

**OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
COMMENDATIONS & COMPLAINTS REPORT
JANUARY 2011
OPA Director's Monthly Message**

The Office of Professional Accountability publishes a monthly report with information about police misconduct complaints and describing incidents where officers were commended for their work. The report provides data on the number and classification of OPA complaints filed each month, with a comparison to the previous year. There are charts showing the percentage of cases closed with different type of findings and information about mediation and policy recommendations. For example, this month, there were 19 closed cases involving 45 allegations of misconduct. 11% resulted in a Sustained finding, with the officer receiving some level of discipline. Another 31% resulted in a Supervisory Intervention, meaning the officer was referred for training or counseling as a result of the complaint.

Beginning with the January 2011 monthly report, the OPA Director will comment on trends she sees developing, point out cases of particular significance, or make other observations about police oversight. This month, there are two items of interest.

In-Car Video: SPD has a policy that officers with In-Car Video systems must make every effort to record citizen contacts. With a series of recent cases caught on videotape, Seattle has witnessed the important role video plays in police accountability. Video does not tell the whole story about a police incident and it can be misleading if the viewer only sees a small part of the overall encounter or if the video is of poor quality. However, video often is invaluable in assessing the conduct of both the officer and citizen, and can help OPA evaluate a complaint from the outset.

If a complaint is filed and In-Car Video is unavailable without an obvious explanation, OPA adds an allegation of failure to use video. In January, two officers were found to have violated the In-Car Video policy and were required to undergo retraining.

In 2010, OPA recommended that the In-Car Video policy be reissued and that the Department audit how video is being used. In January 2011, SPD began the recommended audit and OPA will provide updates as information becomes available.

Profanity: The use of profanity by SPD officers while doing law enforcement is discouraged as unprofessional. This report notes a case where an officer received a supervisory intervention for using profanity even though the citizen was using vulgar language. We expect our officers to strive for professionalism even in the face of difficult encounters.

The following report provides examples of outstanding work done by Seattle police officers who work day in and day out serving the Seattle community, along with information about how OPA investigated complaints where officers' conduct might have been lacking.

Office of Professional Accountability (OPA) Commendations & Complaints Report January 2011

Commendations:

Commendations Received in January: 18

Commendations Received to Date: 18

Officer Brian Thomas	The President of the Cowan Park Neighborhood Association commends Officer Thomas on "his persistence and thoroughness" . . . and his "uncanny instinct to be in the right place at the right time for the right reason." Officer Thomas is also commended for "volunteering to go beyond his 'job description' to find out what could be done" in helping the neighborhood deal with issues.
Officer Mike Shinn Officer Tyler Getts	A homeowner, awakened by his barking dog, found the door to his residence open and a burglary suspect outside by his car. Officers Shinn and Getts responded promptly to the 911-call for service, captured two adult burglars, and booked them both into jail for investigation of residential burglary. The homeowner thanks Officers Shinn and Getts for their quick and successful response.
Officer Leigh Fiedler	A resident new to the Seattle area commends Officer Fiedler for her "professional and compassionate" service and "exemplary behavior" when Officer Fiedler assisted her with a problem she encountered upon arriving in the area.
Officer Michael Virgilio Officer Shaun Hilton	The father of a young woman whose boyfriend was threatening suicide commends Officers Virgilio and Hilton for handling the incident "very well," noting that they were "firm, yet compassionate and informative." The service provided by Officers Virgilio and Hilton led to the mental health treatment that the boyfriend needed and the treatment reportedly has benefitted the boyfriend greatly.
Detective Suzanne Moore	A community member commends Detective Moore for her commitment, competence, and compassion investigating cases involving the abuse and neglect of vulnerable adults in our community.
Officer Jorge Bourdon	Family members commend Officer Bourdon for his poise, professionalism, and sensitivity in assisting the family, other police officers, fire department personnel, and a Chaplin at the scene of a natural death investigation of a 4 ½ month old baby.
Officer Felix Reyes	An employee of a downtown business commends Officer Reyes for regularly patrolling a parking garage in a "sketchy environment" and noticeably reducing the number of illegal drug dealers and trespassers loitering about, making the area safer for everyone.
Officer Jason Atofau Officer Eric Sauer Officer Jacob Leenstra Officer Jacob Nelson Officer Todd Jones Officer Ian Walsh	The mother of a 12-year old daughter, who reported her daughter missing, commends Officers Atofau, Sauer, Leenstra, Nelson, Jones, and Walsh for their "compassionate support, speedy response, and thorough involvement" responding to and investigating the missing child case. The mother notes that the effort of these officers and the overall effort of the Seattle Police Department gave her great comfort.

