and enforcement of applicable laws. We were impressed with the thoughtful, methodical approach they take to their work, and by the effectiveness of their coordination with other local stakeholders in addressing this sensitive issue.

One of our in-person visits also involved an opportunity to develop more familiarity with Santa Rosa's "inRESPONSE" mental health support team, which is part of the City's strategy for assisting unsheltered individuals. To the extent that mental health challenges – and crises – are so frequently an element in significant police encounters with the homeless and others, the emergence of alternative interventions and supports has widespread implications. inRESPONSE, which began operations in 2022, combines mental health clinicians with emergency medical providers and support coordinators; these teams roll out to designated calls for service that might otherwise be routed to the Police or Fire Department. Their involvement not only alleviates some of the workload pressures on traditional first responders, but is also more likely to facilitate the kind of assistance that will help subjects address underlying problems more effectively.

We discuss the concept in more detail below. Certainly, the Department's leadership in helping to create the program and maintaining a collaborative relationship with inRESPONSE staff has been noteworthy.

Along with the complaint investigations that comprise the largest portion of our regular work in Santa Rosa, our mandate also includes critical incident review and the latitude to evaluate Department policies and practices. In 2023, the Department was not involved in an officer-involved shooting or in-custody death; it did have three force incidents that met the standard for public reporting under state law due to the level of subject injury.

Our interest in SRPD's force review protocol goes back to our first year in the auditing role, when we evaluated a handful of cases in which a public complaint about a police encounter included an allegation of excessive force. This gave us an opportunity to become acclimated to the Department's regular process for the supervisory evaluation of individual force deployments – which occurs independently and regardless of the complaint process. In our view, there was room for improvement.

This was particularly true in terms of the supervisors' inclination to go beyond the "bottom line" question of whether the force was technically justified, and to look for broader opportunities to both affirm effective performance and address potential improvements in communication, tactics, decision-making, or other elements of the encounter. Accordingly, we offered a few relevant recommendations in our First Report.

We were gratified by the Department's agreement, and were curious about whether we would notice responsive updates in a review of 2023 incidents. To that end, we performed a focused audit, in which we looked at the SRPD review packages for 20 force incidents chosen largely at random. The results, as we discuss below in more detail, were mixed. While SRPD did provide some new, more detailed guidelines for supervisors in an effort to make the review process more holistic and robust, the execution was better in some instances than others. We remain convinced that the Department would benefit from making thorough, methodical assessment the rule instead of a welcome exception. Accordingly, we hope the progress in 2023 was the start of an evolution that will continue.

One major step forward that did occur was a commitment to a more flexible and rigorous review process for force deployments that result in significant injury to the subject or are otherwise unusual, noteworthy, or deserving of a more comprehensive analysis. The Department consulted with us in establishing a "Major Incident Review Board" concept that should enhance the evaluation of key events going forward. We also discuss this below.

We made in-person visits to Santa Rosa on two occasions. These gave us the opportunity to meet with a range of SRPD personnel, go on ride-alongs, and engage with City officials as well as members of the public. Our visits centered around formal appearances at City Hall: once to give a presentation to the entire City Council about our initial year in the IPA role, and a few months later to provide updates to the Council's Public Safety Committee. This latter agenda item was a joint appearance with SRPD leadership, which included the Department's responses to our First Report's eight recommendations. A gathering with the Chief's new Community Advisory Team (a group of residents selected by the City Manager to provide the Chief with a sounding board for evaluating community priorities) also provided valuable insight into SRPD's standing in the City.

Unlike our duties in other jurisdictions, which in some instances are limited to "after the fact" assessments of completed investigations, we engage with SRPD on a regular basis – and can help ensure the objectivity and thoroughness of individual cases as they are unfolding. We are gratified by the times we are able to strengthen SRPD's response to a given event by contributing our experience and our outsider's perspective. As part of our commitment to transparency, this Report is meant to provide the public with a window into SRPD's accountability mechanisms, and the Department with encouragement to continue enhancing those systems in keeping with new understandings and a commitment to best practices.

Complaints and Allegations of Misconduct

Overview

As described above, SRPD has the responsibility for conducting administrative investigations into both public complaints of officer misconduct and self-generated cases in which personnel are alleged to have violated Department policy in some way. With some limited exceptions, those cases are handled by a sergeant investigator who is assigned to the Department's "Professional Standards"² team. That person's work is directly overseen by a lieutenant. And both work closely with the IPA office at all stages of an unfolding investigation – from initial intake to framing of allegations to evidence-gathering to review to resolution.

In 2023, SRPD opened a total of 56 new investigations– a decrease of several from the overall total of 67 in the preceding year. A more noteworthy decrease was in the subset of cases that originated with complaints by members of the public (as opposed to the Department *internally* identifying a policy violation during its regular review procedures). The public generated 41 complaints, which were significantly fewer than the 53 that had been submitted in 2022. Conversely, the 15 Department-generated matters were one more than the previous year's total.

A chart that tracks the individual investigations is provided in Appendix A.

As with our first year as the Independent Police Auditor, we found the Department's body-worn camera ("BWC") protocol to be a major influence in the investigative process. A majority of the public complaints were resolved

² Many agencies refer to the assignment as "Internal Affairs."

definitively, without the need for interviews of involved personnel, on the basis of officer recordings about the disputed encounter. Representative examples included the following:

- A complainant asserted that the officer had wrongly sided with the auto dealership when responding to a call about a dispute he was having about his vehicle. BWC footage established the officer's appropriate levels of objectivity and professionalism.
- A mother expressed concerns that her young son had been mistreated when he was briefly in police custody awaiting a caregiver after the arrest of his father. BWC recordings showed the officers had been conscientious and solicitous of the boy under difficult circumstances.
- A complaint about the sufficiency of officer response to an alleged burglary was disproven by the responding officer's recordings, which showed the expected due diligence on his part.

BWC has become so influential in the processing of complaints and other areas of performance that its absence is both unusual and conspicuous.³ In one case in which a third-party adult asserted that the juvenile he accompanied to SRPD headquarters was treated disrespectfully by the detective who interviewed him, there was no recording of the relevant exchanges. The lack of definitive evidence meant that the outcome was "not sustained" – an unsatisfying result that was once much more commonplace when it came to addressing disputed versions of events. But the Department did address the technological gap that had contributed to the detective's mistaken assumption that recording was occurring.⁴

Notably, there were no cases in which officers in the field had failed to activate their cameras, which is in itself another violation of policy. The Department

³One complaint case involved an allegation that a civilian traffic volunteer made an inappropriate comment to a resident in the context of a parking dispute. That position is not equipped with cameras, and the investigation was closed out as "not sustained." The Department may wish to consider providing these its civilian personnel with some form of recording capability (even if audio only), in light of the potential for conflict in the limited encounters with the public they do have.

