



Use of Force Audit Report August 2025 (Final)

Report # UOF082025
(Data Sample – Jan 2025 – Jun 2025)

Submitted by PSAB: August 20, 2025
Response from FOB: September 18, 2025
Final Report Submitted: September 23, 2025

Previous Report Date: February 24, 2025

Audit Team

This audit was managed and conducted by the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Executive Summary

The Audit and Review Section (ARS) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB) initiated a Use of Force Audit in August 2025. The audit universe covered the period from January 1 to June 30, 2025. This audit is conducted to ensure that New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) officers' "Use of Force" and follow-up investigations are conducted in accordance with the rights secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States. NOPD agrees to ensure that audits are conducted professionally and effectively, to elicit accurate and reliable information.

This process is regulated by Consent Decree (CD) paragraphs 54, 56, 67, 78, 79, 81, 86, 87, and 88. Also, Chapter 1.3.6 Reporting Use of Force, Chapter 1.7.1 Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW), Chapter 41.3.8 In Car Camera, Chapter 41.3.10 BWC.

This audit was conducted on the following levels of force using the Use of Force Protocol:

- Level 1-4 Use of Force. The L1-L4 audit addresses twenty-eight (28) checklist questions.
- Unreported Use of Force. The Unreported Use of Force addresses four (4) checklist questions.

For report clarity, the levels of reported use of force as defined in Chapter 1.3.6, paragraph 10, are listed on page 7 of report.

Number of non-compliant L1-L4 Checklist Questions (5):

- Q4:** BWC's Complete (BWCs Found/BWCs Expected) - **(93%)**
Q19: Supervisor's UoF Investigation Submitted within 72 hrs. or Extension Requested (L1-L4) – **(93%)**
Q20: Supervisor's UoF Extension Request Sent to Division Captain (L1-L4) – **(92%)**
Q21: Supervisor's approved use of force report submitted to FIT within the required 21 Days from Incident Date– **(48%)**
Q32: Officer Force Statement(s) Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4) – **(86%)**

Number of non-compliant L4 – OIS (Officer Involved Shooting) or ASI (Administrative Shooting Investigation) Checklist Questions: (None audited this period)

Number of Non-Compliant Unreported Use of Force Questions: None (0)

Universe Used to Create L1-L2 Sample **(193)**

Universe Used to Create L3 Sample **(6)**

Universe Used to Create L4 Sample **(4)**

Universe Used to Create Unreported Use of Force Sample **(350)**

L1-L4 (Non-OIS/ASI) Sample Target to Audit (60):

The sample target represented 25% of available L1-L2 entries (53)

The sample target represented 50% of available L3 entries (3)
The sample target represented 100% of available L4 entries (4)

Unreported Use of Force Sample Target to Audit (314):

The sample target represented 90% of available Unreported Use of Force entries.

Scores of 95% or higher are considered substantial compliance. Supervisors should address any noted deficiencies with specific training through In-service Training classes or Daily Training Bulletins (DTBs). This training should be reinforced by close and effective supervision in addition to Supervisor Feedback Logs entries.

The overall score of the Use of Force L1-L4 Audit is as follows: Overall – **95%**

The overall score of the Unreported Use of Force Audit is as follows: Overall – **100%**

The overall score of the Use of Force Review Board (UFRB) meeting reviews: Overall – **100%**

More detailed results are embedded in the Scorecards and Conclusion sections.

Table of Contents (Phase I)

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	5
Initiating and Conducting the Use of Force Audit	8
List of Case Files Reviewed by Auditor	10
Use of Force Scorecard Table 1 (L1-4).....	11
Use of Force Scorecard Table 2 (L4 ASI-Shooting)	13
Unreported Use of Force Scorecard Table 3	14
Case File Reviews – Table 1 Checklist (L1-4).....	15
Case File Reviews – Table 2 Checklist (L4 ASI).....	19
Unreported Use of Force – Results	20
Use of Force Review Board (UFRB) Checklist	19
Compliance Score	23
<i>Final Results</i>	23
Conclusions (Final)	24
Recommendations.....	25
Use of Force Responses & PSAB Notes:.....	26
Appendix C – Report Distribution	32

Introduction

The Auditing and Review Section (ARS) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted an audit of Use of Force Level 1 to 4 incidents. The time span to conduct the audit was from January 7, 2025, to January 31, 2025. Audits, which involve reviews of the Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB) meetings and subsequent follow-up, are conducted after each scheduled meeting, and will be reported in a separate report at year-end.

Purpose

The Use of Force audit is conducted to verify departmental compliance with the Consent Decree and NOPD Operations Manual as it pertains to “Use of Force” and the subsequent investigations. Consent Decree (CD) paragraphs include 54, 56, 67, 78, 79, 81, 86, 87, and 88. The following are the NOPD Policy Chapters involved:

Chapter 1.3.6 Reporting Use of Force

Chapter 1.7.1 Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW)

Chapter 41.3.8 In Car Camera

Chapter 41.3.10 BWC

Scope

This audit assesses and documents whether the force employed by New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) officers is documented and recorded properly, and whether supervisors conducted thorough follow-up investigations. Once the review is completed, the audit manager will submit a report to the Deputy Chief of Field Operations Bureau (FOB), and the Captain of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB) pointing out any deficiencies or confirming a thorough investigation. These audit reports will assist in ensuring officers and supervisors are informed of where opportunities for improvement exist as it relates to the proper reporting and documentation of Use of Force investigations in the future. A “final report” will also be sent to the appropriate monitor from the OCDM. The audit assesses the following aspects of officer and supervisor’s responsibilities:

- Whether involved officers appropriately complied with pre-use-of-force requirements (e.g., de-escalation, warnings)
- Whether audited uses of force are consistent with policy and law
- Whether involved officers appropriately complied with post-use-of-force requirements (e.g., immediate notifications, provision of medical aid)
- Whether the involved officers and witness officers completed required reports
- Whether supervisors responded to the scene of uses of force, when required
- Whether supervisors appropriately investigated uses of force, including reviews of available recordings
- Whether supervisors appropriately reviewed use-of-force reports
- Whether the chain of command appropriately reviewed use-of-force reports
- Whether potentially out-of-policy uses of force resulted in referral to Public Integrity Bureau
- Whether the Use of Force Review Board appropriately evaluated serious use of force incidents.