Commendations:

Officer Ryan Blake	The mother of a young man, whom Officer Blake had stopped for a traffic offense, commends Officer Blake for taking the “extra steps” necessary to clarify her son’s driving status, which resulted in the matter being handled effectively and efficiently.
Officer Michael Cross The Seattle Police Department	A community member thanks Officer Cross for being “patient and answering” questions about the Seattle Police Department. The community member notes, “I don’t think any of the Seattle Police Officers are commended enough for the amount of work they do. I just wanted to let them know that the small things make a huge difference, and they are very much appreciated.”
The Seattle Police Department	A community member writes, “I want all of the officers in SPD to know that not everyone is anti-SPD. I think you men and women do an outstanding job. Keep up the good work.”
Officer Corey Williams Officer Casey Steiger Officer Debra Pelich Officer Brett Schoenberg Officer Vanessa Flick	A patrol sergeant commends Officers Williams, Steiger, Pelich, Schoenberg, and Flick for their response to a disturbance call involving a suspect armed with a hatchet threatening and injuring another person. The suspect was arrested and booked into jail.
Officer David Serpanos Officer Bruce Menne Officer Michael Korner Officer Dale Davenport Officer Molly Clark Officer Daljiit Gill Officer Bruce Godsoe Officer David Toner	A patrol sergeant commends Officers Serpanos, Menne, Korner, Davenport, Clark, Gill, Godsoe, and Toner for their competence and effort in locating the driver of a hit and run vehicle who had left the scene of a collision that had seriously injured a pedestrian.
Officer Jacques Pirak Officer Sonya Fry Officer Wes Collier Officer Stephanie McKinney Officer Brian Hope	A patrol sergeant commends Officers Pirak, Fry, Collier, McKinney, and Hope for their effort in responding to a strong-arm robbery of a woman crossing a city street late at night by a suspect impersonating a police officer. The suspect was arrested and booked into jail.
Detective Glenn Kerns	The Vice President of a local bank thanks Detective Kerns for the “very valuable and useful information” about protecting the bank’s assets against fraud that he provided during a presentation to the bank’s risk managers
Detective Jim Rodgers Detective Frank Clark	A detective sergeant commends Detectives Rodgers and Clark for their effort investigating a commercial robbery that resulted in the arrest of three suspects who not only committed that robbery but who were also booked into jail for an unrelated residential burglary.
Officer Michael Stankiewicz Officer Alfred Warner	The manager of an apartment building commends Officers Stankiewicz and Warner for their work in ending a series of burglaries in the apartment complex being committed by suspects actually staying in the building at times. The manager states Officers Stankiewicz and Warner “couldn’t have been more professional or efficient while being sensitive to how the situation could upset those living in the building.”
The Seattle Police Officers working at the Seattle Center on New Year’s Eve	The Director of the Seattle Center expresses his “appreciation for the tremendous support, professionalism and compassion your officers provided.” The Director goes on to say, “My staff raved about the work ethic of SPD officers as they patrolled the grounds and responded almost instantaneously to any and all situations” during the New Year’s Eve celebration at the Seattle Center.

January 2011 Closed Cases:

Cases involving alleged misconduct of officers and employees in the course of their official public duties are summarized below. Identifying information has been removed.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT: LAWS

Synopsis	Action Taken
The complainant was jaywalking with her adult daughter when the named officer, off-duty but on his way to work, drove close to them, then turned his car around, returned to them, and allegedly stated that he was going to find them after he began his work shift and kill them.	Allegation: Violation of Law Administrative (Threats to Kill) – NOT SUSTAINED The evidence demonstrated that the officer likely acted in a less than professional manner but the evidence could neither prove nor disprove the allegation that the named officer threatened to kill the complainant.
10-0331 After a due diligence check, the Human Resource Section discovered that the named employee and former spouse had been involved in an assault and/or property destruction during a domestic disturbance.	Allegation: Violation of Law Administrative (DV) – NOT SUSTAINED An outside law enforcement agency investigated an incident of domestic violence involving named employee and former spouse. During the course of the investigation, named employee's former spouse refused to cooperate with the investigation; this resulted in the Deputy Prosecuting Attorney to decline the filing of charges. Similarly, the named employee's former spouse has not cooperated with the OPA-IS investigation. Therefore, the allegation of misconduct was neither proved nor disproved by a preponderance of the evidence.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT: PROFESSIONALISM

