

*City of Santa Rosa*

# Independent Police Auditor's First Report re: Santa Rosa Police Department

March 2023



Michael Gennaco  
Stephen Connolly  
Teresa Magula  
Brian Corr



323-821-0586  
7142 Trask Avenue | Playa del Rey, CA  
90293  
[OIRGroup.com](http://OIRGroup.com)

# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	3
Complaints and Allegations of Misconduct .....	9
The Complaint Process: Strengths and Potential for Improvement .....	11
IPA Input: Opportunities to Enhance SRPD Response .....	16
SRPD Force Review Process .....	19
SRPD Critical Incident Review .....	23
IPA Community Engagement .....	24
Implicit Bias Training .....	26
Other SRPD Initiatives .....	30
inRESPONSE .....	30
Chief's Community Ambassador Team .....	31
Conclusion .....	32
Appendix: Complaint Case Summaries .....	0

# Introduction

Relative to many jurisdictions in California and across the country, the City of Santa Rosa was an “early adopter” of independent oversight of its Police Department (“SRPD”). It had hired an outside consultant to review its internal practices in 2014, and had a full-time auditor from 2016 through 2018 to review misconduct investigations, uses of force, and general police practices, but then had not filled the position when that auditor departed.

In 2020, as the City’s leadership was re-evaluating its model and considering how best to revive its fallow oversight program, Santa Rosa experienced the George Floyd protest movement in a couple of significant ways. The first was direct: several days of demonstrations in the City created challenges for SRPD and led to enforcement activity that included controversial force deployments and widespread arrests. And the second was systemic: amidst a national reconsideration of policing and potential reforms, Santa Rosa took the opportunity to design a new and more robust model of oversight.

The goals of this new approach were to increase accountability and transparency, and to enhance existing review processes through outside scrutiny and input. And to achieve these goals, the mechanism that emerged was the introduction of “real time” independent monitoring.

Under the new model, the Independent Police Auditor (“IPA”) would be able to track any allegations of misconduct from the beginning of the process through the end – with an opportunity to actively participate in both investigations and outcomes. A range of other review functions were also incorporated into the scope of work, including assessment of critical incidents, policies and procedures, and Department training. The City also added a “community outreach” element to the IPA role, which called for availability to the public and periodic meetings as organized by City staff.

The selection of a new IPA was finalized in the fall of 2021, and OIR Group began its work in November. OIR Group is a team of police practices experts that has worked exclusively in the field of independent oversight of law enforcement since 2001. It is led by Michael Gennaco, a former federal prosecutor and a nationally recognized leader in the oversight profession. OIR Group has worked in jurisdictions throughout California and in several other states, and its members have reviewed hundreds of critical incidents and thousands of misconduct investigations involving the police.

One component of the IPA responsibilities is the submission of an annual public report that summarizes the year's investigations and includes an evaluation of SRPD's internal review processes and other operations. This First Audit Report covers 2022 activities and is meant to provide a window into SRPD accountability from the perspective of its outside monitor.

67 investigations into allegations of misconduct were initiated by the Department during the calendar year. Though several of these related to internal employment matters and were begun by SRPD administration, the majority were the result of external complaints from members of the public. Those cases that fell within our scope were followed throughout the process by the IPA. Below, we discuss the mechanics of our involvement in more detail. But it is important to note that we were able to play an active role in SRPD's handling of these matters, and to consult with the Department on the outcomes that were reached.

We are pleased to report several positive impressions from our initial year in the role. First and foremost, we wish to emphasize that the Department has fully "held up its end" in terms of cooperation and facilitation of our involvement. From the start of our tenure as IPA, SRPD has been fully transparent, communicative, and receptive to our questions and challenges. We have regular meetings with the leadership of the Department's "Professional Standards" unit (which has the lead role in conducting misconduct investigations), frequent conversations and correspondence regarding the progress of pending matters, and opportunities to interact with the Chief and other members of the command staff as needed.

The protocol also allows us to participate in investigative interviews and ask our own questions of subject officers. And, importantly, we also have

complete, unredacted, and autonomous access to the Department's own "IA Pro" computer database, which organizes all relevant evidence, reports, and memos related to each personnel investigation. We are able to watch all body-worn camera recordings related to each case, and listen to any recorded interviews that are part of the investigation. This arrangement provides "unfettered" access in the most comprehensive way and is indicative of the Department's acceptance of what we need to function effectively as an independent auditor.

This access is pivotal to the transparency that the City prioritized in designing the current oversight model, and SRPD has been fully cooperative in facilitating our ability to see confidential files and records with the same clearance as Department executives. This dynamic obviously speaks to the openness of the agency to outside scrutiny. And for us, the access obviously strengthens our ability to make informed assessments, and accordingly to offer our input from a stronger and more persuasive foundation.

To be clear, the IPA is not empowered to *require* particular outcomes – that authority continues to rest with the Chief of Police. But our close connection to the progress of each case helps allow us to ensure that investigations are appropriately thorough and that outcomes are a legitimate response to the available evidence.

As for those outcomes, we found that the Department's final decision regarding each case was reasonable and consistent with the results of the investigative process. Our agreement with individual outcomes was generally complete and straightforward. And when our opinions about specific aspects of a case did differ (as we discuss later in this Report), we nonetheless believed that the Department took our views into consideration and that SRPD's assessments and responses were reasonable ones.

It is important to note that it is *not* the role of the IPA to substitute its judgment for that of the Department's leadership. Such an approach is neither a feature of the actual model nor, in our view, an optimal way to achieve effective internal discipline within a law enforcement agency. Instead, control and responsibility in Santa Rosa properly rest within the Department itself. This ensures that it has ownership over its own standards and the proper

accountability of its personnel – qualities that the public has every right to expect.

But the IPA can and does reinforce the effectiveness of the Department's internal processes through active monitoring, regular consultation, transparency, and the introduction of an outside perspective. We appreciate the extent to which SRPD has engaged in this relationship – going beyond the letter of its obligations and participating in productive dialogue and responsive adjustments throughout the year.

Another component of our work pertains to systemic evaluations of Department policies and practices. The majority of our focus to date has been in the arena of complaint investigations, and along with our involvement in each individual case, we also developed broader impressions about SRPD's investigative model. We consider it to be sound overall, and – as stated above – it led to appropriate outcomes and a significant number of disciplinary consequences when allegations were sustained. At the same time, we offer some broader analysis and make recommendations about potential enhancements to the Department's current approach.

Specifically, we hope the Department will routinize formal interviews of subject officers when body-camera recordings are not completely dispositive of the factual issues in the case. And we encourage SRPD to consider adjustments to its lower-level disciplinary consequences, which can be more lenient than we have experienced in other organizations.

Proposals for improvement also emerged from our initial impressions of SRPD's process for reviewing officers' use of physical force. The Department does require documentation and expects its supervisors to ensure that any use of force is justified and consistent with policy. But, as we discuss below, more could be done to make these reviews more consistently rigorous and meaningful. This is particularly true with regard to the collateral elements of an encounter (including communication, tactics, training, equipment, and supervision) that may warrant intervention even if the use of force itself complies with policy requirements.