Methodology

Population source – IAPro Force Investigation Team (FIT) Incident List (NOPD source file)

Sample size – 25% of Level 1 and 2, 50% of Level 3 incidents, 100% of Level 4 incidents.

Documentation to be reviewed – All documents and investigative material contained within each individual FIT file, as well as associated police reports.

BWC/Video/Audio to be reviewed – All associated video footage for involved and/or witness officers, as well as Use of Force investigative rank, as needed to corroborate the written reports and statements.

Testing Instrument(s) – New Orleans Police Department Operations Manual Chapters and thirty-two (32) L1-L4 Checklist questions and twenty-six (26) L4 Shooting (ASI) Checklist questions.

Each individual incident file will be audited in its entirety via “double-blind” auditing process by two (2) members of the Auditing and Review Section (ARS), to give a reliable and thorough review of each use of force incident.

Data

The audit range can be set quarterly (3 months) or semi-annually (6 months). This review encompassed a period of six (6) months. The FIT IAPro system file dump provides the ARS team with all item numbers that were investigated and completed during that audit period. ARS then takes those item numbers and enters EXCEL’s randomizer generator for items to be selected for review. ARS then reviews 25% of the L1-L2 items, 50% of the L3 items and all L4 (if any exist), within the audit range.

The use of force audit’s sample size consisted of **53** randomly selected L1-L2 case files, **3** L-3 case files, **4** L-4 case files, for a total of **60** auditable incidents. In addition, **351** report files were selected to be audited for potential unreported use of force. The use of force sample is derived using EXCEL’s “RAND” function and using a weighted count from each district to parse the sample equitably. The raw data for both samples used was for the period of July to December of 2024.

The unreported use of force data is comprised of **4** separate data dumps from the EPR (Electronic Police Reports) data system.

- EPR dump of reports where an **officer was injured** for the audit range selected for review.
- EPR dump of reports where a **suspect was injured** for the same audit range.
- EPR dump of reports where **injury in custody** is reported for the same audit range.
- EPR dump reports of **resisting arrest** for the same audit range.

Each report from the dumps is reviewed for information where an action might have led to a use of force. The auditor will first check the Blue Team/IAPro system to see if the report had a reported use of force. Also, if the auditor determines there might be an unreportable use of force, the video

is then reviewed as well. Any potential use of force identified as unreported will be noted in the report and sent to the district for further review and if necessary, will proceed with a formal disciplinary investigation.

Initiating and Conducting the Use of Force Audit

The initial raw data was downloaded from the IAPro system on July 29, 2025, to prep the sample distribution file that would be utilized by ARS, for the current audit.

During this audit prep, the sample was then parsed and distributed to the assigned auditors for initial review of allocation count in preparation for the audit.

Each item case file was then systematically reviewed via “double-blind” audit process by the Auditing and Review Section, based on each case file’s compliance with the New Orleans Police Department Operations Manual Chapters, as it relates to “Use of Force” investigations. To facilitate this process, the team used the twenty-eight (28) point Use of Force audit checklist from the protocol document, as the tool to review and analyze the content of every case file.

Levels of Reported Use of Force Definitions:

- Level-1 uses of force include pointing a firearm at a person and hand control or escort techniques (e.g., elbow grip, wrist grip, or shoulder grip) applied as pressure point compliance techniques that are not reasonably expected to cause injury; takedowns that do not result in actual injury or complaint of injury; and use of an impact weapon for non-striking purposes (e.g., prying limbs, and moving or controlling a person) that does not result in actual injury or complaint of injury. It does not include escorting, touching, or handcuffing a person with minimal or no resistance.
- Level-2 uses of force include use of a CEW (including where a CEW is fired at a person but misses); the use of “flash bangs” and “aerial flash bangs” to compel compliance from an unwilling subject (see paragraph 71(c)); a canine deployment resulting in an apprehension without contact and force that causes or could reasonably be expected to cause an injury greater than transitory pain but does not rise to a Level 3 use of force.
- Level 3 uses of force include any strike to the head (except for a strike with an impact weapon); use of impact weapons when contact is made (except to the head), regardless of injury; a canine deployment resulting in an apprehension contact or that is not a bite or the destruction of an animal.
- Level 4 uses of force include all ‘serious uses of force’ including: (a) All uses of lethal force by an NOPD officer; (b) All critical firearm discharges by an NOPD officer. (c) All uses of force by an NOPD officer result in serious physical injury or requiring hospitalization. (d) All neck holds; (e) All uses of force by an NOPD officer resulting in a loss of consciousness. (f) All canine bites; (g) More than two applications of a CEW on an individual during a single interaction, regardless of the mode or duration of the application, and whether the applications are by the same or different officers, or CEW application for 15 seconds or longer, continuous, or consecutive. (h) Any strike, blow, kick, CEW application, or similar use of force against a handcuffed subject; and (i) Any vehicle pursuit resulting in death, serious physical injury, or injuries requiring

hospitalization. (j) Any use of specialized weapons, such as gas dispersants, the use of “flash bangs” and “aerial flash bangs” or impact rounds for the purposes of crowd control (See Chapter 46.2.1 – Response to First Amendment Assemblies, Mass Demonstrations, and Civil Disturbances), including the munitions listed Chapter 46.2.1) app E.

