



Auditing and Review Unit  
Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

# Stops, Searches & Arrest Audit

## June 2023 (FOB and ISB)

Sample Period June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2022 – May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2023

Report# **SSA062023**

Submitted by PSAB: 7/19/2023.

Response from NOPD: 8/24/2023.

Report: 9/11/2023.

Amended: 1/23/2024

*Final Date of Previous Audit: 11/2/2022.*

### **Audit Team**

This audit was managed and conducted by the Audit and Review Unit individuals listed below:

Timothy Lindsey, Innovation Manager – Auditing

Bianca Harris, Auditor

Chelsea Albritton, Auditor

Jessica Jones, Auditor

Jovan Berry, Auditor

Melinda Foy, Auditor

Cardell Silas, Auditor

Chris Porter, Auditor

Danta Lewis, Auditor

Taneva Bowers, Auditor

Lonnal Lamb, Auditor

---

## Executive Summary

---

The Audit and Review Unit of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted an audit of Stops, Searches and Arrests (SSA) related to incidents which occurred between June 2022 and May 2023. In addition to the SSA audit, three (3) sub-audits, Consent to Search, Strip/Cavity, and Probation/Parole, are conducted as part of the overall SSA audit. These sub-audits encompassed incidents which also occurred between June 2022 and May of 2023. The audit is designed to measure compliance to NOPD policies and the Consent Decree, thereby ensuring that all stops, searches, and arrests are conducted and executed consistent with those policies and constitutional law. The audit also ensures all incidents are documented appropriately, that the documentation is complete and accurate, and that stops, searches, and arrests are carried out with fairness and respect. This audit spans the period during which the NOPD Field Operations Bureau (FOB) SSA Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was being executed, following its implementation as an outcome of the May 2021 SSA audit results.

This audit is amended to exclude data used that was outside of the 12-month sample period as stated above (June 2022 to May 2023). The excluded data (Jan 2022 to April 2022) was replaced with randomized data within the accepted sample period in order to maintain the sample integrity.

### Stops, Searches, and Arrests – Audit

- **SSA Overall** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **95.4%**. The previous audit compliance score was 96%.
- **SSA Incidents** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **90%**. The previous audit score was 90%. The categories include the following: “FIC Exists, If Required”, “FIC Submitted By ETOD”, “FIC Approved in 72 Hrs.”, “No Boilerplate”, “Videos and Reports Are Consistent”, “Arrested in Residence with Consent, Warrant, or Exigent Circumstances”, and “Supervisor Made Scene, If Required”. Most of the categories on this scorecard pertain to the officer documenting his/her action with the public. FICs and EPRs should be complete, accurate and timely. The deficiencies with regard to FIC submittals and approvals within policy timeframes are currently being addressed through the SSA Inspections as part of the FOB Corrective Action Plan. This has led to improvements in: (1) creating FIC’s as required improved from 96% to 100%; and (2) video to report consistency improved from 83% to 93%. Specific training with In-service Training classes or Daily Training Bulletins (DTBs) continue being utilized to reinforce close and effective supervision. FIC submittal and approval timeliness remains below NOPD goals due to current system limitations.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 124, 126, 136, 145, 149, 150 (sub-paragraph: Evidence).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 150 (sub-paragraph: report submittal and approval timeliness).
- **SSA Procedural Justice** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **97%**. The previous audit score was 98%. The categories include the following: “Officers Introduced

Themselves”, “Officers Explained Reason for Stop”, “Officers Allowed Subject to Explain”, “Officers Responded to Subject's Reasonable Questions”, “Officers Communicated Result Stop”, “Took No Longer than Necessary”, and “Officers Were Reasonably Courteous and Professional”. The 4% deficit on this scorecard is slightly less as last audit: the “Officer Introduced Themselves” category with an 88% compliance rate. When reasonably possible, officers should identify themselves as soon as practical on a stop. This improvement is indicative of concerted efforts by FOB to ensure officers identify themselves in an expeditious manner.

- Compliant CD paragraphs include 181 (sub-paragraph 2-4-Explanation, Timely, Professional).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 181 (sub-paragraph: 1-Identified).
- **SSA Stops** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **98%**. The previous audit score was 97%. The categories include the following: “Officer had RS/PC for Stop”, “Officer Adequately Documented RS/PC to Stop”, “Reason for Handcuffs Documented in Report” and “Handcuffing Within Policy”. The “Reason for Handcuffs Documented in Report” remains 97% in this audit. This can be attributed to the fact that the Department has continued to educate officers, using DTBs, in-service training, as well as utilizing the FOB CAP (corrective action plan) developed after the 2021 audit.
- Compliant CD paragraphs include 122, 123, 126, 149, 150 (sub-paragraph-Documentation).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
  - Note: Handcuffing is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy.
- **SSA Searches** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **96%**. The previous audit score was 93%. The categories include the following: “Officer Had Valid Legal Basis to Search Subject” and “Officer Adequately Documented Legal Basis to Search”. The score for “Officers adequately documenting a legal basis to search” improved to **95% from 90% the previous audit**. This signifies continued improvement for two consecutive audits. This can be attributed to the fact that the Department has continued to educate officers, using DTBs, in-service training, as well as utilizing the FOB CAP developed after the 2021 audit.
- Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 149, 150 (sub-paragraph-Documentation).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 130.
- **SSA Arrests** - scorecard has an overall compliance score of **98%**. The previous audit score was 96%. The categories include the following: “Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking”, “Officer had Probable Cause to Arrest Subject”, “Officer Adequately Documented PC to Arrest”, and “Miranda Given, if required”. The “Miranda Given, if required” metric scored **97%**. The previous audit score was 87%. Probable cause, approved arrest summaries (Gist’s), and documentation policies continue to be adhered to in a consistent, and timely manner.
- Compliant CD paragraphs include 141, 144, 145.
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
  - Note: Miranda is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy.

### **Stops, Searches, and Arrests – Probation & Parole Sub-audit.**

The Audit and Review Unit of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted this sub-audit of Stops, Searches and Arrests (SSA) related specifically to incidents where the person stopped, searched, or arrested was on probation or parole. The sample was derived using data provided by Orleans Probation and Parole office. This sub-audit was conducted as part of the overall SSA audit and encompassed incidents which also occurred between June 2022 and May of 2023. The entire universe of people on probation or parole was 2140. Of these, 39 were listed on an FIC/EPR during the audit period. This was the universe of individuals on probation or parole who were stopped, searched, or arrested by NOPD officers during the audit time period. All of these encountered were included in this probation and parole audit.

- **SSA Overall – Probation & Parole** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **96%**. The previous audit compliance score was also 96%. This sub-audit looked at a targeted sample of SSA data specifically involving persons either on probation and/or parole.
- **SSA Incidents – Probation & Parole** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **91%**. The previous audit score was also 91%. The categories include the following: “FIC Exists, If Required”, “FIC Submitted By ETOD”, “FIC Approved in 72 Hrs.”, “No Boilerplate”, “Videos and Reports Are Consistent”, “Arrested in Residence with Consent, Warrant, or Exigent Circumstances”, and “Supervisor Made Scene, If Required”. As in the SSA audit, most of the categories on this scorecard pertain to the officer documenting his/her action with the public. FICs and EPRs should be complete, accurate and timely. The deficiencies with regard to FIC submittals and approvals within policy timeframes, currently being addressed through the SSA Inspections as part of the FOB Corrective Action Plan. Video to Report consistency improved from 86% to **90%**. FIC submittal and approval timeliness remains problematic due to current system limitations.
- - Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 124, 126, 136, 145, 149, 150 (sub-paragraph: Evidence).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 150 (sub-paragraph: report submittal and approval timeliness).
- **SSA Procedural Justice – Probation & Parole** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **98%**. The previous audit score was also 100%. The categories include the following: “Officers Introduced Themselves”, “Officers Explained Reason for Stop”, “Officers Allowed Subject to Explain”, “Officers Responded to Subject's Reasonable Questions”, “Officers Communicated Result Stop”, “Took No Longer than Necessary”, and “Officers Were Reasonably Courteous and Professional”. The contributing deficit on this scorecard is the “Officer Introduced Themselves” category with a **90%** compliance rate. This in line with the main SSA audit which had the same deficiency at a rate of 92%. When reasonably possible, officers should identify themselves as soon as practical on a stop.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 181(sub-paragraph 2-4-Explanation, Timely, Professional).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 181 (sub-paragraph: 1-

Identified).

- **SSA Stops – Probation & Parole** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **99%**. The previous audit score was 99%. The categories include the following: “Officer had RS/PC for Stop”, “Officer Adequately Documented RS/PC to Stop”, “Reason for Handcuffs Documented in Report” and “Handcuffing Within Policy”. The “Reason for handcuffs documented in the report” scored 97% in this audit versus the previous score of 100%.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 122, 123, 126, 149, 150 (sub-paragraph-Documentation).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
  - Note: Handcuffing is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy.
- **SSA Searches – Probation & Parole** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **96%**. The previous audit score was 100%. The categories include the following: “Officer Had Valid Legal Basis to Search Subject” and “Officer Adequately Documented Legal Basis to Search”. The score for “Officers adequately documenting a legal basis to search” was slightly down at **96% from 100% the previous audit**.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 149, 150 (sub-paragraph-Documentation).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 130.
- **SSA Arrests – Probation & Parole** - scorecard has an overall compliance score of **100%**. The previous audit score was 97%. The categories include the following: “Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking”, “Officer had Probable Cause to Arrest Subject”, “Officer Adequately Documented PC to Arrest”, and “Miranda Given, if required”. The “Miranda Given, if required” metric scored **100%** which is an improvement from the previous audit score of 94%. Probable cause, approved arrest summaries (Gist’s), and documentation policies continue to be adhered to in a consistent, and timely manner.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 141, 144, 145.
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
  - Note: Miranda is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy.

#### **Stops, Searches and Arrests – Consent to Search Sub-audit.**

The Audit and Review Unit of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted this sub-audit of Stops, Searches and Arrests (SSA) related specifically to incidents where the FIC or EPR indicated that the search legal basis was “Consent to Search”. The sample was derived using this data. This sub-audit was conducted as part of the overall SSA audit and encompassed incidents which also occurred between June 2022 and May of 2023. This audit consists of 42 incidents and comprised the entire universe of consent searches for the time period.

- **SSA Overall – Consent to Search** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **95%**. The previous audit compliance score was also 89%. This sub-audit looked at a targeted sample of SSA data specifically involving incidents where legal basis consent to search given or consent to search in narrative. Overall scores impacted by policy issues with Public Safety

Rides. Thirty-eight (38) of the 42 incidents audited were not actually consent to searches but the search legal basis had erroneously been designated as “consent to search”.

- **SSA Incidents – Consent to Search** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **91%**. The previous audit score was 82%. The categories include the following: “FIC Exists, If Required”, “FIC Submitted By ETOD”, “FIC Approved in 72 Hrs.”, “No Boilerplate”, “Videos and Reports Are Consistent”, “Arrested in Residence with Consent, Warrant, or Exigent Circumstances”, and “Supervisor Made Scene, If Required”. As in the SSA audit, most of the categories on this scorecard pertain to the officer documenting his/her action with the public. FICs and EPRs should be complete, accurate and timely. The deficiencies with regard to FIC submittals and approvals within policy timeframes, currently being addressed through the SSA Inspections as part of the FOB Corrective Action Plan. Video to Report consistency improved from 50% to **90%**. FIC submittal and approval timeliness remains below NOPD goals due to current system limitations.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 124, 126, 136, 145, 149.
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 150 (sub-paragraph: report submittal and approval timeliness, 150 (sub-paragraph: Evidence).
- **SSA Procedural Justice – Consent to Search** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **98%**. The previous audit score was also 98%. The categories include the following: “Officers Introduced Themselves”, “Officers Explained Reason for Stop”, “Officers Allowed Subject to Explain”, “Officers Responded to Subject's Reasonable Questions”, “Officers Communicated Result Stop”, “Took No Longer than Necessary”, and “Officers Were Reasonably Courteous and Professional”. The contributing deficit on this scorecard is the “Officer Introduced Themselves” category with a **90%** compliance rate. This in line with the main SSA audit which had the same deficiency at a rate of 92%. When reasonably possible, officers should identify themselves as soon as practical on a stop.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 181(sub-paragraph 2-4-Explanation, Timely, Professional).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 181 (sub-paragraph: 1-Identified).
- **SSA Stops – Consent to Search** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **99%**. The previous audit score was 98%. The categories include the following: “Officer had RS/PC for Stop”, “Officer Adequately Documented RS/PC to Stop”, “Reason for Handcuffs Documented in Report” and “Handcuffing Within Policy”. The “Reason for handcuffs documented in the report” scored 100% in this audit versus the previous score of 100%. Reasonable Suspicion/Probable Cause for Stop and documentation both improved from 75% to **98%**.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 122, 123, 126, 149, 150 (sub-paragraph-Documentation).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
  - Note: Handcuffing is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy.
- **SSA Searches – Consent to Search** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **96%**. The



previous audit score was 56%. The categories include the following: “Officer Had Valid Legal Basis to Search Subject” and “Officer Adequately Documented Legal Basis to Search”. The score for “Officers adequately documenting a legal basis to search” improved to **94% from 56% the previous audit.**

- Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 149.
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 130, 150 (sub-paragraph-Documentation).
- **SSA Arrests – Consent to Search** - scorecard has an overall compliance score of **99%**. The previous audit score was 100%. The categories include the following: “Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking”, “Officer had Probable Cause to Arrest Subject”, “Officer Adequately Documented PC to Arrest”, and “Miranda Given, if required”. The “Miranda Given, if required” metric scored **95%**. While compliant, it is slightly down from the previous audit score of 100%. Probable cause, approved arrest summaries (Gist’s), and documentation policies continue to be adhered to in a consistent, and timely manner.
- Compliant CD paragraphs include 141, 144, 145.
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
  - Note: Miranda is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy.
- **Consent to Search Audit** – Subject scorecard has an overall compliance score of **24%**. The previous audit score was 20%. **Overall scores impacted by FIC legal basis being selected incorrectly.** Thirty-eight (38) of the incidents had incorrect legal basis of consent to search selected. Of the 38 incidents with incorrect legal basis, 34 were for SITA (Search Incident to Arrest), 3 were warrant related, and 1 medical related. Four of the incidents audited did involve consent to search. Of the 4 incidents identified as consent to search in the sample, 1 was for courtesy rides. The officer(s) actually had probable cause to arrest (SITA), warrant or medical (SITA), but mislabeled their search basis on the FIC form. Documentation errors should be addressed during the SSA Inspections or the FIC review process.

### **Stops, Searches and Arrests – Strip & Cavity Sub-audit.**

The Audit and Review Unit of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted this sub-audit of Stops, Searches and Arrests (SSA) related specifically to incidents where the FIC or EPR indicated that strip or cavity search occurred. The sample was derived using this data. This audit was conducted as part of the overall SSA audit and encompassed incidents which also occurred between June 2022 and May of 2023. There were three strip searches conducted by NOPD during this audit period and all were reviewed as part of this audit. NOPD conducted no cavity searches during the audit period.

This audit was the entirety of all searches which were recorded as having a strip or cavity search occur and numbered 3 instances during the audit period.

- **SSA Overall – Strip/Cavity** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **98%**. The previous audit compliance score was 90%. This sub-audit looked at a targeted sample of SSA data

specifically involving persons who were either strip or cavity searched.

- **SSA Incidents – Strip/Cavity** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **100%**. The previous audit score was 91%. The categories include the following: “FIC Exists, If Required”, “FIC Submitted By ETOD”, “FIC Approved in 72 Hrs.”, “No Boilerplate”, “Videos and Reports Are Consistent”, “Arrested in Residence with Consent, Warrant, or Exigent Circumstances”, and “Supervisor Made Scene, If Required”. As in the SSA audit, most of the categories on this scorecard pertain to the officer documenting his/her action with the public. FICs and EPRs should be complete, accurate and timely.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 124, 126, 136, 145, 149, 150.
- **SSA Procedural Justice – Strip/Cavity** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **100%**. The previous audit score was also 100%. The categories include the following: “Officers Introduced Themselves”, “Officers Explained Reason for Stop”, “Officers Allowed Subject to Explain”, “Officers Responded to Subject's Reasonable Questions”, “Officers Communicated Result Stop”, “Took No Longer than Necessary”, and “Officers Were Reasonably Courteous and Professional”. The previous deficit on this scorecard was related to “Officer Introduced Themselves” category. The category scored a **100%** compliance rate. This was an improvement from the previous deficiency at a rate of 92%. When reasonably possible, officers should identify themselves as soon as practical on a stop.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 181(sub-paragraph 2-4-Explanation, Timely, Professional).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 181 (sub-paragraph: 1-Identified).
- **SSA Stops – Strip/Cavity** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **93%**. The previous audit score was 99%. The categories include the following: “Officer had RS/PC for Stop”, “Officer Adequately Documented RS/PC to Stop”, “Reason for Handcuffs Documented in Report” and “Handcuffing Within Policy”. The “Reason for handcuffs documented in the report” scored 67% in this audit versus the previous score of 100%.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 122, 123, 126, 149, 150 (sub-paragraph-Documentation).
  - Non-compliant CD paragraphs – None: Handcuffing is a Policy issue, not CD.
  - Note: Handcuffing is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy.
- **SSA Searches – Strip/Cavity** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **100%**. The previous audit score was 100%. The categories include the following: “Officer Had Valid Legal Basis to Search Subject” and “Officer Adequately Documented Legal Basis to Search”.
  - Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 130, 149, 150(Documentation).
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
- **SSA Arrests – Strip/Cavity** - scorecard has an overall compliance score of **100%**. The previous audit score was 97%. The categories include the following: “Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking”, “Officer had Probable Cause to Arrest Subject”, “Officer Adequately Documented PC to Arrest”, and “Miranda Given, if required”. The “Miranda Given, if



required” metric scored **100%** which is an improvement from the previous audit score of 94%. Probable cause, approved arrest summaries (Gist’s), and documentation policies continue to be adhered to in a consistent, and timely manner.