The Department did not have any officer-involved shootings or in-custody deaths in 2022. However, the year did see the completion of SRPD's internal

investigation into an incident that resulted in the death of a subject in 2021. In that case, officers were responding to a call for service in a neighborhood where multiple residents reported hearing gunshots.<sup>1</sup> After the arrival of multiple officers, they encountered a man who was holding a large rock and refusing to comply with officer instructions. SRPD personnel eventually used a Taser and other force to overcome his resistance and take him into custody; he lost consciousness at the scene and was later pronounced dead after being transported to the hospital.

The incident was investigated by Sheriff's Office detectives and reviewed for possible criminal culpability by the District Attorney's Office, which declined any prosecution for the officers' actions. Meanwhile, the Department evaluated the incident internally – which gave us our first window into SRPD's critical incident response.

Another key element of our first year was a focus on equity issues within the Department. SRPD's efforts in this arena included the development of a new four-hour training block on "implicit bias" – a concept that has gotten increased national attention in recent years as communities continue to grapple with a long legacy of discrimination in policing. In our capacity as IPA, we had the opportunity to contribute to this development and observe the finished product, which was presented to all officers over the course of several individual sessions in the fall. As we discuss below, we were impressed with the sincerity and dedication of the "in-house" team of SRPD personnel that created and presented the program. And we considered it a worthy start to what we hope will be an ongoing point of emphasis within the agency.

We expand on these topics in the Report that follows, which we hope will add to people's understanding not only of our role but also – and more importantly – of SRPD operations. But we conclude this overview by reiterating that City officials have made public outreach a significant element of the IPA function. We are accordingly committed to being available to Santa Rosans who contact us about their specific concerns or more general viewpoints about policing. And we appreciated the chance to meet elected officials and a number of residents during three days of scheduled activities in August 2022.

---

<sup>1</sup> An assault rifle, which additional investigation connected back to the subject, was later recovered at the scene.



OIR Group's years of experience across a number of jurisdictions have provided us with a valuable range of impressions about best practices in law enforcement. We bring that experience, and a deep familiarity with "what works" in effective agencies, to each assignment. But we are also careful to recognize that each department operates in a unique context, and that local history, priorities, institutions, and community dynamics are influential in ways that are important to understand. We look forward to continuing that process in Santa Rosa, and hope this Report will contribute to a dialogue that we welcome.

# Complaints and Allegations of Misconduct

SRPD opened 67 new complaint matters in 2022. Fourteen of them were internally generated, which is to say that Department management identified a concern in performance or behavior and initiated its own administrative review. And the rest were external – complaints from members of the public about some aspect of an encounter with SRPD personnel.

Most of the related investigations are complete. The total marked a notable increase over 2021's 54 complaints, but it can be difficult to draw meaningful conclusions from short term fluctuations. (And, in an interesting counterexample, only one complaint was lodged in the first month of 2023.) At the same time, it makes sense for an agency to take a step back and look for trends, with an eye toward broader interventions.

In 2022, many of the complaints seemed to be related to officer demeanor and perceptions of disrespectful treatment – a gratuitous negative comment, or a seeming unwillingness to listen and explain, or a perception that the officer was improperly "taking sides" in a dispute. And several related to interactions with the homeless, and the propriety of officer enforcement activity. We discussed both of these "common denominators" with SRPD officials, and the Department is focused on addressing these key areas through briefing reminders and other interventions.<sup>2</sup>

In terms of the content of other complaints, there was considerable variation. Seven of them included (or revolved around) allegations of excessive force; in

---

<sup>2</sup> We also had the opportunity to meet with the supervisor who leads the Department's "Downtown Enforcement Team," which focuses on interventions with the City's unhoused population. It was an informative chance to learn about the different protocols that govern the team's strategies and approaches.

each completed case, the charges were unfounded.<sup>3</sup> Four of them included allegations of profiling or biased policing in the context of traffic stops; again, in each of the three currently completed cases, the conduct was evaluated and found to be consistent with policy. These are issues of particular sensitivity, and we considered the Department's handling of them to be cognizant of this and appropriately diligent.

The active, "real time" monitoring of personnel investigations is the core function of the IPA role in Santa Rosa. Our access to complaint information and evidence from the outset of every new case is a key element in the process. One foundational aspect of that access is technological: we have our own accounts in the Department's actual database for tracking activity across several categories, including complaint investigations and uses of force. And we have the ability to review at our convenience the original body-worn camera recordings when they are relevant to a new case.

A second, and equally important, element to our access is the regular communications we have with the SRPD investigators and decision-makers who are responsible for addressing all personnel matters. We hear about all new complaints within days of their initiation, and can follow the progress of the ensuing investigation at whatever level of involvement is needed. And when the evidence-gathering is complete, we have the opportunity to raise questions and share our own impressions about appropriate outcomes before dispositions are finalized.

This model constitutes a significant commitment on the part of the City and SRPD, not only to full transparency but also to the input and perspective of an independent entity. Our years of experience and familiarity with effective approaches from other jurisdictions informed our exchanges with the Department, and our sense is that the "finished product" was regularly enhanced by the combination of our involvement and SRPD's willingness to consider our views in reaching – and/or adjusting – conclusions about individual investigations.

As discussed below, we occasionally saw things differently than did the agency's decision-makers when it came to specific aspects of individual

---

<sup>3</sup> One case is currently still pending.

cases. And we also developed thoughts over time as to how SRPD might enhance its current processes through systemic refinements. However, it is important to note that none of these issues undermined our sense that each case outcome was both legitimate in its rationale and justified by the available evidence.

## The Complaint Process: Strengths and Potential for Improvement

We found the Department's handling of outside complaints to be very solid in the foundational ways by which we judge effectiveness. Complaints were taken seriously, investigated objectively, and assessed fairly when the evidence-gathering was complete. Importantly, we were also impressed with the way complainants were uniformly treated with respect in presenting their issues; interviews with these individuals were thorough and appropriately objective as well as respectful.

Throughout the year, we noted that allegations were addressed promptly, and the timeliness of case completion was an obvious priority. Under state law, law enforcement agencies have up to one year to finalize investigations without losing the ability to impose discipline for violations of policy; none of the SRPD cases we have evaluated have even come close to the lapsing of this deadline – an attribute that is not universal in our experience in other jurisdictions. But there are other benefits to timeliness as well, including public confidence and the ability to intervene promptly if and when performance issues are identified. Accordingly, the Department's strong showing in this regard is commendable.