⁴ This related to the stand-alone recording capabilities within the headquarters building itself, which have been enhanced.

understandably takes pride in this level of compliance, which is not universal in our experience. And it also reflects the extent to which the cameras have become "second nature" for the officers – and recognized as an asset to their work instead of a burden.

Department-Initiated Investigations

With regard to the Department-initiated reviews, they ranged in seriousness. Four of them related to a specific issue that was unrelated to public contact or enforcement activity: officers damaging gas pumps inadvertently by driving away with fuel hoses attached to their vehicles. While this type of negligence certainly merits attention and remediation, it does not implicate the public's most serious concerns when it comes to police misconduct.

Other examples of issues flagged by the Department (and addressed through sustained investigations and remedial measures) included the following:

- Two accidental discharges of weapons (neither resulting in injury);
- Managerial issues relating to supervisory performance in handling staff; and
- A preventable traffic collision.

As for the more significant allegations, one officer's performance in two different incidents, relatively close in time, had the common thread of abrupt aggression toward the subjects of calls for service as he decided to detain them. This was both verbal and physical in nature, in a departure from agency expectations about de-escalation and effective communication. To its credit, the Department caught the issues during its regular supervisory review process for the incidents; the appropriateness of a specific use of force was a particular concern. SRPD placed the officer on temporary leave while conducting its investigation (which included an additional "quality assurance" check of his other interactions during this period, to rule out the possibility of other potential problems). It found the officer had violated several policies, and his return to full duty was conditioned on different remedial measures.

Toward the end of the year, a supervisor's review of another arrest by a different officer also generated concerns about a specific force deployment (which had apparently not caused injury but also had not initially been reported – a potential violation of SRPD's force reporting requirements). This led to another formal investigation into the force and collateral issues, which ultimately resulted in corrective action by the Department.

We appreciate the vigilance these cases showed in an important arena. In our First Report, we mentioned our sense that there was room for greater rigor in the Department's scrutiny of force events, and we discuss SRPD's response below in a section that describes the "use of force" audit that we performed in this cycle. The willingness to resolve questions through further inquiry in the administrative discipline process – and hold officers accountable where warranted – is consistent with best practices for when police power is exercised through physical force.

Investigations into Public Complaints

As for the misconduct allegations that emerged from members of the public, they also ranged in severity. Discourtesy, for example, was featured as the whole or part of six of the individual complaints from the public. None were sustained.

One of the more noteworthy complaints came from a man whose vehicle had been glancingly struck by a turning SRPD patrol car as he waited at a traffic light. The damage was quite minor, but the man was understandably puzzled by the officer's subsequent failure to stop and address the collision.

The involved officer came forward later in the shift – after the man had reported his concerns to the Department – and stated he hadn't realized that there had actually been contact between the cars. But an investigation nonetheless ensued. It incorporated video footage from the involved member of the public (who had a mounted camera) and surveillance cameras from a nearby business, as well as a formal interview of the officer and witnesses.

The officer (who had been changing direction in response to a call for service) persuasively maintained that his departure from the scene had been

predicated on a lack of awareness, and there was not sufficient evidence to disprove this. (He was, of course, found to be at fault for the collision, and the Department appropriately addressed the man's repair expenses.) In spite of the inconclusive result, though, the thoroughness of the investigation itself reflected well on the process.

Three of the 41 total citizen complaints were from individuals who were unhappy about traffic citations they had received; three others came from people who alleged having observed dangerous or inappropriate driving activity by SRPD personnel. (One case, for example, turned on the complainant's contention that a patrol car's windows were improperly tinted – a Vehicle Code restriction from which law enforcement is actually exempt.) One complainant expressed his frustration over the lack of responsiveness to his outreach about illegal fireworks activity on the Fourth of July; SRPD was sympathetic but able to cite the overwhelming volume of calls to explain its limited ability to address the issue in a timely fashion.

In each of these instances, the investigations did not establish evidence of misconduct. But the Department's handling of them was, in our view, appropriate in terms of the due diligence that was shown, the legitimacy of the outcomes, and the professionalism of the outreach to the complainants. This sometimes included sophisticated efforts to pin down the identity of involved SRPD drivers through whatever partial information (date/time/location) was available from the complaint.

Notably, allegations of bias were quite limited. This is a particularly sensitive aspect of policing for obvious reasons, and SRPD is appropriately vigilant in assessing the claims when they arise. This year, though, only two cases featured assertions of bias as a component of the complainant's concerns. Neither was substantiated. Interestingly, both seemed to emerge in part from frustrations over communication barriers (as opposed to "racial profiling" or biased enforcement).⁵

⁵One woman felt her lack of fluency in English had undermined officers' treatment of her claims in a dispute with security at a hospital; in the other case, a hearing-impaired individual alleged that he had been unfairly marginalized at an open-house event that the Department participated in.

Homelessness was an underlying factor in seven of the public complaints; these were a mix of personal outreach (from individuals who alleged their own mistreatment in the context of enforcement activity) and third-party efforts by advocates who were asking for review of specific incidents on behalf of the unhoused.

None of the allegations in these cases was substantiated, and we concurred with each of these findings.

One of the complaints came from a passerby who accused officers of harassing a woman who had her possessions in a shopping cart and was upset over being stopped. But the investigation established that the officers had familiarity with the woman, who was on probation with search terms. Another case came from an unhoused woman who accused officers of triggering her PTSD during an encounter at the outdoor encampment where she was living. The SRPD investigator looked for documentation or BWC recordings that aligned with the timing and circumstances of her allegations, but could not find anything that matched. (Nor did the woman's claims of officer comments suggest, on their face, conduct that constituted a potential policy violation.)

Several of the more detailed allegations were related to the efforts of the Department's "Downtown Enforcement Team (DET)." This is a cadre of officers, led by a sergeant, whose specific assignment revolves around engaging with the unhoused in a variety of ways, including active patrol of the downtown area, the supervised clearing of illegal encampments, and arrests for criminal activity.

There were multiple complaints against the members of this unit, some of which stemmed from the clearing of camping areas that resulted in people losing their possessions. The concerns voiced by advocates in this circumstance are certainly understandable.