List of Case Files Reviewed

The following is a breakdown of the case files by auditors that conducted each “double-blind” review:

L1-L3 (Table 1)

Auditor 1 & Auditor 2 (7)
Auditor 3 & Auditor 4 (5)
Auditor 3 & Auditor 1 (3)
Auditor 4 and Auditor 5 (3)
Auditor 4 & Auditor 2 (4)
Auditor 6 & Auditor 10 (10)
Auditor 5 & Auditor 7 (8)
Auditor 8 & Auditor 9 (9)
Auditor 9 & Auditor 2 (2)
Auditor 7 & Auditor 8 (1)
Auditor 7 & Auditor 1 (1)
Auditor 3 & Auditor 4 (1)
Auditor 10 & Auditor 8 (1)
Auditor 6 & Auditor 7 (1)

Total: (56) L1–L3 Case Files

L4 – Table 1 (Non-ASI)

Auditor 1 & Auditor 5 (1)
Auditor 10 Jr & Auditor 8 (1)
Auditor 3 & Auditor 9 (1)
Auditor 2 & Auditor 7 (1)

Total: (4) L4 Case Files

Use of Force Scorecard Table 1 (L1-4)

The following checklist below was used by the auditing team to review each L1-L3 and L4 non-shooting case files.

Use of Force Level 1 - 4 Checklist Audit (Table 1)

Report Period: August, 2025

ARS percentages for Consent Decree requirements for Use of Force Level 1-4 Checklist Audit for data reviewed between Jan - Jun 2025.

Check-List Questions	Score	Y	N	U	NA	NA Explanations	Consent Decree #	NOPD Policy Chapters	
USE OF FORCE REPORTING									
1	Supervisor Responded to the Incident (L2-L4)	100%	19	0	0	41	41 were N/A (not applicable) where supervisors are not required to make scene for L-1 events. (34 supervisors did make scene when not required)	84, 86(a)	Ch 1.3.6 p25, Ch. 1.7.1 p77, p80, p90
2	Incidents Where BWC was Activated Per Policy (L1-L4) (Information Only)		48	6	0	6	6 were N/A (not applicable). 3 N/As were paid detail (no BWC worn); 2 NA officer working admin at time. 1 BCW is not assigned to the detective not wearing BWC	Ch 41.3.10	Ch 41.3.10 p11
3	BWC was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor (L2-L4)	100%	46	0	0	14	14 were N/A (not applicable). 2 NAs were admin officers (no BWC worn); 3 NA paid detail (No BWC worn). 1 NA a detective as involved and they are not assigned body worn cameras. 5 NA Not L2-L4; 3 NA missing BWC;	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 41.3.10 p35
4	BWC's Complete (BWCs Complete Found/BWCs Complete Expected)	93%	129	9				Ch 41.3.10	Ch 41.3.10 p11
5	Dash Cam (In Car Camera) was Activated Per Policy (L1-L4)	97%	37	1	0	22	22 were N/A (not applicable). 22 - NA dashcams not relevant to the viewing of the use of force; not in sight of incident.	Ch 41.3.8	Ch 41.3.8 p14
6	Dash Cam (In Car Camera) was Reviewed by Supervisor (L2-L4)	100%	30	0	0	30	30 were N/A (not applicable) 30 -NA Not L2/L3 Not required.	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p33
7	BWCS Labelled Correctly	96%	51	2	0	7	6 were N/A (not applicable) no footage. 1 mislabeled	86(d)	Ch 41.3.10 p35
8	If CEW was Activated, it was within Policy (L2-L4)	100%	6	0	0	54	54 were N/A (not applicable) 54 NA- Not a CEW related incident.	54	Ch 1.3.6 p28, p33
9	CEW was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor, if Activated (L2-L4)	100%	6	0	0	54	54 NA - Non-CEW related.	67	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 1.7.1 p 91, p104, p106, p113
10	Officer was Checked For Injuries (L2-L4)	100%	23	0	0	37	37 were N/A (not applicable). 37 NA Not L2-L4;	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p28, p33
11	Photograph(s) taken of Officer Injuries, if applicable (L2-L4)	100%	10	0	0	50	50 were N/A (not applicable) 50 NA - No officer injuries.	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 1.7.1 p107(c), p79, p80
12	Subject of Force was Checked For Injuries (L2-L4)	100%	25	0	0	35	35 were N/A (not applicable) 33 NA Not L2-L4; 2 NA Subject not injured.	86(a)	Ch 1.3.6 p24, Ch. 1.7.1, p74, p78, p84
13	Photograph(s) taken of Subject of Force Injuries, if applicable (L1-L4)	100%	21	0	0	39	39 were N/A (not applicable). 35 NA - No injuries of subject. 4 Other	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 1.7.1 p107(c), p79, p80
14	Subject of Force Interviewed (L2-L4)	100%	25	0	0	35	35 were N/A (not applicable). 35 NA L1 only	86(a)	Ch 1.3.6 p28
15	Subject of Force Interview Exists (Recorded) (L2-L4)	100%	22	0	0	38	38 were N/A (not applicable). 35 NA L1 only	86(a)	Ch 1.3.6 p28
16	Supervisor Avoided Leading Questions (L2-L4)	100%	20	0	0	40	40 were N/A (not applicable) due to supervisor interview unavailable due to no recording of interview/interview not required for L1	86(f)	Ch 1.3.6 p24
17	Canvass for Civilian Witness(es) was Made (L2-L4)	100%	16	0	0	44	44 were N/A (not applicable). Of the total number of NAs, 38 were Not L2-L4	86(e)	Ch 1.3.6 p24, Ch. 1.7.1 p. 82
18	Supervisor GIST Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4)	97%	58	2	0	0	None	87	Ch 1.3.6 p28, Ch. 1.3 p21(e), Ch. 1.7.1 p45
19	Supervisor's UoF Investigation Submitted within 72 hrs or Extension Requested (L1-L4)	93%	53	4	0	3	4 NA - Investigated by FIT directly.	88	Ch 1.3.6 p32
20	Supervisor's UoF Extension Request Sent to Division Captain (L1-L4)	92%	45	4	1	10	12 were N/A (not applicable) due to no extension request being made for the use of force report	88	Ch 1.3.6 p32
21	Supervisor's approved use of force report submitted to FIT within the required 21 Days from Incident Date:	48%	27	29	0	4	4 was N/A (not applicable) due to the use of force being considered a Level 4 and the incident was handled by FIT.	89	Ch 1.3.6 p32
22	Reasonableness of Force was Documented (L1-L4)	100%	60	0	0	0	None	88(a)	Ch 1.3.6 p31, Ch. 1.7.1 p5, p46
23	Equip, Training or Policy Issues were Addressed by Supervisor (L1-L4)	98%	59	1	0	0	None	86(c), 88(a,d,e)	Ch 1.3.6 p28, p33
FORCE STATEMENTS									
24	Force Statement(s) Found (L1-L4)	100%	60	0	0	0		78, 81	Ch 1.3.6 p16, p18
25	Reason(s) for Encounter Documented in Force Statement(s) (L1-L4)	100%	60	0	0	0	None	78	Ch 1.3.6 p16, Ch. 1.7.1, p36
26	Force Details Documented (L1-L4)	100%	60	0	0	0	None	78	Ch 1.3.6 p16, Ch. 1.7.1, p36
27	Report established officer had reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop subject:	100%	59	0	0	1	1 NA mental commitment	122/123	Ch 1.2.4.1 p12
28	CEW force statements consistent w/videos (L2-L4)	100%	6	0	0	54	54 were N/A. 54 NA - Non-CEW related	67	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 1.7.1 p 91, p104, p106, p113
29	Each CEW cycle was Justified within Policy, if Activated (L2-L4)	100%	6	0	0	54	54 were N/A. 54 NA - Non-CEW related	56	Ch 1.3.6 p31, Ch. 1.7.1, p53, p57
30	# CEW cycles explained in force statement / Total # CEW cycles	100%	11	0				57	Ch 1.3.6 p31, Ch. 1.7.1, p53, p57
31	Boilerplate Language was avoided in Force Statement(s) (L1-L4)	100%	60	0	0	0	None	79	Ch 1.3.6 p17
32	Officer Force Statement(s) Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4)	86%	50	8	0	2	2 NA extension given	78	Ch 1.3.6 p6, p19
	Total	95%	1,160	60	1	668			