While some of this is attributable to the diligence of the main investigator and the prioritization given to case completion, another is the influence of body-worn camera recordings as dispositive evidence regarding what occurred. Many of the individual cases we reviewed that were initiated by members of the public were resolved in straightforward fashion, based on the investigator's viewing of available recordings of the encounter at issue. Formal interviews of

witness or subject officers were deemed necessary in only five of the cases that began with a citizen complaint.<sup>4</sup>

In many instances, this approach matched our prior experience. Readily available evidence established what had occurred, and it was clear that the allegations were refuted. Examples included the following:

- A man who had clashed with security at a hospital (where he was a visitor) made various allegations about the officers who responded and eventually took him into custody. The reports and body-worn camera evidence established that the different actions at issue had either not occurred or were consistent with proper protocol.
- A person who had had a prior negative experience with a specific officer alleged harassment when he happened to knock on their apartment door when doing a welfare check on an unrelated individual. The body-worn camera recording established that the officer had been properly assigned to the call, was not aware that the complainant would be at the location, and handled the subsequent encounter with restraint and professionalism.
- A parent complained about her minor son's being arrested on the basis of an old warrant that had been resolved. Recordings and other records established that officers had been acting in good faith based on the (incorrect) status of the warrant in the system, and had done their due diligence in handling the situation.
- A complaint about a social media posting that allegedly expressed politically divisive views was resolved when the content at issue turned out to have been the responsibility of someone else, on an account that the accused officer had no connection to.
- A complainant alleged racial bias in the officers' handling of a traffic stop and misidentification of his race/ethnicity in the resulting citation; the body-worn camera recordings and other records established that the officers had been justified in the stop and professional in their interactions with the complainant; the mistake in identification was

---

<sup>4</sup> This pattern also held in cases that were begun within the agency: there were four cases (out of fourteen) for which the Department found an interview to be necessary – though several resulted in findings that misconduct had occurred.

inadvertent and officers followed appropriate protocol. The bias allegation was unfounded.

Other cases that were resolved without an interview were more complicated – and in our view fell into different categories.

In a small number of these investigations, it was determined that officers had indeed violated policy, but that an interview to explore these issues in greater detail was nonetheless not necessary. This was usually because the misconduct at issue was deemed minor in nature, and the proposed consequence took the form of a documented counseling or an evaluation note. These interventions fall below the threshold of "formal discipline;" accordingly, the Department has reasoned that the need for formal questioning – and an opportunity for the officer to explain or otherwise provide context – is lessened.<sup>5</sup>

Examples in this category included the following:

- An officer inadvertently mishandled an arrestee's property, causing a small amount of money to be misplaced; the SRPD proactively referred the complainant to City Risk Management for reimbursement.
- An officer made an inappropriate comment about a third party while waiting with an arrestee to be treated at the hospital; the remarks were recorded on his body-worn camera.
- An inexperienced officer improperly disposed of contraband that was taken from a subject during a brief detention.
- An officer arrived at work early, got in uniform, and then took a Department vehicle on a personal errand prior to the start of his shift.
- An officer was unprofessionally sarcastic and argumentative in dealing with a difficult subject who disagreed with his handling of a call.
- An officer used unprofessional language toward a subject in the context of an enforcement action.

---

<sup>5</sup> The officers themselves are also apparently accepting of this dynamic, rather than pushing for the opportunity to formally share their "side of the story" in an interview context.

We agreed with the Department about the relatively minor nature of the identified offenses in these cases. Our understanding is also that the officer's record will show that a policy violation occurred, and that the outcomes can become the basis for future "progressive" discipline (meaning more substantial) consequences in the event that the relevant conduct recurs. We have also been advised that even "non-disciplinary" remediations are also to be discussed in the officer's annual evaluation, a practice that is not routinely followed by other law enforcement agencies. And we recognize that, with the exception of serious misconduct that warrants termination (and is rare), the primary goal of the discipline process is to *correct* problematic behavior.

It has also been our experience that there is variance in the culture of agencies when it comes to the discipline process: the significance or impact of even a low-level intervention can have a different resonance in an agency where standards and expectations are high. Historically, that has been in the case in Santa Rosa. Department leadership assures us that the measures they utilize are taken seriously by the officers and accomplish the corrective goals of the process.

These are components of a valid argument about the sufficiency of the current system. Nonetheless, we have expressed a couple of concerns about this paradigm. One is that consequences have occasionally seemed more lenient than we might have expected – even in light of the Department's distinctive thresholds.<sup>6</sup> The other is that it seems likely to influence decision-making about whether an interview is needed or appropriate. Simply put, if a lesser outcome means less process, that can incentivize leaning towards leniency in cases that may warrant a sanction that is at least slightly firmer.

To be clear, we do not believe this stems from a reluctance to work on the part of the Professional Standards Unit – on the contrary, that small team is clearly dedicated and industrious. It seems instead to be the product of longstanding

---

<sup>6</sup> In a couple of different instances within the year, for example, an officer was found to have engaged in a second example of comparable (albeit low-level) misconduct – including discourtesy – and in both cases received only an evaluation note. (To SRPD's credit, the response to the second case also included mandated training specific to the relevant performance issues in recognition of the need for further intervention.)

protocol – that misconduct investigations are kept relatively informal in the absence of a definitive need to conduct interviews with named personnel.

The Department's disinclination to engage in formal interviews unless clearly necessary is unusual in our experience, and it is one we have encouraged them to reconsider. What a change would cost in terms of effort and added imposition on officers would be worth it in terms of the benefits that would accrue.

In our view, there is no inherent stigma attached to a formal interview process. And it obviously facilitates fact-gathering, particularly about the mindset of the officer. Additionally, in cases where other evidence suggests strongly that a policy violation has occurred, affording an interview would ensure that more formal discipline remains an option, while promoting the officer's rights to put his or her own "best foot forward."<sup>7</sup>

While a shift would be helpful in some cases of low-level shortcomings like the aforementioned, it would also be relevant to a third category of "no interview" cases that we observed: namely, ones in which some aspect of the incident is *not* completely explained by the video recordings or other available evidence, or in which requiring a more formal accounting by the officer him or herself seems warranted by the circumstances.

For example, in one case involving a parent's complaint that her pregnant daughter's encounter with an estranged boyfriend had been mishandled by the responding officer, the body-worn camera recordings established that the officer had in fact investigated the issues appropriately and reached reasonable conclusions at the scene. But when the young woman went to the hospital to be checked, she apparently shared additional information with nursing staff that prompted another call to the police. We had questions about this latter phase of the incident (to which the same officer had responded), in part because some of the relevant interactions at the hospital had not been recorded.

---

<sup>7</sup> This could potentially take different forms, including offering explanation and context that mitigates the incident or showing a clear acceptance of responsibility.



At our request, SRPD did further investigation in the form of *informal* questioning of the officer, and we were satisfied with the clarifications that emerged. Still, our sense was that the better practice would have been to have afforded him his rights and questioned him "officially" to get the information.

To be clear, there were only a handful of the 67 cases we assessed that were affected by this reticence. That is, in some ways, all the more reason to push for a new, more inclusive paradigm when it comes to interviewing officers: the workload increase would not be significant. And it would strengthen the fact-finding and overall quality of an important process.

#### RECOMMENDATION 1:

SRPD should expand the range of complaint cases for which it conducts formal interviews of subject officers, in order to ensure the completeness of fact-gathering and the proper discretion for administering discipline where applicable.

#### RECOMMENDATION 2:

SRPD should review its approach to disciplinary consequences for low-level policy violations, and consider leaning more in the direction of a formal process.

## IPA Input: Opportunities to Enhance SRPD Response

In terms of our contribution to the process, we reiterate our appreciation for the Department's transparency and facilitation of our input. We have developed a standardized protocol with SRPD for notifications, updates, evidence review, and opportunities to provide feedback prior to any decisions about individual cases being finalized. Depending on the case, this has often taken the form of simply confirming the adequacy of the investigative steps and the legitimacy of the proposed outcome. Our ability to independently review all aspects of the

investigation adds a layer of thoroughness and objectivity to the process, even in the most straightforward of matters.

