CITY OF CINCINNATI

Fifteenth Status Report to the Independent Monitor

February 12, 2006

Cincinnati Police Department

Colonel Thomas H. Streicher, Jr., Police Chief

S. Gregory Baker, Executive Manager of Police Relations
Police Relations Section

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	Page 2
II.	General Policies	Page 4
III.	Use of Force Policy	Page 6
IV.	Incident Documentation, Investigation, and Review	Page 12
V.	Citizen Complaint Process	Page 16
VI.	Management and Supervision	Page 24
VII.	Training	Page 29

I. INTRODUCTION

In April 2001, the Mayor of Cincinnati, and other interested persons within the City, requested the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) to conduct a review of the Cincinnati Police Department's (CPD) policies and procedures, specifically those that related to the uses of force. This request indicated the City's commitment to minimizing the risk of excessive Use of Force in the CPD and to promoting police integrity. In response to these requests, the DOJ launched an investigation pursuant to authority granted under 42 U.S.C. 14141, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

The DOJ's investigation, conducted with the full cooperation of the City, included extensive interviews with City and CPD officials, CPD officers, leaders of the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) and the African-American police officers' association (Sentinels), community members and civil rights organization representatives.

At the close of the investigation, which lasted approximately one year, the DOJ determined that the jurisdictional requirements of 42 U.S.C. 14141 were sufficiently satisfied to permit the Parties to enter into the **Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)**. As a result of the City's and the CPD's high level of voluntary cooperation and willingness to implement meaningful change, the DOJ believed the MOA, rather than contested litigation, represented the best opportunity to address the DOJ's concerns. On April 11, 2002, history was made in the City of Cincinnati. The City of Cincinnati and the United States Department of Justice entered into the landmark Agreement.[1]

At the same time, representatives for the City, the Cincinnati Black United Front (CBUF), the American Civil Liberties Union of Ohio (ACLU), and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) executed the **Collaborative Agreement** (CA). Brought about in part by a series of legal actions citing patterns of discrimination by police, this latter Agreement also served as an alternative to court litigation. Under this Agreement, the Federal District Court introduced a process where various stakeholders in the community could examine the broader social conflicts in the City by gathering the views of as many citizens as possible on improving the relationship between police officers and the community. Through the distribution of questionnaires and a series of public meetings involving different segments of the community, the following goals became the cornerstones of the Collaborative Agreement:

[1] Neither the City's entry into this Agreement, nor its decision to implement changes in CPD policies and procedures is an admission by the City, the CPD, or any officer or employee of either, that any of them have engaged in any unconstitutional, illegal, or otherwise improper activities or conduct.

1. Police officers and community members will become proactive partners in community problem solving.
2. Police officers and community members will build relationships of respect, cooperation, and trust within and between the police and the citizens.
3. Police officers and community members will work to improve education, oversight, monitoring, hiring practices, and accountability of the Cincinnati Police Department.
4. Police officers and community members will ensure fair, equitable, and courteous treatment for all by members of the police department.
5. Police officers and community members will create methods to establish the public's understanding of police policies and procedures and to recognize exceptional service provided by members of the police department.

Implementation of both Agreements will not only reform police practice, but will enhance trust, communication, and cooperation between the police and the community. The settlements have fostered a union that has motivated all segments of the community to come together and focus on building the positive and productive relations necessary to maintain a vibrant city core and surrounding metropolitan area. The City of Cincinnati is enthusiastic and committed to this endeavor and has already begun initiatives to involve virtually all City departments in the process.

The two Agreements will be overseen by an Independent Monitor. Consistent with the consensus decision-making process incorporated in the collaborative process, all collaborative partners unanimously selected the independent monitor.

II. GENERAL POLICIES

A. Mental Health Response Team (MHRT)

The MOA's requirements with regard to the MHRT are located in paragraph 10.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor finds the CPD to be in compliance with the requirements of MOA paragraph 10, including MHRT policy and training; availability of trained MHRT officers during all shifts; appropriate responses to MHRT calls; and a partnership with mental health professionals making such professionals available to assist the CPD onsite in interactions with mentally ill persons. The monitor believes the addition of 28 new MHRT officers should be a very helpful complement to the program. More MHRT trained officers means that there will be fewer situations where a particular District does not have an MHRT officer working, requiring an MHRT officer from a different District to be dispatched to the scene.

As the Monitor has noted in prior quarters, the MHRT program has received very positive appraisals from mental health professionals, community members and members of the CPD.

Status Update

Training

There was no MHRT training during the fourth quarter.

MHRT Availability

To ensure the availability of MHRT officers 24/7 and city-wide, the CPD continues to track the number of MHRT officers deployed on a daily basis. The tracking process allows the CPD to take a look at MHRT staffing levels by shift, district, and department-wide. According to the April, May, and June staffing reports, the CPD was able to provide consistent MHRT service. The MHRT staffing reports are included in Appendix Item 1.

MHRT Officer Dispatch Summary

Effective May 1, 2003, the Police Communications Section began to record the dispatch disposition of MHRT officers to all calls involving suspected mentally ill individuals. When dispatching these calls, the dispatcher makes an entry into a designated field for all MHRT calls, indicating one of the following dispositions:

MHD - A MHRT unit was dispatched to the call.
MHNA - A MHRT unit was not dispatched because all MHRT units city-wide were busy.
MHNW - There were no MHRT units working in the city.

During this reporting period, the CPD documented (via the Computer Aided Dispatch report) 1,563 calls involving mentally ill persons. In 115 of those instances, the call did not meet the criteria for dispatch and was cancelled, or the call was handled by another agency. In 132 cases, the call was dispatched as another incident type and later changed to a MHRT by the responding officers. This equates to 1,316 calls eligible for MHRT officer dispatch. For 1,240 of the calls (94%), a MHRT officer was dispatched. For this reporting period, there were only five calls for which a MHRT officer was working but not available for dispatch, and there were two instances where a MHRT officer was not working. A monthly analysis of these calls is included in Appendix Item 2.

Mobile Crisis Team Workers

The Psychiatric Emergency Services Department of University Hospital continues its partnership with the CPD. This partnership has enabled Mobile Crisis Team personnel to work within police districts in conjunction with police personnel. Currently, the program operates in Districts One and Five.

