

City of Santa Rosa

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

June 2025



Michael Gennaco
Stephen Connolly
Teresa Magula



OIRGroup.com

Table of Contents

Introduction3

Complaints and Allegations of Misconduct7

Overview7

Holistic Review10

New Protocol: Allegations Involving Executive Command13

Force and Critical Incident Review15

Major Incident Review Board.....17

Training Cadre18

SRPD and Vehicle Pursuits.....20

IPA Visits to Santa Rosa.....26

Conclusion.....28

2024 SRPD Personnel Investigations: IPA Monitoring.....29

Introduction

2024 was the third year of OIR Group's tenure as the Independent Police Auditor ("IPA") for the City of Santa Rosa.¹ From the beginning, our role was designed by the City to revolve around active and real-time monitoring of misconduct investigations. The goal was to ensure the legitimacy of the Police Department's internal processes for addressing allegations of wrongful behavior, and by extension the appropriate accountability for employees when expectations and policy standards were not met.

Any form of independent oversight of law enforcement continues to be the exception rather than the rule in California (and throughout the country). Even more novel is the approach chosen by Santa Rosa, which calls for ongoing participation in the process *before* complaint and misconduct investigations are finalized.

There are two key elements to the effectiveness of this protocol. The first is access. Through its agreement with the City, the IPA Office has direct access to the database used by SRPD to store evidence and track progress across a range of internal review systems. Importantly, we are able to review the body-worn-camera recordings associated with individual incidents, as well as police reports, interviews, photographs, or other relevant material. This allows us to make our own objective assessments about the underlying conduct and the Department's response.

¹ Based in southern California, OIR Group is a team of experts in police practices that has worked exclusively in the field of civilian oversight of law enforcement since 2001. It has worked in a variety of consulting capacities for jurisdictions throughout California and in several other states. More information, including dozens of public reports, is available at our website, oirgroup.com

The second key feature of the oversight model is regular interaction. SRPD notifies us when a new complaint or significant incident arises, and we have the opportunity to both track and participate in the subsequent review process. This includes helping to frame the scope of the investigation, and even participating in and adding our own questions to officer interviews. When the case is complete, we talk to the Department's decision-makers about outcomes and bring an outside perspective that ideally enhances the deliberations and the soundness of the final outcome.

As we have noted before, we do not have the authority to force the Department to take particular action, or impose our own judgment over the Department's determinations. That authority and responsibility continue to rest with the Chief and the City Manager's Office. We endorse this approach, since ownership of the important task of upholding agency standards is, in our view, best treated as an internal priority for a variety of reasons. But the combination of access and influence that the IPA Office has under the Santa Rosa model is a significant way of ensuring the rigor, objectivity, and trustworthiness of SRPD's work in this arena. This is especially true in light of the public reporting component of the IPA's role in the City structure.

This third Report is meant to provide transparency and insight. Theoretically, it would also be a forum for calling the Department to account if our review process led us to believe that serious flaws in intent or execution were undermining the legitimacy of case outcomes – in general or in any particular instance. But that has not been our experience.

Instead, we are able to reinforce our previous impressions from our initial Reports to the community here: that SRPD takes complaints from the public seriously, that investigators are skilled and appropriately diligent in gathering and presenting evidence in misconduct cases, and that outcomes are fair and reasonable, and that remedial measures are imposed when necessary. If we occasionally differ at the margins of specific decisions, we nonetheless consider SRPD's actions to be consistently fair and reasonable.

This year's Report discusses the 62 new misconduct investigations that were opened in 2024. Most but not all, were initiated by public complaints, with the remainder undertaken by the Department when its own scrutiny of officer performance indicated that policies had potentially been violated. As in the

past, we include a case chart of completed investigations as an appendix, with descriptions of individual allegations and outcomes.

Our contractual relationship with the City also gives us the latitude to delve into other areas of Department operations. The intent is to learn about SRPD's approach to internal review in arenas where policy and practice have significant impacts on public and officer safety, public concern, and risk management.

Ideally, law enforcement agencies treat their own supervisor-level evaluations as an opportunity as well as a duty – a forum for assessing performance that combines "bottom line" accountability with broader attempts to learn and improve going forward. We try to contribute to this through outside scrutiny of existing processes and suggestions for adjustment based on best practices.

Last year, for example, we conducted an audit of the SRPD process for supervisory review of force incidents. We noted some strengths and some places where refinement was recommended. The Department has been responsive, and, as we discuss below, has made further strides in terms of moving its culture in the direction of regular, constructive self-improvement as well as accountability.

For this year's topic, we chose to focus on SRPD's approach to vehicle pursuits: from policy to practice to mechanisms for assessment. Pursuits are one of law enforcement's inherently high-risk activities, and agencies vary significantly in both their expectations and their rigors in enforcing the standards they have adopted. Based on a sampling of specific incidents from 2024, we offer our insights into the process. We also encourage the Department to enhance its feedback loops for when performance issues are spotted – as they seemingly often are.

Fortunately, the chances of additional progress have been boosted by two initiatives that took hold in 2024. The first was the implementation of a new "Major Incident Review Board" protocol – a management-level "round table" of sorts that comprehensively studies major force events and other noteworthy operations. The intent is to treat these incidents as learning opportunities; as we discuss below, the fruits of the initial efforts have shown the model's potential.

A second positive trend was the creation of a new "training cadre" that assigned two officers and a sergeant to the full-time role of evaluating force incidents, vehicle pursuits, and other critical events – and then turning their insights into refinements in the Department's practices. We talk below about that unit's formation, its early accomplishments, and the commitment to productive self-scrutiny that it represents for SRPD.

Like any law enforcement agency – or organization, for that matter – SRPD has limitations. Accordingly, 2024 saw its share of conduct-related concerns and individual events that were handled imperfectly; these are also discussed below. But when shortcomings arise, the Department has shown a willingness to engage in the work of accountability and remediation. And we remain appreciative of the Department's openness and receptivity to our contributions as the Independent Police Auditor.

We also take this opportunity to extend our appreciation to Santa Rosa's City Manager. In the different jurisdictions we work, our level of interaction with public officials outside of law enforcement varies considerably. Along with providing us an important window into local developments and concerns, our monthly meetings with the City Manager reflect a gratifying prioritization of SRPD's effectiveness and oversight's role in contributing to it.