But the DET is well-versed in the rights of the unhoused and the parameters of legal enforcement actions in this sensitive context. Their approach is methodical and carefully documented, and they take pains to ensure that they

are providing the requisite advance notification for a planned removal (which is conducted in conjunction with the City's Public Works staff).⁶

The DET works closely with the City's "Housing and Community Services" Department to provide a multi-faceted approach in addressing the needs of the unhoused in balance with public safety and crime prevention. One element of the program is regular interventions that are scheduled in advance and that bring together DET officers, Housing and Community Service program leaders, and representatives from local support organizations (including Catholic Charities). The teams respond in tandem to multiple locations within the City that have been pre-identified on the basis of calls for service or other indicators.⁷

We accompanied the DET one morning in October on one of these planned operations,⁸ and had the opportunity to observe the tailored range of approaches that the City has developed in response to this ongoing issue. As for the SRPD component of that process, we were impressed with the professionalism and patience of the DET members – as well as their expertise.

They are extremely well-versed in the legalities of homeless enforcement, and seem equally sophisticated in their awareness of issues specific to Santa Rosa. This included a direct knowledge of the backstories for many of the affected individuals, who are often the subject of repeated contacts (and occasionally repeated arrests).

The nature of their work – including the persistence of the larger issue and the cyclical quality of their encounters with many of the same subjects – could easily lead to frustration and "compassion fatigue" on the part of the DET

⁶ One exception (which came up repeatedly in this year's cases) is when the possessions of the unhoused are proximate to a "waterway" within the definition of the California Fish and Game Code; protections against pollution allow law enforcement greater latitude in addressing violations.

⁷ RV's in poor condition are a regular feature of program; these are tagged and warned about potential violations.

⁸ Eleven different locations had been targeted in the course of the previous week; we visited several before the officers were diverted to an emergent and larger-scale call for service at which their assistance was needed.

personnel. We saw glimmers of this from time in our review of the recordings from the different disputed encounters that surfaced from the complaints. Officers occasionally lapsed into brusque dismissal of questions or concerns, and sometimes slipped from the even-keeled, respectful style of interaction that made a positive impression during our in-person visit.⁹

But these moments were seemingly rare. They never rose to the level of a policy violation in the view of the Department (or in ours), and contrasted noticeably with the high level of professionalism that was more often apparent. The DET's commitment to a very challenging job, and its effective teamwork with the City's other representatives in this arena, reflected well on SRPD.

IPA and the Complaint Process

In our second full year of providing oversight services for the City, we continued to have a sense of the core legitimacy of the Department's internal system – and continued to welcome opportunities to provide input and potentially strengthen the quality of SRPD's responses.

Our influence occurred at different phases of the process. Several of the complainants reached out to us directly, either to ensure we were notified of their concerns or to ask about their options for pursuing their allegations. We made it clear in those interactions that the Department had the primary investigative responsibility, but that we would be actively monitoring the case for thoroughness and objectivity.

We consider effective communication with complainants to be a priority, particularly with regard to any intake interview and "back end" notification as to outcomes. By and large, the Department does an excellent job with the front end of the process. Even when complaints are submitted in writing and specific about the issues of concern, the Internal Affairs investigator is

⁹ The team members were also responsible for a number of the Department's force uses during the year – a dynamic that corresponded to some extent with the high volume of arrests the unit produces. (Their sergeant estimated that arrests range on average between 30 and 40 per week.) We discuss SRPD's force review process in more detail below.

conscientious about following up with an interview in an effort to gain clarity and make sure the complainant feels both heard and understood.^{10 11}

One area that could potentially benefit from further attention is in the "closeout" letters that the Department sends when the investigation is complete. This element of the process is required under state law, but many agencies take a minimalist approach that can engender more frustration and skepticism than trust in the validity of the agency's review.

To be fair, this is partly because of legal restrictions that entitle involved officers to a certain level of confidentiality. But even so, there is information about the process that *can* be shared, and would presumably enhance the complainant's sense of having been taken seriously – even when the result is the un-founding of the allegation.

In our view, currently SRPD falls in the middle of the range. The letters are certainly polite and often personalized,¹² but don't always reflect the rigor of the investigative process or the nuance of the decision-making to the extent they could.¹³

¹⁰ We regularly listen to those interviews for a couple of reasons: one, as an extra "set of ears" for importing all the components of a complaint for follow-up in the investigation, and two as a check on the receptivity and objectivity of the interviewer in a context that can be daunting to members of the public. We are pleased to confirm that the Internal Affairs personnel we have worked with are very effective in this regard.

¹¹ This occasionally leads to direct responsive action as well as investigation, as in one example from the year where the Department provided a belated police report to address some of a complainant's concerns about inadequate response to a call for service.

¹² Commendably, there have also been several instances in which the investigator has taken time to reach out and provide a telephonic explanation to the complainant – a gesture that personalizes the process and provides a forum for more context. We appreciate the Department's willingness to take this step.

¹³ The letters do provide information about the IPA's role, and also offer contact information for our Office as another potential resource.

RECOMMENDATION 1:

SRPD should continue exploring approaches to providing complainants with detailed information about the nature of its investigative work and the basis for its findings.

We also participated in different ways during the investigative process itself. This included the opportunity to help conduct the actual interviews of subject officers – an unusual level of direct involvement for an oversight entity. And we regularly reach out to the handling investigator with questions or requests for additional follow-up regarding specific elements of a case – and appreciate the patience and responsiveness with which that feedback is received.

In one noteworthy case, a third-party expressed concerns about what he considered to be a potentially overzealous enforcement response in a public park he was visiting with his children. (He had found an officer's aggressive driving, foot pursuit, and takedown of the subject to be alarming.) The investigation established a legitimate basis for the officer's response (in light of the nature of the crime at issue) and found that the driving behavior had not deviated from expectations.

We agreed with all this. But in the course of reviewing the totality of the event, we focused on a *second* use of force that the complainant had never even seen. This was at a different location, when the handcuffed subject kicked at officers as he was getting out of a car. After taking him to the ground to regain control, one officer was positioned with a knee near the subject's neck area for several seconds. We asked for further review regarding that tactic, and SRPD provided this in the form of a detailed re-evaluation. Though no policy violations were found, the Department engaged in productive discussion and follow-up with the involved personnel.