For the fourth quarter of 2005, statistics were maintained for individuals in both districts who could be identified as being in need of mental health services. Identification is made through an incident history, police reports (Form 316), or by hospital records. Information regarding the number of MHRT runs handled by police, the Mobile Crisis Team, or a combination of both is also tabulated. Once an individual has been identified, social demographic data regarding the subject and the outcome of each incident is documented and entered into a database in each of the districts.

2005 Fourth Quarter	**District One**	**District Five**
Total runs	229	239
CPD only	138	139
Mobile Crisis Team only	31	34
CPD assisted by the Mobile Crisis Team	51	57
Mobile Crisis Team assisted by CPD	9	9
Total individuals identified	178	160
Mobile Crisis Team consultations	2	0

B. Foot Pursuits

The provisions of the MOA related to foot pursuits are located in paragraph 11.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor reviewed 19 Use of Force and citizen complaint investigations in which a foot pursuit was involved. The supervising investigator documented a review of the foot pursuit on the Use of Force report in 18 of these cases. CPD policy, training, and actual practice on foot pursuits is in compliance with this MOA paragraph.

Status Update - Nothing to report.

III. USE OF FORCE POLICY

A. General Use of Force Policies

The MOA's requirements pertaining to use of force are located in paragraphs 12 and 13.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor has previously determined that the CPD's Use of Force policy and training are in compliance with the MOA provisions. During this quarter, the Monitor reviewed CPD Use of Force investigations to assess whether officers are implementing the CPD's Use of Force policies in compliance with the MOA. As required by the MOA, CPD procedures incorporate a Use of Force model that "relates the officer's responses and Use of Force options to the actions of the subject."

In the 31 TASER incidents that the Monitor Team reviewed this quarter, the documentation and investigation indicated that in each of the incidents, the officer's Use of Force was reasonably related to the level of resistance and actions of the suspect. This included several incidents where the subject's resistance consisted of "conspicuously ignoring" the officer, refusing to lie on the ground, refusing to put their arms behind their back and submit to being handcuffed, or refusing to spit out contraband that the officer believed the subject had in his or her mouth. However, because the CPD's Use of Force policy allows officers to use the TASER if a subject is non-compliant, and the CPD puts the TASER at the lowest level of the Use of Force continuum (along with chemical spray), these circumstances are within the scope of the requirements of the MOA.

The Monitor also reviewed 13 incidents involving force other than TASERS. For these incidents, it appeared that the officer's Use of Force was reasonably related to the actions and level of resistance and actions of the subject.

There were five TASER incidents where a warning of Use of Force was not given. In four of the incidents, the investigating supervisor reported that the warnings were not given because of the exigency of the situation. The Monitor concurred with two, but believed that in the other three incidents the officer had an opportunity to warn the subject that refusing to submit to arrest would result in a Use of Force .

The Monitor found the City in compliance with the provisions of MOA ¶¶12 and 13. However, given the incidents in which officers did not warn subjects that Use of Force would be used if they did not comply with the officer's orders, the Monitor will carefully assess this issue in the next quarter.

Status Update

Near the end of the third quarter, the CPD and the DOJ agreed on documentation and investigation requirements for TASER incidents. As a result, Procedure 12.545 was revised and implemented on October 18, 2005 to reflect this agreement. A copy of the current procedure is included in Appendix Item 3. The following changes have occurred:

- In the narrative portion of the Form 18, a statement is required indicating the subject of the Use of Force was interviewed as part of the investigation and the identity of the supervisor who interviewed the subject.
- Supervisors are required to tape record the interview of a subject of a Use of Force who makes an excessive force allegation.
- Supervisors are required to tape record interviews in TASER investigations where the subject of the Use of Force was handcuffed at the time of the deployment.

B. TASERS

There were 104 TASER deployments in the fourth quarter of 2005. Full TASER implementation began in the second quarter of 2004. A breakdown of TASER usage by quarter is as follows:

Second quarter 2004	177
Third quarter 2004	198
Fourth quarter 2004	148
First quarter 2005	137
Second quarter 2005	143
Third quarter 2005	166
Fourth quarter 2005	104

It is important to note that TASER usage decreased 37% in the fourth quarter as compared to the previous quarter. It is also important to note that deployments are considerably less when compared to the same quarter in 2004.

During this quarter, there were 5 injuries associated with the 104 deployments. Four of the five injuries occurred as a result of the subject falling to the ground after deployment.[2] The fifth injury consisted of the TASER probe lodged in a bone of the subject's hand. Most of the injuries were treated at the scene by a fire company.

Since the CPD began deployment of the X26 TASER, there have been 1,145 deployments to date. None of these 1,145 individuals were admitted to a hospital for a TASER related injury.

[2] Injuries from TASER deployments are summarized in Appendix Item 4. During the fourth quarter, 43% of TASER deployments occurred during a foot pursuit. An itemized report supporting that figure is included in Appendix Item 5.

The number of Use of Force incidents has **declined 19%** in the past 12 months (see the table below).

Use of Force Table

	1st Q 2004	2nd Q 2004	3rd Q 2004	4th Q 2004	1st Q 2005	2nd Q 2005	3rd Q 2005	4th Q 2005
Chemical Irritant - Unrestrained Subjects	76	30	10	8	8	12	5	9
Restrained Subjects	10	9	10	9	11	10	3	2
Physical Force	17	4	2	1	4	4	3	9
Takedowns with Injury	11	4	8	6	10	3	2	9
Non-compliant suspects	40	41	30	31	23	18	29	35
PR 24	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Canine	4	1	3	5	6	7	5	5
TASER	72	177	198	148	137	143	166	104
Beanbag/Foam Round	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Pepperball	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Firearms Discharge	3	2	0	0	1	2	0	2
Total	**234**	**268**	**262**	**209**	**200**	**199**	**215**	**176**

The highlighted rows in this table reflect an annual **24% reduction** over the previous 12 months in instances where officers had to engage non-compliant subjects.[3] The TASER has reduced the need for officers to have physical, often violent, encounters with resistive subjects.

In the fourth quarter, there were 12 TASER incidents where subjects possessed deadly weapons.[4] Clearly, the use of the non-lethal TASER continues to be a valuable tool for CPD officers.