Complaints and Allegations of Misconduct

Overview

In Santa Rosa, the core function of the Independent Police Auditor is the active, real-time monitoring of administrative investigations into officer conduct. We work closely and on a regular basis with the Police Department's "Professional Standards" unit, which has primary responsibility for the gathering and initial assessment of evidence in each case. An SRPD sergeant acts as the lead investigator in most cases.²

At each step in the process, the IPA has the chance to review and participate, from the initial framing of the issues and potential policy violations to the assessment of body-worn camera recordings and other evidence. This includes the ability to participate directly in interviews of officers and to ask our own clarifying or follow-up questions. Our access to the Department's computer system for tracking investigation and our ability to independently review all body-worn camera recordings help ensure that we are seeing all relevant information. This is the foundation we use to form our own judgments as to the validity of the investigative work and the legitimacy of final outcomes.

The Department has been steadfast in its willingness to meet the City's expectations for transparency and cooperation with the IPA role. We don't take this lightly. To reiterate, the Santa Rosa model of early involvement and

² There are a couple of exceptions. One is when the subject of the investigation is also a supervisor; these tend to be handled by someone of a higher rank. Additionally, several cases in 2024 were handled by other sergeants, a new trend in the agency. Distributing relatively straightforward matters to other members of the agency serves both to ease the Professional Standards workload and to create a culture of shared managerial "ownership" of the discipline process. It is a concept we endorse, and we found the quality of these investigations to be consistently solid and often quite good.

full access for an oversight entity is a distinctive one. At its best, it leads not only to greater transparency but also dialogue that strengthens individual case reviews along the way.

In 2024, SRPD opened a total of 62 new investigations. This is roughly commensurate with numbers from the prior two years: 67 in 2022 and 56 in 2023.³ Of these, 11 were initiated by Department management based on concerns that arose in various ways. The remainder stemmed from public complaints. The Appendix at the back of this Report provides a thumbnail sketch of the allegations and outcomes for each of these investigations.

These matters ranged quite a bit in complexity. Many were straightforward: for example, there were two instances in which officers negligently damaged gas pumps after fueling their patrol vehicles, and GPS data was used to corroborate a public complaint about speeding by an on-duty SRPD employee. And multiple cases were resolved promptly by comparing a complainant's allegations to the conclusive evidence on body-worn camera recordings.

- An unhoused person told a third-party advocate that he was assaulted by officers outside a closed support services facility. After the advocate reported it to SRPD, the relevant encounter was identified, and recordings showed that no physical contact or other misconduct had occurred.
- A woman complained that an invalid traffic stop had resulted in the loss of her license; BWC recordings established that officers had been professional and patient, and that she had acknowledged falling asleep behind the wheel of her running car.
- An unhoused individual alleged that officers had "harassed" him about the safety of his vehicle. The recordings showed that the officers' intervention was appropriate – but that one moment of discourtesy merited (and received) further attention.

³ The volume of cases varies over time, and for reasons that are not always predictable. So far in 2025, for example, there were only two new public complaints in the first two months of the year – followed by a dozen new cases opened in March. This three-year "sample size" serves as a useful barometer, then, and been largely consistent.

- A woman made several negative claims about an officer who responded to a neighbor dispute about a barking dog. The recordings showed that the woman's specific allegations did not align with the officer's handling of the situation.

Other investigations were more demanding, and the Department's review was appropriately rigorous. Examples included the following:

- Multiple officers were included in an investigation into the allegedly improper detention of a male and female during the search for a homicide suspect. Each was interviewed after a methodical review of recordings to determine the extent of each person's involvement as both a witness and potential subject of misconduct charges. The Department ultimately found that there had been irregularities in protocol and documentation by some involved personnel, resulting in accountability.⁴
- An anonymous letter from within the Department raised several allegations against a supervisor for mistreatment of co-workers. The ensuing investigation involved formal interviews of more than thirty employees in the course of addressing individual incidents and a broader pattern of behavior. The investigation ultimately revealed serious violations of workplace policy, and appropriate consequences to the subject supervisor.
- A woman listed three separate situations involving female victims that she believed the Department had handled ineffectively – which suggested a possible pattern of bias. (She had been personally involved in one of the incidents – a clash with a male driver in a parking lot.) The Department did a meticulous review of each case. It did identify procedural shortcomings (which were substantively corrected) in two of the matters. But the investigations persuasively established that the errors were inadvertent and that overall performance had been conscientious.

⁴ This case was initiated after the involved couple – who were both factually innocent and cooperative during questioning – filed a legal claim against the City in the aftermath of their experience. That litigation was recently settled. It is heartening that SRPD appropriately considered this civil claim through an accountability lens – as if it were a public complaint.

- A woman complained that SRPD was responsible for her wrongful detention in another jurisdiction. The investigator acquired records from that agency as well as the SRPD response to assess the legitimacy of the original detention and the professionalism with which she was treated while being detained.
- A woman challenged the legitimacy of her arrest on several grounds, including an assertion that body-worn camera recordings had been altered. The investigator confirmed with the camera company that each video's "audit trail" would be captured in the system, and any editing or changing would be tracked. The allegation was determined to be unfounded.

We believe that our experienced, independent vantage point constitutes "value added" for the investigative process and the decisions that arise from it. Apart from this, though, our experience of SRPD's own investigative efforts is a favorable one. The Department assigns skilled personnel to serve in its Professional Standards unit, and we have found their work to be appropriately thorough, objective, and convincing on a consistent basis.

Holistic Review

One of the areas that we have emphasized with SRPD since beginning our tenure in Santa Rosa is the value of treating all internal review processes – including administrative discipline cases – as "holistic" opportunities for the Department to improve. The idea is to evaluate the underlying incidents through a broad lens, addressing not only the essential question of whether formal misconduct occurred, but also any additional issues or performance notes for which some follow-up is warranted. That extra attention could take the form of counseling, training, staff-wide reminders, or other methods of non-disciplinary remediation.

The Department has made real progress in this regard. While issue-spotting and informal supervisory intervention are surely not new concepts for the agency, it has become more conscientious about documenting such moments when they occur. This approach helps turn good intentions into concrete action, and also creates a record for future reference.

We noted this as a developing trend in this year's grouping of cases. And we also contributed to it by occasionally offering our own "extra" observations, which the Department was generally responsive about incorporating into its handling of the relevant cases.

For example, one concern we noted in a few investigations related to the initial intake interviews with complainants. The less experienced supervisors who sometimes handled these first interactions would occasionally treat them as occasions to clarify police procedure or even debate the facts of the underlying encounter. Though they were seemingly well-intentioned (and/or correct in their assertions), the efforts to explain were understandably not always well-received – and at times even ended up antagonizing the member of the public.