General Comments

ARU audited the Use of Force Level 1-4 sample list case files for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

For an explanation of the procedures and scoring system for this review, see the associated "Protocol" document.

For a list of relevant policies, contact ARU as needed.

For the audit results for each case file, see the accompanying RawData spreadsheets.

Scores below 95% are highlighted in red.

Use of Force Level 1 -4 Checklist Audit By District

Report Period: August 2025

ARU percentages for Consent Decree requirements for Use of Force Level 1-4 Checklist Audit for data reviewed between Jan - Jun 2025.

Check-List Questions	District/Unit								SOD	FIT	Overall Score	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Use of Force Reporting												
1	Supervisor Responded to the Incident (L2-L4)	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2	Incidents Where BWC was Activated Per Policy (L1-L4) (Information Only)	8/9	3/5	3/3	4/4	4/5	8/9	6/6	7/7	2/2	3/3	48/54
3	BWC was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor (L2-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
4	BWC's Complete (BWCs Complete Found/BWCs Complete Expected)	92%	67%	100%	100%	80%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93%
5	Dash Cam (In Car Camera) was Activated Per Policy (L1-L4)	89%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	97%
6	Dash Cam (In Car Camera) was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor (L2-L4)	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%
7	BWC'S Labelled Correctly	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	100%	86%	100%	-	96%
8	If CEW was Activated, it was within Policy (L2-L4)	-	-	100%	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	100%
9	CEW was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor, if Activated (L2-L4)	-	-	100%	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	100%
10	Officer was Checked For Injuries (L2-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
11	Photograph(s) taken of Officer Injuries, if applicable (L2-L4)	-	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%
12	Subject of Force was Checked For Injuries (L2-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
13	Photograph(s) taken of Subject of Force Injuries, if applicable (L1-L4)	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
14	Subject of Force Interviewed (L2-L4)	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
15	Subject of Force Interview Exists (Recorded) (L2-L4)	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
16	Supervisor Avoided Leading Questions (L2-L4)	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
17	Canvass for Civilian Witness(es) was Made (L2-L4)	100%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%
18	Supervisor GIST Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4)	78%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%
19	Supervisor's UoF Investigation Submitted within 72 hrs or Extension Requested(L1-L4)	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%	93%
20	Supervisor's UoF Extension Request Sent to Division Captain (L1-L4)	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	89%	-	100%	92%
21	Supervisor's approved use of force report submitted to FIT within the required 21 Days from Incident Date:	22%	20%	50%	100%	100%	40%	71%	11%	100%	-	48%
22	Reasonableness of Force was Documented (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
23	Equip, Training or Policy Issues were Addressed by Supervisor (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%	98%
Force Statements												
24	Force Statement(s) Found (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
25	Reason(s) for Encounter Documented in Force Statement(s) (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
26	Force Details Documented (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
27	Report established officer had reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop subject:	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
28	CEW force statements consistent w/videos (L2-L4)	-	-	100%	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	100%
29	Each CEW cycle was Justified within Policy, if Activated (L2-L4)	-	-	100%	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	100%
30	# CEW cycles explained in force statement / Total # CEW cycles	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	-	100%	100%
31	Boilerplate Language was avoided in Force Statement(s) (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
32	Officer Force Statement(s) Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4)	78%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	83%	80%	100%	50%	86%
	Total	88%	92%	98%	100%	96%	96%	98%	93%	95%	99%	95%

General Comments

ARU audited the Use of Force Level 1-4 sample list case files for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

For an explanation of the procedures and scoring system for this review, see the associated "Protocol" document.