During the period January 1, 2005 to December 31, 2005, CPD officers had to use force in only 2.08% of arrest situations, as compared to 2.56% in the previous 12 months.[5]

[3] This would include any instance where an officer had to resort to hands-on contact with a suspect/prisoner (physical force, takedowns with injury, and non-compliant/hard hands).
[4] 2005-73882, 73886, 74165, 74300, 74437, 74606, 75426, 75728, 75830, 75877, 75932, 77012
[5] 38,076 arrests during the period 01/01/04 to 12/31/04; 37,941 arrests during the period 01/01/05 to 12/31/05

The table below highlights a **24% decrease** in injuries to suspects/prisoners over the last 12 months:

Suspect/Prisoner Injuries Resulting from Police Contact[6]

	01/01/04 – 12/31/04	01/01/05 – 12/31/05
Hard hands with injury	103	92
Beanbags	0	2
Pepperball	0	1
40 mm foam	1	0
TASER	85	57
Other force[7]	27	12
Total	216	164

Additionally, injuries to officers resulting from arrests and assaults **dropped 20%** over the last 12 months (40 between 01/04 and 12/04, and 32 between 01/05 and 12/05).

C. Chemical Spray

The MOA provisions pertaining to chemical spray are found in paragraphs 14-19.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor Team reviewed seven chemical spray incidents from the third quarter of 2005 and determined that the CPD was in compliance with the MOA.

Status Update

There were eleven deployments of chemical irritant in the fourth quarter. As can be seen in the Use of Force table, chemical irritant usage has **dropped 63%** in the past 12 months.

Nine of the eleven reports this quarter document a warning of impending force. The other reports (2005-74631 and 2005-74832) explain the exigent circumstances which prevented the warning.

Two of the deployments involved restrained prisoners (2005-75158 and 2005-75667).

Decontamination of sprayed individuals occurred in all but two of the deployments. One incident (2005-76595) involved approximately 30 individuals involved in a fight. The participants fled the scene after chemical irritant was dispersed. The other incident (2005-74832) involved an individual who refused to be decontaminated.

This quarter's deployments have been summarized in Appendix Items 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

[6] Does not include ingestions of contraband, injuries sustained to prisoners as a result of a vehicle crash from a pursuit, injuries from canine bites, etc. (any injury where the TASER would not have been a force option in an incident is not included). In regards to contraband, suspects normally swallow contraband before the officer comes in contact with them.

[7] Includes strikes, kicks, PR 24, firearms

D. Canines

The MOA provisions relating to canine policy are located in paragraph 20.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD's canine policy, deployment of canines, and review of investigations are in compliance with the MOA.

Status Update

Canines were deployed in connection with 166 incidents during the fourth quarter. As a result, 16 individuals were located with 5 of those suspects being bitten by a dog. This equates to a 31% unit bite ratio.

The canine bite ratio reports generated pursuant to MOA paragraph 20 are included in Appendix Items 11, 12 and 13. These reports examine the following six-month periods:

May 1, 2005 – October 31, 2005 (bite ratio 22%)
June 1, 2005 – November 30, 2005 (bite ratio 22%)
July 1, 2005 – December 31, 2005 (bite ratio 19%)

The canine statistics generated by the ETS database have been included in Appendix Items14, 15 and 16.

E. Beanbag Shotguns / 40mm Foam Rounds / Pepperball

The MOA provisions relating to beanbag shotguns and 40mm foam rounds are located in paragraphs 21, 22, and 23.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD is in compliance with the MOA requirements relating to beanbag shotgun deployment.

Status Update

During the fourth quarter of 2005, there were no incidents involving the deployment of the beanbag shotgun or the 40 millimeter foam round. There was one incident involving the deployment of the Pepperball launcher.

On November 28, 2005, officers observed a male subject acting erratically inside an apartment and determined he was MHRT. The officers were unable to persuade the subject to open his door so they could check on his welfare. When the officers gained entry to the

residence they observed the subject pick up a wine bottle and start hitting it against a table to break it. The officers yelled for the subject to drop the bottle and finally the subject put the bottle down. He then placed his hand on a large knife and started to pick it up. An officer observed this and immediately deployed his TASER, which had partial effect. The subject spun around then lunged at the officers. Another officer deployed the Pepperball launcher and struck the subject with ten rounds. The subject still did not comply with the officers verbal commands and lunged at an officer with the knife in hand. The officer deployed his TASER, causing the subject to fall to the ground. The subject was handcuffed without further incident. (2005-75728).

IV. INCIDENT DOCUMENTATION, INVESTIGATION & REVIEW

A. Documentation

The MOA provisions relating to documentation are located in paragraphs 24 and 25.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Form 18NC – Non-Compliant Suspect Arrestee Report

The Monitor reviewed 14 Non-Compliant Suspect/ Arrest Report Forms from the previous quarter and concluded that the CPD is in compliance with the requirements applicable to these incidents.

Takedowns with Injury

During the third quarter of 2005, there were only two takedowns or use of hard hands that resulted in injury to the suspect, but not hospitalization. The Monitor Team reviewed one Injury to Prisoner Report from a takedown from the third quarter of 2005, and three Injury to Prisoner Reports involving chemical spray. The Monitor concluded that the CPD is in compliance with the MOA requirements for these incidents.

TASERS

The Department of Justice and the CPD agreed on the level of documentation and investigation required for TASER incidents. Taped statements are necessary for incidents in which a TASER is deployed on a restrained person, or where the subject makes a complaint of excessive force. In incidents where tapes are not required, the investigative report will document that the subject was interviewed. Procedure 12.545 was revised and implemented on October 18, 2005 to reflect this agreement.

In this quarter, the Monitor reviewed 31 TASER incidents and ten citizen complaint cases in which a TASER was deployed. Several of the TASER Use of Force reports document the fact that the subject was interviewed, although other incidents the Monitor reviewed occurred before the CPD revised its Use of Force procedure and do not include that documentation. The Monitor finds the CPD in compliance with the MOA, but will review TASER incidents in the next quarter with respect to revised MOA paragraph 24.

Status Update

Form 18NC – Non-Compliant Suspect Arrestee Report

There were 35 incidents of hard hands without injury during the fourth quarter.

Takedowns with Injury

There were nine takedowns with injury during the fourth quarter.

TASERS

There were 104 TASER incidents during the fourth quarter.

B. Investigation

The MOA provisions relating to investigation are located in paragraphs 26-31.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Policy

The Monitor concludes that the CPD is in compliance with MOA paragraphs 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31.