We spoke with the Department about the importance of maintaining the right focus in these interviews: namely, the listening to and documenting of the complainant's concerns so that appropriate review of them by an investigator can occur. While there are occasionally people who genuinely approach the process in "question mode," rather than complaint mode, the default setting for supervisors should be neutral intake and sharing of information about the subsequent process. A different approach can leave an impression of defensiveness or resistance that is out of sync with an effective complaint process.

Fortunately, SRPD was responsive to this feedback, and has addressed the topic both directly and through Department-wide communications. As mentioned above, we support inclusion when it comes to involving a range of supervisors into these important interactions; this reminder should help ensure that everyone is well-equipped when called upon.

Other examples from the cases themselves included the following:

- A mother complained about the arrest of her teenage son, who was initially stopped for jaywalking and became upset with the officers, who eventually chose to detain him and struggled to get him into handcuffs. While the officers' actions were found to be justified, the mother also mentioned that two officers had engaged in a fist bump after her son was seated in a patrol car – a gesture he observed and considered disrespectful, exacerbating his sense of mistreatment. Having

confirmed this moment on the body-worn camera recordings of the incident, we raised it with the Department as something to follow-up on informally. The officers, who had not been focused on the young man or intending to antagonize him, were counseled about the importance of appearances, professionalism, and awareness.

- A woman complained about the alleged insensitivity of an officer who had handled a call for service involving a domestic incident with her elderly mother. Though the recordings established that no policy violation had occurred, the officer was counseled about potential alternative approaches in his communication style.
- A woman complained about the responsiveness and effectiveness of detective personnel during the pendency of a lengthy investigation into possible sexual abuse of a minor. Though the investigation itself was found to have been appropriate, two members of the detective unit were counseled about the importance of providing updates to reporting parties on a regular basis.
- A case involving the mishandling of firearms and ammunition that had been thrown away on someone else's private property led to a finding that the involved officer had violated policy re collection of evidence. It also shed light on a gap in Department procedure regarding the proper disposal of these materials, and the Department updated its guidelines to provide greater clarity for personnel in the future.
- A woman's phone was seized as a function of a sealed warrant. She did not receive any documentation regarding the confiscation of her property, and the involved detectives also did not have body-worn cameras during their encounter with the woman. Both issues were identified and led to specific changes in protocol to ensure that some receipt is provided, and that detectives equip themselves with cameras for conducting these interactions in the future.

Importantly, and in another dimension to an effective review process, the Department also responded substantively to complainant concerns when relevant to the facts at issue. For example, in one complaint from a man who believed he was wrongly arrested in a domestic incident, he maintained that important video surveillance evidence from an apartment complex had not been collected. The investigator located the video and, in spite of its apparently limited relevance, forwarded it to the handling prosecutor along with a supplemental report.

We saw other instances in which inadvertent errors in documentation were rectified, or where information was added to incident or collision reports to address a complainant's specific concerns. These cases were reminders that, for many public complainants, the primary motive is to fix a perceived problem rather than to call out alleged misconduct for accountability purposes. The Department's responsiveness to these situations, where applicable, was commendable.

New Protocol: Allegations Involving Executive Command

One complaint investigation from last year was relatively minor in substance but notable in a few other ways. It involved a public complaint by a man who, as a pedestrian, believed he had directly witnessed a driving violation by a Department executive (whom he had recognized and was able to name.)

The investigation itself had impressive features. The investigator first sought out and obtained accessed surveillance video from the location that captured the incident. The investigator also went to the relevant intersection, got out on foot, and recreated the circumstances of the alleged failure to yield. He established conclusively that the Department member's driving had not been problematic as alleged.

A second noteworthy feature to the case was the communication between the investigator and the complainant. Recognizing the sincerity and constructive intent of the man's original outreach, the investigator reached out to him by phone at the end of the process and offered a detailed explanation of his findings and the basis for them.⁵

⁵ We listened to that recording, and were struck by the thoughtful, constructive interaction it reflected. This dynamic was present in a few of the cases in this year's pool: when circumstances warranted it, the investigator took the time to discuss outcomes with the complainants in ways that clearly enhanced their sense of being heard and understood – even when their allegations were not substantiated.

Lastly, in spite of the exoneration of the named SRPD employee, we raised the *process* issue that the case represented: namely, the Department's protocol for addressing the sensitivities when a top executive in a law enforcement agency is the subject of allegations. The dynamic raises a couple of concerns, including the ability to ensure an investigation that is unfettered by a power imbalance and the question of who is best situated to serve as the decision-maker.

We discussed this matter with SRPD leadership as well as the City Manager (who oversees the Police Department as part of the City structure). After some dialogue and sample drafts of a new protocol, the City settled on an updated policy that clarifies a new mechanism for cases in which the Chief is named. (The Chief chose to retain discretion on the handling of investigations involving captain-level personnel and below.) The new policy language (under Section 1020.10.2) calls for future misconduct allegations to be referred to the City Manager's Office for decisions about how the investigation will occur, who will conduct it, and how the outcome will be decided.

In our experience, these situations arise very infrequently. But we appreciate the Department's recognition that a clear policy for addressing them has value, as well as its collaborative efforts in creating such a policy for the first time.

Force and Critical Incident Review

Last year's IPA Annual Report included a lengthy discussion of SRPD's force review process, and featured a "mini-audit" of a random sampling of completed force packages. Our focus was not on officer performance in the field, but instead on the effectiveness of the Department's internal review system for evaluating, reinforcing, or remediating that performance.

We found that the Department's standard supervisory assessments do help ensure that officers are accountable for the force they use. But a key takeaway of our audit was also that there was room for more rigorous scrutiny regarding the totality of these events and the potential improvement opportunities that they often present.

In 2024, the Department showed a commitment to this goal in a few productive, encouraging ways. One was the first-time creation of a "Use of Force Analysis" report that looked at cumulative data from 2023 across a variety of categories. These included the type of force, comparative totals by month and time of day, and relation to other relevant metrics like arrests and calls for service.

The report also produced recommendations for potential focal points in training and documentation. (For example, the limited effectiveness of the Taser in several incidents suggested a potential focus for re-training, and certain less lethal options appeared to be under-utilized.)

Producing such a report is labor-intensive – but in our view extremely worthwhile. We encourage to Department to continue prioritizing its assembly and benefiting from its insights with concrete follow-ups. Our understanding is that SRPD is shifting to a new computer tracking system that will facilitate this process (as well as others).