As for the decision-making process, the case outcomes are not finalized until we have had the chance to weigh in with our assessment or recommendations. In cases where violations of policy have been established, we meet with Department executives about appropriate resolutions and consequences. Without substituting our judgement for that of the Department, we have reached basic agreement with SRPD as to the results of all the

cases, and believe those results to be supported by the evidence and constructive in their potential influence on future performance.

With regard to "constructive" outcomes, we noted cases in which no formal policy had been violated, but that the actions of the officers fell short of the ideal in ways that merited some form of follow-up. (In a few instances, for example, officer demeanor and communication were impatient, dismissive, or otherwise negative in ways that were not egregious, but that understandably led to a complainant's feelings of discourteous treatment.) We encouraged the Department to engage in counseling, training reminders, or other non-disciplinary interventions in these situations. This was in keeping with our view that the complaint process is ideally a forum for feedback and improved performance in ways that extend beyond formal accountability.

We appreciate the extent to which the Department appears to be more conscious of these learning opportunities as a regular element of its review process. And we encourage SRPD to continue building on the practice – including by documenting follow-ups that occur as part of the case's written summary.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

SRPD should give continued focus to non-disciplinary interventions that may be appropriate in the aftermath of a complaint investigation, and should document its responsive actions within the case materials.

SRPD Force Review Process

One of the focal points of our auditing efforts this year was the Department's process for the standard review of force deployments. We wrote extensively in our First Report about our sense that there was room for SRPD to strengthen its approach to this important element of operations. Our concerns were less about the uses of force themselves (for which our monitoring window was somewhat narrow)¹⁴ than the process and the product when it came to its supervisory assessments of these events.

In fact, four of our eight formal recommendations last year related to this topic. We encouraged the Department to enhance its reviews of force incidents by expanding their scope beyond the compliance with policy, giving greater emphasis to de-escalation efforts in terms of officer documentation and supervisor evaluation, and improving the quality of interviews with subjects.

The Department responded favorably. In a presentation to the City Council's Public Safety Committee, SRPD leadership followed up on the recommendations a few months after we had shared our thoughts in an initial presentation to the full Council. It agreed with each concept in principle, and, importantly, also cited concrete steps that had been taken in the aftermath of our Report's completion.

Foremost among these was a "Training Bulletin" that was intended to "provide Sergeants and Officers a standard framework and best practices for conducting use of force report writing and investigations in a field setting." This was an enhancement of existing protocols that was meant to re-frame expectations for explaining (by involved officers) and analyzing (by reviewing supervisors) in the aftermath of a use of force. And it was accompanied by a

¹⁴Because force cases are not a component of our standard responsibilities (which are primarily centered on misconduct investigations), our experience of the Department's review protocols was initially limited to cases that involved an allegation of force-related misconduct – which happened only in a handful of instances.

briefing from the training sergeant as a means of reinforcing the Bulletin's key concepts.

The most significant changes related to topics we covered in our Report. These included reminders to improve the objectivity and effectiveness of subject interviews as to their own experience of the incident, and an overlay of specific topics that officers (and reviewing supervisors) should address to ensure the thoroughness of their documentation. This included a line item related to any "de-escalation/crisis intervention" techniques that were applicable.

Perhaps most encouragingly, the Bulletin cited a new element in the template that supervisors are now required to complete in the relevant database when a force incident occurs. It related to whether any "Training needs" were identified by the supervisor in assessing the incident as a whole. If "yes," the supervisor is then meant to both explain the circumstances and articulate the plan for addressing the issue.

In our view, this constituted a valuable addition to the standard (and obviously important) determination about whether the force itself was "reasonable, lawful, and within policy." Overwhelmingly, SRPD finds that its officers' force deployments are consistent with policy, and this aligns with our own impressions from the subset of cases we have reviewed. But as we pointed out last year, these incidents often have collateral features that merit attention in their own right. These could include officer tactics, decision-making, communication, coordination with partners, supervision, choice of force options, transition to medical care as needed, reporting, and post-incident investigative steps.

Our past experience was that SRPD's engagement with these broader, "holistic" features of incident review was not as robust as it might have been. And although Department leadership maintained that relevant issue-spotting and remedial measures *were* part of their process (even though not always documented or formalized), they acknowledged the potential benefits of increased emphasis and documentation. Accordingly, the new "Training needs" feature to the process seemed like a promising upgrade – and one we hoped would be influential in reality as well as theory.

IPA Review of Sample Cases

With that in mind, we moved to assess the force review process more broadly during this audit cycle. Taking advantage of the discretion to review different aspects of SRPD operations that is a feature of our scope of work with the City, we looked at the review packages from a range of force incidents from last year in order to deepen our familiarity with SRPD's process and any noteworthy evolutions.

To do this, we worked with the Department to semi-randomly choose a sampling of completed incident reviews from a six-month period. Without knowing additional details, we wanted to see examples of deployments from different force options, and picked several from prominent categories (which included takedowns, Taser, and "personal body weapons" – usually punches or knee strikes.)

We looked at a total of eighteen from this time period, and also surveyed a few additional incidents that had resulted in significant injury to the subject. This included a review of reports, body-worn camera recordings, and the supervisory workup in the Department database. The goal was not to endorse or reject individual findings after the fact, but instead to evaluate the process as a whole and the extent to which SRPD appeared to be maximizing the potential for appropriate accountability and improvements.

All of the uses of force in our sampling were found to be in policy. This was not surprising or controversial in our view; most of the deployments were limited in nature and clearly predicated by the resistance of the involved subjects. And we noted several moments of effective performance as well.

These included different examples of officers making concerted efforts to establish rapport and use communication to de-escalate prior to the force, or to re-engage constructively with subjects or facilitate their medical needs in the aftermath of a deployment. In fact, officers' ability to "shift gears" once a physical struggle was over was both notable and frequently on display. And we saw officers on multiple occasions show a willingness to use teamwork in resetting a dynamic that had become heated, such as by rotating assignments within a call for service or after a use of force had occurred.

The fundamental legitimacy of the force uses that we observed (in terms of their justification, reasonableness, and proportionality), as well as the attributes we mention above and the baseline of scrutiny that SRPD regularly applies, are all deserving of acknowledgment. However, our fundamental sense was that the needle of "holistic" review – a broad-based, inclusive form of issue-spotting and constructive remediation – had not moved as much as we had hoped. We return to that larger point below, but not before expressing one concern about the quality of the underlying investigations that accompany every force incident: we found the interviews with subjects to be of mixed quality.