Review of Force Investigations

During this quarter, the Monitor Team reviewed 44 investigative files involving Use of Force incidents (including TASER deployments, canine bites, hard hands and takedowns, and chemical sprays). The Monitor reached the following conclusions from those investigations:

- In all of the use-of-force incidents, the officer notified a supervisor, and the supervisor responded to the scene (MOA ¶26).

- There was only one incident where the Use of Force was investigated by a supervisor who used force or authorized the Use of Force, or whose conduct led to the reportable incident (MOA ¶26).

- In all of the incidents, the supervisor investigated, evaluated and documented the incident giving rise to the Use of Force, and the documentation included facts and circumstances that either justified or failed to justify the officer's conduct (MOA ¶27).

- In all of the incidents, the supervisor reviewed the basis for the initial stop and seizure and determined whether the officer's actions were within CPD policy (MOA ¶27).

- In all of the incidents, all officers involved in or at the scene of the Use of Force were identified on the Use-of-force Report and provided a statement (MOA ¶30).

- All of the use-of-force investigations were reviewed by a lieutenant or higher. In a number of incidents, the lieutenant or captain reviewing the investigation determined that the investigation was not sufficiently thorough and directed that deficiencies be corrected (MOA ¶31).

Status Update

Policy

As previously stated, Procedure 12.545 was revised in the fourth quarter to reflect the agreement with the DOJ regarding TASER reporting requirements.

Review of Force Investigations

Nothing to report.

C. Review of Critical Firearms Discharges

The relevant provisions of the MOA are located in paragraphs 32, 33, and 34.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD's policy on critical firearms discharges and the Firearms Discharge Board complies with the MOA.

There were no firearms discharges at a suspect in the third quarter of 2005. There were three investigations of firearms discharges from previous quarters (05-pi-01, 05-pi-02 and 05-pi-04) that were reviewed and approved by the Firearms Discharge Board (FDB) in this quarter. A Monitor Team member attended the FDB review of one of the 2005 firearms discharges. For each of the FDB reports, the FDB determined that the firearms discharges were consistent with CPD policies and training; that the officers used proper tactics; and that lesser force alternatives were not reasonably available.

Status Update

New members of the Firearms Discharge Board were appointed in January 2006, as per Procedure 12.550. In addition to the core members, Inspections Section recommended that the affected District/Section Commander also have a chair on the board, which was approved by the Police Chief.

There were two incidents of firearm discharges at suspects in the fourth quarter of 2005. Their status is as follows:

Police Investigation Number / Date of Incident	**Status**
05-pi-06 / 11/2/05	In progress; IIS investigative report pending; Case under review by the Firearm Discharge Board
05-pi-08 / 12/29/05	Pending; Case still under investigation by CIS and IIS

A copy of the FDB Status Report is included in Appendix Item 17.

V. CITIZEN COMPLAINT PROCESS

A. Openness of the Complaint Process

Paragraphs 35, 36, 37, and 38 of the MOA deal with the openness of the complaint process.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The City is in compliance with the MOA requirement that complaint forms and informational material be made available in public buildings such as City Hall, the library and CPD District buildings, and that officers carry forms and materials in their vehicles at all times while on duty. Also, the City has now put in place new protocols to compare the cases that the CCA has in its files with the cases that the CPD has in its files, to ensure that every complaint is opened and investigated appropriately.

The Monitor reviewed 19 IIS investigations of citizen complaints completed in the third quarter of 2005. The Monitor found the CPD to be in compliance with the MOA provisions prohibiting officers from discouraging any person from making a complaint, and that complaints can be filed in any form, including in writing or verbally, in person or by mail, telephone, fax or e-mail.

The Monitor also finds that the CPD is in compliance with the requirements that a complaint form will be completed for each complaint, that each complaint will be assigned a unique identifier, and that each complaint will be resolved in writing. Therefore, the CPD is in compliance with MOA ¶¶36 and 37.

Status Update - Nothing to report.

B. Investigation of Complaints

Paragraphs 39-50 of the MOA deal with the investigation of complaints.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Time Period of Investigations

The Monitor has determined that the CPD is in not in compliance with the requirement that investigations be completed within 90 days of receiving the allegations.

Review of Investigations

Review of the data of IIS cases closed during the third quarter of 2005 showed that a total of 78 cases were cleared during the quarter. Of those cases, 31 exceeded the 90-day investigative requirement. The CPD's data of CCRP cases closed during the third quarter of 2005 showed that 48 cases were cleared

during this time frame. Eight of those cases exceeded the 90-day investigative requirement.[8]

In the next quarter, the Monitor also wanted to review CCRP files from the CPD Districts. While the ETS system contains electronic versions of the investigative reports from these cases, the Monitor believed it did not contain all of the documents and materials from these files. For this reason, the Monitor did not make an assessment of compliance this quarter on the MOA provisions specifically related to CCRP investigations, MOA ¶¶47 and 48.

The Monitor reviewed 19 IIS investigations in this quarter. Generally, these investigations were complete and thorough and in compliance with the MOA requirements. However, the Monitor determined that some investigations were not complete and thorough, as required by the MOA provisions.

- No complaints involved investigations where the on-scene investigation was conducted by a CPD member who authorized or was involved in the conduct that was the basis of the complaint. (MOA ¶40)

- Improper leading questions were used in one investigation (MOA ¶41). Because of the leading questions in that investigation, it was not clear that the investigation was free of bias, and that an effort to make a credibility determination was made. Four investigations did not have tapes, so the Monitor could not determine if leading questions were used or not.

- The Monitor Team found that in many of the cases, the CPD considered all relevant evidence, including circumstantial, direct and physical evidence, as appropriate. Complaint investigations where not all of the relevant evidence was considered, or where relevant witnesses were not identified and interviewed, included Tracking Nos. IIS 05087, IIS 05093, and IIS 05111. (MOA ¶¶41, 49(f))

- There were two complaint investigations where sufficient efforts were not made to resolve material inconsistencies between evidence and witness statements, or where relevant areas of inquiry and follow up questions were not addressed. (MOA ¶¶41, 49(g))

- The investigating supervisor appropriately reviewed the initial stop and search and seizure, with the exception of one case. (MOA ¶42)

- The complaint investigations reviewed and resolved all relevant police activity, including conduct not included in the initial complaint. (MOA ¶42)

[8] The MOA requires that IIS investigations be complete within 90 days after receiving the investigation "absent exceptional circumstances." The CPD policy allows investigators to submit an "extension request" for due to extenuating circumstances. None of the investigative files that the Monitor reviewed included an extension request, nor did the CPD document any exceptional circumstances for any of the other investigations that exceeded the 90 day limit.