In other instances, we have used the opportunity to offer more substantive influence. Again, this is in part a credit to the Department's receptivity, and the contributions have taken different forms.

More routinely, this involvement has included being an "extra set of eyes" in ensuring that each element of a multi-part complaint is properly identified and addressed. More significantly, for example, we were asked to consult with the Chief during the decision-making process about whether to release a newly hired officer from his probationary employment after he was the subject of multiple complaints in his first months with the Department. And we regularly offer a different perspective on officer behavior that has shaped the agency's assessment of specific cases.

This latter contribution often takes the form of centering the complainant's experience and perceptions. With some limited exceptions, most of the complaints we looked at seemed to have been made in earnest and were driven by sincere concerns or frustrations. The Department often found, and rightfully, that assertions were erroneous or that the officers' actions – while perhaps genuinely bothersome to the complainant – were appropriate to the situation and consistent with training or expectations. Examples included the following:

- A man who was assisting a neighbor with a medical emergency complained that responding officers had treated him disrespectfully, including shining a light in his eyes and brusquely removing him from the scene. Though the officers had been understandably unsure of the man's role, and needed to be direct in addressing the immediate problem, we saw his reaction to the incident to be understandable.
- A man who was sitting on a blanket in a public area and writing in a journal was approached by two officers who began to question him, and eventually asked him for identification. The man found the encounter to be intrusive and unsettling. Even though the officers (including one trainee) were entirely professional and within their legal rights, the man seemed genuinely unhappy about being the focus of the unsolicited encounter.

- Parents complained to the Department that more had not been done by the responding officer when their teenage daughters experienced unwelcome advances from an unknown stranger at a coffee shop. Body-worn camera recordings established that the officer had, in fact, taken the matter seriously and done appropriate due diligence, but did not see the man in the area and did not have evidence of an actual crime.
- A young man generated a call for service about "suspicious activity" by remaining in his parked car for an extended period in a residential neighborhood. Responding officers encouraged him to move along by noting – incorrectly – that he was parked illegally. Then, when he was slow to leave (and based on other observations), they decided to have him exit the vehicle so that they could evaluate him for possible intoxication. Though he was eventually free to go, he alleged improper harassment.

In each of these examples, we agreed with the Department's eventual determination that no policies had been violated. But we also encouraged SRPD to go beyond the minimum notification requirements and to supplement its findings with an acknowledgment of the complainant's sincere concerns and relevant explanation as to the basis for the outcome. Encouragingly, the Department enhanced the basic format of its letter and worked to provide additional background that would ideally heighten the relevant person's sense of being heard and understood. And there were several instances in which the main investigator took the time to make a follow-up phone call at the conclusion of the case. We appreciated these efforts – and also supported the instances in which the Department took the time to engage in additional informal communication with involved officers, even when no formal misconduct had occurred.

At its best, the citizen complaint process not only promotes appropriate accountability, but also offers agencies a window into how their individual or collective actions are being perceived by the public that they serve. An encounter that is just a routine part of an officer's day can be – and often is – a memorable, impression-forming event for the average person with limited police contact. We hope SRPD will continue to look for opportunities to utilize the complaint process as a feedback loop that can potentially build relationships and enhance understanding on both sides.

# SRPD Force Review Process

Compared to the structured and comprehensive protocol for our involvement in the complaint investigation process, our exposure to SRPD's "use of force" review process has been more limited. At the same time, part of our mandate is to assess the process and related policies and training, with an eye toward making any recommendations about potential enhancements that may seem warranted. And force applications are understandably a priority area of public interest with regard to police accountability.

Accordingly, we used our window into several actual force cases (which overlapped with personnel complaint investigations) as a starting point for learning more about the Department's process. Our experience this year indicates that there is room for strengthening the current SRPD model. This is true with regard to the rigor of initial review, the documentation of identified issues, and the development of a mechanism for follow-up where appropriate. We discuss our findings below.

SRPD policy is appropriate and up to date in tracking state standards for the legal and justified use of various force options. Importantly, it also establishes a structure for appropriate internal accountability and review on those occasions when officers use force.

Per policy, officers have an obligation to notify a supervisor "immediately" when they have had any physical contact that rises above a low threshold, and must document their actions and the reasons for them in their report of the incident/arrest itself.<sup>8</sup> Supervisors, for their part, are expected under policy to go to the scene "if reasonably available," take initial statements from the

---

<sup>8</sup> To the Department's credit, it also tracks instances in which an officer points his or her firearm in the context of a police encounter, even if no other force was used.

involved officers, obtain a recorded interview from the subject<sup>9</sup>, and gather evidence of injury where relevant.

The existence of body-worn camera recordings – and the expectation that they be reviewed as part of this process – is obviously a key component of the Department's ability to know and assess what occurred. It also appears to influence written reporting: involved officers routinely document their physical actions quite concisely, and encourage readers of their reports to refer to the recordings "for further details."

The responding first-level supervisor is expected to review the completed reports and related recordings, and from there to reach a determination as to whether the force is in policy. That assessment then goes to a lieutenant, who provides a secondary evaluation of the officer action and determines if further action is needed.

Overwhelmingly, the answer to that last question appears to be "no." SRPD records for 2022 include close to 200 separate incidents involving a use of force – none of which were found by the Department to warrant an administrative investigation. (The small number of force-related complaint cases that we initially became familiar with had been generated by the civilians upon whom force was used.)

This is not automatically a cause for concern or skepticism. For one thing, most of the incidents at issue involved very minor force (such as holds or restraints or takedowns). Moreover, and importantly, in the cases we happened to sample for different reasons, we did not find reason to disagree with the SRPD "bottom-line" conclusion in any of them. Still, we would be more persuaded about the legitimacy of SRPD force deployments – and the sufficiency of its accountability and review protocols – if the documentation

---

<sup>9</sup> Our understanding is that SRPD supervisors' general practice is to be *present* but not directly involved when these interviews take place; this is in part because the questioning (by the handling officer) often overlaps with the criminal issues that the officer will be documenting in the arrest report. As we discuss below, we recommend another approach.

and "fruits" of the process (in terms of non-disciplinary issue spotting and response) were more comprehensive than the current model appears to be.<sup>10</sup>

Instead of the detailed, thorough holistic written work product we have seen in other jurisdictions, the SRPD "template" for supervisory analysis is narrowly framed, and supervisors rarely go beyond a terse summary and very direct responses to a checklist of factors for consideration. Nor did the subject's perspective on the incident always appear to be prominent within the process. For one thing, supervisors often left the interviews of subjects to the officers who engaged in the force; this creates obvious impediments to objectivity and candor and is not a best practice. And the sampling of interviews we assessed often focused more on the subject's actions than on that person's perspective as to the nature and legitimacy of the force that was used against him or her.

Perhaps most importantly, we noted very few examples in which performance issues (such as officer tactics, decision-making, communication, or choice of force options) that were outside the ultimate policy question were explored, addressed, or even mentioned. De-escalation efforts (or the lack thereof) were rarely cited or commented upon, in spite of their prominence in Department policy and evolving state standards.