Subject Interviews

As we noted last year, objective evidence-gathering from the perspective of the person on the "receiving end" of officer force is important for a few reasons, but officer accountability is certainly one of them.¹⁵ It is also part of Department policy, and a point that was emphasized in last summer's Training Briefing. Nonetheless, there was a perfunctory quality to many of the examples we looked at.¹⁶

At times, for example, the inquiry was focused primarily on the simple question of whether the subject knew he was dealing with the police (with the implication that any lack of compliance was therefore the explanation/justification for whatever else happened). And there were other instances of interview techniques that seemed questionable in our view. One officer's question for a subject in an ambulance whose arm had been sprained was, "Why'd you resist my partners?" – a framing that was accurate but that also imposed an assessment of blameworthiness on the subject from the outset. A supervisor described his own interview with another subject by

¹⁵ While it is true that body-worn camera recordings are an invaluable asset to understanding what occurred in each incident, there can be inherent limitations to what they capture in the context of a close physical encounter, or when angles are not perfectly aligned with specific actions, or when cameras fall off.

¹⁶ We also acknowledge that there were instances in which the subject refused to cooperate with questioning, or was too intoxicated to provide meaningful responses. In the latter instance, we suggest that another attempt to obtain the subject's version be made after some time has lapsed.

saying "I asked if the officers could have done anything different and he said no." And a woman who clearly hoped to be cited and released instead of taken to jail seemed more eager to please than to give a full accounting of her experience – after she had been knocked to the ground and injured as she tried to pedal a bicycle away from the officer who was now getting her statement.

In our view, the better approach is one that solicits the subject's version of events in as unobtrusive and objective a way as possible. The core question is really some version of "We're going to be looking at our officers' actions as well, so can you tell me what happened when you got arrested?" And SRPD should continue to emphasize the importance of supervisor engagement with the process – a protocol that was not consistently prioritized within our audit sampling of cases.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

SRPD should continue to work with supervisors and officers to enhance the objectivity and effectiveness of subject interviews in the aftermath of a force incident.

"Holistic" Reviews

As for the overall process, and specifically the quality of the supervisory analysis, we see continued room for growth. The most direct indication of that, within the cases we looked at, was that the "Training needs identified" question was rarely answered affirmatively in the supervisory review form.

One obvious reason for that in any given case would be that the actual circumstances did not merit further follow-up or intervention, and we recognize that this was true in several of the incidents we looked at. And a small number of cases did prompt commentary from supervision in ways that seemed useful to us.

For example, in one case that ended up in an extended struggle to handcuff a resistant female who had a warrant, the supervisor noted that the initial hesitation of a trainee officer before engaging had created a tactical

disadvantage and allowed the situation to deteriorate. This was addressed. Another supervisor pointed out that a lengthy and ultimately fruitless attempt to gain compliance with an intoxicated subject would perhaps have benefitted from a request for a backup officer who could have better bridged a language barrier with the man.

These were simple points that were easy to act upon and, in our view, enhanced the value of the process. But they were the exception. In other instances, our sense was that *some* aspect of the incident was worthwhile grist for a deeper analysis, and potential learning opportunity for the involved personnel and/or the Department as a whole, yet the documented assessment did not capture additional insights.

One of the cases, for example, involved a suicidal female who had a knife and was sitting in a parked car. Multiple officers responded and tried to engage with her, but she drove away from the scene and officers followed – in part because she had made vague threats toward third parties. Officers ended up surrounding her, unsuccessfully Tasing her, and then managing to safely control her with physical restraints. It was a multi-faceted, complex event with several "moving parts" (including commendable efforts at establishing a dialogue with the woman by multiple officers) and different scenes. But the supervisory summary was quite concise, and no follow-up items were identified.

Another encounter involved a man who got out of his vehicle and ignored the officer who sought to detain him as he arrived at his destination – a residence at which a large party was spilling into the yard and street. The man's continued resistance led to a takedown and a prolonged struggle to handcuff him; meanwhile, numerous bystanders from the party crowded the area, and several of them angrily expressed their disapproval. Responding officers created a protective line of sorts, many of them cursing at the crowd members¹⁷ and physically shoving them back as their partners continued to grapple with the subject. They were finally able to remove him from the scene, and the remaining officers departed soon afterward.

¹⁷ This was a potential deviation from Department policy that was not addressed.

In the review process, one supervisor took the time to compliment the decision to disengage from the crowd in a coordinated fashion and depart quickly once the man had been arrested. This was an interesting observation. But it surprised us that the larger incident had not prompted a more thorough debrief of what was an unusual and challenging large-scale encounter.

Lastly, we noted a case in which the officer's forceful takedown of an intoxicated and resistant subject caused him to hit his head on the ground in a way that led to serious injury. While the force was reasonably found to be in policy, the unintended severity of it seemingly merited more consideration than it appeared to receive.

Our understanding is that, for different reasons, the culture of the agency has long taken a binary approach to force incidents (particularly when it comes to documentation): in policy or out, and no additional analysis needed. We feel strongly, though, that a more comprehensive process is both worthwhile and warranted by the inherent significance of force deployments. To its credit, the Department took meaningful steps in that direction last year, but the substantive results have been slower to materialize.

One possible issue is that the "Training needs identified" database prompt for supervisors is narrow in ways that curtail analysis. Even a change as simple as "Training/*Counseling opportunity* identified" would expand the range of issue-spotting and attendant interventions that occur to supervisors. By the same token, effective tactics by officers are certainly worthy of reinforcement in ways that also merit attention, documentation, and follow-up.

Ideally, then, it would become second nature for reviewing supervisors to assess the Department's actions holistically and with an eye toward continuous adjustment and improvement. And there are positive signs in this regard. We have been told by Department leadership that a push in that direction has been a recent focal point at the managerial level. That is gratifying – particularly since our quick review of incident write-ups from later in the year did note a greater prevalence of the analyses and responses we support. We hope it is a trend that continues.

RECOMMENDATION 4:

SRPD leadership should re-emphasize and clarify its expectation that the supervisory review of force incidents should focus on learning opportunities and performance improvements as well as compliance with policy.

RECOMMENDATION 5:

SRPD should amend its database template to promote a wider range of issue-spotting and responsive action by reviewing supervisors.

Major Incident Review Board

Finally, we do have further reason for optimism about the Department's intent to strengthen the internal review mechanisms for this important aspect of police operations. Earlier this year, SRPD finalized a new policy which establishes a "Major Incident Review Board." This Board will bring together executive-level Department members and others (including subject matter experts as needed) to formally assess force incidents that rise to a defined level of seriousness (including not only officer-involved shootings and in-custody deaths, but also certain vehicle collisions, force incidents involving significant bodily injury to the subject, and other incidents as selected by the Chief for assessment).