- Four IIS complaint investigations did not include taped interviews of complainants, involved officers and witnesses [Tracking Nos. IIS 05093; IIS 05110; IIS 05111, IIS 05152]. One complaint involved an injury to prisoner report and the other three involved a TASER report. These reports do not include taped interviews, and IIS did not follow up to conduct taped interviews. In addition, for Tracking No. IIS 05074, taped interviews were not conducted for some of the witnesses. (MOA ¶49(a))

- In most of the cases reviewed by the Monitor Team, the investigator prepared a report that included a description of the alleged misconduct, any other misconduct identified during the course of the investigation, a summary and analysis of all relevant evidence gathered, and proposed findings and analysis supporting the findings. The findings were not supported by the evidence and sound analysis, however, in two cases. (MOA ¶50)

The Monitor finds that the CPD has complied with MOA ¶¶39, 40, 42, 43, and 46. The City is not in compliance with the requirement that investigations be completed within 90 days of the filing of the compliant (MOA ¶50). The CPD is in partial compliance with MOA ¶¶ 41 and 49.

Status Update

Time Period of Investigations

As of January 31, 2006, all 2005 IIS cases have been closed. IIS investigators will continue to include an approved memorandum in the file jacket explaining any exigent circumstances which prevent the case from being completed within 90 days. The importance of including a copy of this extension request with the case file copy for the Monitor has been stressed to IIS.

IIS Investigations

Review of the data of IIS cases closed during the fourth quarter of 2005 revealed a total of 103 cases cleared during this timeframe. Of those 103 cases, 57 exceeded the 90-day investigative requirement.

A summary of closed IIS cases during this quarter is included in Appendix Item 18.

CCRP Investigations

Review of the data of CCRP cases closed during the fourth quarter of 2005 revealed a total of 49 cases were cleared during this timeframe. Of those 49 cases, 10 exceeded the 90-day investigative requirement.

A summary of closed CCRP cases during this quarter is included in Appendix Item 19.

Review of Investigations

With regards to the Monitor's intent to review the CCRP files at each District; the Monitor believed the ETS system did not contain all of the documents and materials related to these files. This issue was discussed at the "All Parties" meeting on January 19, 2006, where it was explained that all documents, including supervisory "signatures" were included in the ETS system. It is not necessary for the Monitor to physically respond to each district to review the CCRP files.

Reference the Monitor's third bulleted issue, the CPD disagrees with the Monitor's determination that all of the relevant evidence was not considered or relevant witnesses were not identified and interviewed, for two of the listed cases. In case 05111, the complainant alleged that the officer who deployed the TASER did not warn him, did not advise he was under arrest and used profanity. This incident occurred on April 16, 2005; it was submitted to CCA by the complainant on May 5, 2005. The Monitor provided a template to assist CPD in understanding how their determinations were made.[9] The concerns listed on the template include:

- ► No effort was made or documented by the investigating supervisor to identify a witness who was sitting on the steps.
    - The investigating supervisor lists the witness on the report and indicates she corroborated the officer's statement. A taped interview of the witness was not required. IIS reviewed the incident including taped statements made to the CCA investigator, and included the witness interview contents in their summary. Once again the witness corroborated the officer's statement. CPD contends there was no reason for IIS to conduct a full investigation or re-interview the witness.
- ► It is unknown if questions by the investigating supervisor were "leading", as no recordings of interviews by the supervisor were included (and) there appear to be no tapes in this investigation.
    - Investigation of a TASER deployment does not require a taped interview of the subject or witnesses. Revisions to the Use of Force procedure have since been made to require taped interviews if the subject is restrained or if there is an allegation of excessive force. These requirements were not

[9] The Monitor did not provide a template for Case 05093, so it is unclear as to why the investigation was not in compliance. Based upon CPD review of the case, there is no basis for the Monitor's finding.

in effect at the time of this incident, and the subject did not make a complaint about the incident until two weeks later.

► No explanation was provided as to why an MVR was not used during this encounter.

- The officer attempted to stop the subject for investigation of Domestic Violence as he walked down the street. The subject initially ignored the officer and continued walking. While it is not explicitly included in the narrative, one can assume the officers exited their vehicle in order to conduct the investigation and apprehend the subject. This was not a traffic stop and the officer was not required to use the MVR while encountering the subject. In addition, at the time of this incident there was no requirement to videotape the transportation of the subject to jail. (Procedure 12.537 revised on 6/7/05).

Reference the Monitor's second and seventh bulleted issue, CPD disagrees with the Monitor's determination that IIS is required to follow up with taped interviews for the listed Injury to Prisoner report (05093) or two of the three TASER reports (05110 and 05111). Reference IIS case 05074, the Monitor advised taped interviews were not conducted for some of the witnesses. On September 15, 2005 the Department of Justice accepted the CPD proposal reference TASER documentation. CPD agreed to modify the Use of Force procedure to: 1) take a taped statement from the complainant if an allegation of excessive Use of Force is made during a Use of Force investigation; and 2) take a taped statement from a subject when a TASER is deployed while they are restrained. This procedure change occurred on October 18, 2005, after the listed investigations occurred. No taped statements were required for the initial investigations.

If the initial investigation by the district supervisor revealed a discrepancy between the subject's description of events and the officer's description, the report would have been forwarded to IIS for a full investigation of the allegation of excessive force. If the complaint was not made at the time of the incident, but rather was made to CCA or at a district after the fact, it would be investigated by IIS only if there was a new or different allegation than what was described during the initial incident. This was not the case, thus the listed reports were "reviewed" by IIS to ensure that the investigation by the district supervisor was done properly and within Department standards. IIS does not normally re-interview the complainant or witnesses, thus there are no taped statements unless the original investigating supervisor or CCA creates one. To address each report:

- Case 05093 – The complainant alleged the arresting officers "slammed his head, shoulder and knee on the ground", placed a knee in his back, and did not recover contraband in his pocket, which he was charged for. The first officer admitted taking the complainant to

the ground after he began to flee and the second officer advised it was necessary to restrain the complainant by placing a knee in his back so that he could be put into custody. An independent witness corroborated the officers' statements. An Injury to Prisoner report was completed for a small abrasion to the complainant's knee; there were no injuries to the complainant's head or shoulder. The issue reference the contraband was to be resolved in court.