Another enhancement to the force review process was a new monthly audit by a Department Captain of a completed evaluation package. As we noted last year, the standard SRPD process after every force deployment involves a sergeant-level investigation into what occurred and whether the force was

consistent with policy and training. This is then reviewed and potentially supplemented by a lieutenant. But captains – the second highest rank in the agency – rarely become involved in the assessment of this process for lower-level incidents.

In the examples we've seen since the protocol began late last year, the captain concurred with the finding the force had been in-policy. However, he also had additional feedback that was detailed and insightful; it ranged from requests for further documentation to points about tactics, de-escalation, and peripheral commentary that was recorded and did not show the officers in their best light.

These results left us with mixed feelings: we were both impressed with the issue-spotting and wishing that it had happened earlier in the process. We know that the Department's emphasis on "holistic review," which we have enthusiastically espoused in each Report, is a work in progress. Our hope is that adding this new layer, even in a limited, once-a-month way, has real potential to enhance the process more broadly.

RECOMMENDATION 1:

SRPD should continue to prioritize enhancements to its standard force review process, especially through training and reinforcement of expectations for supervisors at all levels regarding thorough, holistic evaluations that are well-documented and include confirmation of relevant follow-up.

One concrete way to effectuate this would be by structuring the inputs in the aforementioned new computer database, so as to evoke specific and detailed reporting from officers and analysis from supervisors about the sorts of issues that sometimes go under-scrutinized.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

SRPD should take advantage of its impending re-design of computerized force tracking to create specific guidelines that further standardize detailed reporting and analysis after a force incident.

Meanwhile, 2024 saw the development of two very positive elements to this Department's infrastructure in this area. We discuss them here.

Major Incident Review Board

In order to ensure that especially noteworthy events (such as officer-involved shootings or other force deployments resulting in significant injury, and operations involving unusual or high-profile elements) receive thorough consideration, SRPD first developed this concept in 2023. We outlined its basic features last year: a panel of high-ranking Department executives that gathers with investigators and subject-matter experts to review selected incidents and assess compliance with policy and determine whether other interventions are warranted.

Last year saw the implementation of the new "Major Incident Review Board" ("MIRB"). In the latter part of 2024, after considerable deliberation about format,⁶ the Department convened this new Board for the first time and looked at six incidents that encompassed a range of issues. They included K-9 deployments that resulted in bites, a suicide that ended a barricaded suspect standoff, and an undercover operation that had exposed the involved officer to considerable danger.⁷

Although we have not been directly involved in these presentations, our understanding is that the process is continuing to evolve – and is prompting some tangible action items to refine policy, training, equipment, or individual performance.

⁶ Part of the SRPD's process for shaping its model was a survey of other agencies' approaches. We were happy to facilitate a day of information-sharing in southern California between a team of Department representatives and officers from two local agencies with whom we have worked, and whose review mechanisms we have endorsed in the past.

⁷ This variety was in keeping with one of our recommendations from last year – that SRPD derive full benefit from its new process by taking an inclusive approach to choosing incidents for it.

Training Cadre

Another step toward refinement of SRPD's internal review mechanisms was the establishment of a new unit in 2024. The Training Sergeant position has now been supplemented by the addition of two experienced officers with expertise in tactics and training. And the group has been given a number of responsibilities that are designed to strengthen the thoroughness and effectiveness of SRPD review processes in a variety of ways

This group, for example, plays a pivotal role not only in putting together the core presentations for the MIRB meetings but also in helping to shape the analysis and outcomes by offering their insights during the discussions.

The unit has also been given a role in backstopping the regular force review process by assessing all incidents when the supervisory investigations are complete. The goal here is not to confirm or challenge the initial findings, but instead to look for items deserving of follow-up at the individual officer level or more broadly. The unit has different options for addressing concerns – often through specific and responsive training. And it has also begun the process of building on the first versions of the cumulative "Use of Force Analysis" discussed above. Along with surface level case review of individual incidents, the unit also tracks data collectively with an eye toward identifying trends and opportunities for useful intervention.

The unit also evaluates completed reviews for all of the Department's vehicle pursuits, with much the same intent. As we discuss below, the unit produced a detailed cumulative overview of the agency's 45 pursuits in 2024, including outcomes, precipitating events, weather conditions, locations within the City, and other factors.

The training cadre has other duties as well – including conducting the advanced officer training that all sworn personnel must complete on an annual basis. (The cadre's officers are generally occupied by conducting this training one day a week.) It also evaluates new equipment options as the Department works to ensure that its officers are benefitting from innovations and new technology. And it has recently added assistance with the background investigation process for new officers to its repertoire.

We had the chance to meet in-person with the new team on a couple of occasions in 2024. We were impressed with their enthusiasm and sense of the unit's potential. Ideally, the Department will continue to find ways to benefit from this new layer of review and response.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

SRPD should look for ways to maximize the influence of its Training Cadre in assessing and improving officer performance in high-risk areas of operations.

SRPD and Vehicle Pursuits

SRPD had 45 reported vehicle pursuits in 2024, slightly fewer than the previous two years and with a smaller number of resulting collisions as well.⁸ Still, the topic remains a focal point in current debates about law enforcement policy and practice, both locally and nationally. For obvious reasons, vehicle pursuits are one of law enforcement's highest risk activities, endangering not only suspects and officers but the third parties who could inadvertently become affected – at times with tragic consequences.

The tension is between the inherent dangers of pursuits versus the potential impacts on criminality when offenders (whose reckless driving may itself be an issue) are not apprehended.⁹

While California law gives a significant measure of liability protection to agencies that have policies to govern their officers' conduct in this context, the risks continue to make the topic a sensitive one. Individual departments have responded to this reality in different ways.

The most direct is in the form of policy. Most significantly, agencies can and do set different thresholds for the level of offender conduct that is needed for a pursuit to be authorized initially. At the low end is, effectively, any failure to yield when a stop is conducted – even for a minor traffic or equipment violation. More restrictive approaches require officers to reasonably believe that an occupant of the vehicle has committed a violent crime and/or is armed and dangerous, or is seemingly impaired in such a way as to present an imminent threat of harm to public safety. This has obvious implications for the number of incidents that a given agency will experience on a regular basis.

⁸ The statistics in this section are derived from our own review of the SRPD database as well as an informative presentation created by the Training Cadre earlier this year.

⁹ There is some anecdotal sense that a percentage of people involved in criminal activity are actually cognizant of restrictions that may apply to a particular agency; this idea fuels a concern that it incentivizes a refusal to comply with officer attempts to conduct vehicle stops.