Synopsis	Action Taken
The complainant, whom the named officer had contacted during the Torchlight Parade for operating a vehicle suspected to be occupied by possible armed gang members, alleged the named officer, while off duty several days later, appeared at his place of employment and commented to the complainant's co-workers about the traffic stop and complainant's refusal to allow a consent search of his car.	Allegation: Exercise of Discretion – SUSTAINED The evidence demonstrated that the named officer did appear at the complainant's place of employment while off duty and did make gratuitous comments regarding the complainant's traffic stop and refusal to allow a consent search of his vehicle. Corrective action: Written reprimand

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT: PROFESSIONALISM

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>The complainant alleged the named officers lacked justification for searching and impounding her car that she was sitting in at the time with 4 other passengers at a city boat ramp and from which a strong odor of marijuana was emanating.</p>	<p>Two named officers</p> <p>Same allegations and findings for each named officer Allegation #1: Exercise of Discretion – SUPERVISORY INTERVENTION Allegation #2: Improper Search – SUPERVISORY INTERVENTION</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that while someone in the complainant's car possessed marijuana, the named officers could not adequately articulate their reasoning for the enforcement action they took and for impounding the complainant's car.</p> <p>Corrective action: The supervisor of the named officers discussed with them the importance of being able to adequately identify and articulate the basis and reasoning for enforcement action that they take.</p>
<p>The complainant, who was walking with her cousin and a group of 5 or 6 people in downtown Seattle, alleged that the named officer was singling out her and her family for enforcement action and used inappropriate language toward her.</p>	<p>Allegation #1: Use of Profanity – SUPERVISORY INTERVENTION Allegation #2: Exercise of Discretion – UNFOUNDED</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officer and other officers had encountered the complainant, her sister and their cousin many times for various enforcement issues in his downtown patrol area. While the records system suggests that the complainant and her family may have been the objects of frequent police inquiries and contacts, it does not demonstrate that the named officer has been involved with the complainant except a few times. The evidence demonstrated that the named officer had a legitimate justification for stopping the complainant.</p> <p>Regarding the use of profanity by the named officer, the evidence demonstrated that the named officer, though encountering similar and more profane language directed at him by the complainant and others in the group he had stopped, did at one point use an unacceptable profanity.</p> <p>Corrective action: The supervisor of the named officer met with him to address the importance of not being baited into using profanity even when the person to whom it is directed is using profane, vulgar, obscene, or abusive language toward him.</p>

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT: PROFESSIONALISM

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>The complainant, a prisoner at the time in the backseat of a parked patrol car, alleged the two named officers, who had just arrested him, momentarily stopped what they were doing to allow two young women, not associated with the incident, first, to take a photograph posing with the named officers standing near the patrol car and, second, to then allow the women to sit on the hood of the patrol car to pose for another photograph.</p>	<p>Two named officers Same allegation for each named officer: Exercise of Discretion</p> <p>For named officer #1: EXONERATED For named officer #2: SUPERVISORY INTERVENTION</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that named officer #1 allowed the women to take the first photograph, in which he posed, “to promote better community relations” and that it did not interfere significantly with the processing of the prisoner. The evidence demonstrated that named officer #2 exercised poor discretion in allowing one of the women to pose on the hood of the patrol car for the second photograph. The evidence demonstrated that both named officers should have been focusing more on their immediate work and the arrest than on engaging in community relations with the young women.</p> <p>Corrective action: The supervisor of named officer #2 counseled him on the importance of prioritizing his work and not being distracted from what should have been his primary focus at the time.</p>
<p>The complainant alleges that named employee #1 did not exercise proper discretion in the manner in which he investigated and handled a child neglect case. Complainant alleges that named employee #2 had a conflict of interest based on the relationship to complainant and his position within the Department. Complainant further alleges that named employee #3’s involvement in the child neglect case was an act of retaliation against complainant because of a previous complaint filed against him.</p>	<p>Named Employee #1: Allegation: Exercise of Discretion—ADMINISTRATIVELY UNFOUNDED Named Employee #2: Allegation: Integrity-Conflict of Interest—ADMINISTRATIVELY UNFOUNDED Named Employee #3: Allegation: Complaint Process/Retaliation—ADMINISTRATIVELY UNFOUNDED</p> <p>Evidence showed that named employee #1 was very thorough in assessing this child neglect incident carefully which included contacting CPS to place the child into protective custody and documenting the incident so an outside agency could be appraised. Named employee #2 is a civilian employee of the Department and related to the complainant. Evidence showed that named employee #2 has never met nor has come in contact with named employee #1. There is no evidence to support the allegation that named employee #2 had any influence on named employee #1’s investigation of the reported child neglect incident. Named employee #3 is a sergeant who had prior interaction with the complainant in 2009 which resulted in complainant filing a complaint against named employee #3. Named employee #3’s involvement in this case consisted of approving the child neglect report written by named employee #1. The preponderance of evidence indicates that named employee #3 did not retaliate against the complainant during the child neglect investigation.</p>