- Case 05110 – The complainant alleged the officer tased him six or seven times during his arrest. The officer's TASER download indicated the complainant was tased three times, which is consistent with what the officer reported at the time of the incident. An independent witness corroborated the officer's statement.

- Case 05074 – This was a complete investigation by IIS rather than a review. The district supervisor conducted several taped interviews at the time of his investigation and the IIS investigator re-interviewed the complainant and some witnesses during the course of the investigation. As indicated in the IIS Case Summary, IIS exhausted every effort to locate and interview all witnesses, however some witnesses refused to cooperate and others were unable to be located. The IIS investigator summarized the taped interviews with the district supervisor wherever able. CPD questions how the Monitor expects an investigator to tape record witnesses when they refuse to cooperate or cannot be located.

C. Adjudication of Complaints

Paragraphs 44 and 45 of the MOA deal with the adjudication of complaints.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The City is in compliance with the requirement that every complaint be closed with one of four dispositions: Sustained, Not Sustained, Unfounded or Exonerated. ("Sustained-Other" is a sustained disposition for a violation that was not initially alleged in the complaint, but that was identified by the CPD.)

Status Update

IIS Cases

During the fourth quarter of 2005, 103 cases involving 256 allegations were investigated and closed by IIS. Those allegations were closed as follows:

Sustained	68
Sustained Other	28
Exonerated	52
Not Sustained	53
Unfounded	55

CCRP Cases

During the fourth quarter of 2005, 49 cases involving 50 allegations were investigated and closed through the CCRP process. Those allegations were closed as follows:

Sustained	3
Sustained Other	2
Exonerated	5
Not Sustained	9
Unfounded	31

Additionally, this quarter the CPD received and processed 106 reports of favorable officer conduct reported on positive contact forms. Also, there were 175 letters of commendation received recognizing the outstanding performance of CPD officers. A copy of the quarterly report relating to the aforementioned information is included in Appendix Item 20.

D. Investigations by the CCA

Paragraphs 51-56 of the MOA deal with investigation by the CCA.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Operations and Procedures

The City has implemented a formal protocol for coordinating parallel CCA and IIS investigations and ensuring a timely flow of information between the agencies, consistent with the MOA ¶54. The City is also in compliance with MOA ¶52, requiring that each citizen complaint be directed to the CCA regardless of where it is initially filed, and MOA ¶53, requiring that CPD officers submit to administrative questions from the CCA, and that the CCA have reasonable access to city records, documents and employees.

MOA ¶55 requires the City to take appropriate action, including discipline where warranted, on completed CCA investigations. MOA ¶56 requires the City Manager to take action within 30 days of the completion of the CCA investigation. The Monitor examined the case management spreadsheet of citizen complaint investigations handled by both the CCA and IIS. At the end of third quarter of 2005, there were a number of cases where the City Manager did not make a final determination after the completion of the CCA investigation. There were also cases in which it did not appear that the City took appropriate action, including discipline, on completed CCA investigations. The City is in partial compliance with MOA ¶¶55 and 56.

Sample Investigations

The Monitor reviewed 13 CCA investigations in this quarter. Generally, these investigations were complete and thorough and in compliance with the MOA requirements. The CCA investigations:

- Considered all relevant evidence, including circumstantial, direct and physical evidence, as appropriate.
- Identified and interviewed relevant witnesses, with the exception of one case.
- Made efforts to resolve material inconsistencies between witness statements in all but two cases.
- Did not improperly use leading questions.
- Reviewed and resolved all relevant police activity, including conduct that was not included in the initial complaint, with the possible exception of one case.

The Monitor finds that the CCA has complied with MOA ¶¶41 and 42.

Status Update

Operations and Procedures

The CPD is confident that past deficiencies regarding the coordination of IIS and CCA cases have been corrected. A copy of an abbreviated version of the CPD/CCA case management spreadsheet is included in Appendix Item 21.

Reference the partial compliance status for MOA ¶¶55 and 56, the CPD believes the issue of the City Manager's case determination not occurring within the time constraints was due to the change in city government, specifically the resignation of the City Manager and the transition process for the interim City Manager. CPD anticipates this issue will be remedied in the next quarter.

Sample Investigations

Nothing to report

VI. Management and Supervision

A. Risk Management and Supervision

Paragraphs 57-66 of the MOA are relevant to risk management and supervision.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Protocol and Data Input Plan

The CPD is in compliance with the MOA requirements for the ETS protocol and data input plan. (MOA ¶60, 61)

Implementation of the ETS system

During this quarter, the Monitor reviewed the implementation of the ETS system and its components. Now that the weighting and analysis components are working correctly, the CPD can use the system for its main purpose under the MOA: identifying patterns of activity for each data category, and initiating intervention for individual officers, supervisors, and units based on appropriate activity and pattern assessment of the data.

The CPD is in compliance with several of the MOA requirements relating to the design and operation of the risk management system, including collecting and recording the data listed in MOA ¶58, and including the appropriate identifying information about officers and citizens for incidents included in the system under MOA ¶59.

It is now necessary to assess whether the CPD is using the data in the system and initiating interventions for officers, supervisors and units as appropriate, as required under MOA ¶62. For compliance with ¶62, the CPD will need to document the following:

- The system is generating reports on a monthly basis describing the data analysis and identifying individual and unit patterns, ¶62(c);
- CPD commanders, managers and supervisors are reviewing system reports at least quarterly and evaluating individual officer, supervisor and unit activity, ¶62(d);
- CPD commanders, managers and supervisors are initiating interventions based on the information and pattern assessment in the system, ¶62(e)
- CPD commanders, managers and supervisors review the records of all officers recently transferred into their sections and units, ¶62(h)

- CPD commanders, managers and supervisors are evaluated on their ability to use the system, ¶62(i)

- Quarterly audits of the system are conducted by the Inspections Section, ¶62(j)

- Quarterly reviews are undertaken by CPD managers of relevant risk management system information to evaluate officer performance citywide, and to evaluate and make appropriate comparisons regarding the performance of CPD units, to identify any significant patterns or series of incidents, ¶62(k).