Santa Rosa's policy aligns directly with that of most other law enforcement agencies in Sonoma County,¹⁰ and gives a baseline authorization for pursuing when an officer reasonably believes the driver is "attempting to evade arrest or detention by fleeing in a vehicle" after being signaled to stop. Approximately half of SRPD's 45 pursuits 2024 began with a vehicle infraction serving as the precipitating event.

To be clear, this "low end" threshold does not provide unlimited latitude to officers. Instead, the policy incorporates several factors that are meant to be given consideration with regard to both initiation and *termination* – the other end of authorization structure. Termination guidelines often end up dictating the conclusion of these incidents, as officers or monitoring supervisors make the decision that the risks of continuing have become too significant in relation to the underlying reason for the apprehension.

The role of supervisors during the pursuit is another critical check on officer behavior. Policy requires officers who initiate a pursuit to immediately be in touch by radio with the Department's communications center and to provide detailed information about the underlying circumstances and the evolving conditions of the pursuit itself. The officer's field supervisor (usually a sergeant) and the Department's current Watch Commander (usually a lieutenant) are then expected to actively monitor the proceedings¹¹; both retain authority over the pursuit and have the ability to stop it at any time. Relevant factors include speed, weather conditions, time of day, and traffic patterns.

These are important "guardrails" – and are seemingly influential ones. Approximately half of last year's pursuits ended in termination. (The suspects ended up stopping in 18 incidents of the incidents; 7 ended in a collision involving the suspect vehicle, three involved "stop techniques" such as spike strips). Some specific examples of terminated incidents included the following:

¹⁰The source of the shared policy language is Lexipol, a national company that provides policy guidance to a large number of departments in California. Lexipol has been criticized in some circles for an approach that often defers to officer decision-making.

¹¹ The field supervisor can and does become involved in the pursuit itself if it is feasible for him or her to do so.

- Officers followed a wanted domestic violence suspect as he left his home mid-day; the suspect failed to yield, but the Watch Commander terminated the pursuit in approximately one minute, based in part on their knowledge of the suspect's identity and confidence that he could be apprehended at another time.
- An officer self-terminated when his pursuit of a speeding suspect seemed to provoke greater speeds and dangerous driving maneuvers in a crowded area.
- A sergeant ended the pursuit of a stolen vehicle within a minute when speeds reached 120 mph on the freeway.
- An officer self-terminated the pursuit of a mini-bike when it crossed a median on the freeway and exited off a ramp, citing the driver's recklessness.

These and other examples showed appropriate restraint and situational awareness. Still, the factors that are meant to guide the decision-making process while a pursuit is unfolding inevitably involve subjectivity and individual judgment. This can be questionable, as shown in some of the incidents we chose for a comprehensive review and discuss below.

As we have seen in other jurisdictions, attempts to calibrate or shape responses too specifically or comprehensively in policy can be unwieldy, leading to uncertainty in the moment and confusion or frustration over subsequent findings. Accordingly, the Department's training and review processes take on added importance.

SRPD prioritizes training its officers with regard to their driving skills and familiarity with policy. It dedicates a full day to these concepts annually – four times the minimum that the state mandates for law enforcement ongoing certification.

A number of officers are also trained in the "PIT"¹² maneuver, which involves an intentional glancing collision that ideally causes the suspect vehicle to spin out abruptly and lose power. Officers must be certified in order to employ the

¹² PIT stands for "Pursuit Intervention Technique."

technique.¹³ While the PIT can be effective under the right circumstances, it can also be dangerous to the pursuer and pursued alike and hard to execute correctly, as we saw in some of the cases we assessed.

Our understanding is that PIT certification is a "one-time" event and does not have to be renewed. We recognize the practicalities of this, but encourage the Department to consider ways that this important skill can be reinforced. Similarly, the "spike strip" is a potentially effective tool for incapacitating vehicles, and is equipment that SRPD has available. But it can also be unwieldy and dangerous to officers if it results in the loss of control. (And, in one of the cases we looked at, the strips also resulted in disabling damage to an involved police vehicle.)

RECOMMENDATION 4:

SRPD should consider ways to strengthen officer training with regard to the PIT maneuver and the use of spike strips in the vehicle pursuit context.

As for the SRPD review process, it corresponds in many ways – both procedurally and substantively – with its approach to review of use of force. A sergeant is responsible for the initial information gathering and review of evidence. (SRPD has in-car cameras as well as body-worn cameras.) The material then goes to a lieutenant, who makes the determination as to whether the pursuit was in policy.

Only one of 2024's incidents was found to be out of policy. That case involved speeds of up to 120 mph and ended for the involved officer with a single-vehicle collision. (Fortunately, the officer was not injured and damage to the patrol car was minimal.) All others were approved.

For the most part, we concurred with this determination, and we noted several incidents in which the officers' restraint and control was especially commendable. That said, some of the more complex matters that we studied

¹³ We reviewed two cases in which the original lead officer ended up deferring to a partner car for this reason.

thoroughly (including by review of available video evidence) left us with questions about the resolution.

We took an in-depth look at six incidents that we knew from the initial descriptions had noteworthy components. (Two came from earlier this year.). One incident, for example, involved a stolen ambulance that had an EMT in the back during the nine-minutes of the pursuit. Another involved multiple attempts at a PIT (including an unapproved technique), and a third ended when the suspect collided with a power pole on a rainy night.

There were strong elements in some of these reviews; in fact, having looked at a majority of the sergeant memos and lieutenant responses from the 2024 case, we noted an encouraging tendency to identify and document peripheral issues that were worthy of attention even though they did not have direct implications for compliance with the pursuit policy. Examples included the following:

- A pursuit that was terminated nonetheless provided a forum for addressing several issues with the several officers involved, including policy reminders, communication expectations, speed, and technique for effectively clearing intersections.
- A pursuit that ended with the successful apprehension of a suspect with a felony warrant led to training points for the involved officer about turning on his siren in a timely fashion, and remembering officer safety principals when conducting a "high risk" stop at the end of the encounter. The officer met with his sergeant to discuss these points.
- A pursuit that was ended when officers lost sight of a speeding motorcycle nonetheless produced training points about excessive speed and adequacy of radio traffic.
- A pursuit that followed one of two racing vehicles ended without incident when the suspect vehicle stopped. But the lieutenant prompted a conversation with involved officers about safety concerns in the approach and arrest of the driver.

These are examples of "holistic" assessments that extend beyond the bottom-line results and provide valuable feedback. We very much endorse the thorough and productive nature of these reviews.