- Compliant CD paragraphs include 141, 144, 145.
  - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
  - Note: Miranda is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy.
- **Strip & Cavity Search** – Subject scorecard has an overall score of **100%** compared to the previous score of 100%. The audit found no specific issues with the strip searches as the officers followed policy and guidelines while conducting such searches.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	2
Introduction .....	11
• <i>Purpose</i> .....	11
• <i>Objectives</i> .....	11
• <i>Background</i> .....	11
• <i>Methodology</i> .....	11
Initiating and Conducting the SSA Audit .....	14
Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Consent to Search) .....	15
Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Strip & Cavity Search) .....	16
Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Probation & Parole) .....	17
Reviews - Scorecards .....	18
Stops, Search, Arrests (SSA) Audit Summary Table .....	18
SSA – Consent to Search Audit Summary Table .....	22
Consent to Search Audit Summary Table .....	27
Conclusion .....	41
District Re-Evaluation Results .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix A – SSAPJ Audit Forms .....	566
Appendix B – Report Distribution .....	866

---

## **Introduction**

---

The Audit and Review Unit of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted an audit of Stops, Searches and Arrests (SSA) related to incidents which occurred between June 2022 and May 2023. In addition, three (3) sub-audits, Consent to Search, Strip/Cavity and Probation and Parole, are conducted as part of the overall SSA audit and encompasses incidents which occurred between the same period. This audit is designed to ensure that all stops, searches, and arrests are conducted and executed consistent with NOPD policy and constitutional law, are documented appropriately, that the documentation is complete and accurate, and that stops, searches, and arrests are carried out with fairness and respect. NOPD Field Operations Bureau (FOB) continues to adhere to its corrective action plan which was implemented following the May 2021 SSA audit.

### **Purpose**

The Stops, Searches, and Arrests audits are completed to ensure stops, searches, and arrests are constitutional and are within policy. Stops, Searches, and Arrests are regulated by, but not limited to, the following Chapters: 1.2.4 – Search and Seizure; 1.2.4.1 – Stops/Terry Stops; 1.2.4.2 – Search Warrant Content, Forms and Reviews; 1.3.1.1 – Handcuffing and Restraint Devices; 1.9 – Arrests; 35.1.7 Non-Disciplinary Responses to Minor Violations; 41.3.10 Body Worn Camera; 41.12– Field Interview Cards; 41.13 Bias-Free Policing; 52.1.1 – Misconduct Intake and Complaint Investigation.

### **Objectives**

This audit is designed to ensure that all Stops, Searches, and Arrests are consistent with NOPD policy and constitutional law. Also, to ensure all are documented appropriately, the documentation is complete and accurate, and that stops, searches, and arrests are carried out with fairness and respect. This audit procedure entails the review of stops, searches, and arrests. Consent searches, strip and cavity searches, search warrants, and performance evaluations are covered in separate audits.

### **Background**

This comprehensive Stops, Searches and Arrest Procedural Justice (SSAPJ) Audit utilizing the standard protocol has now been further enhanced to ensure all relevant issues regarding the last audit have been addressed. Originally, Stops, Searches and Arrests were each audited independently. In December of 2019, Stop, Search and Arrest audits were redesigned and consolidated into one audit. Then, following the 2021 audit, further enhancements were made relative to the corrective actions implemented, as well as additional audit questions being added. This resulting audit was more detailed, and a deeper diving review of the most fundamental actions taken by officers.

### **Methodology**

Auditors qualitatively assessed each incident using the SSA forms listed below to ensure each stop, search, and arrest is compliant with legal requirements and NOPD policy. Auditors analyzed reports, field interview cards, body-worn cameras and or in-car cameras to ensure officers had a valid legal basis to conduct a stop, search, or arrest, that officers documented such basis, and that

documentation was complete and accurate.

The following SSA forms document the audit criteria:

1. SSA Subject Audit Form
2. SSA Incident Audit Form
3. Consent to Search Form
4. Strip/Cavity Search Form

Each stop (CAD or FIC), search (FIC), or arrest (FIC or EPR) incident the sample required one SSA Incident form and one SSA subject form for each person suspected of a crime during the incident. For the purposes of this audit, every person an officer identified who was not a victim or witness is a subject and requires an SSA subject form. For example, consider an incident involving an officer stopping a vehicle because he/she believed the driver matched a description of a wanted person. He/she identified the driver and the front passenger in the vehicle and none of the rear passengers. For this incident, an SSA subject form was required for the driver (suspected of being wanted) and for the front passenger (identified by the officer). Although the officer was required to document approximate demographics for the rear passengers in a FIC, SSA subject forms were not needed for them.

Each Consent to Search (FIC or EPR) incident in the sample required one SSA Incident form, one SSA subject form for each person suspected of a crime during the incident, and one Consent to Search form. For the purposes of this sub-audit, the process is the same as the SSA process. This sample is reported separately from the SSA sample.

Each Strip/Cavity Search (FIC or EPR) Incident in the sample required one SSA Incident form, one SSA subject form for each person suspected of a crime during the incident, and one Strip/Cavity Search form. For the purposes of this sub-audit, the process is the same as the SSA process. This sample is reported separately from the SSA sample.

Each Probation and Parole (FIC or EPR) Incident in the sample required one SSA Incident form and one SSA subject form for each person suspected of a crime during the incident. For the purposes of this sub-audit, the process is the same as the SSA process. This sample is reported separately from the SSA sample.

All documents and related incidents that are in the sample and were not audited because there is no stop, search or arrest were to be deselected. All deselections were recorded in the Deselection Log.

Auditors searched for and reviewed all documentation related to the incident sampled. This involved:

1. Reading the documents sampled to determine which officers were on scene and when.
2. Searching Evidence.com by officer and time and by using multi-camera option to find related videos that were labelled differently.
3. Reviewing the prior and proceeding CAD activity for the officers on scene.

4. Searching for FICs and EPRs using subject names and the date of the incident as documented on video or in reports.
5. Searching for FICs and EPRs using officer information and the date of the incident as documented on video or in reports.
6. Reviewing the related item numbers as documented in FICs and EPRs.

If video is available for the incident, auditors watched all interactions between officers and non-members. Auditors skipped through sections of video that did not involve interactions between officers and non-members. Auditors watched videos recorded by other officers on scene to observe all interactions. Auditors also watched the beginning and end of each officer's BWC video to determine whether the officer activated and deactivated their BWC as required by policy.

Auditors read the guidance in the audit forms on a regular basis. Changes to audit forms were clearly communicated to auditors by the audit supervisor. Auditors re-read policies when guidance in audit forms recommended, they do so or when the policy requirements were not clear enough to the auditor to allow them to confidently score an audit criterion.

When audit results required comments, auditors thoroughly explained the evidence that they observed that led to their Response of the result for the audit criteria in question. For example, if an auditor scored "Videos and Reports as Significantly Consistent" with a "No" indicating non-compliance, they explained how the video shows something that is not consistent with the report. Such a comment read like the following: "The FIC documents a pat down, however the BWC shows a search incident to arrest."

Drawing on their knowledge of NOPD policies, auditors noted any policy violations they observed that were not specifically addressed in the SSA audit tools in the "Notify PSS" section of the form.

---

## Initiating and Conducting the SSA Audit

---

The final **SSA** sample size for this audit was determined to be **99** incidents due to stratification and rounding.

1. The universe of Stops, Searches, and Arrests are exported into an excel spreadsheet. Stops, searches and arrests are sorted based on the date the digital document is created. Incidents are assigned a random number using Excel's random number function (RAND).
2. Documents are sampled starting from the smallest random number assigned and continuing from smallest to largest until the required sample size is reached.
3. Sample sizes are representative of the Department, not each District/division, when reporting publicly. For reference, during June 2022 - May 2023, NOPD's Stops, Searches, and Arrests universe amounted to 53,000+ incidents. Per the sample size calculator given to NOPD by the Los Angeles Police Department Auditing Unit, a sample size of about 97 incidents is representative of a population of 37,048 when doing a one-tailed test, with a 95% degree of confidence, and a 4% error rate.
4. When reporting publicly, audit results are stratified by division/District; the number of audit results per division/District are proportionate to the actual activity by the division/District. The results include at least one incident from each division/District with activity during the reporting time period to ensure all Districts/divisions with activity are included in public reports.
5. Randomly sampled documents (CAD, FIC, or EPR) that do not document a stop, search, or arrest by NOPD will be deselected. For the purposes of this audit, anyone who is identified by an officer and who is not a witness or victim, is considered stopped. If the document is part of the arrest universe and an auditor determines the related incident does not include an arrest by NOPD, but does include a stop or search by NOPD, the document and related incident will be audited focusing on the stop and search. When a document is deselected, the auditor will continue to the document with the next lowest random number.



---

## **Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Consent to Search)**

---

The **Consent to Search SSA** audit contained the entire known universe of incidents (42) in which consent to search was flagged on an FIC/EPR or determined to have been conducted during the audit period of June 2022 to May 2023. This audit follows the SSA guidelines for auditing. ARU took the following steps to identify consent searches:

1. The universe of Consent to Search is exported into an excel spreadsheet. No Randomization takes place.
2. The incidents are then reviewed prior to auditing to determine if consent to search is indicated on the reports. Any incidents where the word “consent” is used in the narrative are verified for the purpose of removing those incidents where consent is mentioned in other contexts outside of the consent to search meaning.
3. Final sample sizes were the totality of all incidents which indicated a legal basis of “consent to search” or the narrative described a consent to search action or was otherwise noted.
4. When reporting publicly, audit results are not stratified by any division/District; The results include all incidents from with consent to search activity during the reporting time period to ensure all activity are included in public reports.
5. Sampled documents (CAD, FIC, or EPR) that do not document a “consent to search” by NOPD will be deselected. When a document is deselected, there is no replacement as the list is all inclusive.

---

## **Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Strip & Cavity Search)**

---

The final **Strip/Cavity SSA** universe for this audit was determined to be **3** incidents in which either a strip or cavity search was determined to have been conducted during the audit period of June 2022 through May of 2023. This sub-audit follows the SSA guidelines for auditing:

1. The universe of Strip and Cavity are exported into an excel spreadsheet. No Randomization takes place.
2. The incidents are then reviewed prior to auditing to determine if Strip or Cavity is indicated on the reports. Any incidents where the words “Strip” or “Cavity” was used in the narrative are verified for the purpose of removing those incidents where “Strip” or “Cavity” is mentioned in other contexts outside of their meaning.
3. Final sample sizes were the totality of all incidents which indicated a “Strip” or “Cavity” search” or the narrative described a such action or is otherwise noted.
4. When reporting publicly, audit results are not stratified by any division/District; The results include all incidents with consent to search activity during the reporting time period to ensure all activity is included in public reports.
5. Sampled documents (CAD, FIC, or EPR) that do not document a “strip” or “cavity” search by NOPD will be deselected. When a document is deselected, there is no replacement as the list is all inclusive.

---

## **Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Probation & Parole)**

---

The final **Probation and Parole SSA** universe size for this sub-audit was determined to be **39** incidents in which an individual was determined to have been on probation and/or parole when a stop and search was conducted during the audit period of June 2022 to May 2023. This sub-audit follows the SSA guidelines for auditing. ARU determined the universe of probation and parole steps by using the following steps:

1. The universe of “Probation & Parole” (P&P) data is exported into an excel spreadsheet. The list is derived by cross-referencing the document from the Probation & Parole Office with the NOPD data. No Randomization took place.
2. The incidents are then reviewed prior to auditing to determine if individuals listed in NOPD data are still actively on probation or parole. This is determined by a review from the probation and parole office, and then indicated on the reports. Any incidents where it is confirmed a person is still actively on probation or parole, those incidents are included in the sample.
3. Final sample sizes are the totality of all incidents which indicate a person was actively on probation or parole or otherwise noted.
4. When reporting publicly, audit results are not stratified by any Division/District; The results include all incidents where persons are on probation or parole, during the reporting time period to ensure all activity is included in public reports.
5. Sampled documents that do not document a stop of a person on probation & parole by NOPD will be deselected. When a document is deselected, there is no replacement as the list is all inclusive.

## Reviews - Scorecards

### Stops, Search, Arrests (SSA) Audit Summary Table

#### Stops Searches and Arrests Sample - June 2023 - Amended (January 2024)

95.4%

Audit Form #	CD ¶ / Chapter	Form	Field Name	Field Text	Number Compliant	Number Required	Compliance Rate	Compliance Threshold Met (>=95%)	Number NA	Total Reviewed
1	CD 124	Incident	Known to be Materially False	If you suspect an officer relied on information he or she knew to be materially false or incorrect to make a stop or detention, contact your supervisor.	Offline Process through Direct Supervisor and PSS Notify					
2	CD 126, 149, 150	Incident	FIC Exists If Required	If required, does an FIC exist for this stop?	99	99	100%	TRUE	0	99
3	CD 150	Incident	FIC Submitted By ETOD	Did the officer submit the FIC to his/her supervisor by the end of the shift?	73	90	81%	FALSE	9	99
4	CD 150	Incident	FIC Approved in 72Hrs	Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?	75	99	76%	FALSE	0	99
5	CD 123, 136, 145,	Incident	No Boilerplate	In the reports, did the officer(s) use specific descriptive language when articulating reasonable suspicion and/or probable cause for any stop, detention, search, or arrest?	96	97	99%	TRUE	2	99
6	CD 123	Incident	Videos and Reports Are Consistent	Are the video(s) and reports significantly consistent?	89	96	93%	FALSE	3	99
7	Ch 1.9 p27-29	Incident	Arrest in Residence Circumstances	If yes [video or reports show the officer entered a residence to make the arrest], which of the following apply? Options: (Consent, Exigent Circumstances, Warrant, None of the above (Not Compliant))	3	3	100%	TRUE	96	99
8C (8A,8B)	CD 133, 143	Incident	Video Shows Supv Made Scene	If the supervisor is required to make scene, does video show the supervisor made the scene?	20	20	100%	TRUE	79	99
9	CD 80, Ch 1,3	Incident	Use of Force Observed	Did any officer use reportable force during this officer-civilian interaction? (Informational Only)	4	97			2	99
10, 11	CD 80, Ch 1,3	Incident	Use of Force Reported	If Force Observed, Is there a corresponding Blue Team Report? (No could indicate it is unreported) 11. Provide Video Documentation.	4	4	100%	TRUE	95	99
12	CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a strip or cavity search? (Informational Only)	0	25			74	99
13	CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Documented	If Strip/Cavity search is observed(yes), is the strip or cavity search documented in the FIC or EPR?	0	0	NA	TRUE	99	99
14	CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a consent to search? (Informational Only)	0	24			75	99
15	CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Documented	If yes, is the consent to search documented in the FIC or EPR?	1	1	100%	TRUE	98	99
16	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Documented	If evidence was seized, is there a CE+P receipt?	32	32	100%	TRUE	67	99
17	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Submitted Immediately	If evidence was seized, was it submitted to CE+P before next Code1 call or ETOD, whichever is first?	32	32	100%	TRUE	67	99

18	CD 123, 149, 150	Incident	Evidence Description Matches Video	If evidence was seized, and there is a CE+P receipt, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video?	31	31	100%	TRUE	68	99
19	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-Compliance Should Have Been Addressed by Supervisor	Did you find any non-compliance related to this incident? (Informational Only)	30	90			9	99
20	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Missing Documentation	Is there non-compliance because there is missing documentation (FIC, EPR, etc.)? (Informational Only)	10	27			72	99
21	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-compliance Evident in Approved Reports	Is the non-compliance evident in the report(s) (FICs/EPRs) and the report(s) are approved? If a supervisor needed to watch video to know about the non-compliance, choose "No." (Informational Only)	10	25			74	99
22	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor On Scene During Non-Compliance	Did a supervisor make the scene and did the non-compliance occur while the supervisor was on scene? (Informational Only)	1	26			73	99
23	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor Required to Watch Video	Was a supervisor required to watch the video? Supervisors are required to watch videos if one or more of the following occurred: a use of force, someone was injured, a complaint was made or an officer told a supervisor that he/she thinks a complaint may be made, a vehicle pursuit, or an officer terminated his/her video early to protect the privacy of an individual. (Informational Only)	3	26			73	99
24	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor Reviewed Video	Did the supervisor watch the video? Review the audit trail for the videos in Evidence.com. (Informational Only)	9	30			69	99
25	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor Aware or Should Have Been Aware of Non-compliance	Did a supervisor know or should have known about the non-compliance? Choose "Yes" if any of the previous 5 questions are "Yes." (Informational Only)	16	27			72	99
26	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-Compliance Addressed by Supervisor	Did a supervisor address all the non-compliance you found related to this incident? (Informational Only)	10	27			72	99
27	CD 181	Incident	Reasonably Courteous	Does video show the officer was reasonably professional and courteous when interacting with the subject or other civilians during the stop?	92	95	97%	TRUE	4	99
28	CD 181	Incident	Identified	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer verbally identify him/herself as a soon a practical?	83	94	88%	FALSE	5	99
29	CD 181	Incident	Explained	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer explain the reason for the stop/interaction as soon as practical?	96	96	100%	TRUE	3	99
30	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Subject Could Explain	Does video show the officer allowed the subject an opportunity to explain his/her situation, ask questions, or voice concerns?	95	95	100%	TRUE	4	99
31	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Responded to Subjects Qs	If the subject was allowed to ask questions, and if the subject had reasonable questions or concerns, does video show the officer respond to them?	78	79	99%	TRUE	20	99
32	Ch 1.2.4.1 P18	Incident	Conclusion	Does video show the officer communicate the result of the stop/interaction to the subject (arrest, ticket, etc.)?	95	96	99%	TRUE	3	99
33	139, 181	Incident	Stop No Longer than Necessary	Does video show the stop was no longer than necessary to take appropriate action?	95	96	99%	TRUE	3	99
34A-D	N/A	Incident	Academy Training	Does this incident make a good training video (Informational Only)	0	81			2	83

35	N/A	Incident	EPIC	Does this incident involve an EPIC Moment; an officer confronting a peer about what they could do better? (Informational Only)	0	78			1	79
36	Ch 41.3.10 P11	Incident	Complete Vid Num and Complete Vid Denominator	Did each officer who conducted a stop, search, or arrest and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required? And did each supervisor who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?	232	258	90%	FALSE		
1A	CD 122	Subject	RS/PC to Stop	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	112	113	99%	TRUE	4	117
2A	CD 122, 123, 126, 149, 150	Subject	RS/PC to Stop in Report	Does the report clearly articulate reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	112	113	99%	TRUE	4	117
3A	Ch. 1.3.1.1 P25	Subject	Reason for Handcuffs Documented	If the officer put the subject in handcuffs, did the officer document a reason to handcuff in the FIC?	75	77	97%	TRUE	40	117
3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Discretionary Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	44	44	100%	TRUE	73	117
3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Mandatory Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	73	74	99%	TRUE	43	117
4	CD 149, 150, Ch. 1.2.4 P1	Subject	Search Legal Numerator and Search Legal Denominator	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	88	91	97%	TRUE	39	130
5	CD 123, 149	Subject	Reason to Search in Report Numerator and Reason to Search in Report Denominator	Does the "Report" sufficiently document a valid legal basis for every search of this subject?	84	88	95%	TRUE	38	126
6	123, Ch 41.12 P12J	Subject	Pat Down Justification	If a pat down was correctly indicated, did the officer give specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous in the justification for pat down text box? <b>Informational Only. Included in Search Report Q5.</b>	28	30	93%	FALSE	87	117
7 & 4	CD 130	Subject	(7) Search Subject on Probation or Parole & (4) Search Legal Numerator, and Search Legal Denominator	(7) Was this subject on parole or probation? & (4) Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	6	7	86%	FALSE	111	118
8	CD 144	Subject	Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking	Was the arrest gist for this subject approved by a supervisor before the subject was booked by the sheriff?	57	58	98%	TRUE	59	117
9	CD 141	Subject	Officer Had PC to Arrest	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer have probable cause to arrest this subject?	66	66	100%	TRUE	51	117
10	CD 141, 145, Ch 1.9 P14, Ch 82.1 P4, Ch 41.12 P15	Subject	PC Clearly Articulated	Did the officer clearly document the probable cause in the report (FIC or EPR)?	65	66	98%	TRUE	51	117
11		Subject	Stop Result	What was result of Stop? <b>Multiple choice</b> (Informational Only)	Physical Arrest 65	Citation Issued 6	No Action Taken 21	Summons Issued 6	Verbal Warning 21	119
12		Subject	Break Given	Did the officer use their discretion to give the subject a break? (Informational Only)	22	99			18	117
15	Ch 1.9.1	Subject	Miranda Given	Did the officer give Miranda Rights, if required? Officers shall advise suspects of their Miranda Rights at the time of arrest or prior to any custodial interrogation. See Chapter: 1.9.1; Note: Miranda does not apply to roadside questioning of a stopped motorist, or a person briefly detained on the street under a Terry stop.	68	70	97%	TRUE	47	117