The mandate of the Board is to reach a determination as to whether the underlying actions of the officers were in compliance with policy. As noted above, this already happens with every case – but this process will ensure more comprehensive and collaborative assessments of that important policy question. Both the training sergeant and the Internal Affairs sergeant will make formal investigative contributions. And the Board will have the opportunity to recommend additional review or follow-up in areas such as training or modifications to policy and procedure.

We look forward to monitoring the efforts of this new Board, and we encourage the Chief to embrace the discretionary as well as defined aspects of the

Board's potential purview, and call upon it to help further ensure the robust consideration of a range of significant events.

RECOMMENDATION 6:

SRPD should take an inclusive approach to enlisting the full "Major Incident Review Board" process, in order to ensure the thorough and constructive scrutiny of a range of significant force events.

IPA Visits to Santa Rosa

We were pleased to have the opportunity to present at City Hall on two occasions in 2023. In June, the full City Council considered our First Report of auditing activities (covering 2022 events) at a public meeting. We shared our initial recommendations as well as offering our overall impressions about SRPD's internal review systems. We appreciated the dialogue that resulted – and were gratified by the Council's request for further follow-up regarding the specific suggestions we had proposed.

The value of advisory recommendations in a role like ours ultimately rests with the way they are handled by the affected agency. Our hope is always that any reform ideas are grounded in sound analysis, attainable from a practical perspective, and measurable in terms of their future implementation and influence. This last piece can be elusive, especially given its dependence on not only each department's willingness to engage, but also on a steady focus in spite of the passage of time and the press of other events.

The City Council's scheduling of a "check-in" from our office and the Department in October, after SRPD had the chance to process and address the recommendations, was a concrete means of helping ensure that good intentions would translate into action. Our October appearance at the Public Safety Subcommittee was a good opportunity for us to connect with the Department and confirm the progress that had occurred.

Our June visit also afforded us the chance to plan and conduct, in conjunction with City officials, a couple of open sessions for the community to meet with four representatives from our Office and share their concerns and perspectives. We were grateful to the people who took the time to visit with us. Direct feedback from the people who encounter the Department personally in some way, and who have their own views on public safety in Santa Rosa, is a valuable addition to our work.

Along those lines, we are always available by email or phone. Several individuals contacted us for different reasons throughout 2023 – including with questions about the complaint process or their own experiences with SRPD. Along with providing information, our role in the process is meant to help

provide assurance to the public as the legitimacy with which the Department addresses allegations or concerns, and we welcome any interactions that contribute to that outcome.

One of the other highlights of our October trip to Santa Rosa was the opportunity to meet with team members from the City's "inRESPONSE" mental health support team. This is an innovative concept spearheaded by the Police Department as part of the City's commitment to new approaches in addressing the needs of the unhoused and individuals who are experiencing mental health challenges. For different (and sometimes overlapping) reasons, these groups generate numerous calls for service, and the persistence of these issues has prompted the development of new models.

The goal of inRESPONSE is to bring a range of non-law enforcement specialists and supports to relevant situations, with the idea that the underlying issues are often most productively addressed outside of the traditional police "tool kit" of enforcement or arrest. As the SRPD web site explains, *"The team is comprised of a licensed mental health clinician, a paramedic, a homeless outreach specialist, and supported by a wrap-around support services providers."*

We met with one of the teams as they were returning from a call, and were impressed with their dedication to the concept and the thoughtfulness with which they discussed their experiences and strategies. There are obvious benefits to the efficiency of the multi-faceted response that the combination of team members is able to provide.

The Director of inRESPONSE also provided us with a valuable overview of the strengths and aspirations of the model. It was clear that the ideas are innovative and evolving. Much of the emphasis was on the importance of continuity in terms of maintaining contact with and support of the clients whom the unit encounters in its thousands of annual contacts. A key feature is the "system navigators" who help assess individual situations and align client needs with the web of resources that come from inRESPONSE's area partners.

As for the coordination with SRPD, this is another important element of the program. The effectiveness of Police Dispatch in routing relevant calls to

inRESPONSE is obviously an integral starting point. But these models work best when law enforcement and the mental health specialists take a collaborative approach, recognizing each other's role and seeing each other as an asset that helps ensure that encounters are sufficiently safe and stable on the one hand, and that the most appropriate, constructive interventions are occurring on the other.

In the course of our regular auditing responsibilities, we came across several incidents from the year in which the effective teamwork of inRESPONSE with the Department was on display. One use of force came at the culmination of a lengthy call in which a young man was trespassing on private property and insisting that he needed to stay there to help a friend whom he believed to be trapped somehow in the yard. The responding officers and inRESPONSE team members worked together in an effort to establish a rapport and figure out the best resolution to the conflict (including an offer to transport the man back to the shelter where was staying). Only when he suddenly became aggressive did officers intervene and take him to the ground to protect the inRESPONSE personnel – who remained on-scene in an effort to see if further assistance for the person was possible. And we noted other SRPD calls in which officers were overtly conscious of a potential role for inRESPONSE colleagues in addressing the situation.

In short, our impressions of the program are extremely favorable – as is our sense that SRPD is embracing its potential and helping to ensure its success. We look forward to monitoring its further progress.

Our in-person visits also included our initial opportunities to meet the members of the "Chief's Community Advisory Team." This group of 23 residents, selected by the City Manager after an application process,¹⁸ provides a structured vehicle for the Chief to get direct feedback from a sampling of the City's different neighborhoods and perspectives. The group meets on a monthly basis, and it hears presentations on key operational issues and new Department initiatives. The team members get the opportunity to ask questions and share their views – a valuable way for the Chief to be both

¹⁸ This approach was, in part, intended to help build an element of independence from SRPD into the choices, thereby adding both procedural and substantive credibility to the group's engagement with the Department.

accountable for the Department's direction and responsive to public priorities. And the membership reportedly – and usefully – brings together a diversity of viewpoints that are offered to the Chief in a spirit of meaningful feedback.

We were struck by the interesting range of life experiences and viewpoints that were evident in our limited opportunities to interact with the group. They also made an impression by having read our First Report and engaging energetically with us about it. We look forward to additional chances to benefit from the group's insights as their tenure continues.