In some instances, though, and depending on the circumstances, the effective issue-spotting should seemingly have translated into more formal accountability. We noted a reluctance to address problematic driving decisions as matters of policy – and the discipline process – even when concerns were rightly identified.

For instance, the case that involved multiple PIT maneuvers led to an extensive review that ultimately led to a finding that the pursuit was in policy – even though one officer used a ramming technique that was not consistent with SRPD policy or training. Though the officer was counseled by his supervisor, no other accountability measures occurred.

In a recent case involving a pursuit for "reckless driving" that ended with the subject colliding with a light pole, we noted several risk factors. These included the rainy conditions, speeds on city streets that reached 74 mph, and one officer's failure to properly clear an intersection at a red light. A briefing about consideration of the weather was the only noted intervention.

Lastly, another case involving extremely high freeway speeds should probably have been terminated sooner (one officer acknowledged being "pretty far back" on the radio, at which point he presumably should not have continued in Code-3 response). The officers eventually lost sight of the suspect car altogether.

We recognize that the violations we noted were at times technical in nature and (fortunately) did not have problematic repercussions. Honest mistakes in performance are often best handled as training opportunities. But the stakes in these incidents are always high. Rigorous review – and accountability where warranted – are important ways in which SRPD's leadership can reinforce expectations about safety and sound decision-making.

RECOMMENDATION 5:

SRPD should continue to prioritize the comprehensive review of vehicle pursuit incidents, and should extend its willingness to address performance that deviates from policy and expectations with formal discipline when warranted.

IPA Visits to Santa Rosa

While we operate out of southern California, we are regular contact with SRPD representatives and other City officials, including our monthly meetings with the City Manager. And we are available to the public by email and phone; several complaints investigations were conducted this year after the complainants made initial outreach to our office.

While these "remote" communications have their place, we also prioritize in-person visits to the City. We had three such visits in 2024, including two in the summer and one in December.

Part of OIR Group's role in Santa Rosa is to present its annual Report to the City Council at a public meeting. We had our most recent opportunity to do this in person June of 2024.

Importantly, the Council has also developed a protocol to maximize the Report's utility by turning to the Police Department at a subsequent meeting and asking for reactions and responses. We were also in attendance in July when the Chief and other members of the Command Staff made a formal presentation to the Public Safety Subcommittee. The Department addressed our latest recommendations for adjustments to its review systems, and discussed the reforms that had already been accomplished or were in progress.

We also featured an opportunity for public dialogue during one of our summer visits in 2024, hosting a "town hall" event at the Utility Field Office facility on Stony Point Road. City officials and Police Department representatives were also in attendance. We remain committed to being a resource for members of the public who wish to share their insights, concerns, and questions about the policing in Santa Rosa.

Another vehicle for engaging with the public continues to be the Chief's Community Advisory Team. This group, selected from an application process by the City Manager's Office, meets monthly at SRPD for presentations and

dialogue with the Chief about current policing issues in Santa Rosa. The C-CAT's members represent a cross-section of backgrounds and perspectives, but share an interest in contributing to effective police-community relations. We appreciated our second opportunity to get together with them in June, at the time our Report was released, and look forward to our next session with them.

Conclusion

Our relationship with the City of Santa Rosa began in 2020, in the aftermath of the George Floyd protest events that had reached the City and led to days of divisive encounters between demonstrators and the Police Department. The City hired us that fall for a project that had two components: an "after-action" review of SRPD's overall response to crowd control challenges in those days, and a participatory role in the several administrative investigations into alleged misconduct that emerged from that period.

Several months after we completed that work in the spring of 2021, we were pleased to be selected for the new version of an Independent Police Auditor position that the Council hoped would help address ongoing concerns. It was a challenging time for policing throughout the country – but also an opportunity for law enforcement agencies to engage with their communities at a new level of transparency and responsiveness.

SRPD's full cooperation with our Office has been a component of its ongoing efforts to meet new public expectations. Our access to confidential accountability systems – and our "real time" ability to influence those systems – allows us to speak with confidence about their legitimacy. And our hope is that the larger result is more effective policing and greater community trust.

There is always room for improvement, and always a need to remain attuned to challenges and priorities that evolve on a regular basis. That work continues in Santa Rosa; we are grateful for our ongoing part in the process.