13		Subject	ID Checked	Did the officer run the subject's ID?	104	105	99%	TRUE	12	117
14	CD 189	Subject	LEP	Did the officer request translation services, if needed?	2	2	100%	TRUE	115	117
20	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Required to Exit Vehicle	Did an officer require this subject to exit a vehicle? (Informational Only)	11	33			84	117
21	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Documented	If you chose yes for "Required to Exit Vehicle", did an officer document the justification to require this subject to exit the vehicle in the FIC?	10	11	91%	FALSE	106	117
22	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Compliant	If you chose yes for Vehicle Exit Justification Documented, is the justification specific to this subject, and/or was a legal vehicle search conducted requiring all occupants to exit the vehicle?	10	10	100%	TRUE	107	117
23	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Category	If this subject was required to exit a vehicle, pick the option below that best describes the justification: (Informational Only)	Driver arrested or not allowed to drive (1)	Subject suspected of an arrestable offense (6)	Other (3)			10
16	CD 189/CD125/183	Subject	Arrest Immigration Status	Was the subject arrested because of or in part due to the subject's immigration status?	63	63	100%	TRUE	53	116
17	CD 183/CD125/183	Subject	Questioned Immigration Status	Was the subject questioned about their immigration status in a manner that was not relevant to the crime in question?	66	66	100%	TRUE	51	117
18	CD 185/cd125	Subject	Officer Comment LGBTQ	Did the officer say something that is possibly offensive about/to LGBTQ individuals?	86	87	99%	TRUE	30	117
19	CD 185/Cd125	Subject	Officer Address LGBTQ	Did the officer address the subject by their chosen name, title, and pronoun?	87	88	99%	TRUE	29	117

## SSA – Consent to Search Audit Summary Table

Audit Form #	CD ¶/Chapter	Form	Field Name	Field Text	Number Compliant	Number Required	Compliance Rate	Compliance Threshold Met (>=95%)	Number NA	Total Reviewed
1	CD 124	Incident	Known to be Materially False	If you suspect an officer relied on information he or she knew to be materially false or incorrect to make a stop or detention, contact your supervisor.	Offline Process through Direct Supervisor and PSS Notify					
2	CD 126, 149, 150	Incident	FIC Exists If Required	If required, does an FIC exist for this stop?	41	41	100%	TRUE	1	42
3	CD 150	Incident	FIC Submitted By ETOD	Did the officer submit the FIC to his/her supervisor by the end of the shift?	29	35	83%	FALSE	7	42
4	CD 150	Incident	FIC Approved in 72Hrs	Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?	32	42	76%	FALSE	0	42
5	CD 123, 136, 145,	Incident	No Boilerplate	In the reports, did the officer(s) use specific descriptive language when articulating reasonable suspicion and/or probable cause for any stop, detention, search, or arrest?	42	42	100%	TRUE	0	42
6	CD 123	Incident	Videos and Reports Are Consistent	Are the video(s) and reports significantly consistent?	37	41	90%	FALSE	1	42
7	Ch 1.9 p27-29	Incident	Arrest in Residence Circumstances	If yes [video or reports show the officer entered a residence to make the arrest], which of the following apply? Options: (Consent, Exigent Circumstances, Warrant, None of the above (Not Compliant))	1	1	100%	TRUE	41	42
8C (8A,8B)	CD 133, 143	Incident	Video Shows Supervisor Made Scene	If the supervisor is required to make scene, does video show the supervisor made the scene?	11	11	100%	TRUE	31	42
9	CD 80, Ch 1,3	Incident	Use of Force Observed	Did any officer use reportable force during this officer-civilian interaction? (Informational Only)	2	41			1	42
10, 11	CD 80, Ch 1,3	Incident	Use of Force Reported	If Force Observed, Is there a corresponding Blue Team Report? (No could indicate it is unreported) 11. Provide Video Documentation.	2	2	100%	TRUE	40	42
12	CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a strip or cavity search? (Informational Only)	0	23			19	42
13	CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Documented	If Strip/Cavity search is observed(yes), is the strip or cavity search documented in the FIC or EPR?	0	0	NA	TRUE	42	42
14	CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a consent to search? (Informational Only)	4	41			1	42
15	CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Documented	If yes, is the consent to search documented in the FIC or EPR?	2	4	50%	FALSE	38	42

16	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Documented	If evidence was seized, is there a CE+P receipt?	11	13	85%	FALSE	29	42
17	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Submitted Immediately	If evidence was seized, was it submitted to CE+P before next Code1 call or ETOD, whichever is first?	11	13	85%	FALSE	29	42
18	CD 123, 149, 150	Incident	Evidence Description Matches Video	If evidence was seized, and there is a CE+P receipt, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video?	11	11	100%	TRUE	31	42
19	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-Compliance Should Have Been Addressed by Supervisor	Did you find any non-compliance related to this incident? (Informational Only)	21	42			0	42
20	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Missing Documentation	Is there non-compliance because there is missing documentation (FIC, EPR, etc.)? (Informational Only)	3	19			23	42
21	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-compliance Evident in Approved Reports	Is the non-compliance evident in the report(s) (FICs/EPRs) and the report(s) are approved? If a supervisor needed to watch video to know about the non-compliance, choose "No." (Informational Only)	15	20			22	42
22	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor On Scene During Non-Compliance	Did a supervisor make the scene and did the non-compliance occur while the supervisor was on scene? (Informational Only)	1	19			23	42
23	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor Required to Watch Video	Was a supervisor required to watch the video? Supervisors are required to watch videos if one or more of the following occurred: a use of force, someone was injured, a complaint was made or an officer told a supervisor that he/she thinks a complaint may be made, a vehicle pursuit, or an officer terminated his/her video early to protect the privacy of an individual. (Informational Only)	1	19			23	42
24	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor Reviewed Video	Did the supervisor watch the video? Review the audit trail for the videos in Evidence.com. (Informational Only)	7	20			22	42

25	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor or Aware or Should Have Been Aware of Non-compliance	Did a supervisor know or should have known about the non-compliance? Choose "Yes" if any of the previous 5 questions are "Yes." (Informational Only)	18	20			22	42
26	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-Compliance Addressed by Supervisor	Did a supervisor address all the non-compliance you found related to this incident? (Informational Only)	3	19			23	42
27	CD 181	Incident	Reasonably Courteous	Does video show the officer was reasonably professional and courteous when interacting with the subject or other civilians during the stop?	41	41	100%	TRUE	1	42
28	CD 181	Incident	Identified	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer verbally identify him/herself as a soon a practical?	36	40	90%	FALSE	2	42
29	CD 181	Incident	Explained	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer explain the reason for the stop/interaction as soon as practical?	38	40	95%	TRUE	2	42
30	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Subject Could Explain	Does video show the officer allowed the subject an opportunity to explain his/her situation, ask questions, or voice concerns?	40	40	100%	TRUE	2	42
31	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Responded to Subjects Qs	If the subject was allowed to ask questions, and if the subject had reasonable questions or concerns, does video show the officer respond to them?	36	37	97%	TRUE	5	42
32	Ch 1.2.4.1 P18	Incident	Conclusion	Does video show the officer communicate the result of the stop/interaction to the subject (arrest, ticket, etc.)?	41	41	100%	TRUE	1	42
33	139, 181	Incident	Stop No Longer than Necessary	Does video show the stop was no longer than necessary to take appropriate action?	41	41	100%	TRUE	1	42
34A-D	N/A	Incident	Academy Training	Does this incident make a good training video (Informational Only)	0	41			1	42
35	N/A	Incident	EPIC	Does this incident involve an EPIC Moment; an officer confronting a peer about what they could do better? (Informational Only)	1	39			3	42
36	Ch 41.3.10 P11	Incident	Complete Vid Num and Complete Vid Denom	Did each officer who conducted a stop, search, or arrest and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required? And did each supervisor who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?	94	110	85%	FALSE		
1A	CD 122	Subject	RS/PC to Stop	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	57	58	98%	TRUE	1	59
2A	CD 122, 123, 126, 149, 150	Subject	RS/PC to Stop in Report	Does the report clearly articulate reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	57	58	98%	TRUE	1	59
3A	Ch. 1.3.1.1 P25	Subject	Reason for Handcuffs Documented	If the officer put the subject in handcuffs, did the officer document a reason to handcuff in the FIC?	53	53	100%	TRUE	6	59

3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Discretionary Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	39	39	100%	TRUE	20	59
3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Mandatory Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	43	43	100%	TRUE	16	59
4	CD 149, 150, Ch. 1.2.4 P1	Subject	Search Legal Numerator and Search Legal Denominator	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	70	71	99%	TRUE	2	73
5	CD 123, 149	Subject	Reason to Search in Report Numerator and Reason to Search in Report Denominator	Does the "Report" sufficiently document a valid legal basis for every search of this subject?	67	71	94%	FALSE	2	73
6	123, Ch 41.12 P12J	Subject	Pat Down Justification	If a pat down was correctly indicated, did the officer give specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous in the justification for pat down text box? <b>Informational Only. Included in Search Report Q5.</b>	10	10	100%	TRUE	49	59
7 & 4	CD 130	Subject	(7) Search Subject on Probation or Parole & (4) Search Legal Numerator, and Search Legal Denominator	(7) Was this subject on parole or probation? & (4) Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	0	0		TRUE	59	59
8	CD 144	Subject	Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking	Was the arrest gist for this subject approved by a supervisor before the subject was booked by the sheriff?	32	32	100%	TRUE	27	59
9	CD 141	Subject	Officer Had PC to Arrest	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer have probable cause to arrest this subject?	41	41	100%	TRUE	18	59
10	CD 141, 145, Ch 1.9 P14, Ch 82.1 P4, Ch 41.12 P15	Subject	PC Clearly Articulated	Did the officer clearly document the probable cause in the report (FIC or EPR)?	41	41	100%	TRUE	18	59
11		Subject	Stop Result	What was result of Stop? <b>Multiple choice</b> (Informational Only)	Physical Arrest 42	Citation Issued 1	No Action Taken 13	Summons Issued 1	Verbal Warning 2	59
12		Subject	Break Given	Did the officer use their discretion to give the subject a break? (Informational Only)	4	46			13	59

15	Ch 1.9.1	Subject	Miranda Given	Did the officer give Miranda Rights, if required? Officers shall advise suspects of their Miranda Rights at the time of arrest or prior to any custodial interrogation. See Chapter: 1.9.1; Note: Miranda does not apply to roadside questioning of a stopped motorist, or a person briefly detained on the street under a Terry stop.	42	44	95%	TRUE	15	59
13		Subject	ID Checked	Did the officer run the subject's ID?	56	56	100%	TRUE	3	59
14	CD 189	Subject	LEP	Did the officer request translation services, if needed?	0	0		TRUE	59	59
20	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Required to Exit Vehicle	Did an officer require this subject to exit a vehicle? (Informational Only)	11	11			48	59
21	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Documented	If you chose yes for "Required to Exit Vehicle", did an officer document the justification to require this subject to exit the vehicle in the FIC?	9	11	82%	FALSE	48	59
22	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Compliant	If you chose yes for Vehicle Exit Justification Documented, is the justification specific to this subject, and/or was a legal vehicle search conducted requiring all occupants to exit the vehicle?	9	9	100%	TRUE	50	59
23	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Category	If this subject was required to exit a vehicle, pick the option below that best describes the justification: (Informational Only)	Driver arrested or not allowed to drive (1)	Subject suspected of an arrestable offense (1)	Subject suspected of an arrestable offense (1)	Other (6)		9
16	CD 189	Subject	Arrest Immigration Status	Was the subject arrested because of or in part due to the subject's immigration status?	34	34	100%	TRUE	25	59
17	CD 183	Subject	Questioned Immigration Status	Was the subject questioned about their immigration status in a manner that was not relevant to the crime in question?	33	33	100%	TRUE	26	59
18	CD 185	Subject	Officer Comment LGBTQ	Did the officer say something that is possibly offensive about/to LGBTQ individuals?	44	44	100%	TRUE	15	59
19	CD 185	Subject	Officer Address LGBTQ	Did the officer address the subject by their chosen name, title, and pronoun?	44	44	100%	TRUE	15	59



## Consent to Search Audit Summary Table

Audit Form #	CD ¶	Form	Field Name	Field Text	Number Compliant	Number Required	Compliance Rate	Compliance Threshold Met (>=95%)	Number NA	Total Reviewed
1	128	Incident	FIC Checked Accurately	<p>1. In the FIC, did the officer accurately check the appropriate boxes to indicate a consent to search occurred? If a consent to search did not occur choose "No - Consent to Search Did Not Occur."</p> <p>If a consent to search occurred but the FIC was not completed correctly choose "No - Consent to Search Occurred, FIC Not Accurate."</p> <p>If a consent to search occurred but an FIC does not exist for the incident choose "No - Consent to Search Occurred, No FIC."</p> <p>NOPD FIC Policy Chapter 41.12 2(e) states that all searches conducted without a warrant, with some exceptions, requires an FIC be completed.</p>	1	42	2%	FALSE	0	42
2	128	Consent to Search	Supervisor Notified Before Search Conducted	2. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the officer notified a supervisor before he/she conducted a search based on consent? Please provide timestamp of the video.	3	4	75%	FALSE	38	42
3	128	Consent to Search	Supervisor Approved Before Search Conducted	3. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the supervisor approved the consent to search before the search was conducted? Please provide timestamp of the video.	3	4	75%	FALSE	38	42
4	129	Consent to Search	Officer Informed Subject of His/her Rights	4. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the officer informing the subject of his or her right to refuse and to revoke consent at any time?	2	4	50%	FALSE	38	42
5	129	Consent to Search	Form 146 Exists	5. If a consent to search occurred, does a Form 146 exist for the consent to search?	2	4	50%	FALSE	38	42
6	131	Consent to Search	Subject Signed Form 146	6. If a consent to search occurred, does form 146 include the signature of the person granting consent?	2	2	100%	TRUE	40	42
7	131	Consent to Search	Officer Signed Form 146	7. If a consent to search occurred, does form 146 include the signature of the officer requesting consent?	2	2	100%	TRUE	40	42

Note: FIC Incorrect (1 - CIT Medical Transport; 28 - SITA, not Consent to Search; 1 - Courtesy Ride requires consent to search on FIC, Not Pat-down, 2-Traffic Stop/released.

## SSA – Strip & Cavity Search Audit Summary Table

Audit Form #	CD ¶/Chapter	Form	Field Name	Field Text	Number Compliant	Number Required	98% Compliance Rate	Compliance Threshold Met (>=95%)	Number NA	Total Reviewed
1	CD 124	Incident	Known to be Materially False	If you suspect an officer relied on information he or she knew to be materially false or incorrect to make a stop or detention, contact your supervisor.	Offline Process through Direct Supervisor and PSS Notify					
2	CD 126, 149, 150	Incident	FIC Exists If Required	If required, does an FIC exist for this stop?	2	2	100%	TRUE	0	2
3	CD 150	Incident	FIC Submitted By ETOD	Did the officer submit the FIC to his/her supervisor by the end of the shift?	2	2	100%	TRUE	1	3
4	CD 150	Incident	FIC Approved in 72Hrs	Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?	2	2	100%	TRUE	1	3
5	CD 123, 136, 145,	Incident	No Boilerplate	In the reports, did the officer(s) use specific descriptive language when articulating reasonable suspicion and/or probable cause for any stop, detention, search, or arrest?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
6	CD 123	Incident	Videos and Reports Are Consistent	Are the video(s) and reports significantly consistent?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
7	Ch 1.9 p27-29	Incident	Arrest in Residence Circumstances	If yes [video or reports show the officer entered a residence to make the arrest], which of the following apply? Options: (Consent, Exigent Circumstances, Warrant, None of the above (Not Compliant))	0	0	NA	TRUE	3	3
8C (8A,8B)	CD 133, 143	Incident	Video Shows Supervisor Made Scene	If the supervisor is required to make scene, does video show the supervisor made the scene?	1	1	100%	TRUE	2	3
9	CD 80, Ch 1,3	Incident	Use of Force Observed	Did any officer use reportable force during this officer-civilian interaction? (Informational Only)	0	3			0	3
10, 11	CD 80, Ch 1,3	Incident	Use of Force Reported	If Force Observed, Is there a corresponding Blue Team Report? (No could indicate it is unreported) 11. Provide Video Documentation.	0	0	NA	TRUE	3	3
12	CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a strip or cavity search? (Informational Only)	2	2			1	3

13	CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Documented	If Strip/Cavity search is observed(yes), is the strip or cavity search documented in the FIC or EPR?	2	2	100%	TRUE	1	3
14	CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a consent to search? (Informational Only)	0	3			0	3
15	CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Documented	If yes, is the consent to search documented in the FIC or EPR?	0	0	NA	TRUE	3	3
16	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Documented	If evidence was seized, is there a CE+P receipt?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
17	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Submitted Immediately	If evidence was seized, was it submitted to CE+P before next Code1 call or ETOD, whichever is first?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
18	CD 123, 149, 150	Incident	Evidence Description Matches Video	If evidence was seized, and there is a CE+P receipt, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
19	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-Compliance Should Have Been Addressed by Supervisor	Did you find any non-compliance related to this incident? (Informational Only)	0	3			0	3
20	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Missing Documentation	Is there non-compliance because there is missing documentation (FIC, EPR, etc.)? (Informational Only)	0	0			3	3
21	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-compliance Evident in Approved Reports	Is the non-compliance evident in the report(s) (FICs/EPRs) and the report(s) are approved? If a supervisor needed to watch video to know about the non-compliance, choose "No." (Informational Only)	0	0			3	3
22	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor On Scene During Non-Compliance	Did a supervisor make the scene and did the non-compliance occur while the supervisor was on scene? (Informational Only)	0	0			3	3
23	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor Required to Watch Video	Was a supervisor required to watch the video? Supervisors are required to watch videos if one or more of the following occurred: a use of force, someone was injured, a complaint was made or an officer told a supervisor that he/she thinks a complaint may be made, a vehicle pursuit, or an officer terminated his/her video early to protect the privacy of an individual. (Informational Only)	0	0			3	3