For a list of relevant policies, contact ARU as needed.

For the audit results for each case file, see the accompanying RawData spreadsheets.

Scores below 95% are highlighted in red.

Use of Force Scorecard Table 2 (L4 ASI-Shooting)

The Audit and Review team audited no L4 shootings during this audit period.

Unreported Use of Force Scorecard Table 3

The following checklist below was used by the auditing team to review each unreported use of force case file.

Of the 350 items in the universe, 314 required further review and none were determined to be unreported uses of force, 21 were deemed reportable use of force with associated FTNs, 289 were deemed no use of force (NA), and 4 were outside agency involved (NA).

Use of Force - Un-Reported

Report Period: August 2025

ARS percentages for Consent Decree requirements for Un-Reported Use of Force Checklist Audit.

Sample Period: Jan - Jul 2025

Check-List Questions	Score	Y	N	U	NA
1 BWC Located for Incident	100%	21			293
4 BWC Reflected a Use of Force	100%	21	-	-	293
5 Use of Force Reported	100%	21	-	-	293
6 EPR reflected a Use of Force	100%	21	-	-	293
Total	100%	84	-	-	1,268

General Comments:

ARS assessed the Unreported use of force for items for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

For an explanation of the procedures and scoring system for this review, see the associated "Protocol" document.

For a list of relevant policies, contact ARU as needed.

Data was retrieved from the following EPR categories: Injuries in Custody, Resisting Arrest, Police Injured, Suspect Injured.

For the assessment results for each case file, see the accompanying RawData spreadsheets.

Worksheet (Jan - Jun 2025)

Types of Injuries Audited	Universe	# Cross-Referenced to UoF Tracker	# Reviewed by Auditors	# Reviewed that Showed No UoF	# Reviewed UoF (Was Reported per IAPro)	# Reviewed Unreported UoF	# Non-NOPD UoF	Comments
Injuries In Custody - EPR	23	8	15	11	4	0	0	
Resisting Arrest - EPR	8	1	7	2	5	0	0	
Police Injured - EPR	21	6	15	14	1	0	0	
Suspect Injured - EPR	298	21	277	262	11	0	4	LCMC, Harbor
Total	350	36	314	289	21	0	4	

Case File Reviews – Table 1 Checklist (L1-4)

The listed information below reveals the outcome of the Audit Team’s table 1 checklist reviews.

1. **Did the supervisor respond to the incident, if required?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 19 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 41 were N/A (not applicable) where supervisors are not required to make scene for L-1 events.
2. **Was the BWC activated per policy? Information Only (See Q4).** Of the 60 cases reviewed, 48 were audited as positive, 6 were negative, and 6 were N/A (not applicable). 3 N/As were paid detail (no BWC worn); 2 NA (Officer on Admin); 1 BWC is detective not wearing BWC.
3. **Was the BWC reviewed by supervisor as required?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 46 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 14 were N/A (not applicable). 14 were N/A (not applicable). 2 NAs were admin officers (no BWC worn); 3 NA paid details (No BWC worn). 1 NA a detective as involved, and they are not assigned body worn cameras. 5 NA Not L2 –L4; 3 NA missing BWC.
4. **BWCs Complete: BWCs Found: / BWCs Expected:** The overall score for this category was **93%**. Of the 138 BWC’s expected, 129 were audited as positive (BWC’s found), 9 were negative (BWC’s missing). None were N/A (not applicable).
5. **Was the Dash Cam activated per policy?** The overall score for this category was revised to **97%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 37 were audited as positive, 1 negative, and 22 were N/A (not applicable). 22 - NA dashcams not relevant to the viewing of the use of force; not in sight of incident.
6. **Was the dash cam reviewed by supervisor?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 30 were audited as positive, and 30 were N/A (not applicable) 30 -NA Not L2/L3 Not required.
7. **Were the BWCs labelled correctly?** The overall score for this category was **96%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 51 were audited as positive, 2 were negative, and 7 were N/A (not applicable) no footage.
8. **If CEW was activated, was it within policy?** The overall score for this category was **100%** Of the 60 cases reviewed, 6 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 54 were N/A (not applicable) 54 NA- Not a CEW related incident.
9. **Was CEW reviewed by supervisor, if activated?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 6 were audited positive, none were negative and 54 were N/A. 54 NA - Non-CEW related.

10. **Was the officer checked for injuries (L2-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 23 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 37 were N/A (not applicable). 37 NA Not L2-L4.
11. **Was photograph(s) taken of officer Injuries, if occurred?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 10 were audited as positive, none were negative and 50 were N/A (not applicable) 40 NA - No officer injuries.
12. **Was the subject of force checked for injuries?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 25 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 35 were N/A (not applicable) 33 NA Not L2-L4; 2 NA Subject not injured.
13. **Was photograph(s) taken of subject of force injuries, if occurred?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 21 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 39 were N/A (not applicable). 35 NA - No injuries of subject.
14. **Was the subject of Force Interviewed?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 25 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 35 were N/A (not applicable). 35 NA L1 only.
15. **Does the subject of force interview exist?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 22 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 38 were N/A (not applicable). 35 NA L1 only
16. **Did the supervisor avoid leading questions (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 20 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 40 were N/A (not applicable) due to supervisor interview unavailable due to no recording of interview/interview not required for L1.
17. **A canvass for civilian witnesses was conducted, if applicable (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 16 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 44 were N/A (not applicable). Of the total number of NA's, 38 were Not L2-L4.
18. **Was the supervisor GIST submitted by end of the tour of duty (ETOD)?** The overall score for this category was **97%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 58 were audited as positive, 2 were negative.
19. **Was the supervisor's UoF investigation submitted within 72 hrs. of incident (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **93%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 53 were audited as positive, 4 were negative, 3 were N/A (not applicable) PIB took over.
20. **Was the supervisor's UoF investigation extension request sent to division captain (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **92%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 45 were audited as positive, 4 were negative, 10 were N/A (not applicable) due to no extension request being made for the use of force. 1 unknown.