While the system capabilities are now sufficient for these actions, and some supervisors are reviewing the ETS data of the officers under their command, records indicate that the CPD has not begun to fully implement these requirements this quarter. For this reason, the Monitor finds that the CPD is in partial compliance with MOA ¶62. Because the CPD is in partial compliance with the requirements of MOA ¶62 for using the risk management system and its data, the CPD is also in partial compliance with MOA ¶57, which requires that the CPD regularly use the ETS data to "promote civil rights and best practices; to manage risk and liability; and to evaluate the performance of CPD officers across all ranks, units and shifts."

Manual Risk Management System

Paragraph 65 required the CPD to use its existing data systems for risk management until the new risk management system was in place. Now that the analysis functionality of the ETS system is working, the CPD is able to properly assess and evaluate its members' activities to identify patterns and trends of at-risk behavior. Supervisors are now mandated to use the ETS to review each officer's activity and establish an intervention plan when an officer exceeds established thresholds. Therefore, ¶65 no longer applies.

Status Update

Protocol and Data Input Plan

Nothing to report

Implementation of the ETS system

Motorola (formally CRISNET), the vendor, has completed the data conversion of importing all the old data into the system. The process began cleaning some of the records reference matching employee names to their official name within the system. Motorola recently made five corrections and modifications to the system, and ITMS found three more corrections to be made. These corrections are minor in nature and are expected to be completed by the first week in February.

In November 2005, CPD performed its first analysis utilizing ETS for the Third Quarter review. This analysis was considered a test analysis for the Department. The first official analysis was conducted in January 2006 for the Fourth Quarter 2005 review.

B. Audit Procedures

Paragraphs 67-69 of the MOA deal with audit procedures.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD is in compliance with MOA ¶¶67, 68(a) and 69. In the next quarter, the Monitor will assess the Inspection Sections' semi-annual audit of IIS investigations for compliance with MOA ¶68(b).

Status Update

Inspections Section has conducted their review of the CCRP process for the fourth quarter of 2005. Eighty complaints were filed with the CPD between October and December. A random audit of 16 cases was conducted on the closed investigations.

Inspections Section reviewed the following criteria:

- Ensure CCRP complaints were entered into the database and the case files were maintained in a central area for each district, section, and unit.
- Ensure necessary documentation was completed for each CCRP investigation.
- Ensure all files contained the appropriate documents.
- Ensure the investigating supervisor notified the complainant of the disposition and whether any corrective or disciplinary action was taken.

Additionally, Inspections Section randomly contacted complainants to evaluate whether their actions and views were accurately captured in the CCRP reports. The audit revealed that all CCRP investigations reviewed were in compliance with the criteria set forth above. A summary of the audit was prepared on January 19, 2006, and is included in Appendix Item 22.

In an effort to achieve continuous process improvement, the CPD re-emphasized the importance of proper case preparation, court attendance and preparedness for court testimony during the fourth quarter.

A legal update from the City Prosecutor was included in the October 11, 2005 Staff Notes reminding officers of what is needed to be prepared for court. In addition, the Department implemented a daily inspection of officer's case jackets by the Court Control commander, who completes a weekly report identifying any deficiencies in the officer's case preparation. The report is forwarded to Inspections for review and appropriate action.

During the last week of October, Inspections Sections conducted a random inspection of officers appearing for court. The focus of the inspection was to determine the level of preparedness of an officer to effectively testify (case knowledge) and provide necessary evidence. A total of 14 officers were inspected, resulting in 17 cases being examined. Of the 14 officers, 12 had case jackets and exhibited a good working knowledge of the case facts. The remaining two officers did not have case jackets: in the first instance the primary officer had the case jacket, and in the second instance the Rapid Indictment Program officer had the case jacket. Inspections found that all 14 officers inspected were well prepared for court with necessary documentation, case knowledge and/or evidence as necessary. A copy of the October 11, 2005 and November 22, 2005 Staff Notes are included in Appendix Item 23.

The CPD also had meetings and correspondence with representatives from both the City and County Prosecutor's Offices to identify and discuss issues in officer, shift or unit performance. A copy of the Inspections Commander Fourth Quarter Report is included in Appendix Item 24.

C. Video Cameras

MOA paragraphs 70-72 deal with video camera requirements.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Based on the City's commitment to equip all patrol cars with MVR/DVRs, the Department of Justice has accepted the City's current status regarding the number of patrol cars outfitted with MVRs as compliant with MOA ¶70. Also, the CPD is in compliance with MOA ¶¶71 and 72. Where officers are aware that a vehicle stop was not recorded, it appears they are notifying the shift supervisor of the reason the stop was not recorded. The CPD is also conducting periodic reviews of MVR tapes and random surveys of MVR equipment to confirm they are in working order.

For the CPD to remain in compliance, CPD officers must implement the CPD's MVR procedures by activating their MVR in circumstances that require MVRs, such as all traffic stops and pursuits.

The Monitor noted that the RAND Corporation identified problems with MVR recordings as part of its first annual report for the CA Evaluation Protocol. One of the components of the evaluation protocol is a review of MVR recordings of traffic stops. The RAND report notes that the video record was not complete in approximately 15 percent of the videotapes reviewed, omitting the beginning, the end, or a middle portion of the incident. In most of these cases, the camera was turned off or ran out of tape before the driver or officer left the scene. In addition, there were a large number of traffic stop incidents for which an MVR recording was not available. Because the RAND review was for traffic stops that occurred in 2004, rather than in 2005, the Monitor's compliance assessment for this quarter did not include the RAND data and concerns. The Monitor will audit MVR recordings in the next quarter to assess whether CPD officers are complying with the MOA's MVR requirements.

Status Update

Forty digital camera systems were purchased in late 2005, and installation began immediately. As of February 1, 2006, all marked patrol vehicles have been outfitted with an MVR or DVR system. A copy of the Department of Justice letter accepting the City's status as compliant with paragraph 70 in included in Appendix Item 25.

D. Police Communications Technology

MOA paragraphs 73 and 74 relate to police communications technology.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor found the CPD to be in compliance with these provisions.

Status Update

The Department selected Motorola as the primary vendor for the new Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) and Records Management System (RMS). The contract is in the process of being reviewed and approved, and the project is expected to begin sometime in February 2006.