24	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor Reviewed Video	Did the supervisor watch the video? Review the audit trail for the videos in Evidence.com. (Informational Only)	2	2			1	3
25	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor Aware or Should Have Been Aware of Non-compliance	Did a supervisor know or should have known about the non-compliance? Choose "Yes" if any of the previous 5 questions are "Yes." (Informational Only)	0	0			3	3
26	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-Compliance Addressed by Supervisor	Did a supervisor address all the non-compliance you found related to this incident? (Informational Only)	0	0			3	3
27	CD 181	Incident	Reasonably Courteous	Does video show the officer was reasonably professional and courteous when interacting with the subject or other civilians during the stop?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
28	CD 181	Incident	Identified	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer verbally identify him/herself as soon a practical?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
29	CD 181	Incident	Explained	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer explain the reason for the stop/interaction as soon as practical?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
30	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Subject Could Explain	Does video show the officer allowed the subject an opportunity to explain his/her situation, ask questions, or voice concerns?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
31	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Responded to Subjects Qs	If the subject was allowed to ask questions, and if the subject had reasonable questions or concerns, does video show the officer respond to them?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
32	Ch 1.2.4.1 P18	Incident	Conclusion	Does video show the officer communicate the result of the stop/interaction to the subject (arrest, ticket, etc.)?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
33	139, 181	Incident	Stop No Longer than Necessary	Does video show the stop was no longer than necessary to take appropriate action?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
34A-D	N/A	Incident	Academy Training	Does this incident make a good training video (Informational Only)	0	3			0	3
35	N/A	Incident	EPIC	Does this incident involve an EPIC Moment; an officer confronting a peer about what they could do better? (Informational Only)	0	3			0	3
36	Ch 41.3.10 P11	Incident	Complete Vid Num and Complete Vid Denom	Did each officer who conducted a stop, search, or arrest and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required? And did each supervisor who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?	11	11	100%	TRUE		
1A	CD 122	Subject	RS/PC to Stop	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3

2A	CD 122, 123, 126, 149, 150	Subject	RS/PC to Stop in Report	Does the report clearly articulate reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
3A	Ch. 1.3.1.1 P25	Subject	Reason for Handcuffs Documented	If the officer put the subject in handcuffs, did the officer document a reason to handcuff in the FIC?	2	3	67%	FALSE	0	3
3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Discretionary Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Mandatory Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
4	CD 149, 150, Ch. 1.2.4 P1	Subject	Search Legal Numerator and Search Legal Denominator	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
5	CD 123, 149	Subject	Reason to Search in Report Numerator and Reason to Search in Report Denominator	Does the "Report" sufficiently document a valid legal basis for every search of this subject?	2	2	100%	TRUE	1	3
6	123, Ch 41.12 P12J	Subject	Pat Down Justification	If a pat down was correctly indicated, did the officer give specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous in the justification for pat down text box? <b>Informational Only. Included in Search Report Q5.</b>	1	1	100%	TRUE	2	3
7 & 4	CD 130	Subject	(7) Search Subject on Probation or Parole & (4) Search Legal Numerator, and Search Legal Denominator	(7) Was this subject on parole or probation? & (4) Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	0	0		TRUE	0	0
8	CD 144	Subject	Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking	Was the arrest gist for this subject approved by a supervisor before the subject was booked by the sheriff?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
9	CD 141	Subject	Officer Had PC to Arrest	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer have probable cause to arrest this subject?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
10	CD 141, 145, Ch 1.9 P14, Ch 82.1 P4, Ch 41.12 P15	Subject	PC Clearly Articulated	Did the officer clearly document the probable cause in the report (FIC or EPR)?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
11		Subject	Stop Result	What was result of Stop? <b>Multiple choice</b> (Informational Only)	Physical Arrest 3	Citation Issued 0	No Action Taken 0	Summons Issued 0	Verbal Warning 0	3
12		Subject	Break Given	Did the officer use their discretion to give the subject a break? (Informational Only)	0	3			0	3
15	Ch 1.9.1	Subject	Miranda Given	Did the officer give Miranda Rights, if required? Officers shall advise suspects of their Miranda Rights at the time of arrest or prior to any custodial interrogation. See Chapter: 1.9.1; Note: Miranda does not apply to roadside questioning of a stopped motorist, or a person briefly detained on the street under a	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3

				Terry stop.						
13		Subject	ID Checked	Did the officer run the subject's ID?	2	3	67%	FALSE	0	3
14	CD 189	Subject	LEP	Did the officer request translation services, if needed?	0	0		TRUE	3	3
20	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Required to Exit Vehicle	Did an officer require this subject to exit a vehicle? (Informational Only)	1	2			1	3
21	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Documented	If you chose yes for "Required to Exit Vehicle", did an officer document the justification to require this subject to exit the vehicle in the FIC?	1	1	100%	TRUE	2	3
22	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Compliant	If you chose yes for Vehicle Exit Justification Documented, is the justification specific to this subject, and/or was a legal vehicle search conducted requiring all occupants to exit the vehicle?	1	1	100%	TRUE	2	3
23	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Category	If this subject was required to exit a vehicle, pick the option below that best describes the justification: (Informational Only)	Driver arrested or not allowed to drive (0)	Subject suspected of an arrestable offense (1)	Subject suspected of an arrestable offense (0)	Other (0)		1
16	CD 189	Subject	Arrest Immigration Status	Was the subject arrested because of or in part due to the subject's immigration status?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
17	CD 183	Subject	Questioned Immigration Status	Was the subject questioned about their immigration status in a manner that was not relevant to the crime in question?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
18	CD 185	Subject	Officer Comment LGBTQ	Did the officer say something that is possibly offensive about/to LGBTQ individuals?	3	3	100%	TRUE	0	3
19	CD 185	Subject	Officer Address LGBTQ	Did the officer address the subject by their chosen name, title, and pronoun?	1	1	100%	TRUE	2	3



## Strip & Cavity Search Audit Summary Table

Strip-Cavity Audit							100%			
Audit Form #	CD ¶	Form	Field Name	Field Text	Number Compliant	Number Required	Compliance Rate	Compliance Threshold Met (>=95%)	Number NA	Total Reviewed
2	Ch. 41.4.1 P10	Strip/Cavity	Video Complete	Complete Video Exists Did each officer(s) who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?  Ch. 41.4.1 P10	7	7	100%	TRUE		
3	132	Strip/Cavity	Probable Cause for Search	Based on the evidence available to you, was there probable cause to conduct the strip or cavity search?  CD 132	2	2	100%	TRUE	0	2
4	132	Strip/Cavity	Probable Cause Articulated in FIC, EPR or Warrant	In the FIC or EPR or Search Warrant, did the officer articulate probable cause that the subject was concealing a weapon or contraband?  CD 132	2	2	100%	TRUE	0	2
5	132	Strip/Cavity	Field Strip Search	If the incident involved a strip search in the field, does the FIC or EPR explain "exigent circumstances where the life of officers or others may be placed at risk"?  CD 132	1	1	100%	TRUE	1	2
6	133	Strip/Cavity	Supervisor Approved Strip Search	If the incident involved a strip search, does video or the report show the officer received approval to conduct the strip search?  CD 133	2	2	100%	TRUE	0	2
7	133 Ch. 1.2.4 P 47 A	Strip/Cavity	Supervisor Approved Strip Search in Writing	If the incident involved a strip search, did the officer receive written approval from a supervisor for the strip search?  Ch. 1.2.4 P 47 A	0	0		TRUE	2	2
8	133	Strip/Cavity	Supervisor Made Scene	If the incident involved a strip search and the officer received approval from a supervisor, does video or the report show the supervisor make the scene?  CD 133	1	1	100%	TRUE	1	2
9	133	Strip/Cavity	Minimum # Officers Present for Strip Search	If the incident involved a strip search, do reports or video show the minimum number of officers necessary to conduct the strip search?  CD 133	2	2	100%	TRUE	0	2

10	133	Strip/Cavity	Strip Gender Identified	<p>If the incident involved a strip search, did the officer take the necessary steps to identify the subject's identified gender?</p> <p>The officer should say something like "Our policy requires the officer conducting the strip search to be the same gender as the person being searched. To ensure compliance with that policy, should we have a policeman or policewoman conduct the search?"</p> <p>CD 133</p>	2	2	100%	TRUE	0	2
11	133	Strip/Cavity	Officer Who Conducted Search is Same Gender as Subject	<p>If the incident involved a strip search, do reports or video show the strip search was performed by officers of the same gender as the identified gender of the subject?</p> <p>This question corresponds to question 8 above. For example, if the subject informed the officer that a policeman should conduct the search, and all officers conducting the search were male, choose "Yes."</p>	2	2	100%	TRUE	0	2
12	132	Strip/Cavity	Privacy Was Provided for Search	<p>If the incident involved a strip search, do reports or video show it was conducted under conditions that provided privacy from all but those authorized to conduct the search?</p> <p>CD 132</p>	2	2	100%	TRUE	0	2
13	133	Strip/Cavity	Strip Professional	<p>If the incident involved a strip search, does video show it was conducted in a professional manner?</p> <p>CD 133</p>	1	1	100%	TRUE	1	2
14	133 Ch. 1.2.4 P49 H	Strip/Cavity	Strip Location of Evidence Documented	<p>If the incident involved a strip search, does documentation include a list of the items, if any, recovered during the search and the location on the body where found?</p> <p>Ch. 1.2.4 P49 H</p>	2	2	100%	TRUE	0	2
15	134	Strip/Cavity	Cavity Search Conducted by Medical Personnel	<p>If the incident involved a cavity search, do reports show it was conducted by medical personnel?</p> <p>CD 134</p>	0	0	-	TRUE	2	2
16	134	Strip/Cavity	Cavity Search At Medical Facility	<p>If the incident involved a cavity search, do reports show it was conducted by at a medical facility?</p> <p>Ch. 1.2.4 P52</p>	0	0	-	TRUE	2	2
17	134	Strip/Cavity	Warrant Obtained for Cavity Search	<p>If the incident involved a cavity search, reports show the officer got a search warrant?</p> <p>CD 134</p>	0	0	-	TRUE	2	2

18	134	Strip/Cavity	Cavity Location of Evidence Documented	<p>If the incident involved a cavity search, does documentation include a list of the items, if any, recovered during the search and the location on the body where found?</p> <p>Ch. 1.2.4 P49 H</p>	0	0	-	TRUE	2	2
19-22	CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-Compliance Addressed by Supervisor	<p>If evidence was seized, and there is a CE+P receipt, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video?</p>	To be used for Supervision Auditing					

## SSA – Probation & Parole Audit Summary Table

Probation & Parole: Stops Searches and Arrests Sample - June, 2023								96%			
Audit Form #		CD ¶/Chapter	Form	Field Name	Field Text	Number Compliant	Number Required	Compliance Rate	Compliance Threshold Met (>=95%)	Number NA	Total Reviewed
1		CD 124	Incident	Known to be Materially False	If you suspect an officer relied on information he or she knew to be materially false or incorrect to make a stop or detention, contact your supervisor.	Offline Process through Direct Supervisor and PSS Notify					
2		CD 126, 149, 150	Incident	FIC Exists If Required	If required, does an FIC exist for this stop?	39	39	100%	TRUE	0	39
3		CD 150	Incident	FIC Submitted By ETOD	Did the officer submit the FIC to his/her supervisor by the end of the shift?	22	29	76%	FALSE	10	39
4		CD 150	Incident	FIC Approved in 72Hrs	Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?	32	39	82%	FALSE	0	39
5		CD 123, 136, 145,	Incident	No Boilerplate	In the reports, did the officer(s) use specific descriptive language when articulating reasonable suspicion and/or probable cause for any stop, detention, search, or arrest?	38	39	97%	TRUE	0	39
6		CD 123	Incident	Videos and Reports Are Consistent	Are the video(s) and reports significantly consistent?	35	39	90%	FALSE	0	39
7		Ch 1.9 p27-29	Incident	Arrest in Residence Circumstances	If yes [video or reports show the officer entered a residence to make the arrest], which of the following apply? Options: (Consent, Exigent Circumstances, Warrant, None of the above (Not Compliant))	0	0	NA	TRUE	39	39
8C (8A,8B)		CD 133, 143	Incident	Video Shows Supervisor made Scene	If the supervisor is required to make scene, does video show the supervisor made the scene?	15	15	100%	TRUE	24	39
9		CD 80, Ch 1,3	Incident	Use of Force Observed	Did any officer use reportable force during this officer-civilian interaction? (Informational Only)	3	39			0	39
10, 11		CD 80, Ch 1,3	Incident	Use of Force Reported	If Force Observed, Is there a corresponding Blue Team Report? (No could indicate it is unreported) 11. Provide Video Documentation.	2	3	67%	FALSE	36	39
12		CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a strip or cavity search? (Informational Only)	0	22			17	39
13		CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Documented	If Strip/Cavity search is observed(yes), is the strip or cavity search documented in the FIC or EPR?	0	0	NA	TRUE	39	39
14		CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a consent to search? (Informational Only)	1	39			0	39
15		CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Documented	If yes, is the consent to search documented in the FIC or EPR?	1	1	100%	TRUE	38	39
16		CD 150	Incident	Evidence Documented	If evidence was seized, is there a CE+P receipt?	20	22	91%	FALSE	17	39
17		CD 150	Incident	Evidence Submitted Immediately	If evidence was seized, was it submitted to CE+P before next Code1 call or ETOD, whichever is first?	21	21	100%	TRUE	18	39

18		CD 123, 149, 150	Incident	Evidence Description Matches Video	If evidence was seized, and there is a CE+P receipt, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video?	21	21	100%	TRUE	18	39
19		CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-Compliance Should Have Been Addressed by Supervisor	Did you find any non-compliance related to this incident? (Informational Only)	12	39			0	39
20		CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Missing Documentation	Is there non-compliance because there is missing documentation (FIC, EPR, etc.)? (Informational Only)	6	11			28	39
21		CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-compliance Evident in Approved Reports	Is the non-compliance evident in the report(s) (FICs/EPRs) and the report(s) are approved? If a supervisor needed to watch video to know about the non-compliance, choose "No." (Informational Only)	1	11			28	39
22		CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor On Scene During Non-Compliance	Did a supervisor make the scene and did the non-compliance occur while the supervisor was on scene? (Informational Only)	0	11			28	39
23		CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor Required to Watch Video	Was a supervisor required to watch the video? Supervisors are required to watch videos if one or more of the following occurred: a use of force, someone was injured, a complaint was made or an officer told a supervisor that he/she thinks a complaint may be made, a vehicle pursuit, or an officer terminated his/her video early to protect the privacy of an individual. (Informational Only)	0	10			29	39
24		CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor Reviewed Video	Did the supervisor watch the video? Review the audit trail for the videos in Evidence.com. (Informational Only)	2	11			28	39
25		CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Supervisor Aware or Should Have Been Aware of Non-compliance	Did a supervisor know or should have known about the non-compliance? Choose "Yes" if any of the previous 5 questions are "Yes." (Informational Only)	3	11			28	39

26		CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	Incident	Non-Compliance Addressed by Supervisor	Did a supervisor address all the non-compliance you found related to this incident? (Informational Only)	6	11			28	39
27		CD 181	Incident	Reasonably Courteous	Does video show the officer was reasonably professional and courteous when interacting with the subject or other civilians during the stop?	38	39	97%	TRUE	0	39
28		CD 181	Incident	Identified	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer verbally identify him/herself as soon as practical?	35	39	90%	FALSE	0	39
29		CD 181	Incident	Explained	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer explain the reason for the stop/interaction as soon as practical?	39	39	100%	TRUE	0	39
30		Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Subject Could Explain	Does video show the officer allowed the subject an opportunity to explain his/her situation, ask questions, or voice concerns?	39	39	100%	TRUE	0	39
31		Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Responded to Subjects Qs	If the subject was allowed to ask questions, and if the subject had reasonable questions or concerns, does video show the officer respond to them?	37	37	100%	TRUE	2	39
32		Ch 1.2.4.1 P18	Incident	Conclusion	Does video show the officer communicate the result of the stop/interaction to the subject (arrest, ticket, etc.)?	38	39	97%	TRUE	0	39
33		139, 181	Incident	Stop No Longer than Necessary	Does video show the stop was no longer than necessary to take appropriate action?	39	39	100%	TRUE	0	39
34A-D		N/A	Incident	Academy Training	Does this incident make a good training video (Informational Only)	1	39			0	39
35		N/A	Incident	EPIC	Does this incident involve an EPIC Moment; an officer confronting a peer about what they could do better? (Informational Only)	0	39			0	39
36		Ch 41.3.10 P11	Incident	Complete Vid Num and Complete Vid Denom	Did each officer who conducted a stop, search, or arrest and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required? And did each supervisor who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?	137	144	95%	TRUE		
1A		CD 122	Subject	RS/PC to Stop	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	42	44	95%	TRUE	0	44
2A		CD 122, 123, 126, 149, 150	Subject	RS/PC to Stop in Report	Does the report clearly articulate reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	42	44	95%	TRUE	0	44
3A		Ch. 1.3.1.1 P25	Subject	Reason for Handcuffs Documented	If the officer put the subject in handcuffs, did the officer document a reason to handcuff in the FIC?	36	37	97%	TRUE	7	44
3B		Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Discretionary Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	26	26	100%	TRUE	18	44
3B		Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Mandatory Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	33	33	100%	TRUE	11	44
4		CD 149, 150, Ch. 1.2.4 P1	Subject	Search Legal Numerator and Search Legal	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	56	58	97%	TRUE	3	61