Conclusion

Our annual reporting process is meant to accomplish some different objectives. One is to provide us with a structured platform to present formal recommendations to the Department in a public context – a process that we hope will push SRPD in directions that will pay dividends in terms of actual effectiveness for the agency. Another is to provide the public with information about law enforcement accountability processes that are often shielded from view. And a third is to remind the Santa Rosa community of the ongoing oversight mechanism that the City committed to in late 2021, and that the Police Department has worked collaboratively to incorporate into its internal disciplinary system and beyond.

A few months into the next year of our audit cycle, we are pleased to be able to end this Report by saying that our interactions with SRPD remain consistent, candid, and constructive. We have had a "front row" seat of sorts for understanding the many strengths of the Department's operations, as well as its willingness to intervene and evolve where necessary at both the individual and collective levels of the organization. We are confident that those dynamics will continue.

2023 SRPD Personnel

Investigations: IPA Monitoring

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Complainant alleged she was treated rudely and in a discriminatory manner by officers responding to a security issue at the hospital where she was a visitor.	Complete. Investigation established that officers had done their due diligence	Concur.	Allegations included bias, which was unfounded.
Church pastor complained that an officer's response to a security issue involving homeless people had been rude and unhelpful.	Complete. BWC recordings showed that officer was brusque but not to the point of violating policy.	Concur.	
Homeless woman alleged officer had triggered her PTSD during an encounter near her encampment.	Investigation complete; investigator did due diligence but could not find a police contact that matched the woman's allegations.	Concur	
Homeless man complained about various aspects of SRPD conduct when he and his wife were arrested.	Investigation complete; BWC showed the officers had been professional and followed protocol in post-arrest procedures.	Concur with findings.	
SRPD opened a case after an officer accidentally discharged a weapon downward that was being confiscated during a call for service (no injuries).	Complete; officer was found to have violated policy and conduct was formally addressed.		
Department initiated an investigation over concerns about the handling of a call for service, with a focus on officer decision-making and use of force.	Admin. investigation complete; violations of policy were identified. Appropriate consequence imposed.	Consulted with P.D. regarding resolution of sustained allegations; concur with outcome	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
		and remediation.	
Department identified concerns with officer's handling of a handcuffed detention.	Admin. investigation complete; violations of policy were identified. Appropriate consequence imposed.	Concur.	
SRPD officer accidentally discharged a less lethal weapon at the conclusion of a call for service. (No injuries.)	Complete; officer was found to have violated policy and conduct was formally addressed.		
SRPD officer inadvertently damaged a gas pump after getting fuel for patrol vehicle.	Complete; officer was found to have violated policy and conduct was formally addressed.		
SRPD initiated the case after officer's data entry error caused the wrong person to be briefly taken into custody.	Officer asserted due diligence during administrative interview; records did not definitively establish negligence on the officer's part.	Concur with outcome.	SRPD has identified and addressed a related technological issue.
Complainant expressed various grievances over SRPD's response to her security concerns.	BWC showed officers had engaged professionally with complainant, who was extremely contentious.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant challenged the legitimacy of a traffic stop (which had only resulted in a warning).	BWC showed officer had been appropriate and within his authority in conducting the stop.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged that traffic stop and citations were retaliatory, and that SRPD officers had harassed him during the encounter.	Complete, officers exonerated.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged that officers were wasting taxpayer money by leaving city limits while on duty.	Complete, officers exonerated. Records showed officers were in fact responding to a call on city- owned property that was located in an adjoining jurisdiction.	Concur with outcome.	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Victim of stolen property alleged that follow-up by officers was insufficient and that his attempts to further the criminal investigation had been handled rudely and dismissively.	Review determined that handling had fallen short of expectations. Conduct was addressed by supervisor.	Concur with outcome.	
Officer was involved in a traffic collision; Department initiated a formal review.	Complete. Allegation was sustained and remedial measures were implemented.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged that officer response to an attempted break in lacked appropriate documentation and regard for victim safety.	Department determined that a report had been discretionary under the circumstances (and that no policy violations had occurred). An officer eventually did provide one at the complainant's request.	Concur with outcome. IPA asked for follow-up on additional aspects of officer response, which was done.	
SRPD officer inadvertently damaged a gas pump after getting fuel for patrol vehicle.	Complete; officer was found to have violated policy and conduct was formally addressed.		
Arrestee challenged several aspects of responding officers' behavior (including violation of Miranda rights and speeding during transport.)	Complete; officers were exonerated regarding each of the listed allegations.	Concur.	
Complainant accused a civilian volunteer of making a racially hostile comment in the context of a dispute over parking citations.	Department determined that the allegations were not sustained, based on lack of proof.	Concur. Available evidence was not conclusive.	
An unhoused individual questioned the legitimacy of an enforcement action against himself and another person, whose belongings were disposed of.	Investigation determined that officers had acted with legal justification and had handled possessions in keeping with policy.	Concur with outcome.	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
A complainant alleged various misconduct issues connected to her arrest for violation of a restraining order.	Investigation complete. Handling officer was found to have fallen short of Department expectations with regard to confirming details of the relevant court order, which had recently been modified.	Concur.	
Third party witness questioned the necessity of officer actions during an arrest at a public park, which had included drawn weapons.	Complete; complaint was deemed unfounded based on body-worn camera recordings and dispatch information as to the alleged crime.	Concur. IPA also asked for further review of a subsequent use of force that was associated with the same incident; SRPD conducted requested follow-up.	
Complainant claimed that a responding SRPD officer had been wrong in "taking the side" of a car dealership when responding to a dispute over service for his vehicle.	The officer's body-worn camera recording established that he had been professional and consistent with agency expectations in encouraging the man to leave the premises at the request of the manager.	Concur with outcome.	

After several weeks had passed, a mother complained about the treatment of her six-year-old son during the period between her husband's arrest after a car stop and the son's release to a family member.	Body-worn camera recordings captured the entire half hour duration before a relative came to get the boy. It showed the officers making a good faith effort to reassure him and tend to his needs. Allegations exonerated.	Concur with outcome; requested follow-up review of one portion of the encounter, which was conducted.	
Third party alleged that SRPD sweep of an encampment, including disposal of property for approximately 15 people, had been improper.	Complete. Investigation determined that officers had followed protocol in conducting enforcement activity at the site.	Concur.	Complainant notified IPA of concerns.
Motorist challenged the legitimacy and accuracy of a traffic citation he received.	The body-worn camera established a valid basis for the stop. Officer was polite and solicitous of the driver/complainant.	Concur.	Technical mistake with citation was corrected.
Third party submitted a detailed complaint alleging procedural flaws and improprieties in SRPD's handling of a homeless encampment sweep that affected approximately 10 people.	Complete. Allegations exonerated based on body-worn camera recordings and explanations of officer actions and decision-making.	Concur.	
Complainant emailed the Department to allege that an officer had been abrasive and threatening to her while she working at a convenience store.	Complete. SRPD successfully identified the officer and exonerated him after review of body-worn camera recording. Sales to intoxicated subjects were a recurring issue at the location.	Concur with outcome after meeting with SRPD re history at site.	