After mentioning this observation to Department leadership in recent months, we were given a couple of relevant counterarguments. The first was that the limited documentation is driven in part by the desire to make the process more efficient for first-line supervisors – thereby allowing them greater latitude to have a positive influence on activity in the field. We respect this point, but wonder if a "happy medium" in balancing these competing interests is possible.

Additionally, we were assured that holistic assessment – and appropriate follow-up – *is* indeed occurring on a regular basis, but is handled informally and not necessarily memorialized in the documentation for the case. We don't doubt that this is so. But we also take the view that "more is better" in terms of

---

<sup>10</sup> This is particularly true insofar as the Professional Standards review of outside complaints that allege excessive or unnecessary force relies on the findings within the standard force review process.

formalization, both a vehicle for standardizing the practice as an expectation and for maximizing the impact of the learning opportunities and responsive measures that do happen.

Ideally, each force application should be vetted carefully to ensure that these exercises of police power are consistent with law, policy, training, and agency expectations. Clearly, individual accountability matters. But these incidents can and should also be a potential forum for gaining insight into tactics, decision-making, training, equipment, policy, and supervision – and thereby improving future performance (and hopefully reducing the need to use force) at the specific officer level and beyond.<sup>11</sup> We urge SRPD to reinforce the work it is already doing in this regard, and make its force review process more rigorous and productive.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 3:**

SRPD should review its current force review process to ensure that supervisors are engaging in holistic assessment of each incident, and that identified issues are addressed even if they do not rise to the level of a policy violation.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4:**

SRPD should revise its current template to require officers who use force to document any efforts at de-escalation and, if none were feasible, explain the reasons why.

---

<sup>11</sup> To SRPD's credit, it does take advantage of its data tracking capabilities by generating alerts to management when certain thresholds of activity by officers are reached within a set time period. For example, a seventh use of force in a 12-month period triggers a notification (although we wonder whether the threshold of seven uses of force is too high before intervention is triggered). A supervisor in that relevant officer's chain of command is then expected to conduct a secondary review of the incidents to determine whether a pattern of behavior warranting further response is discernible. We endorse this sort of "early intervention" mechanism, and look forward to learning more about it.

#### RECOMMENDATION 5:

SRPD should revise its current template to require reviewing sergeants to expressly consider and evaluate any efforts at de-escalation that preceded the use of force.

#### RECOMMENDATION 6:

SRPD should revisit its current protocol for interview of subjects upon whom force has been used, and reinforce the policy expectation that a supervisor will handle this responsibility.

## SRPD Critical Incident Review

SRPD has not had an officer-involved shooting resulting in injury since 2017. Late in 2021, it did experience an officer-involved death of an individual who had been subjected to different less lethal force options (including a Taser application) when SRPD responded to a call for service regarding gunshots being fired in the early morning hours in a residential neighborhood. Multiple SRPD officers (including a supervisor) went to the scene and eventually encountered the subject, who was holding a rock and resistant to communications and commands. Evidence obtained later included the recovery of an assault rifle that the subject had apparently been firing before the officers' arrival.

The SRPD respondents put a coordinated plan together to take him into custody as he picked up a second rock, and a brief struggle to control and handcuff him ensued. Soon after he had been arrested, he lost consciousness; he was later pronounced dead at the hospital in spite of different medical interventions (including by the officers).

Because the subject died in the context of a police contact, the incident initiated a criminal investigation in keeping with established County



protocols.<sup>12</sup> In this case, the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office took the lead role in the investigation, which it then submitted to the County District Attorney's Office. The D.A. ultimately found that the officers' actions had been limited to less lethal force that was reasonable and justified in light of the subject's actions. Accordingly, the DA found no violation of law.

While that investigation and review was occurring, the Department moved forward on two tracks, consistent with its existing "Employee Involved Critical Incident" Protocol. One was an administrative review by Professional Standards into potential violations of agency policy – an overlapping but separate set of issues from those assessed by the criminal investigation. The other was an assessment by the Department's Training supervisor as to whether there were broader issues of "training, equipment, and supervision" that merited intervention of some kind.

We had the opportunity to monitor these reviews as they unfolded, and to share our perspective with SRPD. We look forward to providing information about our findings and systemic recommendations in a future public report.

## IPA Community Engagement

A four-person contingent from OIR Group spent three days in Santa Rosa in early August 2022 to engage in a series of activities coordinated by the City. IPA representatives included a fluent Spanish-speaker and an expert in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion as well as a past president of the National Association for the Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement. It was an opportunity to gather information directly from community members about their experiences with the Police Department, as well as to meet with SRPD and City leadership, and to get a better sense of texture and nature of the community. The IPA team engaged with stakeholders in a variety of contexts and enhanced its understanding of Santa Rosa and its residents.

During the visit, IPA members worked collaboratively with Santa Rosa Community Engagement Division (CED) staff to hold two community listening sessions and

---

<sup>12</sup> This county-wide investigative arrangement was originally developed in 1993, and has since been updated on several occasions – most recently in 2019.

two community drop-in sessions at Tia Maria Panaderia and Victory Outreach Church. Understanding that there is a particular history of concerns in the Latino community and the Roseland area, CED staff conducted publicity in both English and Spanish.

The formal community meetings were held at public institutions – the Sheppard Elementary School and the Finley Community Center – which seemed to create a welcoming and open environment for the diverse community members who attended. Both meetings were attended by elected and appointed City officials, and the Mayor and City Manager made brief statements at each. The Police Chief was also present to listen and respond to questions.

IPA members also had the opportunity to meet with the newly appointed Chief of Police, who emphasized his commitment to transparency and his openness to our perspectives on best practices for internal review. Ride-alongs with SRPD patrol officers also provided valuable insight into both the City and the experience of line-level Department personnel. We also appreciated the chance to sit with representatives from the officers' labor association, who were welcoming while expressing their own priorities and concerns with candor.

We appreciated the insights we received from community members who attended one or more of the available events. These individuals articulated a range of impressions about their community and the role of policing in their lives. A number of people mentioned the negative impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on community cohesion in Santa Rosa. And the complexities of dealing with the homeless were evident, as people expressed their frustration with law enforcement from both directions: that enforcement actions added undue burdens on people who were already struggling, *and* that issues associated with the unhoused population suggested that more engagement was needed.

Our visit happened to come at the end of a week that saw a fatal officer-involved shooting involving the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department. Concerns relating to that incident (which was being criminally investigated by SRPD in keeping with usual protocols) were shared in few different settings – a reminder that many community members group different law enforcement agencies together in their perceptions about trust and the impact of both

personal experience and high-profile incidents. SRPD leadership is aware of this dynamic, and continues its efforts to enhance engagement and dialogue with stakeholders from throughout the City.

Meanwhile, we look forward to establishing further connections with Santa Rosans through upcoming visits and outreach efforts – like this public Report. Our experiences across multiple jurisdictions have familiarized us with "best practices" in law enforcement, and we have an advanced understanding of law enforcement investigation and review processes. But we also recognize that each community has its own history, dynamics, strengths, and challenges. As we continue to develop our relationships in Santa Rosa, we welcome the input from interested members of the public, and thank those who have taken the time to connect with us in some manner during the past year.