				Denominat or							
5		CD 123, 149	Subject	Reason to Search in Report Numerator and Reason to Search in Report Denominat or	Does the "Report" sufficiently document a valid legal basis for every search of this subject?	54	56	96%	TRUE	3	59
6		123, Ch 41.12 P12J	Subject	Pat Down Justification	If a pat down was correctly indicated, did the officer give specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous in the justification for pat down text box? Informational Only. Included in Search Report Q5.	15	17	88%	FALSE	27	44
7 & 4		CD 130	Subject	(7) Search Subject on Probation or Parole & (4) Search Legal Numerator, and Search Legal Denominat or	(7) Was this subject on parole or probation? & (4) Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	53	55	96%	TRUE	0	55
8		CD 144	Subject	Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking	Was the arrest gist for this subject approved by a supervisor before the subject was booked by the sheriff?	28	28	100%	TRUE	16	44
9		CD 141	Subject	Officer Had PC to Arrest	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer have probable cause to arrest this subject?	28	28	100%	TRUE	16	44
10		CD 141, 145, Ch 1.9 P14, Ch 82.1 P4, Ch 41.12 P15	Subject	PC Clearly Articulated	Did the officer clearly document the probable cause in the report (FIC or EPR)?	28	28	100%	TRUE	16	44
11			Subject	Stop Result	What was result of Stop? Multiple choice (Informational Only)	Physical Arrest 29	Citation Issued 4	No Action Taken 9	Summons Issued 2	Verbal Warning 2	46
12			Subject	Break Given	Did the officer use their discretion to give the subject a break? (Informational Only)	1	37			7	44
15		Ch 1.9.1	Subject	Miranda Given	Did the officer give Miranda Rights, if required? Officers shall advise suspects of their Miranda Rights at the time of arrest or prior to any custodial interrogation. See Chapter: 1.9.1; Note: Miranda does not apply to roadside questioning of a stopped motorist, or a person briefly detained on the street under a Terry stop.	36	36	100%	TRUE	8	44
13			Subject	ID Checked	Did the officer run the subject's ID?	44	44	100%	TRUE	0	44
14		CD 189	Subject	LEP	Did the officer request translation services, if needed?	0	0		TRUE	44	44
20		CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Required to Exit Vehicle	Did an officer require this subject to exit a vehicle? (Informational Only)	13	14			30	44

21		CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Documente d	If you chose yes for "Required to Exit Vehicle", did an officer document the justification to require this subject to exit the vehicle in the FIC?	13	13	100%	TRUE	31	44
22		CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Compliant	If you chose yes for Vehicle Exit Justification Documented, is the justification specific to this subject, and/or was a legal vehicle search conducted requiring all occupants to exit the vehicle?	13	13	100%	TRUE	31	44
23		CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Category	If this subject was required to exit a vehicle, pick the option below that best describes the justification: (Informational Only)	Driver arrested or not allowed to drive (4)	Subject suspected of an arrestable offense (5)	Other (3)			12
16		CD 189	Subject	Arrest Immigration Status	Was the subject arrested because of or in part due to the subject's immigration status?	24	24	100%	TRUE	20	44
17		CD 183	Subject	Questioned Immigration Status	Was the subject questioned about their immigration status in a manner that was not relevant to the crime in question?	33	34	97%	TRUE	10	44
18		CD 185	Subject	Officer Comment LGBTQ	Did the officer say something that is possibly offensive about/to LGBTQ individuals?	35	35	100%	TRUE	9	44
19		CD 185	Subject	Officer Address LGBTQ	Did the officer address the subject by their chosen name, title, and pronoun?	35	35	100%	TRUE	9	44



---

## Conclusion

---

### Results

The results of this audit were verified through two processes:

1. Double-blind auditor peer review
2. Audit supervisor review

In the double-blind auditor peer review, two auditors independently assessed each incident and completed the initial SSA Incident and Subject form entries. The two auditors then discussed and resolved any discrepancies between the two sets of results. Any discrepancy that cannot be resolved was escalated to their supervisor who then resolved the discrepancy, and who may have also drawn on the expertise of others, including but not limited to the PSAB Deputy Superintendent, the PSAB Captain, other PSAB Innovation Managers, members of the Education and Training Division, members of the District Attorney's office, members of the Office of the Consent Decree Monitor, and members of the Department of Justice.

During the Audit Supervisor review, an Innovation Manager reviewed the resolved audit results for accuracy and completeness. Any issues were sent back to auditors for corrections and the interaction is documented on the audit forms.

The following deviations from compliance were identified in the SSA audit results:

FICs should be submitted by the end of the shift and approved by a supervisor within 72 hours. FIC submitted scored **81%**. The previous score was 90%. The FIC approved within 72 hours scored **76%**. The previous score was 78%.

Videos and reports consistent metric scored 89 of 96 (**93%**). The previous score was 83%. The discrepancies involve minor errors, such as typographical errors. Examples include incomplete or inadequate documentation.

For the "Complete Video" question, auditors check if each officer that conducted a stop, search, or arrest activated his/her BWC as required. If the officer is not assigned a BWC, the question is NA. The includes supervisors who made the scene and have been issued a BWC. Of the 29 non-compliant videos reviewed, 14 were related to incomplete videos at CLU, 8 incidents where the officer was early or late in activating their BWC, and 7 missing or could not be found. This category was scored **90%**. This is an improvement to the previous audit score of 89%. Early BWC shut-off at CLU remains the primary issue with incomplete video.

If reasonably possible, officers should identify him/herself as soon as practical during an interaction. Auditors review if video shows that the officer verbally identified him/herself. This category was scored **88%**. This is an improvement to the previous audit score of 72%.

The category "Reason to Search in Report" scores whether the reason for each search was

sufficiently documented in the report. This category does not address whether a valid reason to search existed, only whether a valid legal basis to search was documented in the corresponding report. For this audit, the category was scored **95%**. This is an improvement to the previous audit score of 83%.

*For “Pat Down Justification,” if a pat down was correctly indicated, auditors check if the officer gave specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous in the corresponding text box of the FIC. This category was scored (25/26) compliant. The previous audit score was (13/20). Note that these audit counts are included in the categories “Search Legal” and “Reason to Search in Report”.*

“Miranda Given, if required” determines if the subject was read their “Miranda Rights” following an arrest. This metric was added to the previous audit review. The score for the category scored **96%**. The category was previously scored 87%.

“Vehicle Exit Justification Documented” determines if the officer properly documented the reason they requested a subject to exit a vehicle during a stop. This metric was added to the previous audit review. The score for the category scored **95%**. The category was previously scored 93%.

With the ongoing FOB “Corrective Action Plan” currently being implemented, only material policy deficiencies identified in the review process were forwarded to the PSS Captain via the “Notify PSS” protocol for follow-up, redirection, or disciplinary action if needed.

All auditing deficiencies identified in the review process were documented in the PSAB reports and scorecards and sent directly to the various Districts for review and action if needed. Note the Districts which responded back to PSAB with their follow-up actions and re-evaluations.

## **Recommendations**

1. Continue to work with Academy and the Field Operations Bureau to provide additional training on:
  - a. FIC/EPR documentation
  - b. BWC activation and de-activation
  - c. Search/Pat Down
2. Continue to work with Policy Standards Section to develop appropriate training, to include DTB’s to address deficiencies.
3. Update FOB inspections to focus on challenges and reduce burdens on field supervisors regarding review of high performing areas.
4. Continue PSAB centralized FIC review of all incidents to improve FIC documentation and allow for early identification of trends.

## District Re-Evaluation Results

### 1<sup>st</sup> District

#### 1. 1<sup>st</sup> District Review:

- Sample Type: **Consent to Search**
- Question: Does a FIC exist, if required?

##### **Action taken by District.**

- 34S RTF/Authorized by Officer/No arrest with unknown suspect/
  - Marked for not having an FIC - FIC not needed for this type of CFS.

##### **PSAB Response**

- After review of NOPD policies, The ARU team determined that a FIC is not required for this event. ARU has changed the score for this item from No to N/A -Not Required.

#### 2. 1<sup>st</sup> District Review:

- Sample Type: **Consent to Search**
- Question
  - Are videos and reports consistent with reports?
  - Did the officers introduce themselves?
  - Did the officers explain the reason for stop?

##### **Action taken by District.**

- Trespassing with arrest
  - Marked for video not matching - I could not find any inconsistency with the documentation and the video. The only thing I found was the item was wrong in Evidence.com. Further explanation is needed.
- Trespassing
  - Marked for two sections: Identification and Explanation - The officers were professional during the arrest. The refrained from talking to the subject due to his constant cursing and threatening the officers and their families. The officers chose silence to avoid conflict.

##### **PSAB Response**

- Video/Report Consistency: ARU team reviewed the item number and came to the following conclusion. The FIC report indicates a search was conducted incident to arrest, then placed in the vehicle. The auditor did not observe the officers conduct a search. At 18:53, Officers place the subject in the vehicle without conducting a search. No change to score made.
- Identification and explanation: In accordance with Chapter 1.2.4.1 Stops, “17. During all stops, officers shall be courteous and professional, including identifying themselves. When reasonable, as early in the contact as safety permits, officers will inform the suspect of the following: (a) The officer’s name; (b) The officer’s rank or title; (c) The fact that the officer is a New Orleans Police Officer; and (d) The reason for the stop.” The officers never introduced themselves. The FIC indicates the officers informed the subject of his charge. At minute mark, 16:31 Officers approach the subject who is sleeping in an outdoor chair (Neither officer provided identification). At minute mark, 17:03 Officer

arrests the subject. The subject was asleep prior to encounter with the police, Upon the officers awakening the subject, the officers had reasonable opportunity to introduce themselves. The officers were not in an unsafe situation. While the subject was in the police vehicle an explanation of circumstances and reasons for the stop. ARU score of No for identification and explanation will remain unchanged.

### 3. 1<sup>st</sup> District Review:

- Sample Type: **SSA - Consent to Search**
- Question: Did Officers Introduce Themselves?

#### **Action taken by District.**

- 62R Arrest
  - Marked for not making an identification – An identification was made at the 1:35 mark on officer.

#### **PSAB Response**

- After review of the BWC, the officer identification to a subject was made at the 01:35 mark of Officer Canales BWC video. This score was adjusted.

## 3<sup>rd</sup> District

### 1. 3<sup>rd</sup> District Review:

- Sample Type: **Consent Search.** SSA Procedural Justice; “Officer allowed subject to explain”. Officer addressed the juveniles as seen on BWC.

#### **Actions taken by 3rd District:**

- Request the “No” be changed to “Yes.”

#### **PSAB Response:**

- ARU reviewed the video of officer read the juveniles their rights. Due to them being juveniles, he said he wouldn’t ask any questions. The only concerns the juveniles had, were around their handcuffs being tight and the officers adjusted them as needed. This question was updated from “No” to “Yes”.

### 2. 3<sup>rd</sup> District Review:

- Sample Type: **Consent Search.** SSA Searches of Subjects; “Reason to Search in Report”. Officers conducted searches.

#### **Actions taken by 3rd District:**

- Request the Valid legal numerator be changed to “2” for both subjects.

#### **PSAB Response:**

- ARU reviewed the video and read the FIC reports. ARU adjusted the numerators for both individuals after determining the searches were all valid and post incident to arrest.

### 3. 3<sup>rd</sup> District Review:

- Sample Type: **Consent Search.** SSA BWC Complete; “Video Complete Numerator”.

#### **Actions taken by 3rd District:**

- Sgt. uploaded additional videos due to multiple item numbers. Lt. conducted roll call

training on BWC usage.

**PSAB Response:**

- No action required.

**4. 3rd District Review:**

- Sample Type: **Consent Search**. SSA Incidents; "FIC Approved within 72 Hours". FICs not approved due to platoon being off for three days.

**Actions taken by 3rd District:**

- Sgt. stated that FICs not approved due to platoon being off for three days.

**PSAB Response:**

- No action required.

## 4<sup>th</sup> District

**1. 4<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: **Search**
- Question: Did the officers introduce themselves?

**Action taken by District.**

- Officers were respectful to the victim and perpetrator. The officers affected the arrest without incident. However, two of the officers never introduce themselves. Both officers were SFL'd.

**PSAB Response**

- Due to the actions taken by the District, No further action is needed for this item.

**2. 4<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: **Stop**
- Question: Did the officers introduce themselves?

**Action taken by District.**

- Officer gave the parties in the vehicle verbal commands. They introduced themselves and explained to the individuals the reasons for the traffic stop.

**PSAB Response**

- This item was already within the compliance standard of NOPD. No further action is needed for this item.

**3. 4<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: **Arrest**
- Question: Did the officers introduce themselves?

**Action taken by District.**

- Officers were respectful to the victim and perpetrator as well as they introduced themselves. The officers affected the arrest without incident.

**PSAB Response**

- This item was already within the compliance standard of NOPD. No further action is needed for this item.

**4. 4<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: **Stop**
- Question: Did the officers introduce themselves?

**Action taken by District**

- The officers introduced themselves. The officers were respectful to the victim, witness, and citizens.

**PSAB Response**

- This item was already within the compliance standard of NOPD. No further action is needed for this item.

**5. 4<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: **Arrest**
- Question: Did the officers introduce themselves?

**Action taken by District.**

- Officers were respectful to the victim and perpetrator as well as they introduced themselves. The officers affected the arrest without incident.

**PSAB Response**

- This item was already within the compliance standard of NOPD. No further action is needed for this item.

**6. 4<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: **Stop**
- Question: Did the officers introduce themselves?

**Action taken by District.**

- The officers gave the parties in the vehicle verbal commands. They introduced themselves and explained to the individuals the reasons for the traffic stop.

### **PSAB Response**

- This item was already within the compliance standard of NOPD. No further action is needed for this item.

## **5<sup>th</sup> District**

### **1. 5<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: Probation
- Question: Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?

#### **Action taken by District.**

- 5<sup>th</sup> District supervisors reviewed the FIC within 72 hours. The FIC was created by Officer on 5/15/23 and kicked back. The FIC was re-submitted by the officer on 5/26/23 and approved on 5/31/23 by Lt.

### **PSAB Response**

- The ARU reviewed this question and noted that the FIC was not approved within 72 hours. Per Chapter 41.12 Paragraph 25 of the Field Interview Card Policy states, “After receiving a submitted FIC, a supervisor of the submitting officer’s Unit shall review the FIC to determine if each stop, frisk, or search was supported by documentation of reasonable suspicion or probable cause”; whether it is consistent with NOPD regulations, policy, and federal and state law; and whether it showed a need for corrective action or review of agency policy, strategy, tactics, or training. Supervisors shall make every reasonable effort to complete this review within 12 hours of receiving the submitted FIC, and in all cases shall complete the review within 72 hours.” When examining this paragraph, specifically “**shall complete the review within 72 hours**”, supervisors are required to approve FIC submissions within (3) three days. If the supervisor is unable to approve, the supervisor is to require that the officer supplement the documentation before the end of that officer’s present tour duty. Requiring the officer to supplement the documentation before the end of the tour duty is detailed in paragraph 26 of the Field Interview Card Policy. There is no change to the scoring for this incident.

### **2. 5<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: Probation
- Question: Did each officer who conducted a stop, search, or arrest and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required? And did each supervisor who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?

#### **Action taken by District.**

- Officer did not deactivate his body-worn camera until after the arrested subject was released to a deputy and her cleared from the incident as stated in NOPD policy Chapter 41.3.10, paragraph 16.

### **PSAB Response**

- Upon review of the scoring for the item in question, ARU determined that Officer followed NOPD standards and policies in the initial scoring. No further action is needed for this item.

### **3. 5<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: Consent to Search
- Question: Did each officer who conducted a stop, search, or arrest and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required? And did each supervisor who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?

**Action taken by District.**

- Officer appears to have attempted to reactivate his camera by double tapping as required by policy. Officer was not aware that his BWC deactivated because his battery was low according to the audit trail.

**PSAB Response**

- Upon review of the audit trail for item, the ARU determined that the officer followed NOPD policies. ARU agrees that BWC malfunction suffices as reasoning for early deactivation. ARU updated the score from “No” to “Yes”, with (2) two out of (2) two having completed video.

**4. 5<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: Consent to Search
- Question: Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?

**Action taken by District.**

- Item was created by the officer on 1/15/2023 same as the incident date. The sergeant and the officer work on Squad D. This squad was AWP from 1/15/2023 to 1/17/2023. After speaking with the sergeant, the officer returned the FIC with corrections on 1/18/2023 and officer made the corrections on 1/19/2023 which was also approved by the sergeant on 1/19/2023.

**PSAB Response**

- The ARU reviewed this question and noted that the FIC was not approved within 72 hours. Per Chapter 41.12 Paragraph 25 of the Field Interview Card Policy states that “After receiving a submitted FIC, a supervisor of the submitting officer’s Unit shall review the FIC to determine if each stop, frisk, or search was supported by documentation of reasonable suspicion or probable cause; whether it is consistent with NOPD regulations, policy, and federal and state law; and whether it showed a need for corrective action or review of agency policy, strategy, tactics, or training. Supervisors **shall** make every reasonable effort to complete this review within 12 hours of receiving the submitted FIC, and in all cases **shall** complete the review within 72 hours.” There is no change to the scoring for this incident.

**5. 5<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: Consent to Search
- Question: Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?

**Action taken by District.**

- The FIC was created by the officer on the same date as the incident date. The sergeant reviewed and approved the FIC on 2/16/2023. The DSA sergeant spoke with C-Platoon Commander, who advised he would review the NOPD Policy Chapter 41.12, Field Interview Cards, paragraph 15, Supervisors Shall Approve All Fic Documentation, with the platoon sergeant.

**PSAB Response**

- There were no changes, as the District agrees with ARU’s non-compliant scoring. No further review is necessary for this incident.

**6. 5<sup>th</sup> District Review:**



- Sample Type: Consent to Search
- Question: Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?

**Action taken by District.**

- The FIC was created by the officer on the same date as the incident date. The sergeant reviewed and approved the FIC on 3/7/2023. DSA sergeant spoke with C-Platoon Commander, who advised he would review the NOPD Policy Chapter 41.12, Field Interview Cards, paragraph 15, Supervisors Shall Approve All Fic Documentation, with the platoon sergeant.

**PSAB Response**

- There were no changes, as the District agrees with ARU's non-compliant scoring. No further review is necessary for this incident.

**7. 5<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: Consent to Search
- Question: Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?

**Action taken by District.**

- The FIC was created by the officer on the same date as the incident date. The sergeant reviewed and approved the FIC on 1/5/2023. DSA sergeant spoke with C-Platoon Commander, who advised he would review the NOPD Policy Chapter 41.12, Field Interview Cards, paragraph 15, Supervisors Shall Approve All Fic Documentation, with the sergeant.

**PSAB Response**

- There were no changes, as the District agrees with ARU's non-complaint scoring. No further review is necessary for this incident.

**8. 5<sup>th</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: Consent to Search
- Question: If reasonably possible, does video show the officer explain the reason for the stop/interaction as soon as practical?
- Question: If the subject was allowed to ask questions, and if the subject had reasonable questions or concerns, does video show the officer respond to them?

**Action taken by District.**

- The officer explained the reason for the stop/interaction as soon as practical according to CD 181 and answered the male's question including explaining according to NOPD Policy Chapter 41.13, paragraph 9(E) at marker 13:00. DSA sergeant added the marker to the officer's BWC video.