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT: RULES/REGULATIONS

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>It is alleged that the named officer failed to comply with several provisions of the “action plan” that he and the Department’s Human Resources Section had agreed upon subsequent to many occasions of the named officer failing to comply with many rules and regulations governing his employment.</p>	<p>Allegations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collective Bargaining Agreement/Standards and Duties: SUPERVISORY INTERVENTION 2. Insubordination: SUPERVISORY INTERVENTION 3. Chain of Command/Standards and Duties: SUPERVISORY INTERVENTION 4. Illness and Injury/Rules and Regulations: SUPERVISORY INTERVENTION 5. Unauthorized Absence from Duty: EXONERATED <p>Though there was clear evidence that demonstrated that the named officer did not follow the provisions of the “action plan” or other directives, there was also some evidence that there might have been at least one instance of inconsistent enforcement of the “action plan”/directives, perhaps leading the named officer to conclude that he was not bound by the expectations that had been presented to him.</p> <p>Corrective action: Supervisory counseling of the named officer will clarify for him that he is expected to strictly follow all directives given to him.</p>
<p>The complainant, who was involved in a vehicle collision that the named officer investigated, alleged that the named officer failed to document the incident properly.</p>	<p>Allegation: Failure to Complete a Vehicle Collision Report – SUPERVISORY INTERVENTION</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that while the named officer assisted all involved motorists at the scene, that he also should have completed a Vehicle Collision Report to document the incident.</p> <p>Corrective action: The immediate supervisor of the named officer met with him to discuss the importance of completing necessary reports.</p>
<p>The complainant, whom the named officers had arrested at his apartment in Seattle for a domestic violence assault that had occurred shortly before, alleged that the named officers entered his apartment absent justification.</p>	<p>Two named officers</p> <p>Same allegation and finding for each named officer: Allegation: Improper Search – SUSTAINED</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that while the named officers had sufficient probable cause – but no arrest warrant-- to arrest the complainant for a domestic violence assault, it also demonstrated that they should not have relied upon the apartment manager providing them a key to enter the complainant’s apartment unit to arrest him after they had unsuccessfully knocked on the complainant’s door, announced that they were police officers, and stated that they were there to arrest him for the domestic violence assault.</p> <p>Corrective action: Written reprimands for each named officer and re-training on the legal justification needed to enter a suspect’s residence under the circumstances of this case.</p>

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT: RULES/REGULATIONS

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>It is alleged that the named officer engage in a vehicle pursuit of a suspected DUI driver and, in the course, lost control of his patrol car and damaged a flower bed of a private residence, then failed to properly report his actions.</p>	<p>Allegation #1: Failing to Report a Vehicle Collision – SUSTAINED Allegation #2: Vehicle Pursuits/Violation of Policy – SUSTAINED</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officer engaged in a vehicle pursuit in violation of Department policy and that the named officer also violated Department policy when he crashed into the flower bed of a private residence and failed to properly report the collision.</p> <p>Corrective action: Allegation #1 – One-day suspension held in abeyance for 2 years, provided no similar misconduct during that time. Allegation #2 – Written reprimand regarding the responsibility to report vehicle collisions.</p>