21. **Was the supervisor's UoF report submitted to FIT within the required 21 days from Incident Date?** The overall score for this category was **48%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 27 were audited as positive, 29 were negative, and 4 were N/A (not applicable) due to the use of force being considered a Level 4 and the incident was handled by FIT.
22. **Was the reasonableness of force documented (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 60 were audited as positive, none were negative.
23. **Were Equip, Training or Policy Issues addressed by supervisor (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **98%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 59 were audited as positive, 1 was negative, none were N/A.
24. **Were the required force statement(s) found?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 60 were audited as positive, none were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).
25. **Were the reason(s) for encounter documented in force statement(s)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 60 were audited as positive, none were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).
26. **Were the force details documented in the statement(s)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 60 were audited as positive, none were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).
27. **Did the report establish that the officer had reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop the subject?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 60 were audited as positive, none were negative.
28. **Were the CEW force statements consistent with the videos?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 6 were audited positive, none were negative and 54 were N/A. 54 NA - Non-CEW related
29. **Was each CEW cycle justified within policy, if discharged?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 6 were audited positive, none were negative, and 54 were N/A. 54 NA - Non-CEW related.
30. **CEW Cycles Explained: Number of CEW cycles explained in force statement / Total number of CEW cycles:** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, there were 11 explained cycles.
31. **Was boilerplate language avoided in force statement(s)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 60 were audited as positive, none were audited as negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).

32. **Were officers force statement(s) submitted by ETOD?** The overall score for this category was **86%**. Of the 60 cases reviewed, 50 were audited as positive, 8 were negative and 2 were N/A (not applicable).

Case File Reviews – Table 2 Checklist (L4 ASI)

The below listed information reveals the outcome of the Audit Team’s table 2 checklist reviews. This table is primarily intended to cover police shootings, and not non-shooting events. However, for purposes of the audit, it was decided to review all L4 using the checklist. Most will be non-applicable if not related to a shooting. Per FIT, all L4 non-shooting events can be audited using the L1-L4 checklist, with FIT as the investigator, not the district.

Please note: There were no Level 4 Police Shootings audited during this period.

Unreported Use of Force – Results

The listed information below reveals the outcome of the Audit Team’s table 3 checklist reviews.

This audit was conducted using the three Use of Force randomized lists from the Use of Force Protocol for the audit period selected:

- List of EPR reports where an officer was identified as injured.
- List of EPR reports where a suspect was identified as injured.
- List of EPR reports where suspect injured in custody.
- List of EPR reports of where a subject was identified as resisting arrest.

Number of Reports Where an Officer was Injured – 21 (universe)

- Number of Reports where an officer was injured which did not have an associated FTN – Fifteen **(15)**
- Of the 15 Officer remaining injured reports, none **(0)** were determined to be Unreported; one **(1)** were cross-referenced with a Reported (FTN), none **(0)** were determined to be outside agency involved, fourteen **(14)** were determined to have no use of force involved

Number of Reports Resisting Arrest – 8 (universe)

- Number of Reports where resisting arrests which did not have an associated FTN – seven (7)
- Of the seven **(7)** remaining Resisting Arrests reports none **(0)** were determined to be Unreported; two **(5)** were cross-referenced with a Reported (FTN), two **(2)** were determined to have no use of force involved, none **(0)** were determined to be outside agency involved.

Number of Reports of Injuries in Custody – 23 (universe)

- Number of Reports where a suspect was injured and in custody which did not have an associated FTN – fifteen **(15)**
- Of the fifteen **(15)** remaining Injuries in Custody reports none **(0)** were determined to be Unreported; four **(4)** were cross-referenced with a Reported (FTN), eleven **(11)** were determined to have no use of force involved.

Number of Reports of Suspect Injured – 298 (universe)

- Number of Reports where a suspect was injured which did not have an associated FTN - two-hundred and seventy-seven **(277)**
- Of the two-hundred and seventy-seven **(277)** remaining Suspect Injured reports none **(0)** were determined to be Unreported; eleven **(11)** were cross-referenced with a Reported (FTN), two-hundred and eighty **(262)** were determined to have no use of force involved, four **(4)** to be outside agency involved.

Scores of 95% or higher are considered substantial compliance. Supervisors should address any noted deficiencies with specific training through In-service Training classes or Daily Training

Bulletins (DTBs). This training should be reinforced by close and effective supervision in addition to Supervisor Feedback Logs entries. The overall score of the unreported Use of Force Audit is as follows: Overall – **100%**.

Use of Force Review Board Checklist – Jan 2025 – Jun 2025

Recommendations

It is determined by the Auditing and Review Section that there are no deficiencies in the UOFRB process currently.

Use of Force Review Board Meeting Assessment

ARS percentages for Consent Decree requirements for Use of Force Checklist Audit.