2024 SRPD Personnel Investigations:

IPA Monitoring

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Female complained that officer was rude and aggressive in responding to her call for service regarding a domestic incident with her mother.	Complete. BWC recordings established that officer's conduct was in-policy.	Concur with outcome.	Communication style reviewed with officer re different approaches.
A mother complained on behalf of her teenage son, who was arrested after being stopped as a pedestrian and who was initially uncooperative with police and asserted that he was mistreated.	Complete. Evidence established that the stop was lawful, and that other elements of the complaint were based on perception more than improper conduct.	Concur with outcome.	Supervisor followed up with involved officers regarding a couple of training points from the encounter.
SRPD generated this case internally based on supervisor concerns; it involved an officer's deviation from expected safety and protocol standards in locating a subject for arrest inside a residence.	Complete. The Department found that there were sustained violations of policy in conjunction with the incident, and addressed them accordingly.	Participated in interview with subject officer; concur with outcome.	
Complainant made a number of allegations in connection with police actions during the response to a domestic incident at his home that involved several family members.	Complete. Investigation established that none of the separate claims within the complaint was supported by the evidence.	Concur with outcome.	Complainant contacted IPA on several occasions regarding his concerns.
A man who was involved in an ongoing domestic dispute with a former partner made separate allegations regarding his arrest and	Complete. Complainant's issues were investigated thoroughly and were each designated as unfounded.	Concur with outcome.	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
several other contacts with SRPD officers.			
Complainant alleged an inadequate SRPD response to her call for service regarding possible safety concerns on her property.	Complete. Department review established that the responding officer had acted in a manner consistent with expectations.	Concur with outcome.	Complainant has had multiple contacts with IPA and other entities regarding this and similar issues.
Complainant was a pedestrian who alleged that he saw two separate SRPD drivers (including a Department executive) illegally fail to yield when he had the right of way.	Complete. Investigator visited the scene, found surveillance cameras, and was able to re-create the sequence of events in showing that no improper driving had occurred.	Concur with outcome	Investigator had a detailed follow-up with complainant regarding review and findings.
Frequent complainant alleged she had received a traffic citation improperly.	Complete; in-car camera recording corroborated that the faulty equipment issue that led to the stop was valid.	Concur with outcome	
Complainant took exception to the search of her home by an SRPD special unit, which was predicated on her adult daughter's probation conditions.	Complete. Officers were acting consistent with their assignment, and in a legal manner.	Concur with outcome.	Investigator followed up with complainant to clarify relevant protocols and the basis for officer actions.
Department generated an administrative investigation into possible policy violations by several participants in an arrest of two individuals during a homicide investigation.	Complete. Investigation showed policy violations by several officers in terms of deviation from proper protocols for reporting and other documentation. These were addressed appropriately.	Participated in subject interviews of the involved personnel. Concur with outcome.	
Department learned of unduly confrontational court testimony by an officer and initiated a review.	Complete. Transcripts showed that officer had fallen short of expectations in his	Concur with outcome.	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
	argumentative handling of cross-examination. This was addressed by supervisors.		
Complainant challenged several SRPD actions that prompted her detention by an outside agency.	Complete. The woman's detention arose from her driving a vehicle that had allegedly been involved in a crime the night before. Officer actions were reviewed in detail and found to be appropriate.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged stolen and damaged property as well as discourtesy by SRPD officers in the context of his being arrested.	Complete. Body-worn camera recordings showed the relevant searches and handling of complainant's possessions, and no misconduct occurred.	IPA requested further investigation into property damage, which was done. Concur with outcome.	
The parent of a recent arrestee (now an adult, but a juvenile at the time of the alleged crime) complained that SRPD had released confidential information inappropriately.	Complete. Review determined that release of information was consistent with law and policy.	Concur with outcome.	Review included legal research by City Attorney's Office.
SRPD initiated an investigation when it learned that an officer had been delinquent by several months in handling follow-up to calls for service.	Complete. Allegations were sustained, and SRPD imposed a range of remedial actions for accountability and future performance.	Participated in subject interview. Concur with outcome.	Issues did not compromise criminal cases.
SRPD initiated an investigation based on a complaint by a civilian employee regarding wrongful treatment by a supervisor.	Complete. Department determined that no policies had been violated, but sought to address the underlying concerns outside the discipline process.	Concur with outcome.	
A third party passed along allegations by an unhoused person	Complete; BWC of the encounter definitively refuted the allegations of mistreatment.	Concur with outcome.	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
that he had been assaulted by SRPD officers outside a service facility.			
Complainant alleged on behalf of a third party that a domestic violence case was mishandled due to racial bias against women of color.	Complete. Review showed that the investigating officer had made a procedural error that was quickly rectified and not attributable to bias. Misconduct allegation was unfounded.	Concur with outcome.	Follow up with involved officer occurred.
Complainant alleged on behalf of a third party that a domestic dispute involving a possible assault was mishandled due to racial bias.	Complete. Review showed that complainant was correct in pointing out gaps in the process for the criminal investigation, but these were attributable to an error by a civilian employee (which was rectified). No misconduct by the investigating officer was established.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged that her report of an assault in a parking lot was improperly disregarded by SRPD, potentially due to racial bias.	Complete. Investigation established that the handling officer reached appropriate conclusions in the field (in part after consultation with a supervisor). No misconduct identified.	Concur with outcome.	Administrative investigation included follow-up into the original incident to ensure that outcome was appropriate.
Complainant alleged that SRPD officers mishandled multiple calls for service at her address regarding domestic tensions.	Investigation complete. Extensive review of multiple calls established that allegations were unfounded.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant believes officers mishandled a traffic stop that led to her loss of license.	Complete. Evidence established that the officers had responded appropriately to the call, which had begun with a report that the complainant asleep behind the wheel.	Concur with outcome.	Complainant has raised other allegations of misconduct on multiple occasions.
Complainant alleged that officers were failing to take appropriate action regarding harassment, threats, and surveillance he was	Complete. SRPD had records of multiple calls for service with unsubstantiated concerns about neighbor contact; BWC showed	Concur with outcome.	Complainant initially contacted IPA

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
experiencing at the hands of neighbors.	appropriate handling and possible mental health issues from complainant.		re these concerns.
Anonymous complainant alleged that an SRPD officer had fallen short of requirements in completing a traffic citation.	Complete. The complaint appears to have been based on misinformation about required details when filling out a ticket	Concur with outcome.	Complainant left a voicemail with IPA to initiate the review.
Complainant alleged that an officer had responded inappropriately, including with physical force, when she approached him about an issue as he was handling another call for service.	Complete. Body-worn camera recording showed that the officer was brusque but not inappropriate, and that any physical contact was incidental.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant believed that her calls to 911 were not handled appropriately by dispatchers.	Complete. Review of the recorded calls established that the interactions with the complainant were, for the most part, appropriate to the circumstances. Follow-up occurred re minor performance concerns.	Concur with outcome.	Complainant has a long history of contacts with SRPD and other agencies, and has contacted IPA on multiple occasions.
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.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged that a dispatcher had lacked compassion and professionalism when	Complete. Dispatch supervisor reviewed the recorded call and found that the allegations were not substantiated.	Concur with outcome.	.

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
responding to an inquiry about seat belt laws.			
Complainant thought that the officer who responded to her call (regarding a suspicious person at a gas station who flashed a badge at her) had not handled it appropriately.	Complete. Key issue was whether the events she described constituted a crime. Officer was found to have handled the call with due diligence.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant was arrested for creating a public disturbance while intoxicated; he filed a complaint regarding his treatment by one involved officer and said his property had been mishandled.	Complete. Officer's actions (including diligence in identifying the uncooperative subject's property) were appropriate.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant said that his arresting officer had violated his rights in various ways, and was insufficiently careful with his injured shoulder.	Complete. Evidence established that that the officer's actions were legally justified, and that he had been appropriately responsive to complainant's physical concerns. BWC activation issue identified and addressed by supervision.	Concur with outcome.	Complaint was initiated by letter to IPA while subject was incarcerated.
Complainant has experienced multiple police contacts in recent months, and shared several allegations relating to the handling or mishandling of events she had been involved with.	Complete. No potential misconduct identified in multiple police contacts; complainant did not respond to efforts at gaining clarification of her concerns.	Concur with outcome.	Complaint was initiated by email to IPA.
Complainant alleged that she had wrongfully received a citation for speeding, and that the officer had intimidated and threatened her when she asked for explanations.	Complete. BWC showed that the officer's interactions (which included summoning a supervisor to the scene) had been characterized inaccurately in the complaint. Unfounded.	Concur with outcome.	Investigator met with complainant to review the incident and discuss the BWC.
		Concur with outcome.	Complainant reached out to