UNNECESSARY FORCE

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>Complainant partially observed named officers using force to arrest a suspect who was intoxicated and throwing furniture out of his apartment window and who struggled with the officers attempting to control him, including punching one officer in the head. The complainant reported the named officers used unnecessary force on the suspect.</p>	<p>Three named officers. Same allegation and finding for each named officer: Unnecessary Use of Force – EXONERATED.</p> <p>The evidence established that the named officers used reasonable and necessary force to arrest a suspect who was uncooperative, intoxicated, assaultive, and dangerous, and who had punched one officer in the head.</p>
<p>Complainant, one of two trespassers rummaging through a dumpster in the back of a business, alleged that the named officer used unnecessary force on him for no reason when they were exiting the dumpster.</p>	<p>Allegation: Unnecessary Use of Force – EXONERATED</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officer was responding to a 911-call for service regarding two trespassers rummaging through a dumpster used by the business and that he encountered two suspects. One of the suspects clearly showed his hands to the named officer and cooperated fully. The other suspect, the complainant, refused to show his hands to the named officer and began to advance on the named officer. The named officer called for a “fast back-up” from other officers and handcuffed him in order to stabilize the scene. The evidence demonstrated that the named officer used reasonable, necessary, and minimal force to control the complainant. A patrol supervisor screened the temporary detention and release of the suspect.</p>

UNNECESSARY FORCE

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>Complainant, who had been reported to 911 as talking to himself and carrying an axe as he walked into a city park, alleged the named officer, one of the officers dispatched to the call, used unnecessary force on him when he was taken into custody.</p>	<p>Allegation: Unnecessary Use of Force – UNFOUNDED</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officer used only reasonable, necessary, minimal, and non-reportable force when he briefly placed his knee upon the complainant’s back while applying handcuffs. The complainant was uneventfully transported by ambulance to a medical center for an involuntary mental health evaluation.</p>
<p>Complainant, whom the named officers were arresting, alleged the named officers used unnecessary force on him, causing injury to his right elbow.</p>	<p>Three named officers. Same allegation and finding for each named officer. Unnecessary Use of Force – EXONERATED</p> <p>The evidence, including in-car video, demonstrated that the complainant was actively resisting being handcuffed and that the named officers applied counter force that was reasonable and necessary to overcome the complainant’s resistance to being handcuffed.</p>
<p>The complainant alleged the named officers used unnecessary force on her when they escorted her to and assisted in placing her upon a gurney when she was loaded into an ambulance, for transport to a local hospital for an involuntary mental health evaluation, after having been involved in a domestic violence disturbance. It is also alleged that the named officers failed to operate their in-car video systems, as required by Department policy.</p>	<p>Three named officers</p> <p>Same allegations for each named officer</p> <p>Allegation #1: Unnecessary Use of Force – UNFOUNDED for each named officer Allegation #2: Violation of In-Car Video Policy – SUPERVISORY INTERVENTION for two of the named officers and EXONERATED for the third named officer</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the complainant was visiting the home of her sister when she became involved in a physical fight. The complainant’s sister attempted to. The complainant assaulted her sister, who phoned 911 for police assistance. The named officers were dispatched to the call and arranged for the complainant to be transported to a local hospital via ambulance for an involuntary mental health evaluation. The evidence demonstrated that the named officers simply escorted and gently assisted the complainant onto the ambulance gurney. The evidence also demonstrated that two of the named officers were not operating their in-car video systems in compliance with Department policy and that the third officer was operating his in-car video system in compliance with Department policy.</p> <p>Corrective action: The supervisor of the two named officers who were in violation of the Department’s in-car video policy discussed with them the importance of complying with the policy.</p>