Review Period: Aug 2025

Sample Period: Jan 2025 - Jun 2025

Check-List Questions			Score	Y	N	U	NA
1	Voting Members Were Present As Required.	100%	5	-	-	-	-
2	Non-Voting Members Were Present As Required (or appointed stand-in as needed).	100%	5	-	-	-	-
3	Secretary of Board Was Present (or appointed stand-in as needed).	100%	5	-	-	-	-
4	Secretary of Board Reported Out Any Pending Action(s) from Previous Board Meeting, if applicable.	100%	5	-	-	-	-
5	This UOFRB Meeting Convened within 30 Days of the Last Meeting (note any exceptions), Meeting Commenced every 30-days	100%	5	-	-	-	-
6	The Secretary of Board Conducted a Roll Call of all Present for Meeting.	100%	5	-	-	-	-
7	The Board Meeting convened no longer than 30 days from receipt of a completed FIT Investigation (unless documented exceptions via the Supt of Police)	100%	5	-	-	-	-
8	UOFRB Heard the Case Presentation From FIT Investigator.	100%	5	-	-	-	-
9	Affirm or Reject Investigative Recommendations. (Auditor confirmed whether Voting Members agreed or disagreed with the FIT outcome).	100%	5	-	-	-	-
10	Policy Violation(s) to be Referred to PIB for Disciplinary Action as agreed among Voting Members, if applicable.	-	-	-	-	-	5
11	Policy Violation(s) Referred from Last UOFRB Meeting were presented by Board Secretary, if applicable.	-	-	-	-	-	5
12	UOFRB Reviewed Incident to determine whether it raised policy, training, equipment, or tactical concerns.	100%	3	-	-	-	2
13	Non-Disciplinary Corrective Action(s) were Recommended, if applicable.	100%	1	-	-	-	4
14	Findings and Recommendations in a report (The Meeting Minutes) were sent to UOFRB from FIT within 15-days of the conclusion of the Last Hearing	100%	3	-	2	-	-
15	The Hearing was recorded as required for UOFRB Audio-Taped Hearings	100%	5	-	-	-	-
16	Auditor(s) Assessed Force Investigation Team Week Spreadsheet and ensured required incidents brought to the Board for a Hearing	100%	3	-	2	-	-
Total			100%	60	-	4	16

General Comments

ARS assessed the UOFRB Meetings for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

For an explanation of the procedures and scoring system for this review, see the associated "Protocol" document.

For a list of relevant policies, contact ARU as needed.

For the assessment results for each case file, see the accompanying RawData spreadsheets.

Scores below 95% are highlighted in red.

Compliance Score

L1-L4 Checklist- Based on the combined total of one thousand eight hundred eighty-nine **(1,889)** checklist items rated, from the sample size of sixty **(60)** case files audited; the “**score**” of this Use of Force case file checklist audit conducted by the Auditing and Review Section was **95%**.

L4 ASI Shooting Checklist- **There were no Level 4 shootings audited during this period.**

Unreported Use of Force- Based on the combined total of one thousand, two hundred fifty-six **(1,256)** checklist items rated, from the sample size of **(314)** case files audited; the “**score**” of this Use of Force case file checklist audit conducted by the Auditing and Review Section was **100%**.

Use of Force Review Board (UFRB) Meeting assessment - **100%**.

Results

- The Unreported Use of Force overall results of August 2025 Use of Force audit have revealed that **all** checklist questions had compliance threshold scores **above 95%**.
- The L1-L4 overall results of the August Use of Force audit have revealed that **2** of the **32** checklist questions had compliance threshold scores **below 95% but over 90%**:

See L1-L4 details below:

1. **(Q4) BWC's Complete (BWCs Found/BWCs Expected).** The overall score for this category was **93%**.
2. **(Q19) Supervisor's UoF Investigation Submitted within 72 hrs. or Extension Requested (L1-L4)** The overall score for this category was **93%**.
3. **(Q20) Supervisor's UoF Extension Request Sent to Division Captain (L1-L4).** The overall score for this category was **92%**.
- 4.

Conclusions (Final)

The results of this audit were verified through a double-blind review. Once this process concluded, the districts/units had an opportunity to review all the audit results and scorecards. District audit re-evaluations were reviewed by PSAB, and the responses are documented in the Use of Force Response and PSAB Notes section.

The following findings are as follows for those area(s) where compliance was **below 90%**:

1. **Supervisor's approved use of force report submitted to FIT within the required 21 Days from Incident Date.** The overall score for this category was **48%**.
2. **Officer Force Statement(s) Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4).** The overall score for this category was **86%**.

The following recommendations will focus on solutions to mitigate the low scores in the future.

Recommendations

Following the Use of Force audit which covered July 2024 – December 2024, “opportunities for improvement” continue to be documented by the PSAB Audit and Review Unit (ARS). As previously identified by the Public Integrity Bureau (PIB), Force Investigation Team (FIT) for the Department to maintain or achieve 95% or better compliance rate, the following areas for improvement were communicated to the various Districts and Bureaus and are as follows:

1. Initial Blue Team entry **shall** be completed by **ETOD** of the supervisors next tour of duty. This **shall** include the involved officer’s and civilian's information, and the types of force used by each.
2. Use of Force reports and documents **shall** be sent over to FIT within 21 days.
3. While all supervisor reports which were submitted beyond the required date, there are several in which the extension appeared to be submitted **AFTER** the 3-day window for such requests. It is imperative that supervisors ask for an extension **BEFORE** the 3-day window expires.

Continuing to take this action will ensure that all Use of Force case files are compliant and within policy guidelines.

Use of Force Responses & PSAB Notes:

7th District Re-evaluation:

Re-evaluation 1:

- **Question #2: BWC Activated Per Policy (L1-L4) - 86%.** The preliminary results revealed the BWC was not activated as required. However, an additional search of the CAD system as well as confirmation with Command Desk revealed the noted item is not assigned to an officer / supervisor assigned to The Seventh District. Unit 984 initiated a traffic stop at the intersection of Alcee Fortier and Peltier Drive. The Sgt reported Level 2 Use of Force and conducted the investigation. The Sgt supervises the GRIP TEAM assigned to FOB. Although the incident occurred in the Seventh District, Seventh District officers / supervisors were not involved. Therefore, the received score of 86% is **Not Justified**.