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Complainant alleged misconduct and harassment by officers who contacted him regarding his unsafe vehicle.	Complete. While the enforcement action and officer conduct were mostly consistent with policy, the investigation did show discourtesy at one point in the encounter; this was addressed.		IPA office to make complaint.
Department-initiated internal matter relating to alleged inappropriate treatment of co-workers.	Complete. Allegations were sustained, and Department issued appropriate consequence.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant was confused and concerned by police contact regarding a banking transaction that he said was legitimate.	Complete. SRPD contact had been requested after bank raised concerns about possible elder abuse. Officer was polite at the scene and determined that no crime had occurred. Complete unfounded.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant took offense to various aspects of officer's actions when he attempted to intervene in a dispute among neighbors over a barking dog.	Complete. Body-worn camera showed that the officer had been professional and appropriate in dealing with the contention between parties; specific allegations were refuted by the evidence.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged that detective had been uncommunicative and ineffective in handling a lengthy investigation into child sex abuse.	Complete. Review determined that detective's actions had been satisfactory over the course of a long process. Supervisor met with detective to reinforce importance of regular communication.	Concur with outcome.	Follow-up meetings with complainant helped resolve issues.
Department opened an investigation into a one-car traffic collision by an officer during a high-speed vehicle pursuit.	Complete. Sustained for violations of driving policy. Officer acknowledged shortcomings in performance.	Concur with outcome.	IPA participated in the subject interview.

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Department initiated a review of an off-duty encounter that involved mutual allegations between an SRPD and a male subject.	Complete. The criminal case was reviewed by an outside agency and no charges were filed. SRPD investigation determined no wrongdoing by subject officer.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged that a civilian SRPD employee had been driving erratically and at excessive speeds.	Complete. GPS data confirmed that the speeding violation had occurred, and the complaint was sustained.	Concur with outcome.	
Department-initiated case addressed an officer's accidental damage to a gas pump.	Complete. Sustained with appropriate remedial measures.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged bias in the way that a civilian employee wrote the report regarding complainant's traffic collision.	Complete. Patrol officers also responded, and the scene and report were handled in a manner consistent with expectations.	Concur with outcome.	Original report was amended to include the blood-alcohol breath test that responding officers had administered at complainant's request.
Complainant alleged profiling and rights violations in the context of his brief detention as a robbery suspect.	Complete. Though the complainant was indeed innocent of any wrongdoing, officer's actions occurred in the context of response to an armed robbery that had just occurred in the area. No violations of policy.	Concur with outcome.	
Unhoused individual complained that her property had not been saved/returned in the aftermath of her arrest for open warrants.	Complete. Body-worn camera recordings showed the complainant refusing to cooperate with officer efforts to identify her property at the outdoor location where she was arrested (and where multiple individuals were apparently camping).	Concur with outcome.	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Complainant claimed that an illegal search had resulted in his arrest and the improper impounding of his vehicle.	Complete. Police reports and body-camera recordings established the probable cause and legal foundation for officers' actions.	Concur with outcome.	
Unhoused individual made complaints about specific enforcement actions taken against him and a third-party (whose vehicle was towed).	Complete. Investigation established that officers were legally justified and handled the disputed interactions appropriately.	Concur with outcome.	Complainant has had multiple contacts with IPA.
Third-party complainant alleged that officer was inappropriately using police contacts as a basis for pursuing personal information about complainant's female friend.	Complete. Body-worn camera recordings of disputed contacts (as well as interviews with involved parties) established that officer's actions had been benign and appropriate.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant's wide-ranging allegations included claims that an officer had wrongly contacted her about trespassing at a public shopping center.	Complete. Complainant's issues were complex and involved different agencies. BWC showed SRPD officer had handled the call for service politely and appropriately.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant made several allegations in conjunction with an enforcement operation that led to her arrest.	Complete. Department did a methodical review of the circumstances relating to her arrest, which was part of a larger criminal investigation. No misconduct was established.	Concur with outcome.	Complainant contacted IPA re her concerns.
Complainant alleged that officers mishandled different calls for service arising from custody issues and restraining orders.	Complete. Each named incident was reviewed and found to have been addressed appropriately by the respective officers involved.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged that his traffic citation and vehicle impound were unconstitutional under various theories.	Complete. Body-worn camera found that the citation (for speeding) was supported by the evidence and that other actions were lawful.	Concur with outcome.	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Complainant alleged that an SRPD officer had collided with her car and left the scene improperly.	Complete. Investigation determined that a minor collision had occurred but that the officer did not realize it at the time. "Sustained" for improper/unsafe driving.	Concur with outcome.	IPA participated in subject interview.
Complainant alleged that the service of a search warrant at her residence had been mishandled by involved officers.	Complete. Records established that the officers' actions were consistent with policy and training, and that the warrant itself was valid.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged unprofessionalism at the end of a call with a civilian dispatcher.	Complete. Phone recording established that the comments were made without realizing caller was on the line; corrective action was taken.	Concur with outcome.	
Department-initiated investigation relating to alleged mishandling of found property that turned out to be evidence in a criminal case.	Complete. Allegation of unsatisfactory performance was sustained against the handling officer; an involved supervisor was exonerated.	Concur with outcome.	
Department-initiated investigation concerning allegations that supervisor was neglecting his duties to attend to personal matters.	Complete. Allegation was sustained, and remedial action was taken.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged lost property, wrongly confiscated driver's license, and improper markings on impounded vehicle.	Complete. Investigation determined that the out-of-state driver's license had in fact been seized inappropriately due to confusion over different state laws. This was addressed. The whereabouts of the lost property was "inconclusive," though no evidence pointed to officer misconduct. Markings on car were not created by SRPD.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged that SRPD officers repeatedly ignored evidence of criminal behavior and wrongly	Complete. Complainant had repeated interactions with SRPD, which were handled appropriately and with due	Concur with outcome.	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
initiated a mental health response to her calls for service.	diligence regarding claims of criminal behavior.		
Complainant, who was briefly detained in the context of domestic disturbance call, believed that an officer's behavior toward him was biased and unduly aggressive.	Complete. Officer was exonerated. Body-worn camera recording showed that officer's actions were professional and appropriate to the known facts.	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged that his traffic accident report had included inaccurate information and improperly ascribed blame.	Complete. Allegations were unfounded. Errors did occur in original report, but were unintentional and appropriately addressed.	Concur with outcome.	Supplemental traffic report did fix relevant information.
Complainants, involved in a traffic collision, claimed that officer mishandled the investigation and was discourteous.	Complete. BWC showed that officer's assessment of the collision was reasonable and appropriate.	Concur with outcome.	