## Implicit Bias Training

Like other California police agencies, SRPD is required to ensure that its officers are in compliance with state standards for ongoing professional training. The minimum requirement is 24 hours every two years, and a significant portion of that is reserved for mandatory refresher training in what are considered perishable skills (including force options, driving, and tactical communication). Most agencies, though – including SRPD – prioritize exceeding these minimums in order to ensure a range of capabilities among its officers, and to address topic areas that correspond to evolving priorities and recognized issues.<sup>13</sup>

Early in our tenure as the new IPA, SRPD officials notified us that one of the focal points of their new training year was the development of a four-hour block on implicit bias – the widely shared tendency to form impressions based on subconscious reactions that can influence decision-making and behavior in a number of ways. As the name suggests, implicit bias is unintentional – even instinctive. But its potential to lead to discrimination and unfair judgement is nonetheless worthy of consideration. And for several years now, it has been

---

<sup>13</sup> SRPD's target is a minimum of 70 hours per year per officer, and they build a number of full training days into the annual calendar so as to achieve this.

thought to have particular relevance to law enforcement, where the disparate treatment of different racial and ethnic groups is a stubborn statistical reality. The state has made addressing racial discrimination a core topic for the basic training certifications of all new officers, and implicit bias is an important element of that instruction.

For the Department to focus on implicit bias as part of its 2022 training cycle is consistent with the national emphasis on racial equity that police agencies are rightfully responding to – and often at the center of. To reiterate, implicit bias is certainly not unique to police officers. What is unique is the authority that the police obviously have, and extent to which making effective observations and acting upon them is integral to police responsibilities.

But *effective* training on this topic can be elusive, and not just in the law enforcement context. It is difficult to communicate the central ideas of implicit bias and its implications without prompting a reflexive defensiveness. Most people pride themselves on not being susceptible to prejudice or unfair "snap judgements," and challenges to that perception are difficult to digest and accept. And police officers are both professionally sensitive to allegations of bias and culturally skeptical when critiques are coming from outsiders.

In the absence of a pre-existing four-hour block that seemed to meet the agency's needs, SRPD management explored options over the course of several months and decided to make developing a presentation an *internal* project and priority. Under the supervision of the Department's Training Sergeant, a group of SRPD officers volunteered to collaborate on the curriculum and instruction. One team member dedicated considerable time to meeting with individuals from local organizations; they shared their lived experience about bias and law enforcement in ways that were helpful. From there, a cadre of 15 officers got certified by POST as trainers in implicit bias, and collaborated on a presentation that was designed to make the principles accessible to all sworn members as part of the fall training cycle.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> The state's commission on police standards has certified the new SRPD training as responsive to legislative requirements regarding instruction in racial equity and bias issues.

In September, the Department invited a group of outside stakeholders from the community to observe a "dress-rehearsal" of the full presentation on a weekday morning. Representatives from a number of Santa Rosa organizations were in attendance, including the local branch of the NAACP, County Human Services, the AAPI Coalition of the North Bay, the District Attorney's Office, the Chief of Police from another local jurisdiction, and Los Cien of Sonoma County.

We were also invited and attended. After observing the full presentation (which also incorporated some different interactive elements), attendees had the opportunity to offer their feedback and insights for the Department's consideration prior to the rollout of the multiple sessions that were offered to SRPD members over the course of several weeks.

We were appreciative of SRPD's efforts in tackling this important and challenging subject. A few elements deserve special recognition, starting with the willingness of so many current officers from diverse backgrounds to give of their time and take responsibility for sharing sensitive ideas with their peers (and command staff, all of whom attended the training themselves). Their sincerity and thoughtfulness were apparent, and their own experiences in law enforcement helped them tailor the presentation with added credibility and insight.

The training did a fine job of explaining the fundamentals of implicit bias and its effects, which emphasized the intrinsic nature of it (as well as the reality that everyone is susceptible to it.) It used actual SRPD activity reports from decades ago to illustrate the historical legacy of discrimination in the City, and the ways in which past practices and contemporary news stories shape the bias that many community members direct at the police. And it talked about the value of recognizing the effects of implicit bias on law enforcement practices, and working to avoid overreliance on confidence about initial impressions.

Importantly, the Department was receptive to the reactions and constructive suggestions of its community focus group. Someone pointed out, for example, that the Native American experience was missing from the presentation, and steps were taken to incorporate it in the final version of the presentation.

Our understanding is that the actual sessions with the Department went well -- particularly in terms of issue spotting and as a foundation for further discussion. Officers received valuable context regarding the historic origins of contemporary skepticism toward the police among many residents. And the presenters offered tools for taking the various insights and incorporating them into more effective connections with the community and greater recognition of pitfalls to avoid.

We are also gratified to learn that the Department's intention is to maintain its focus on these issues as a point of emphasis for regular training cycles. While state requires refresher training only every five years, SRPD plans to build on its new course, update it as needed, and offer it every other year instead. We hope Department management will follow through on this inclination and reinforce the constructive beginning that this year's program represents.

As the Department considers ways to improve its training in this area, we recommend partnering with individuals who have special life experience and expertise in this field – *not* to supplant the internally driven process but to supplement it. A broader array of presenters and facilitators could enhance the training experience and ensure that all training in this area is not limited to perspectives within the organization.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 7:**

SRPD should commit to making issues of racial equity and implicit bias a regular part of its recurring schedule.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 8:**

As SRPD considers future training in this area, it should consider supplementing its internal facilitators with contributors from outside the organization.

# Other SRPD Initiatives

## inRESPONSE

As we move forward in our role as independent auditor of SRPD, we will be tracking important developments in the Department's operations and connection to the Santa Rosa community. One area we look forward to learning more about is the "inRESPONSE" mental health support team, which began its work in January of last year.

"inRESPONSE" is Santa Rosa's version of an approach that is growing around the country. A number of jurisdictions are adapting to the recognition that many of the situations that involve troubled individuals and that are traditionally handled by police may be resolved more effectively by other service providers. The City of Santa Rosa has embraced this concept through a program developed by the Police Department. inRESPONSE revolves around team response units comprised not of officers but of mental health clinicians, emergency medical providers, and support coordinators familiar with the different resources available for people in need, with a particular focus on the needs of the unhoused. Two overlapping units are currently available for parts of each day in the week; the goal is to eventually expand to the point of round the clock coverage.

The Department's dispatchers are trained to recognize circumstances that are suitable for deployment of an inRESPONSE unit. Patrol officers remain available to address any circumstances involving a weapon or potential violence. But if the situation is stabilized in those regards, then the unarmed staff of inRESPONSE is designed to offer a range of interventions outside the limitations of enforcement and the justice system. Ideally, the team members can assist in ways that go beyond resolution of the immediate issue and toward addressing underlying mental health and behavioral challenges. In the first year of the program, inRESPONSE units handled nearly 3000 calls for service that otherwise would have fallen as a default to the Police Department. The resulting responses took various forms, ranging from practical assistance to referrals for support resources to crisis intervention.

The City's commitment to this program, and the Department's role in coordinating and facilitating its initial successes, are creditable. It is one thing to recognize the outsized impact of mental health issues and homelessness on the public safety concerns that currently arise in large communities. It is another to pursue new and potentially more constructive approaches.