Complainant was upset about the lack of apparent police response to multiple calls regarding illegal fireworks in his neighborhood.	Investigation complete; SRPD response was reasonable during a high-volume night of similar calls.	Concur.	
Complainant contacted SRPD with concerns in the aftermath of a minor collision with a Department patrol car.	Officer was found to have been at fault in the collision, but allegations that he had knowingly left the scene without addressing the accident were "not sustained."	IPA participated in the administrative interview of the subject officer. Concur with outcome.	SRPD assisted the complainant with accident claims.
A hearing-impaired individual felt he was treated insensitively at a Department-sponsored social event.	Complete. An interview with the complainant established the nature of his broader concerns, which did not allege specific misconduct.	Concur; Department provided explanation about its efforts at accommodation.	
Complainant alleged that two separate encounters with SRPD officers that occurred within hours (and several months ago) had been mishandled and improperly led to her arrest.	Complete. Officers were exonerated on the basis of body-worn camera recordings.	IPA requested additional investigation, which SRPD conducted. Concur with outcome.	Complainant also contacted IPA regarding her concerns.
Complainant alleged that an SRPD officer had treated him unfairly and disrespectfully in the context of multiple calls for service at his home (where he had recurring disputes with a roommate).	Investigation complete. BWC showed impatience on the part of the officer, but not to the point of a policy violation.	IPA was contacted by complainant about the matter. Concur with outcome.	

Third party alleged that officers had wrongfully harassed and detained a homeless individual.	Complete. Officers were exonerated based on body-worn camera recordings and other available evidence as to the incident.	Concur; complainant was not aware of the background of (and legal justification for) the stop.	
Complainant alleged dangerous driving behavior by an SRPD officer at a specific date and time.	Complete. Investigation used technology to narrow down possible involved officers, but could not establish that driving misconduct had occurred.	Concur.	
Complainant accused responding SRPD officers of bias, excessive force, and false arrest when they took her into custody after a physical fight with a juvenile that occurred under disputed circumstances.	Investigation complete. Review of body-worn camera recordings showed officers gathering evidence objectively and making appropriate determinations about the incident.	Concur. IPA asked for secondary review of officers' finding re "fault." It was conducted.	
Complainant alleged inappropriate use of the carpool lane by an SRPD officer during morning commute hours.	Complete. Investigation established the car and driver but could not definitively prove a violation of policy.	Concur.	
Complainant alleged that the Department was responsible for leaving repeated and unwarranted notices on her RV.	Complete. Relevant communications from Department were consistent with policy and procedure.	Concur.	
Internal matter from SRPD management regarding a supervisor's ensuring of proper shift coverage.	Addressed through appropriate intervention with subject.	Concur.	

Internal matter generated by SRPD: supervisor was alleged to have improperly limited the police involvement in a call for service regarding a deceased person.	Investigation complete. Shortcomings were found to have been a function of training deficiencies, and have been addressed.	Concur.	
Complainant identified several concerns regarding a police encounter involving herself and an unhoused companion, which resulted in the lengthy detentions of both.	Concur. BWC recordings corresponded to each allegation and found officer enforcement behavior to be consistent with expectations.	IPA noted peripheral issues of officer professional-ism, which were addressed.	
Complainant made numerous allegations of misconduct against SRPD officers (and other legal officials), dating back several years.	Pending further communication with complainant after thorough review of available evidence.	Complainant has corresponded with IPA; was referred to PD.	
SRPD officer inadvertently damaged a gas pump after getting fuel for patrol vehicle.	Complete; officer was found to have violated policy and conduct was formally addressed.		
SRPD officer inadvertently damaged a gas pump after getting fuel for patrol vehicle.	Complete; officer was found to have violated policy and conduct was formally addressed.		
Attorney filed a complaint on behalf of his client, alleging that multiple "hate crimes" being perpetrated against her by neighborhood youth are not being addressed appropriately by SRPD.	Pending. Awaiting further clarification from complainant.		
Complainant alleged rudeness on the part of dispatcher when he called to report an accident that he had been involved in.	Complete. Recording of the call showed that dispatcher was brusque but professional in handling the caller, who was unfocused in his requests.	Concur.	

Third-party complainant is the guardian of a juvenile, and alleged that he had been treated disrespectfully during an encounter at the police station.	Complete. Allegation was not "not sustained" because recordings did not occur. Communication issues were addressed with the subject officer.	Concur.	SRPD addressed tech issues that contributed to missing information in the case.
Husband and wife complainants alleged that off-duty SRPD officer had mistreated them at a youth football game in the course of resolving another dispute involving the husband.	Complete. Cell phone videos established the parameters of the officer's actions, which were found to have not violated policy for off-duty behavior.	Concur with outcome. Suggested relevant follow-up with the involved officer and supervisor who took complaint.	
Internally generated case regarding an officer's off-duty and private social media postings related to SRPD personnel.	Complete. Officer accepted responsibility for the actions, which were found to be out of policy.	IPA participated in the administrative interview. Concur with findings.	
Complainant alleged that he had not received promised compensation from his work as a confidential informant.	Complete. Investigation determined that there was appropriate documentation of the officer's dealings with the informant, and that no "broken promises" had occurred in the relationship.	Concur.	
Husband of arrestee alleged that officers had wrongfully confiscated credit cards belonging to him.	Complete. Officers were exonerated. Arrest for trespassing was lawful, and cards were properly being held for safekeeping.	Concur.	
Complainant had applied unsuccessfully to be an officer with SRPD, and alleged that inaccurate and confidential information about her is being wrongfully shared with other prospective employers.	Complete. Investigation determined that background investigator had not been responsible for misinformation.	Complainant contacted IPA about her options.	

Internally generated: officer's use of force raised questions based on notification gaps and language.	Complete. Officer was found to have violated policies related to reporting and professional language, but force itself reasonable. Appropriate action taken.	IPA participated in interview with subject officer.	
--	--	---	--