**PSAB Response**

- Upon reviewing the BWC for the incident, ARU noted the following time markers:
  - 07:34 Subject asked why he was being detained (1).
    - Please note that the subject was cooperative and compliant with instructions.
  - 08:47 Subject was escorted to the police Unit and patted down. The subject again inquired why he was being detained (2).
  - 10:10 The subject was read his Miranda Rights
  - 10:40 The subject again asked why he was being detained (3).
  - 10:49 The subject was placed inside of the police Unit.
  - 11:00 Officer 1 advised officer 2 to notify the subject of why he was being detained.
  - 11:42 Officer 2 approached the subject and began collecting his personal information without notifying the subject why he was being detained.

- 13:02 Officer 1 notified the subject of why he was being detained.
- Based on the time stamps provided above, and the compliant nature of the subject, the ARU determined that the officers did not provide an explanation for the stop as soon as practical, nor was the subject's questions or concerns addressed between minutes 07:34 and 13:02. There is no change to the scoring for this incident.
  - Per Chapter 41.13 paragraph 9(b) of the Bias Free policy, (b) Provide a self-introduction and explain to the subject the reason for the contact as soon as practical, unless providing this information will compromise the investigation or the safety of officers or other persons. In ordinary vehicle stops, this information shall be provided before asking for driver's license, vehicle registration, and proof of insurance or other identification.
    - The BWC footage does not suggest informing the subject of the reason for the stop would impede the investigation.
  - Per Chapter 1.2.4.1 Paragraph 17 (d) of the Stops policy, During all stops, officers shall be courteous and professional, including identifying themselves. When reasonable, **as early in the contact as safety permits**, officers will inform the suspect of the following: (d) The reason for the stop.

#### 9. 5<sup>th</sup> District Review:

- Sample Type: Consent to Search
- Question: If evidence was seized, is there a CE+P receipt?
- Question: If evidence was seized, was it submitted to CE+P before next Code1 call or ETOD, whichever is first?

#### Action taken by District.

- The DSA sergeant contacted Central Property & Evidence and learned the officer placed evidence on the books under the item. He placed three exhibits under the item number on 3/1/2023 at 8:05 pm. Exhibit 001 was listed as "one black ski mask," Exhibit 002 was listed as "one black/red flathead screwdriver," and Exhibit 003 was listed as "one black ski mask." The DSA sergeant discovered that the officer made an error and inadvertently forgot to add the CEP receipt# C0091923 to the EPR report. The DSA sergeant notified Lieutenant and advised him of the mistake to request a supplemental report is completed and the receipt is added to the report.

#### PSAB Response

- Chapter 84.1 paragraph 10 of the Evidence and Property states that "All pertinent information regarding articles received at CE&P shall be entered into the Section's computer system and a receipt shall be generated. The receipt shall be supplied to the submitting member for his/her record and verified for accuracy and completeness by the submitting member prior to his/her leaving CE&P. **This receipt shall become part of the submitting member's investigative report (EPR)**". Upon reviewing the policy, ARU determined that CE&P receipts must be attached to the EPR. The facts surrounding this EPR submission are as such: There was no CE&P attached at the time the audit was conducted. There will be no changes to the score.

### 6<sup>th</sup> District

#### 1. 6<sup>th</sup> District Review:

- Sample Type: **Arrests**. SSA Incidents; “FIC Documents the Vehicle Exit Justification”. Lt. does not believe the incident fell under the vehicle stop policy.

**Actions taken by 6<sup>th</sup> District:**

- Lt. requested that the entry be changed from “No” to “NA” as the request for passenger to exit vehicle was part of an investigation around a fight.

**PSAB Response:**

- ARU reviewed the BWC of the incident, and it was clear that there were 2 individuals sitting in a truck. Officer commanded the individual exit the vehicle, which he did. Because the officer listed the person as a pedestrian instead of a passenger in a vehicle, there was no vehicle exit data in the FIC. This was explained to the Lt. and PSAB made no changes.

## 8th District

### 1. 8th District Review:

- Sample Type: Arrest
- Question: Does a FIC exist, if required?

**Action taken by 8<sup>th</sup> District.**

- Item states missing F.I.C. The call was a dispatched call for service, not a terry-stop which doesn’t require an F.I.C. via policy.

**PSAB Response**

- After review of NOPD policies, The ARU team determined that a FIC is not required for this event. ARU has changed the score for this item from No to N/A -Not Required and all subsequent FIC related question to N/A – Not Required

### 2. 8th District Review:

- Sample Type: Search
- Question: Number of officers with complete video vs Number of officers involved

**Action taken by 8<sup>th</sup> District.**

- 95G Video shows arrest and transport to station where subject was placed in holding cell. This was during Mardi Gras when the district had headquartered personal transporting for them.

**PSAB Response**

- After review of NOPD policies, The ARU team determined that per policy, Chapter 41.3.10 Section 11 sub-section (f), BWC is required for all arrest and transports. No BWC of the transport to CLU was available for the auditor to review. Due to the evidence available to the auditor, the of complete officer videos will remain non-compliant.

### 3. 8th District Review:

- Sample Type: Arrest
- Question: Number of officers with complete video vs Number of officers involved

**Action taken by 8<sup>th</sup> District.**

- The item has two videos of incident in Evidence.com. The camera was partially blocked for the first few minutes of the video.

**PSAB Response**

- After review of NOPD policies, The ARU team determined that per policy, Chapter 41.3.10 Section 29, “It is the Member’s responsibility to ensure that the view of the camera is unobstructed by clothing or uniform accessories. Body-worn cameras, when worn by District members in uniform patrol functions (i.e., officers and rank), shall be worn at chest height, pointing in front of the officer and horizontal to the ground.” The officer camera was obstructed for 15 minutes of recording. The BWC was in the officers pocket for the entire duration of the incident. The assisting officer was complete, and the scene was cleared. Due to the evidence and circumstances reviewed by the auditor it is determined that the number of complete videos will be adjusted from 0 to 1 out of 2.

#### **4. 8th District Review:**

- Sample Type: Search
- Question: Were the officers reasonably courteous?

##### **Action taken by 8<sup>th</sup> District.**

- This was a call for service on a domestic battery incident. When the officers arrived they were informed that the female committed a battery at which time she was handcuffed and arrested. Chapter 1.2.4.1 refers to stops that are conducted by officers, not arrests that are made during a call for service. For this reason, this item should be marked compliant.

##### **PSAB Response**

- After review of NOPD policies and BWC video, The ARU team determined that due to the nature of the incident and circumstances at hand the officers did act with reasonable courteous according to policy. However, Officer Blount did fail to introduce herself to the subject. The ARU team has determined to update the score for explained from No to Yes Although this is a call for service for Domestic Battery, per policy Chapter 42.4 Section 8 sub-section (b), Officers shall incorporate in their investigation to attempt to determine the prominent aggressor. The officers explained why she was being arrested however they failed to investigate or even determine if the offender acted in self-defense. Their actions were not a form of de-escalation. For that matter, the ARU team will retain the score of No for reasonable courtesy.

#### **5. 8th District Review:**

- Sample Type: Search
- Question: Were the officers reasonably courteous?

##### **Action taken by 8<sup>th</sup> District.**

- When you watch the video at both of those time marks the subject’s hands are not in full view of the camera. The auditor is assuming that he is not moving and says he didn’t observe the subject reaching for the gun. The subject already had his hand on the gun at this time. The auditor fails to state is at the beginning of the video the 52 sec. mark when the officer is approaching the male his hands are in his jacket pocket. When the officer stops him and makes these comments you cannot see the males hands and can only see from the middle of his back and up. After the comments you can see the subject’s right hand as he is holding it away from his body. At the 1.50-minute mark the officer removes a gun from the front right jacket pocket where the subject had his hand in when he was approached. This video should be marked compliant.

### **PSAB Response**

- After review of NOPD policies and BWC video, The ARU team determined that due to the nature of the incident and circumstances at hand the officers did act with reasonable courteous according to policy. The ARU team will change the score of No to Yes for reasonable courteous.

### **6. 8th District Review:**

- Sample Type: Search
- Question:
  - Did the officer introduce themselves?
  - Were the officers reasonably courteous?

### **Action taken by 8<sup>th</sup> District.**

- This is all taken from the officer's BWC video. The officer was not discourteous to the male when he approached him. On the officer's BWC after the male is handcuffed and the weapon is removed, the officer introduces himself and the other officer and informs the subject of why he is being arrested. This was done when it was safe to do so. Removing a loaded firearm from a subject on Bourbon Street without incident should take preference over the officers introducing themselves from a safety standard as the policy states. This video should be marked compliant in both categories.

### **PSAB Response**

- The officers were in no immediate threat of danger when they approached the subject. The subject showed no signs of resistance or threat of flight. The officers could have introduced themselves prior to stating the reason for their approach. The policy states officers shall introduce themselves when practical. Due to the low threat level, the officers did not introduce themselves when practical. The score for identifying themselves when practical will retain a No score. The officers did however act with reasonable courteous throughout the situation. The ARU team determined that the score for reasonable courteous will change from No to Yes.

### **7. 8th District Review:**

- Sample Type: Arrest
- Question: Is probable cause clearly articulated?

### **Action taken by 8<sup>th</sup> District.**

- This was a domestic violence call where the F.I.C. stated subject was arrested for Domestic Violence. The report indicated that the subject had grabbed the victim around the neck (choking, restricting breathing). The FIC doesn't give the specific actions of what domestic violence the arrested subject had committed it does give the probable cause for the arrest.

### **PSAB Response**

- After review of the FIC, per policy Chapter 41.12 Section 12 sub-section (h) All FICs shall include the reason for the stop, including a clear and specific articulation of the facts creating reasonable suspicion or probable cause. The officer stated "CALL FOR SERVICE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AT HOTEL. THE SUBJECT WAS ARRESTED FOR DOMESTIC ABUSE BATTERY UNDER ABOVE ITEM." Merely stating the regard for the call for service is not clear and specific articulation of the facts that created the reasonable suspicion or probable cause. Although

the EPR, states the allege allegations the FIC does not. Based on the results of the review, the ARU team determined that the score for probable cause being clearly articulated will retain a No.

## 2nd District

### 1. 2<sup>nd</sup> District Review:

- Sample Type: Consent to Search
- Question: Was FIC submitted by ETOD, if required?

#### Action taken by 2<sup>nd</sup> District.

- The audit states that the officer under he item did not submit the FIC by ETOD. The DSA Sgt. after reviewing the FIC under the item number, the attached FIC was submitted on Feb 4,2023, the same date that the incident took place, and the supervisor approved the FIC the next date which was Feb 5,2023.

#### PSAB Response

- After review of the FIC and of the supporting documentation the submittal date for the FIC was 2/5/2023 at 08:37. Although the FIC was created on 2/4/2023 it was not submitted until the following day after the ETOD. The ARU team will retain the “No” score for this section.

### 2. 2<sup>nd</sup> District Review:

- Sample Type: Consent to Search
- Question: Are the videos and reports significantly consistent?

#### Action taken by 2<sup>nd</sup> District.

- Under item number, the audit stated that the video and report are not consistent. The DSA Sgt. Stated that the only inconsistency with the report and video was that the officer wrote in the report that the bb gun was in plain view in the yellow backpack on her person, but the officer should have written that the yellow bag was not on the subject person but located near to where the subject was seated.

#### PSAB Response

- The ARU team has determined to retain the “No” score for this section of the audit.
  - Per Officer’s FIC:"OFFICERS THEN OBSERVED, VIA PLAIN VIEW A BLACK BB GUN IN A YELLOW BACKPACK THAT WAS ON HER PERSON" However, upon video review, at the 11:05 mark of Officer Netter-Moses BWC video the officer has to physically open the subjects backpack to retrieve the object. See details below:
    - Video Details, Christopher Netter-Moses, May 22, 2023, 12:47
      - 11:05-Officer then remove the clothing from the top of the bag and opens subject’s bag and observe a gun he believes to be a bb gun. Subject advised that gun is a water gun because she was beat up a few days ago and robbed before they arrived needed it for protection.
    - (Non-Compliant-Search and Seizure-Chapter 1.2.4 (35-f) If the subject is carrying an object such as a handbag, suitcase, briefcase, sack, or other item

that may contain or conceal a weapon, the officer may not search it. Instead, the officer should place it out of reach of the subject.)

**3. 2<sup>nd</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: Stop
- Question: Patted down for more than weapons?

**Action taken by 2<sup>nd</sup> District.**

- On August 30, 2023, the two sergeants' reviewed the shortcomings found on the SSA Audit for June 2023.
- The supervisors reviewed item number. The SSA Scorecard advised that the officer patted the suspect down "for more than weapons". After reviewing the FIC and BWC Video of the incident, this assertion was learned to be correct. Although the officer arrested the suspect for Domestic Battery, conducted a Search Incident to Arrest and transported him to the Orleans Justice Center, the officer erroneously labeled the FIC as a Pat Down/ search for weapons. The officer was counseled on Searches Incident to Arrests and Pat Downs. The officer was queried until the supervisors were assured the officer understood the difference.

**PSAB Response**

- No action required by PSAB. Officer training incident was memorialized in the Supervisor Feedback Log as Counseling.

**4. 2<sup>nd</sup> District Review:**

- Sample Type: Stop
- Question: RS/PC to stop subject. Passengers ID'd and Not a suspect?

**Action taken by 2<sup>nd</sup> District.**

- On August 30, 2023, the two sergeants' reviewed the shortcomings found on the SSA Audit for June 2023.
- The supervisors reviewed item number and the SSA Scorecard advised the officer had "ID'd and NOT a suspect". Again, after reviews of the FIC and BWC video, it was learned the officer conducted a Traffic Stop on a vehicle that disregarded a Red Light/ Traffic Control Device. The officer identified the driver and ultimately issued a verbal warning. The officer politely asked the passengers for their names. While the passengers were obviously not driving the vehicle in question, the office had the wherewithal to kindly ask the passengers information just in case the suspects had recently committed a crime which would explain why they were in such a hurry they disregarded the Red Light. The supervisors met with the officer and explained they understood the purpose of his action but absent the extenuating circumstances being added in the narrative section of the FIC, it would appear as if he "ID'd" a person who was "NOT a suspect".

**PSAB Response**

- No action required by PSAB. Officer training incident was memorialized in the Supervisor Feedback Log as Counseling.

*Timothy A. Lindsey*

**Innovation Manager, Auditing**

**Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau**



## Appendix A – SSAPJ Audit Forms

### SSAPJ Audit Forms:



# SSAPJ Incident Audit Form

Read Me ID Info 1-6 7-8 9-11 12-15 16-18 19-22 23-29 Misc Video Review

1. Watch as much video as reasonably possible to ensure you have thoroughly reviewed the incident. You must watch video of all the interactions between an officer and a non-employee. You may skip through or fast forward through parts of the video that do not involve interactions with non-employees. If another officer interacts with a non-employee and you cannot see and hear the interaction in the video you are currently watching, you must watch the other officer's video, if it exists. Clearly document the video segments you watch under question 31 - Video Info of the SSA Incident form so that any reviewer knows exactly what video segments you watched and did not watch.

2. Notify your supervisor when:

- It appears officers rely on demographics to establish reasonable suspicion or probable cause for a stop, detention, search, or arrest.
- It appears officers rely on information they know to be materially false to conduct a stop, detention, search, or arrest.
- You observe policy violations that are not captured by your audit results
- Officers' actions are egregious and therefore require prompt intervention

3. Do not discuss this incident with any auditor, peer, or supervisor, until you have thoroughly reviewed the incident.

4. If you do not think this incident involves a stop, search or arrest, please discuss the possible deselection with an auditor or the ARU supervisor. If you decide to deselect, close this form without saving and record the deselection in the deselection log.

Read Me ID Info 1-6 7-8 9-11 12-15 16-18 19-22 23-29 Misc Video Review

### Use?

If you do not think this incident involves a stop, search or arrest, please discuss the possible deselection with an auditor or the ARU supervisor. If you decide to deselect, close this form without saving and record the deselection in the deselection log.

### Sample/Distribution Identifying Information

Field names (column names) are in grey text.

Pick your name below.	In which sample is this incident?	Enter the Item #	If an FIC exists, enter the FIC ID #	If an EPR exists, enter the EPR ID #
Created By	Sample Type	Item Number	FIC ID	EPR ID
Tim Lindsey				
Faith Thornton	Stop			
Charmel Peterson	Search			
Betty Johnson	Arrest			
Michael Sarver				
Matt Segraves				



What is the reporting year, month, week, district, and platoon?

Review Year	Review Month	Week	District	Platoon
2019	Jun	WK1	1	A
2020	Jul	WK2	2	B
2021	Aug	WK3	3	C
2022	Sep	WK4	4	GA
2023	Oct	WK5	5	Promenade
	Nov		6	Mounted
	Dec		8	DWI
	Jan		7	K9
	Feb		ISB	MC1 MC2
	Mar		MSB	VOWS

### Known to Be Materially False

- CD 124: If you suspect an officer relied on information he or she knew to be materially false or incorrect to make a stop or detention, contact your supervisor. CD 124 reads: NOPD officers shall not use or rely on information known to be materially false or incorrect in effectuating an investigatory stop or detention. Materially false information could be planted evidence or results from running a different plate.

### Stops Scorecard

- If required, does an FIC exist for this stop?

CD 126, 139

See Ch. 41.12 FICs for guidance on when FICs are required.

FIC Exists If required

Yes

No

FIC Not Required

If the FIC is under a different item number than the CAD item number, please record the item number on the FIC.

FIC Item if Different than CAD
- Did the officer submit the FIC to his/her supervisor by the end of the shift?

Review the BWC recording time and the FIC Submit Date. If a BWC does not exist, review the CAD times. For the purposes of this question, the end of the shift is when the officer left work.

[The FIC Submit date reflects the most recent submit date. When an FIC is kicked-back and an officer updates it and re-submits it, we lose the first submit date.]

CD 150, Ch. 41.12 P9

FIC Submitted By ETOD

Yes

No

No FIC
- Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours? For the purposes of this question use the Submit Date and the Approval Date.

If the FIC is currently disapproved, use the Supervisor Last Modified Date.

CD 150 [modified interpretation, CD amendment likely], Ch. 41.12 P15

FIC Approved in 72Hrs

Yes

No

No FIC

### Boilerplate Language

- In the reports, did the officer(s) use specific descriptive language when articulating reasonable suspicion and/or probable cause for any stop, detention, search, or arrest?

CD 123, 145; Ch. 41.12 P1, 1.2.4 P16, 1.9 P14

Officers cannot use "boilerplate" or "pat" language, such as "traffic violation" or "officer safety" when explaining their actions.