## Chief's Community Ambassador Team

In keeping with the City's ongoing interest in having the Department be accountable and responsive to the public it serves, SRPD has developed a new advisory group called the Chief's Community Ambassador Team ("C-CAT"). Comprised of 15 to 20 individuals who live, work, or otherwise have a "sphere of influence" in Santa Rosa, the C-CAT is currently being selected in anticipation of beginning its work this spring. Members will meet monthly with the Chief and will have flexibility to offer input in other ways.

While SRPD has had a Chief's advisory group in the past, this model adds an interesting new element to the concept: applicants will be selected to participate not by the Chief himself but instead by the City Manager. This step will help promote the independence of the team, and add a constructive layer of critical distance to its interactions with the Chief.

For his part, the Chief welcomes the opportunity as his tenure moves through its second year. We also look forward to meeting with the C-CAT, sharing our perspective, and benefitting from the members' insights into Santa Rosa and its priorities.



# Conclusion

With one year complete as the Independent Police Auditor, we are pleased to say that we have been able to accomplish the fundamental goals of the City's new model of oversight: through our access to information and evidence, and our ability to influence investigations and outcomes from an independent perspective, we have helped to strengthen accountability and ensure the legitimacy of SRPD's complaint investigations.

We reiterate our appreciation for SRPD's cooperation and, importantly, its receptivity. Facilitating the transparency that comes with outsider access is inherently a recognition of the public's heightened interest in meaningful oversight. Beyond that, though, the Department has shown a willingness to accommodate requests during the investigation process, address questions and concerns forthrightly, adjust constructively when persuaded by our views, and disagree respectfully when differences persist. This is no small thing – and far from a "given" when it comes to interactions between law enforcement and monitors.

While our first year has been encouraging in many respects, it has also provided us with a foundation from which to pursue potential reforms at a systemic (as opposed to case by case) level. Above, we have described some of our recommendations for making existing protocols more robust, and explained the rationale behind them. We look forward to engaging with the Department on these issues and, ideally, developing new approaches that will prove to be beneficial.

We also hope to increase our auditing profile with regard to training – an arena which not only works to reinforce core proficiencies but allows Department leadership to choose topics to prioritize in terms of equipping officers for the evolving demands of the profession. We anticipate being able to survey this year's "curriculum" and attend some sessions in person as a firsthand means of evaluating SRPD's approach.

Finally, we hope that our familiarity with a range of stakeholders and residents of the City will expand through more regular communications. We have benefitted from the input we received in August, and from the additional

outreach from thoughtful individuals throughout the year. And we welcome people to be in touch with our team by contacting us through our website at [www.oirgroup.com](http://www.oirgroup.com)

# Appendix: 2022 Personnel Investigations

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
In-custody death involving use of force	Admin. Investigation complete; officers' actions were in policy. Equipment and training issues identified.	Concur with findings.	No criminal charges against officers per D.A (August 2022)
Man was arrested after quarreling with security and then SRPD over access to the hospital where his wife was being treated; he had several complaints about his treatment.	Exonerated	Concur	
Complainant approached officers who were responding to another call, and believed his concern was not handled properly.	Inconclusive re discourtesy, unfounded for BWC activation.	Concur	
Complainant alleged officer was inappropriately aggressive and threatening in responding to a	Sustained	Concur	Officer no longer with SRPD.

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
disturbance between neighbors.			
Man submitted a complaint about an officer's handling of a dispute nearly a year earlier that became physical and resulted in assault charges against him.	Complete; officer exonerated	Concur	
Spouse complained about several aspects of her husband's arrest for resisting officer after an incident at a restaurant, including his detention in a hot car and the loss of a \$20 dollar bill.	Complete. Allegations were unfounded, with the exception of mishandling of the arrestee's property.	Concur with findings, recommendation to SRPD about civil claims process.	
Woman was arrested for domestic violence and made several different allegations about officer conduct.	Complete; officer conduct found to be in policy, with one allegation "inconclusive."	Requested further investigation, which was done.	
Woman complained about various aspects of her arrest for domestic violence, including officer judgement and possible use of force resulting in injury.	Complete, officers exonerated	Concur with outcome.	
Complainant alleged shoulder injury from an arrest that had occurred several months earlier.	Complete, officers exonerated.	Concur with outcome after review of BWC.	
Officer improperly handled contraband evidence in the context of a stop that did not lead to an arrest.	Complete, sustained for performance.	Concur	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Complainant alleged that a sergeant had mishandled a call from service approximately 10 years ago, and interfered with his getting needed medication	Complete, no corroborating records found to support incomplete allegations.	Concur	
Anonymous complainant observed an arrest and thought officers had treated subject inappropriately, including excessive force and abandonment of his property.	Complete, officers exonerated.	Concur	Force was reviewed separately and found to be in policy.
Woman alleged that officers did not properly respond to her complaint about her former husband's visit to her home, which she said devolved into unwanted physical contact.	Complete; two officers were found to have violated policy; one for failure to handle the initial report correctly, and the other for inappropriate comments during the woman's visit to the station.	Concur	SRPD followed up and submitted a criminal report based on the woman's allegations.
Individual alleged "Bane Act" violation by officer; complainant had had a negative previous encounter with the officer and was upset by his appearance at residence during an unrelated investigation.	Complete, officer exonerated; he did not intentionally contact or upset the complainant and remained professional in de-escalating the encounter	Concur	IPA spoke with complainant about case after notification letter.
Individual alleged harassment and improper detention when he was confronted by multiple officers while sitting in a parked car.	Complete, officers exonerated.	Concur with lack of policy violation, though some aspects of complaint were understandable.	Informal follow-up with officer suggested by IPA.

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Man arrested for “drunk in public” complained about his request for a supervisor response not being honored, as well as other issues.	Complete, officer exonerated, though a secondary violation of body-worn camera policy was identified and addressed.	Concur	
Mother complained about minor’s arrest for old warrant.	Complete; officer’s actions proper; warrant still showed in computer.	Concur	
Doctor complained about officer’s treatment of arrestee at emergency room, including possible excessive force	Complete. Officer’s force was found to be in policy; his tactics and communication with subject prior to force were “inconclusive” based on lack of BWC; “Sustained” for gaps in BWC recordings.	Participated in subject interview. Concur.	SRPD identified BWC issue.
Complainants alleged a lack of proper investigation regarding a traffic collision near their home.	Investigation complete; officers exonerated.	Concur.	
Possible unlawful CLETS access involving a former officer.	Complete, no misconduct identified.		This case was referred by IPA after complainant outreach.
Third party allegation about officer speeding almost hitting homeless person in early morning hours.	Complete; lack of detail (date, officer I.D.) or corroboration resulted in finding of “inconclusive.”	Concur	
Complainant was offended by inaccurate personal identifiers on citation and alleged racial bias.	Complete, officers were exonerated.	Concur with no finding of misconduct; any mistake was inadvertent and officer behavior was consistent	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
		with RIPA guidelines.	
Complainant says officers arrested him without justification and searched his home illegally.	Complete, officers exonerated.	Concur; investigation materials and warrant established justification for officer actions.	
Complainant accused officers of discourtesy and harassment when he was questioned while sitting by himself in a park.	Complete; no finding of formal misconduct, but issues re improved communication were addressed.	Concur with finding, recommendation re: notification letter.	
Complainant was upset about officers' treatment of him as he sought to assist a medically distressed individual.	Complete, officers exonerated.	Concur	Follow-up outreach recommended
Officer allegedly made inappropriate comment about a third party while waiting for arrestee to be treated at hospital.	Sustained.	Concur	
Man complained on behalf of his pregnant daughter that responding officer did not properly handle an alleged domestic violence incident (involving ex-boyfriend)	Investigation complete; officer exonerated.	Concur after request for follow-up investigation.	
Woman alleged discourteous treatment and a failure by officers to take her concerns seriously	Investigation complete. No formal policy violations, but "customer service" issues were addressed.	Concur	IPA requested follow-up with officers and SRPD agreed.