E. Discipline Matrix

MOA paragraphs 75-76 are relevant to discipline and promotional policy.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Review of the data for 2005 investigations indicate appropriate discipline for cases sustained by the CPD and affirmed by the City Manager. The City is in compliance for this quarter.

Status Update - Nothing to report.

VII. TRAINING

A. Use of Force – Management Oversight and Curriculum

MOA paragraphs 77 – 81 are relevant to management oversight of training and training curriculum.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD remains in compliance with these provisions; however, the Monitor encourages the City to reopen its search for the Director of the Training Academy and fill that position.

Status Update

During this quarter, Use of Force was covered multiple times in the Roll Call Training Program. In addition, Use of Force Investigation and Reporting was covered in New Supervisors training on December 23, 2005. A copy of the course outline is included in Appendix Item 26.

The Police Academy conducted another needs assessment for training. Various training items were discussed at the Training Committee meeting held on November 16, 2005. A summary of the meeting is included in Appendix Item 27.

Implementation of a Use of Force Review Board

In January 2006, the Police Chief authorized a comprehensive review of serious uses of force by a Use of Force Review Board. Incidents involving the discharge of firearms by police are not included in this process and are still addressed by the Firearms Discharge Board (Procedure 12.550). The Use of Force Review Board will be made up of command officers from Training Section, Inspections Section, the affected officer's District/Section, Patrol or Investigations Bureau (rotating) and a Bureau Commander (rotating).

The purpose of the Use of Force Review Board is to enhance the Department's ability to evaluate serious Use of Force incidents by utilizing the expertise of various commanders rather than confining the review and evaluation of these incidents to the officer's immediate supervisors. By taking advantage of the broad knowledge and experience of the command staff, the Department will increase the quality of the review and promote continuous improvement and education of all Department members.

A copy of the Staff Note outlining the Use of Force Review Board is included in Appendix Item 28.

B. Handling Citizen Complaints

MOA paragraph 82 is relevant to citizen complaint training.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD is in compliance with this section of the MOA.

Status Update - Nothing to report.

C. Leadership/Command Accountability Training

MOA paragraph 83 is relevant to leadership/command accountability training.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor found the CPD to be in compliance with this MOA provision.

Status Update

Captain Gene Hamann is currently attending the Police Executive Leadership College, and Captain Paul Broxterman is scheduled to attend the Southern Police Institute in February 2006 in Louisville, Kentucky.

D. Canine Training

MOA paragraph 84 is relevant to canine training.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor Team will be observing canine training in the first quarter of 2006 and will assess compliance in their next report.

Status Update - Nothing to report.

E. Scenario Based Training

MOA paragraph 85 is relevant to scenario-based training.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD remains in compliance with this provision.

Status Update

During the fourth quarter of 2005, the CPD provided 1,755 hours of Roll Call Training. Several new scenarios taken from CPD incidents were added to the library. Other areas reviewed include:

- Search Warrants
- Search and Seizure
- Proper Use of Force
- Use of SWAT and Crisis Negotiations Team

The Roll Call Training calendars and summary for this quarter have been included in Appendix Items 29 and 30.

F. Revised Training Based on Review of Civil Lawsuits Pertaining to Officer Misconduct

MOA paragraph 86 is relevant to training based on civil lawsuits.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD is in compliance with this provision.

Status Update

The quarterly meeting between the City Solicitor's office and the CPD took place on December 1, 2005. The following items were discussed:

- Updates were given on seven court cases involving the CPD.
- The Law Department expressed concern about officers neglecting to obtain written Consent to Search Without a Warrant (Form 601). It was decided a Staff Note would be developed to remind officers to use the form whenever possible, and the issue will be reviewed during in-service training.

The minutes from the meeting have been included in Appendix Item 31.

G. Orientation to the MOA

MOA paragraph 87 is relevant to MOA orientation training.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The City remains in compliance with this provision.

Status Update

Department supervisors attended Management in-service training during the fourth quarter. One block of instruction was related to the CCA. Mr. Wendell France, Executive Director of the CCA, and Mr. S. Gregory Baker, Executive Manager of Police Relations for the CPD, provided an overview of civilian review, the role of the CCA, and the CCA process.

H. Field Training Officers (FTO)

MOA Paragraphs 88-89 deal with the training of field training officers.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The City remains in compliance with this provision.

Status Update

There was no FTO training during the fourth quarter. A new Field Training Officer course is scheduled to begin on February 27, 2006.

Firearms Training

MOA paragraphs 90-91 are relevant to firearms training.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD remains in compliance with these MOA provisions.

Status Update

During the fourth quarter, 286 officers attended firearms qualifications.

APPENDIX

- MHRT Tracking Summary 1
- Table 10-1 – MHRT Deployment Summary 2
- Updated Use of Force Procedure 12.545 3
- Summary of Fourth Quarter TASER Injuries 4
- Itemized List of TASER Reports Related to a Foot Pursuit 5
- Table 14-1 – Chemical Irritant Summary – Group Deployments 6
- Table 14-2 – Chemical Irritant Summary – Verbal Commands 7
- Table 14-3 – Chemical Irritant Summary – Decontamination 8
- Table 14-4 – Chemical Irritant Summary – Restrained Individuals 9
- Table 18-1 – Chemical Irritant Distribution 10
- Canine Bite Ratio Report – October 11
- Canine Bite Ratio Report – November 12
- Canine Bite Ratio Report – December 13
- Canine Deployment Summary Report 14
- Table 20-1 – Canine Deployment Summary 15
- Table 20-2 – Canine Bite Summary 16
- Firearms Discharge Board Status Report 17
- IIS Case Closure Summary 18
- CCRP Case Closure Summary 19
- Citizen Feedback Program – Fourth Quarter 20
- CPD/CCA Case Management Spreadsheet 21
- Citizen Complaint Resolution Process – 2005 Fourth Quarter Audit 22
- Inspections and Legal Update Staff Notes 23
- Prosecutors' Input Memorandum 24
- Department of Justice Letter of Compliancy 25
- Lesson Plan for Use of Force Investigation and Reporting 26
- Training Committee Meeting Minutes 27
- Use of Force Review Board Staff Note 28
- Roll Call Training Schedules – Fourth Quarter 29
- CPD Training Records – Fourth Quarter 30
- Meeting with the Law Department Minutes 31