Choose "Yes" if the officer did NOT use any boilerplate language. Choose "No" if the officer used boilerplate language.

If you selected "No", please record the boilerplate language in the FIC:

Boilerplate Explanation
- No Boilerplate

Yes

No

NA No FIC/EPR

6 Are the video(s) and reports significantly consistent?

If there is anything you see on video that proves as aspect of the report to be inaccurate, choose "No."

Use the Inconsistency Categories below like a checklist. Check that each category is reported accurately.

CD 123; Ch. 1.9 P14; Ch 1.2.4 P63,65; Ch 82.1 P7-8; Rule 2 P3B

If you chose "No," indicating something about the report is inaccurate, please explain below, including the relevant timestamp of the videos. Please list every inaccuracy.

Discrepancy Explanation

Please pick all the inconsistency categories that apply. These categories should match your discrepancy explanation above.

Inconsistency Categories

- ☐ Passenger Info
- ☐ Search Info
- ☐ Subject Info
- ☐ Exit Vehicle Info
- ☐ Result Info
- ☐ Reason for Stop Info
- ☐ Evidence Info
- ☐ Vehicle Description Info
- ☐ Consent to Search not Documented
- ☐ Other

Videos and Reports Are Consistent

Yes  
No  
NA No FIC/EPR  
NA No Video

7 Do video or reports show the officer entered a residence to make the arrest?

See Chapter 1.9 paragraphs 27-29 for guidance.

Arrest in Residence

Yes  
No  
NA - No Arrest

If yes, which of the following apply?

Arrest in Residence Circumstances

Consent  
Exigent Circumstances  
Warrant  
None of the above (Not Compliant)  
NA - Not in Residence  
NA - No Arrest

8 A Do video or reports suggest a supervisor required to make the scene?

CD 143; Ch. 1.9 P9, 12

If the incident met the narcotics arrests exception in Ch. 1.9, choose "No."

Narcotics arrest exception requirements:

- (a) The arrest only involved narcotics;
- (b) The suspect was relocated to the station to test the narcotics;
- (c) The supervisor was present at the station to review the arrest recommendation;
- (d) And there were no injuries involved.

SupervisorRequiredtoMakeScene

Yes  
No  
No - Narcotics Exception  
NA - No Arrest  
Unknown/DV

8 B If the supervisor was required to make the scene, please pick the reason below.

Reason Supe required to make scene

One or more charges can be charged as a felony. Look up the charge and see if it includes "with hard labor" or "with or without hard labor"  
An officer used L2 or L3 force  
Custodial arrest for crossing or traversing a police cordon(Municipal Code §54-442) or resisting an officer (Municipal Code § 54-441)  
Custodial arrest and the most serious violation is vehicle infraction or simple drug possession  
Custodial arrest that is not in FQ or CBD & the charge is Disturbing the Peace, Criminal Trespass, Obstructing Public Passages, or Begging/Vagrancy  
Unknown/DV

8 C If the supervisor is required to make scene, does video show the supervisor made the scene?

CD 143; Ch. 1.9 P9, 12

VideoShowsSupeMadeScene

Yes  
No  
NA - Not Required  
NA - No Arrest  
NA - No Video  
NA - Unknown/DV

We use these questions to ensure our universe of uses of force is complete. Reportable uses of force identified here will be included in the use of force audit.

<b>9</b>	Did any officer use reportable force during this officer-civilian interaction?	UseOfForce <div>Yes No No Video</div>
<b>10</b>	Is there a corresponding Blue Team Report? There likely won't be an APPROVED Blue Team report. But there should be an incomplete one.  [Because IAPro and BlueTeam are down and MAX is down, check the FTN log to see if a corresponding use of force report has been initiated.]  If you chose "No," indicating you believe this incident involves unreported reportable force, notify your supervisor.	ForceReported <div>Yes No No Use of Force No Video</div>
<b>11</b>	If an officer used reportable force, give the video details including the min/sec mark of the force'  UoFVidDetails <div></div>	

We use these questions to ensure our universes of strip and cavity searches are complete. Such searches identified here will be included in the strip/cavity audit.

<b>12</b>	Does the incident involve a strip or cavity search?	Strip Cavity Search Occurred <div>Yes No</div>
<b>13</b>	If yes, is the strip or cavity search documented in the FIC or EPR?  If you chose "No," indicating this incident involved an undocumented strip or cavity search, notify your supervisor.	Strip Cavity Documented <div>Yes No NA-No Strip/Cavity</div>

### Consent to Search Scorecard

<b>14</b>	Did this incident involve a consent to search?  Sometimes officers will ask for consent when they do not need consent. If the officer had another valid legal basis to perform the search, it was not a search by consent.	Consent Search Occurred <div>Yes No</div>
<b>15</b>	If yes, is the consent to search documented in an FIC or EPR?  If you choose "No," indicating this incident involved an undocument consent to search, notify your supervisor.	Consent Search Documented <div>Yes No NA-No Consent Search</div>

## Evidence

<b>16</b> If evidence was seized, is there a CE+P receipt?  A CE+P receipt should be attached to an EPR. They can also be in DTS.  CD 150; Ch 84.1 P8, 24	Evidence Documented <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 100px;">           Yes            No            No Evidence Seized            No EPR         </div>
<b>17</b> If evidence was seized, was it submitted to CE+P before the next Code 1 call the officer(s) handled or ETOD, whichever is first? Review the Chain of Custody History report in BEAST and the unit's CAD activity. The date/time the item was submitted into property must be before the unit's next Code 1 arrival time or ETOD, whichever is first.  [Audit method incomplete for evidence placed in dropboxes.]  CD 150	Evidence Submitted Immediately <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 100px;">           Yes            No            No Evidence Seized         </div>
<b>18</b> If evidence was seized, and there is a CE+P receipt, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video?  CD 123; Ch 82.1 P7-8; RS 14-134.2, 14-130.1; Rule 2 P3B	Evidence Description Matches Video <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 100px;">           Yes            No            No Evidence Seized            CE+P Receipt Not Available         </div>

## Supervisory Review

Because this section pertains to the entire incident, complete the rest of this form and the subject forms prior to completing this section.

<b>19</b> Did you find any non-compliance related to this incident?	Non-Compliance Should Have Been Addressed <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 100px;">           Yes            No         </div>
<b>20</b> The following questions A-E determine whether a supervisor knew or should have known about the non-compliance:	
<b>20 A</b> Is there non-compliance because there is missing documentation (FIC, EPR, etc.)?	Missing Documentation <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 100px;">           Yes            No            NA-Full Compliance         </div>
<b>20 B</b> Is the non-compliance evident in the report(s) (FICs/EPRs) and the report(s) are approved?  If a supervisor needed to watch video to know about the non-compliance, choose "No."	Non-compliance Evident in Approved Reports <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 100px;">           Yes            No            NA-Full Compliance         </div>
<b>20 C</b> Did a supervisor make the scene and did the non-compliance occur while the supervisor was on scene?	Supervisor On Scene During Non-Compliance <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 100px;">           Yes            No            NA-Full Compliance         </div>
<b>20 D</b> Was a supervisor required to watch the video?  Supervisors are required to watch videos if one or more of the following occurred: a use of force, someone was injured, a complaint was made or an officer told a supervisor that he/she thinks a complaint may be made, a vehicle pursuit, or an officer terminated his/her video early to protect the privacy of an individual.	Supervisor Required to Watch Video <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 100px;">           Yes            No            NA-Full Compliance         </div>
<b>20 E</b> Did the supervisor watch the video? Review the audit trail for the videos in Evidence.com.	Supervisor Reviewed Video <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 100px;">           Yes            No            NA-Full Compliance         </div>

<p><b>20 F</b> Did a supervisor know or should have known about the non-compliance?</p> <p>Choose "Yes" if any of A-E are "Yes."</p>	<p>Supervisor Aware or Should Have Been Aware of Non-compliance</p> <div> <div></div> <div>Yes</div> <div>No</div> <div>NA-Full Compliance</div> </div>
<p><b>21</b> Please list the SFLIDs for any corresponding SFLs or Control numbers for any corresponding FDIs?</p>	<p>SFLIDs-CNTRL Nos</p> <div></div>
<p><b>22</b> Did a supervisor address all the non-compliance you found related to this incident?</p> <p>CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C</p> <p>If a corresponding SFL or FDI exists but does not cover all non-compliance, please explain:</p> <p>Supervisory Review Comments</p> <div></div>	<p>Non-Compliance Addressed by Supervisor</p> <div> <div></div> <div>Yes</div> <div>No</div> <div>NA - Full Compliance</div> </div>

### Procedural Justice

<p><b>23</b> Does video show the officer was reasonably professional and courteous when interacting with the subject or other civilians during the stop?</p> <p>CD 181; Ch 41.13 P9A; Civil Service Rule 3?</p> <p>Enter "No," if the officer(s) should have been more professional or courteous.</p> <p>If you selected "No", please explain::</p> <p>NotCourteousEnoughExplanation</p> <div></div>	<p>Reasonably Courteous</p> <div> <div></div> <div>Yes</div> <div>No</div> <div>NA - No Video</div> </div>
<p><b>24</b> If reasonably possible, does video show the officer verbally identify him/herself as soon a practical?</p> <p>CD 181; Ch 41.13 P9B</p>	<p>Identified</p> <div> <div></div> <div>Yes</div> <div>No</div> <div>NA - No Video</div> </div>

25	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer explain the reason for the stop/interaction as soon as practical?	Explained
CD 181; Ch 41.13 P9B	<div></div> Yes No NA - No Video	
26	Does video show the officer allowed the subject an opportunity to explain his/her situation, ask questions, or voice concerns?	Subject Could Explain
	<div></div> Yes No NA - No Video	
27	If the subject was allowed to ask questions, and if the subject had reasonable questions or concerns, does video show the officer respond to them?	Responded to Subjects Qs
Ch 41.13 P9E	<div></div> Yes No NA - No Video NA - No Qs	
28	Does video show the officer communicate the result of the stop/interaction to the subject (arrest, ticket, etc.)?	Conclusion
	<div></div> Yes No NA - No Video	
29	Does video show the stop was no longer than necessary to take appropriate action?	Stop No Longer than Necessary
CD 181, Ch 1.2.4.1 P20, Ch 1.2.4.3 P8; ; Ch 41.13 P9C	<div></div> Yes No NA - No Video	
	<p>Constitutional law requires that stops are no longer than necessary to carry out the purpose of the stop. See <i>Rodriguez v. United States</i>, 575 U.S. 348, 135 S. Ct. 1609, 191 L. Ed. 2d 492 (2015) ("If an officer can complete traffic-based inquiries expeditiously, then that is the amount of 'time reasonably required to complete [the stop's] mission.' . . . [A] traffic stop 'prolonged beyond' that point is 'unlawful.'").</p>	

## Flag for Academy Training

30 A Would this make a good training video?:

FlagforAcademy

Yes  
No  
No Video

30 B If you are flagging the video for the academy, please identify the exact portion of the video you think the academy should consider using.

FlagforAcademyBWCInfo

30 C If you want to flag this video for Academy, please select your reason(s):

FlagForAcademyReason

Video Shows Exemplary Police Actions  
Video Shows Non-Exemplary Police Actions  
Use of Force Tactics  
Handcuffing  
Arrest and Search  
Other

## EPIC

31 Does this incident involve an EPIC Moment; an officer confronting a peer about what they could do better? (Doing something encouraged by NOPD's EPIC program?)

EPICIncident

Yes  
No  
No Video

If yes please explain, including the video label and the minute of the example:

EPICExplain

## Video Coverage

32 Did each officer who conducted a stop, search, or arrest and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required? And did each supervisor who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?

# of such officers who had complete video (numerator)

CompleteVidNum

/

# of such officers (denominator)

CompleteVidDenom

Ch 41.3.10 P11

List the officers you included in the denominator. And describe any incomplete or missing video.

CompleteVidExplain

## Video Info

33 To help someone review your work, please record below the officer name and BWC ID (usually an Item #) for the best video coverage of the incident. Include minutes if the video is long and the important parts are hard to find. If L3 is critical, please include A# and starting time. If you did not watch all the videos, record the minutes of the videos you watched.

Video Info



# SSAPJ Subject Audit Form

Instructions Identifying Info Subject Info Stop Searches Arrests Miscellaneous Immigration LGBTQ Review

1. Watch as much video as reasonably possible to ensure you have thoroughly reviewed the incident. You must watch video of all the interactions between an officer and a non-employee. You may skip through or fast forward through parts of the video that do not involve interactions with non-employees. If another officer interacts with a non-employee and you cannot see and hear the interaction in the video you are currently watching, you must watch the other officer's video, if it exists. Clearly document the video segments you watch under question 31 - Video Info of the SSA Incident form so that any reviewer knows exactly what video segments you watched and did not watch.

2. Notify your supervisor when:

- It appears officers rely on demographics to establish reasonable suspicion or probable cause for a stop, detention, search, or arrest.
- It appears officers rely on information they know to be materially false to conduct a stop, detention, search, or arrest.
- You observe policy violations that are not captured by your audit results
- Officers' actions are egregious and therefore require prompt intervention

3. Do not discuss this incident with any auditor, peer, or supervisor, until you have thoroughly reviewed the incident.

4. If you do not think this incident involves a stop, search or arrest, please discuss the possible deselection with an auditor or the ARU supervisor. If you decide to deselect, close this form without saving and record the deselection in the deselection log.

\*\*\*Complete this form for each subject stopped, searched, or arrested for every incident in the Stop, Search or Arrest sample. If the subject was not documented in the reports, complete the fields based on your observations.\*\*\*

A stopped subject is:

- a suspect in an investigation with whom an officer is interacting in person
- someone an officer attempts to identify and who is not a victim or witness

Reviewing Auditor

In which sample is this incident?

Enter the Item #

Enter FIC ID

Enter the EPR ID #

Reviewing Auditor

Sample Type

Item Number

FIC ID

EPR ID

Tim Lindsey  
Faith Thornton  
Charmel Peterson  
Betty Johnson  
Michael Sarver  
Matt Segraves

Stop  
Search  
Arrest



What is the reporting year, month, week, district, platoon?

Review Year	Review Month	Week	District	Platoon
2019	Jun	WK1	1	A
2020	Jul	WK2	2	B
2021	Aug	WK3	3	C
2022	Sep	WK4	4	GA
2023	Oct	WK5	5	Promenade
	Nov		6	Mounted
	Dec		8	DWI
	Jan		7	K9
	Feb		ISB	MC1 MC2
	Mar		MSB	VOWS
	Apr		Other	TIGER
	May		SOD	GANG
				Other

### Subject Info

If the subject was not documented in the reports, complete the fields based on your observations.

Subject First

Subject Last

Subject Sex

Male  
Female  
Unknown

Subject Race-Ethnicity

Black/African-American  
White  
Hispanic/Latino  
Asian  
Amer.Ind./Alaskan Nat.  
Unknown

Subject DOB

Event Date

Subject Age

-And-

-Or-

## Subject Stop

<p><b>1 A</b> Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?</p> <p>Ch. 1.2.4.1, Ch 41.13 P10 and others</p> <p>Reasonable Suspicion (Definition)—Articulable facts that, within the totality of the circumstances, lead an officer to reasonably suspect that criminal activity has been or is about to be committed.. The standard for reasonable suspicion is less than probable cause but must be more than a hunch or a subjective feeling.</p> <p>Probable Cause (Definition)—The facts and circumstances known to the officer at the time that would justify a reasonable person in believing the suspect committed or was committing an offense.</p> <p>If this subject was ID'd and was not suspected of any crime (e.g., a passenger in a vehicle who was asked for ID without being suspected of a crime), choose "No-ID'd and NOT a Suspect."</p>	<p>RS/PC to Stop</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 150px;"> <p>Yes - RS</p> <p>Yes - PC</p> <p>No</p> <p>No-ID'd and NOT a Suspect</p> </div>
<p><b>1 B</b> If you chose "No" for 1 A, therefore indicating there was no reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop the subject, please explain:</p> <p>No RS/PC to Stop Comments</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 30px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	
<p><b>2 A</b> Does the report clearly articulate reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?</p> <p>Refer to guidance in 1 A. Additionally, if the officer relied on boilerplate language, choose "No."</p> <p>CD 122, 123, 126, 149; Ch 41.13 P10; Ch 41.12 P12H, Ch 1.9 P14</p> <p>If this subject was ID'd and was not suspected of any crime (e.g., a passenger in a vehicle who was asked for ID without being suspected of a crime), choose "No-ID'd and NOT a Suspect."</p>	<p>RS/PC to Stop in Report</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 100px;"> <p>Yes - RS</p> <p>Yes - PC</p> <p>No</p> <p>No-ID'd and NOT a Suspect</p> <p>No-No FIC/EPR</p> </div>
<p><b>2 B</b> If you chose "No" for 2 A, therefore indicating the officer did not document reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject, please explain:</p> <p>No RS/PC to Stop in Report Comments</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 60px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	
<p><b>3 A</b> If the officer put the subject in handcuffs, did the officer document a reason to handcuff in the FIC?</p> <p>Ch. 1.3.1.1 P25</p> <p>If the FIC checkbox for "Arrest Made" under "Actions Taken" is checked and the video or FIC documents the subject was taken to lock-up, choose "Yes."</p> <p>If an FIC does not exist and one was required per Ch 41.12, choose "No-No FIC."</p> <p>If you chose "Yes," what was the reason for handcuffing documented in the FIC?</p> <p>Reason for Handcuffs Text</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 60px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	<p>Reason for Handcuffs Documented</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 80px;"> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No-No FIC</p> <p>NA-No Handcuffs</p> <p>NA-FIC Not Required</p> </div>

**3 B** If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy? Record compliance with discretionary and mandatory handcuffing requirements separately.

Ch. 1.3.1.1

See Ch. 1.3.1.1 P 12, 13, 22 for guidance. These paragraphs allow an officer to handcuff a subject if one of the following are true:

- the officer intended to book the subject (take to lock-up)
- the subject resisted detention
- the subject posed a safety concern
- the subject posed a flight concern, or
- the subject posed an interference concern.

However, also see P 30-41 for special circumstances under which subjects may not be handcuffed.

If based on your understanding of Ch 1.3.1.1 you think the subject was handcuffed in violation of policy, choose "No" and explain below. If you think the handcuffing was within policy, choose "Yes" and explain below.