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Man submitted a lengthy interview in support of his contention that SRPD is denying his second amendment rights through their enforcement activity.	Complete; no misconduct by SRPD identified.	Concur	
Several months after the incident, a woman submitted a complaint about the circumstances of her arrest on what eventually proved to be various charges, and the loss of property she experienced while in custody.	Complete; no misconduct by SRPD. Property loss unfortunate, but SRPD showed due diligence.	Concur	
Officer allegedly sought special treatment by attending a public event in uniform and in a Department vehicle while off-duty.	Complete; sustained for conduct unbecoming.	Concur	Internally generated investigation by SRPD.
Man complained about various aspects of an arrest and claimed that officers were biased in their response to ongoing dispute with his former wife.	Investigation complete; officers exonerated.	Concur	
A man and woman complained about two separate incidents in which they believed officers mishandled calls for service at their residence against a backdrop of a dispute with property manager.	Complete; officers exonerated.	Concur	



<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>IPA Input</b>	<b>Other</b>
Failure by officer to write a report after doing initial investigation into sexual assault allegation from several years ago.	Complete; sustained for failure to write report.	Concur	This case was generated internally by SRPD.
Father complained on behalf of his 20-year-old son that a vehicle citation was inappropriate and based on a discriminatory stop.	Complete; BWC showed officer conduct was appropriate.	Concur	Complaint was several months after original incident.
Third party complained about the handling of an encounter with an ailing homeless individual under the 101 Freeway. Allegation of improper attention to medical issues and wrongful disposal of property.	Complete; officers exonerated. SRPD identified BWC issue for one of the officers.	Concur	Officer did summon medical personnel to scene.
Complaint about a social media posting that expressed politically divisive views.	Complete; the posting was not actually connected to the accused officer.	Concur with finding of no misconduct.	
Complainant resented the way officers treated him when police were on scene to assist with a transfer of belongings from him to his estranged adult daughter. Allegations of rudeness and disrespectful treatment	Complete; no formal misconduct identified, and investigator met with complainant to explain further.		IPA requested follow-up with officer re minor demeanor concerns.
Individual who was stopped for illegal driving activity and who had minor children in vehicle filed a complaint about officers' treatment of	Complete; officers exonerated.	Concur	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
him. Arrested on several charges.			
Mother complained that an incident of sexual harassment involving her minor daughter in a public was not taken seriously by the officer who responded to the call for service.	Complete; officer handled the call appropriately	Concur	Follow-up outreach by SRPD recommended
Officer who was off-duty and out of state was involved in a confrontation that resulted in a police contact. Mutual "citizen's arrests" resulted.	Inconclusive for initial conduct; officer handled the aftermath appropriately.	Concur	No charges filed by the local jurisdiction.
Complainant alleged officer mishandled the report of a physical dispute she had with a guard at a Social Security office; she also alleged discourtesy and bias in his communications with her.	Complete; exonerated as to handling of the underlying incident, and sustained for discourtesy.	Concur	
Female arrestee alleged she was handled with unnecessary roughness, including an alleged slap to her head after she spat at the officer while in handcuffs.	SRPD originally found use of force in policy. Complaint investigation also revisited other elements of the complaint and determined that allegations were unfounded.	Concur	IPA requested further review based on BWC, which SRPD conducted.
Third-party alleged that officers had mishandled the clearing of an encampment.	Complete; BWC refuted most of the allegations, though an officer's profanity became the basis for a "Sustained" violation of policy.	Concur	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Internally generated complaint regarding BWC activation and failure to respond to email requests re case updates.	Complete. Department sustained allegations.	Concur.	
Complainant alleged an officer got improper access and conducted an improper search at her workplace.	Complete; no misconduct identified.	Concur after discussion with SRPD re protocols.	
Complainant alleged improper stop/detention due to possible profiling after he was pulled over near the scene of "sideshow" activity.	Complete; allegations not sustained.	Concur; stop was brief and no evidence of bias.	
Woman alleged that an officer had used excessive force when police responded to a disturbance involving her at a government services office.	Complete; officer exonerated.	Concur	
Woman alleged that an officer had taken insufficient action with regard to her recent report of a prior sexual assault (from several years prior).	Complete; accused officer had done due diligence re allegations.	Concur	
Grandmother alleged that a molestation case involving her granddaughter had not been adequately pursued by SRPD investigator.	Complete; detective was found to have handled the case appropriately.	Concur.	

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
Department opened a formal investigation after hearing allegations of inappropriate comments and other potentially harassing behavior by an SRPD officer.	Investigation was conducted by an outside third party and determined that several policy violations had occurred.	Concur with findings.	Subject officer is no longer with the agency.
Third party provided a complaint that a woman had been mistreated by SRPD, in violation of homeless injunction.	Complete; investigation showed due diligence but was unable to identify or corroborate a problematic encounter with the person in question.	Concur.	
A woman alleged that an officer had been rude and biased in his handling of a dispute between her husband tenant and the property owner regarding construction issues.	Complete. Sustained for rudeness but no evidence of bias.	Concur.	IPA requested further review after initial findings, and SRPD agreed.
Complainant was a passenger during a vehicle stop and ended up arrested for obstructing/resisting. He had different allegations about the incident, including excessive force by the officer.	Complete. Force was found to be in policy, but Department determined that use of profanity had violated profanity policy.	Concur.	
Complainant was arrested at a motel for a parole violation, and alleged mishandling of his property by the officers.	Complete; officers exonerated.	Concur	IPA requested follow-up with officer regarding peripheral

Allegation	Status	IPA Input	Other
			issue; SRPD concurred.
Officer came to work early, dressed out, and then took an SRPD vehicle to a scheduled personal event so he could be back for start of shift.	Complete; sustained for minor policy violation.	Concur	Internally generated by SRPD.
Complainant of racial profiling by a motorist who was stopped and cited for modified exhaust.	Complete; investigation found no evidence of bias or other misconduct in the stop.	Concur	IPA requested further investigation based on remaining questions, and SRPD agreed.
Complainant alleged that officers had been disengaged and insensitive in responding to an incident in which she had been assaulted.	Complete; BWC showed that officer performance had been appropriate and that language barriers had primarily contributed to complainant's perceptions.	Concur	IPA received complaint from third party and contacted SRPD.
Complainant felt that officers did not properly report the circumstances of what he alleged was a "road rage" traffic collision.	Complete; SRPD found that officers had handled the call correctly by documenting relevant findings in the traffic collision report.	Concur after request for clarification re protocols and further documentation.	