UNNECESSARY FORCE

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>The complainant, who is the mother of a man whom the named officer arrested on an outstanding warrant for Promoting Commercial Sexual Abuse of a Minor, alleged the officer used unnecessary force when arresting her son.</p>	<p>Allegation: Unnecessary Use of Force – ADMINISTRATIVELY UNFOUNDED</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the alleged misconduct simply did not occur as alleged by the arrestee’s mother, who was not present at the time of her son’s arrest.</p>
<p>The brother of a person, whom the named officers had arrested for involvement in a “shots fired” call and for unlawfully possessing a handgun, alleged the named officers “beat” his brother when arresting him. Note: the complainant was not present at the scene and the person arrested was criminally charged for the gun crimes.</p>	<p>Two named officers</p> <p>Same allegation and finding for each named officer: Unnecessary Use of Force – UNFOUNDED</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the alleged “beating” of the person arrested simply did not occur as alleged.</p>
<p>The complainant, whom the named officers arrested in the course of investigating a complainant that the complainant had been following him for a significant distance and who had walked up to within 1 or 2 feet of this person and the named officers as the named officers were attempting to sort out the matter, alleged the named officers used unnecessary force on him and failed to advise him of his Miranda Rights after arresting him.</p>	<p>Two named officers</p> <p>Same allegations and findings for each named officer: Allegation #1: Unnecessary Use of Force – EXONERATED Allegation #2: Failure to Advise of Miranda Rights – UNFOUNDED</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officers used minimal force to handcuff the complainant and did advise him of his Miranda Rights. The evidence also demonstrates that the named officers were justified in drawing their service weapons when the complainant quickly reached inside his jacket (intimating he was reaching for a gun), then quickly pulled out his hand and pointed it toward the named officers, clutching what they fortunately recognized to be a baseball hat, as he grinned at the named officers (intimating that he had almost tricked them into shooting him). The evidence demonstrated that the complainant was likely under the influence of a controlled substance and possibly suffering from mental health issues.</p>

Definitions of Findings:

“Sustained” means the allegation of misconduct is supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

“Not Sustained” means the allegation of misconduct was neither proved nor disproved by a preponderance of the evidence.

“Unfounded” means a preponderance of evidence indicates the alleged act did not occur as reported or classified, or is false.

“Exonerated” means a preponderance of evidence indicates the conduct alleged did occur, but that the conduct was justified, lawful and proper.

“Supervisory Intervention” means while there may have been a violation of policy, it was not a willful violation, and/or the violation did not amount to misconduct. The employee’s chain of command is to provide appropriate training, counseling and/or to review for deficient policies or inadequate training.

“Administratively Unfounded/Exonerated” is a discretionary finding which may be made prior to the completion that the complaint was determined to be significantly flawed procedurally or legally; or without merit, i.e., complaint is false or subject recants allegations, preliminary investigation reveals mistaken/wrongful employee identification, etc, or the employee’s actions were found to be justified, lawful and proper and according to training.

“Administratively Inactivated” means that the investigation cannot proceed forward, usually due to insufficient information or the pendency of other investigations. The investigation may be reactivated upon the discovery of new, substantive information or evidence. Inactivated cases will be included in statistics but may not be summarized in this report if publication may jeopardize a subsequent investigation.

Mediation Program:

The OPA Director selected 7 cases to be resolved through the Mediation Program during January 2011.

Of the 7 cases selected for the Mediation Program, 3 complainants declined to participate and 3 cases are being scheduled for mediation. In 1 case, the complaint was inadvertently sent to the named employee's supervisor for investigation after the complainant had agreed to participate in the mediation process; there was no response back from the named employee. Therefore, the case was closed as being handled by the supervisor.

Cases Opened (2010/2011 by Month Comparison)

Date	PIR		SR		LI		IS		TOTAL	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
1/1-1/31	8	9	8	8	1	1	12	19	29	37
2/1-2/28	18		9		1		16		44	0
3/1-3/31	30		6		1		16		53	0
4/1-4/30	31		9		3		13		56	0
5/1-5/31	15		10		3		23		51	0
6/1-6/30	25		14		1		13		53	0
7/1-7/31	23		10		1		18		52	0
8/1-8/31	20		6		3		12		41	0
9/1-9/30	16		9		4		17		46	0
10/1-10/31	13		9		5		17		44	0
11/1-11/30	12		16		8		19		55	0
12/1-12/31	18		13		2		13		46	0
Totals	229	9	119	8	33	1	189	19	570	37

Complaint Classification

Preliminary Investigation Report (PIR) complaints involve conduct that would not constitute misconduct and are referred to the employee's supervisor for follow up.

Supervisory Referral (SR) complaints are those that, even if events occurred as described, signify minor misconduct and/or a training gap. The complaint is referred to the employee's supervisor for review, counseling, and training as necessary.

Line Investigations (LI) complaints involving minor misconduct are investigated by the officer's chain of command.

Investigation Section (IS) complaints are more complex and involve more serious allegations and are investigated by OPA-IS.