Handcuffs Within Policy Comments

Discretionary Handcuffs Within Policy

Yes

No

No Handcuffs

Mandatory Handcuffs Within Policy

Yes

No

No Handcuffs

## Subject Searches

<p><b>4</b> Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?</p> <p>Ch. 1.2.4 P1</p> <p>An officer must have a legal reason to stop a subject and a legal reason to search a subject in order to search a subject.</p> <p>Refer to Ch. 1.2.4 Search and Seizure for more guidance. Discuss the search(es) with an officer if necessary.</p> <p>If a search of a vehicle occurs, most of the time it will make the most sense to include the search on the driver's audit form. There may be scenarios in which it makes more sense to include the search on a passenger's audit form.</p> <p>Please describe the searches conducted on this subject and this subject's property and explain any non-compliance. Hypothetical text: "Vehicle Exception/Pat Down/Consent to Search Person/Search Incident to Arrest. There does not appear to be probable cause to justify the vehicle exception to the warrant requirement."</p> <p>Search Legal Comments</p>	<p>Enter the number of searches conducted on this subject and this subject's property that had a valid legal basis.</p> <p>Search Legal Numerator</p> <input type="text"/> <p>/</p> <p>Enter the number searches conducted on this subject and this subject's property.</p> <p>Search Legal Denominator</p> <input type="text"/>
<p><b>5</b> Does the report document a valid legal basis for every search of this subject?</p> <p>CD 149; Ch 41.12 P12I-L; Ch 1.2.4 P62A; Ch 82.1 P4</p> <p>If the FIC indicates a pat down occurred the justification for the pat down must give specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous.</p> <p>Refer to Ch. 1.2.4 Search and Seizure for more guidance. Discuss the search(es) with an officer if necessary.</p> <p>See guidance above for vehicle searches.</p> <p>Please describe the searches conducted on this subject and this subject's property and explain any non-compliance.</p> <p>Reason to Search in Report Comments</p>	<p>Enter the number of searches conducted on th subject and this subject's property for which th FIC</p> <p>Reason to Search in Report Numerator</p> <input type="text"/> <p>/</p> <p>Enter the number of searches conducted on th subject and this subject's property.</p> <p>Reason to Search in Report Denominator</p> <input type="text"/>

<p>6 If a pat down was correctly indicated, did the officer give specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous in the justification for pat down text box?</p> <p>Ch 41.12 P12J</p> <p>If one of the reasons the officer conducted the pat down was for contraband, choose "No."</p> <p>If you chose "No" for "Justification Specifies Armed and Dangerous," please pick a noncompliant category. Leave blank if you chose "Yes."</p>	<p>PatDownJustification</p> <div> Yes  No  NA-No Pat Down </div> <p>PatDownNotCompliantCat</p> <div> Justification Insufficient  For More Than Weapons  Justification Insufficient &amp; For More than Weapons </div>
<p>7 Was this subject on parole or probation?</p> <p>Use the spreadsheet provided by the corrections department. Search by subject name, demographics, and address.</p>	<p>Search Subject on Probation or Parole</p> <div> Yes  No  Subject Not Searched </div>
<p>8 Was the arrest gist for this subject approved by a supervisor before the subject was booked by the sheriff?</p> <p>[need to verify ability to audit]</p> <p>CD 145; Ch 1.9 P13,49-50</p>	<p>Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking</p> <div> Yes  No  NA-Existing Warrant  Subject Not Arrested </div>
<p>9 Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer have probable cause to arrest this subject?</p> <p>CD 141; Ch 1.9 P1</p> <p>Is at least one charge good? Do you believe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-the officer had a legal reason to stop the subject,</li> <li>-the officer had a legal reason to search the subject, if relevant to the charge,</li> <li>-and the facts and circumstances known to the officer at the time would justify a reasonable person in believing the suspect committed or was committing an offense?</li> </ul> <p>Please explain PC for the arrest or the lack thereof.</p> <p>OfficerHadPCtoArrest Comments</p> <div></div>	<p>OfficerHadPCtoArrest</p> <div> Yes  No  Subject Not Arrested </div>
<p>10 Did the officer clearly document the probable cause in the report (FIC or EPR)? In other words, does the report give the facts and circumstances known to the officer at the time which would justify a reasonable person in believing the suspect committed or was committing an offense?</p> <p>The report must also clearly articulate a legal reason to stop the subject, and a legal reason to search the subject, if a search was relevant to the arrest charge.</p> <p>Ch 1.9 P14; Ch 82.1 P4; Ch 41.12 P15</p> <p>Please explain PC for the arrest or the lack th as articulated in the report</p> <p>PC Clearly Articulated Comments</p> <div></div>	<p>PC Clearly Articulated</p> <div> Yes  No  Subject Not Arrested </div>

### Subject Miscellaneous

- 11 Did the officer use their discretion to give the subject a break?

Just because an officer checks the verbal warning box in the stop result section of the FIC, doesn't mean a break was given. There must be an offense for which the officer chooses not to cite, summons, or arrest.

If the officer gave this subject a break, please explain what officer could have done but decided not to.

Break Given Explain

Break Given

Yes  
No  
No Video  
NA-No Crime

- 12 Did the officer run the subject's ID?:

ID Check

Yes  
No  
No Video  
The Officer did not have a chance to

- 13 Did the officer request translation services, if needed?

LEP

Yes  
No  
No Video  
No Translation Needed  
Flag

- 15 Did the officer give Miranda Rights, If required?

Officers shall advise suspects of their Miranda Rights at the time of arrest or prior to any custodial interrogation. See Chapter: 1.9.1;

Note: Miranda does not apply to roadside questioning of a stopped motorist or a person briefly detained on the street under a Terry stop.

Miranda Given, If Required

Yes  
No  
NA

Previous Page

Next Page

**SUBJECT  
IMMIGRATION**

16 Was the subject arrested because of, or in part due to the subject's immigration status?

StopImmigrationStatus

Find items



17 Was the subject questioned about their immigration status in a manner that was not relevant to the crime in question?

QuestionedImmigrationStatus

Find items



ImmigrationComments

**Subject LGBTQ**

16 Did the officer say something that is possibly offensive about/to LGBTQ individuals?

OfficerCommentLGBTQ

Yes  
No  
No Video

17 Did the officer address the subject by their chosen name, title, and pronoun?

OfficerAddressLGBTQ

Yes  
No  
Gender Identity Unknown  
No Video

LGBTQComments:

#Name?

## SUBJECT EXIT VEHICLE

Did an officer require this subject to exit a vehicle?

Required to Exit Vehicle

Find items



If you chose yes for "Required to Exit Vehicle", did an officer document the justification to require this subject to exit the vehicle in the FIC?

Vehicle Exit Justification Documented

Find items



If you chose yes for Vehicle Exit Justification Documented, is the justification specific to this subject, and/or was a legal vehicle search conducted requiring all occupants to exit the vehicle?

Vehicle Exit Justification Compliant

Find items



If this subject was required to exit a vehicle, pick the option below that best describes the justification:

Vehicle Exit Justification Category

Find items



If you chose Other, please explain

Vehicle Exit Justification Category Other Explanation





## Consent to Search Audit Fo

Instructions	Identifying Info	Subject Info	Audit Criteria	Supervisory Review	Review
<p>1. In the FIC, did the officer accurately check the appropriate boxes to indicate a consent to search occurred?</p> <p>If a consent to search did not occur choose "No - Consent to Search Did Not Occur."</p> <p>If a consent to search occurred but the FIC was not completed correctly choose "No - Consent to Search Occurred, FIC Not Accurate."</p> <p>If a consent to search occurred but an FIC does not exist for the incident choose "No - Consent to Search Occurred, No FIC."</p>			<p>FIC Checked Accurately</p> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No-Consent to Search Did Not Occur-FIC Not Accurate <input type="checkbox"/> No-Consent to Search Occurred, FIC Not Accurate <input type="checkbox"/> No-Consent to Search Occurred, No FIC</div>		
<p>2. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the officer notified a supervisor before he/she conducted a search based on consent? Please provide timestamp of the video.</p> <p>CD 128</p>			<p>Supervisor Notified Before Search Conducted</p> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA-No Video <input type="checkbox"/> NA-Incomplete Video <input type="checkbox"/> Consent to Search Did Not Occur</div>		
<p>3. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the supervisor approved the consent to search before the search was conducted? Please provide timestamp of the video.</p> <p>CD 128</p>			<p>Supervisor Approved Before Search Conducted</p> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No-Approved After <input type="checkbox"/> NA-No Video <input type="checkbox"/> NA-Incomplete Video <input type="checkbox"/> Consent to Search Did Not Occur</div>		
<p>4. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the officer</p>			<p>Officer Informed Subject of His/Her Rights</p>		
<p><a href="#">Submit Record</a></p>			<p>Enter Status <input type="button" value="v"/></p>		
<p>Record: 14 of 42 of 42 <input type="button" value="No Filter"/> Search <input type="button" value="v"/></p>			<p><a href="#">Return to M</a></p>		



## Consent to Search Audit Form

<p>4. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the officer informing the subject of his or her right to refuse and to revoke consent at any time?</p> <p>CD 129</p>		<p>NA-Incomplete Video Consent to Search Did Not Occur</p>
<p>5. If a consent to search occurred, does a Form 146 exist for the consent to search?</p> <p>CD 129</p>		<p>Officer Informed Subject of His/Her Rights</p> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA-No Video <input type="checkbox"/> NA-Incomplete Video <input type="checkbox"/> Consent to Search Did Not Occur</div>
<p>If yes, please help the reviewer find the form by giving the item # of the EPR to which the form is attached, for example.</p>		<p>Form 146 Exists</p> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Consent to Search Did Not Occur</div>
<p>6. If a consent to search occurred, does form 146 include the signature of the person granting consent?</p> <p>CD 131</p>		<p>FindForm</p> <div><input type="text"/></div>
<p>7. If a consent to search occurred, does form 146 include the signature of the officer requesting consent?</p>		<p>Subject Signed Form 146</p> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA-No Form <input type="checkbox"/> NA-Attachments Not Available <input type="checkbox"/> NA-Consent to Search Did Not Occur</div>
<p><a href="#">Submit Record</a></p>		<p>Officer Signed Form 146</p> <div><input type="text"/></div>
<p>Record: 14 of 42 of 42 <input type="button" value="No Filter"/> Search <input type="button" value="v"/></p>		<p>Enter Status <input type="button" value="v"/></p>
		<p><a href="#">Return to Main</a></p>



# Strip and Cavity Search Audit Form

Identifying Info   **Subject Info**   1-4   **Strip (5-14)**   **Cavity (15-18)**   Supervisory Review (19-22)   Review

Pick the auditor that is making this entry?

Created By

Tim Lindsey  
Betty Johnson  
Chelsea Albritton  
Mekensie Maxwell  
Lanitra Lacey  
Reconciled (DB)  
Jessica Jones  
Bianca Harris

From which sample did this incident come from?

Sample Type

Stop  
Search  
Arrest  
Consent Search  
Strip/Cavity  
Probation & Parole

Enter the item number from the sampling spreadsheet.

Item Number

Please attempt to find all related item numbers and list them here.

Related Item Numbers

Please enter the District or Division to which the primary officer is assigned.

District/Division

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

**Submit Record**

Enter Status



**Return to Main**

Please enter the reporting  
Month

Review Month

Jan  
Feb  
Mar  
Apr  
May  
Jun  
Jul  
Aug  
Sep  
Oct  
Nov  
Dec

Please enter the reporting  
year.

Review Year

2020  
2021  
2022  
2023  
2024

**Next Page**

## Subject Info

---

Subject First

Subject Last

Subject Sex

Male

Female

Unknown

Subject Race-Ethnicity

Black/African-American

White

Hispanic/Latino

Asian

Amer.Ind./Alaskan Nat.

Unknown

Subject DOB

-And-

Event Date

-Or-

Subject Age

1 What search type occurred during this incident?

"A strip search is defined as any search of a person that includes the removal or rearrangement of some or all clothing to permit visual inspection of the exterior of the suspect's groin/genital area, buttocks, female breasts, or undergarments covering these areas. A body cavity search is defined as any visual or physical inspection of a person's genital or anal cavities with or without any physical

Search Type

<div>Strip</div> <div>Cavity</div> <div>Both</div>
--

2 Complete Video Exists

Did each officer(s) who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?

Ch. 41.4.1 P10

# of Primary Officers with Complete Video

CompleteVidNum

--

/

# of Primary Officers

CompleteVidDenom

--

Please list the officer you thought to be primary officers and give details on any missing or incomplete video.

CompleteVidExplain

--

If video exists, help the reviewer find the video of the strip or cavity search.

SearchVidDetails

--

If video exists, help the reviewer find the video of the strip or cavity search.

SearchVidDetails

- 3
- Based on the evidence available to you, was there probable cause to conduct the strip or cavity search?
- PC for Search

CD 132

Yes

No

- 4
- In the FIC or EPR or Search Warrant, did the officer articulate probable cause that the subject was concealing a weapon or contraband?
- PC for Search in Report

CD 132

Yes

No

No Report

Previous Page

Next Page

## Strip Search

- 5 If the incident involved a strip search in the field, does the FIC or EPR explain "exigent circumstances where the life of officers or others may be placed at risk"?

CD 132

Strip Field EC

Yes  
No  
No Report  
No Field Strip Search

- 6 If the incident involved a strip search, does video or the report show the officer received approval to conduct the strip search?

CD 133

Strip Supervisor Approved

Yes  
No  
No Strip Search

- 7 If the incident involved a strip search, did the officer receive written approval from a supervisor for the strip search?

Ch. 1.2.4 P 47 A

Strip Supervisor Approved in Writing

Yes  
No  
No Strip Search  
N/A

- 8 If the incident involved a strip search and the officer received approval from a supervisor, does video or the report show the supervisor make the scene?

CD 133

Strip Supervisor Made Scene

Yes  
No  
No Strip Search

<p><b>9</b> If the incident involved a strip search, do reports or video show the minimum number of officers necessary to conduct the strip search?</p> <p>CD 133</p> <p>How many officers were present during the strip search?</p> <p>How many were not necessary? Enter 0 if all were necessary.</p>	<p>Strip Min Officers Necessary</p> <div> <input type="text"/> </div> <p>Yes No No Reports or Video No Strip Search</p> <p>Num Present During Strip</p> <div> <input type="text"/> </div> <p>Num Not Necessary</p> <div> <input type="text"/> </div>
<p><b>10</b> If the incident involved a strip search, did the officer take the necessary steps to identify the subject's identified gender?</p> <p>The officer should say something like "Our policy requires the officer conducting the strip search to be the same gender as the person being searched. To ensure compliance with that policy, should we have a policeman or policewoman conduct the search?"</p> <p>CD 133</p>	<p>Strip Gender Identified</p> <div> <input type="text"/> </div> <p>Yes No No Reports to Video No Strip Search</p>
<p><b>11</b> If the incident involved a strip search, do reports or video show the strip search was performed by officers of the same gender as the identified-gender of the subject?</p> <p>This question corresponds to question 8 above. For example, if the subject informed the officer that a policeman should conduct the search, and all officers conducting the search were male, choose "Yes."</p> <p>If "No " please explain:</p>	<p>Strip Officers Same Gender</p> <div> <input type="text"/> </div> <p>Yes No Unclear No Reports or Video No Strip Search</p>



- 12 If the incident involved a strip search, do reports or video show it was conducted under conditions that provided privacy from all but those authorized to conduct the search?

CD 132

Strip Privacy

Yes  
No  
No Reports or Video  
No Strip Search

- 13 If the incident involved a strip search, does video show it was conducted in a professional manner?

CD 133

Strip Professional

Yes  
No  
No Strip Search

- 14 If the incident involved a strip search, does documentation include a list of the items, if any, recovered during the search and the location on the body where found?

Ch. 1.2.4 P49 H

Strip Location of Evidence Documented

Yes  
No  
No Video  
No Strip Search

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

## Cavity Search

- 15 If the incident involved a cavity search, do reports show it was conducted by medical personnel?

CD 134

Cavity By Medical Personnel

Yes  
No  
No Reports  
No Cavity Search

- 16 If the incident involved a cavity search, do reports show it was conducted by at a medical facility?

Ch. 1.2.4 P52

Cavity At Medical Facility

Yes  
No  
No Reports  
No Cavity Search

- 17 If the incident involved a cavity search, reports show the officer got a search warrant?

CD 134

Cavity Warrant Issued

Yes  
No  
No Reports  
No Cavity Search

- 18 If the incident involved a cavity search, does documentation include a list of the items, if any, recovered during the search and the location on or in the body where found?

Ch. 1.2.4 P55 H

Cavity Location of Evidence Documented

Yes  
No  
No Cavity Search

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

## Supervisory Review

**19** Did you find any non-compliance related to this incident in the sections above?

Non-Compliance Should Have Been Addressed

Yes  
No

**20** The following questions A-E determine whether the supervisor knew or should have known about the non-compliance.

**20 A** Is there non-compliance because there is missing documentation (FIC, EPR, etc)?

Missing Documentation

Yes  
No  
NA-Full Compliance

**20 B** B. Is the non-compliance evident in the report(s) (FICs/EPRs) and the report(s) are approved?

Non-compliance Evident in Approved Reports

If a supervisor needed to watch video to know about the non-compliance, choose "No."

Yes  
No  
NA-Full Compliance

<b>20 C</b>	C. Did a supervisor make the scene and did the non-compliance occur while the supervisor was on scene?	Supervisor On Scene During Non-compliance
		<div><div></div><div>Yes</div><div>No</div><div>NA-Full Compliance</div></div>

<b>20 D</b>	D. Was a supervisor required to watch the video?	Supervisor Required to Watch Video
	Supervisors are required to watch videos if one or more of the following occurred: a use of force, someone was injured, a complaint was made or an officer told a supervisor that he/she thinks a complaint may be made, a vehicle pursuit, or an officer terminated his/her video early to protect the privacy of an individual.	<div><div></div><div>Yes</div><div>No</div><div>NA-Full Compliance</div></div>

<b>20 E</b>	E. Did the supervisor watch the video?	Supervisor Reviewed Video
	Review the audit trail for the videos in Evidence.com	<div><div></div><div>Yes</div><div>No</div></div>

<b>20 F</b>	F. Did a supervisor know or should have known about the non-compliance?	Supervisor Aware or Should Have Been Aware of Non-compliance
	Choose "Yes" if any of A-E are "Yes."	<div><div></div></div>

<b>21</b>	Please list the SFLIDs for any corresponding SFLs or Control numbers for any corresponding FDIs?	SFLIDs-CNTRL Nos
		<div></div>

<b>22</b>	Did a supervisor address all the non-compliance you found above?	Non-Compliance Addressed by Supervisor
	CD 144, 146, 151	<div><div></div><div>Yes</div><div>No</div></div>

If a corresponding SFL or FDI exists but does not cover all non-compliance, please explain:

Supervisory Review Comments

Auditor Comments

Reviewer Comments

**Previous Page**

**First Page**

---

## **Appendix B – Report Distribution**

---

Superintendent

Chief Deputy Superintendent Field Operations Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Public Integrity Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Management Services Bureau City Attorney Sunni

City Attorney's Office

Assistant City Attorney