PSAB Response:

- PSAB confirmed that the Sgt and officer are on the FOB GRIP team. Therefore, the record was re-assigned to GRIP from the 7th District. The resulting change improves question #2 to 100%.

Re-evaluation 2:

- **Question #4: BWC Complete (BWC's Found / BWC's Expected - 94%.** The preliminary results revealed the BWC was not activated as required. However, an additional search of the CAD system as well as confirmation with Command Desk revealed the noted item is not assigned to an officer / supervisor assigned to The Seventh District. Unit 984 initiated a traffic stop at the intersection of Alcee Fortier and Peltier Drive. The Sgt reported Level 2 Use of Force and conducted the investigation. The Sgt supervises the GRIP TEAM assigned to FOB. Although the incident occurred in the Seventh District, Seventh District officers / supervisors were not involved. Therefore, the received score of 94% is **Not Justified**.

PSAB Response:

- PSAB confirmed that the Sgt and officer are on the FOB GRIP team. Therefore, the record was re-assigned to GRIP from the 7th District. The resulting change improves question #4 to 100%.

Re-evaluation 3:

- **Question #21 – Supervisor’s Approved Use of Force Report Submitted to FIT within the required 21 days from date of incident -67%.** Two (2) Items are Use of Force reports properly assigned to The Seventh District. The sergeants were the reporting supervisors responsible for completing the investigations. Each sergeant received an extension to complete the report. However, the sergeants failed to submit the report within the allotted timeframe. Therefore, this portion of the review and given score is **Justified**.
- The Item was also selected for review and flagged as non-compliant for timely submission. However, the item / report was not assigned to a supervisor from The Seventh District. After further review, I discovered that Third District sergeant responded to 4301 Chef Menteur Hwy (Walmart) after receiving notification that the officer’s working the paid

detail had a Level 1 Use of Force. Perhaps the Sergeant was unsure how to label the officers' assignment versus the incident occurrence location. Nonetheless, this incident occurred and was investigated in The Third Police District. Therefore, the total given score of 67% is **Not Justified**.

-

PSAB Response:

- No action required for 2 Items.
- **1 item** – The sergeant (3rd District) routed the investigation through 3rd District Rank. PSAB therefore transferred the item to the 3rd District. The resulting change improved the score from 63% to 71%.

Re-evaluation 4:

- **Question #32- Officer Force Statement(s) Submitted by ETOD - 88%.** The preliminary results revealed the officer's "Force Statement" was not submitted by ETOD. After further review and confirmation with the FIT Specialist, it was determined that the sergeant did not receive all officer's "Force Statements" by ETOD. The Use of Force occurred on May 19, 2025. The sergeant received and approved officer's "Force Statement" on May 23, 2025, days after the initial occurrence date. Therefore, the score of 88% is Justified.

PSAB Response:

- No action required for item

8th District Re-evaluation:

Re-evaluation 1:

- **Question # 19 Supervisor's UOF Investigation Submitted within 72 hrs. Extension Requested (L1-L4) 90%.** The Raw data has item # B-18354-25 being marked as no. The extension was requested for Feb 19th, the same day as the occurrence. Since the extension was requested, this should be changed to yes.

PSAB Response:

- 8th District provided the email requesting and approving the extension request. With this evidence, PSAB has approved the change to "Yes". The resulting change improves question #19 from 90% to **100%**.

Re-evaluation 2:

- **Question # 20 Supervisor's UOF Extension Request Sent to Division Captain (L1-L4) 63%.** The raw data list three Items being marked as no. one item is marked as N/A due to it being marked no for question 19. The extension requests for other 2 items were sent within 72 hrs. of occurrence. A copy of the emails is attached. Since the 1st item should be modified in question 19, the response to question 20 should also be yes. was also requested within 72 hrs., so this should be changed to yes.

PSAB Response:

- 8th District provided the emails requesting and approving the extension requests for the

three items. With this evidence, PSAB has approved the change to “Yes”. The resulting change improves question #20 from 67% to **89%**.

2nd District Re-evaluation:

Re-evaluation 1:

- **Question # 21 Supervisor's approved use of force report submitted to FIT within the required 21 Days from Incident Date:** We were dinged for not having the review done in 21 days under question 21 for Item. I don't know if that one is on us, because it was a GRIP Unit use of force that occurred in the second district, but the author was a second district supervisor for some reason. That use of force should have been routed through GRIP's chain of command. I don't have access to see the routing chain on that, so I can't confirm whether it was routed through the Second District chain of command.

PSAB Response:

- The investigation flowed through the 2nd District rank for item in question. No Change made.

Re-evaluation 2:

- **Question # 4 BWCs Complete: BWCs Found: / BWCs Expected:** Question 4 appears to be overall whether a BWC existed under the item, as evidence by the expected/found aspect. In the two we were dinged on the BWCs existed and were located but were not activated per policy, which should satisfy Question 4 at 100%.

PSAB Response:

- Item 1 – No Use of Force Video was found. We are measuring whether a use of force video exists, and none does for the officer. For #Q2 not being activated on time, and #Q4 for not capturing any of the use of force. PSAB will make no changes.
- Item 2 - Officer's BWC was turned on late and did not capture the UOF. Same as above. PSAB determined that no change be made.

5th District Re-evaluation:

Re-evaluation 1:

- **Question #2: BWC Activated Per Policy (L1-L4) - 80%.** Sergeant reviewed the Use of Force Report Draft Audit report, which listed item number in question. Sergeant also reviewed the Scorecard spreadsheet. The Item number occurred during Mardi Gras. Sergeant attempted to locate body-worn cameras for the above-listed officers and was unable to locate any body-worn cameras; however, due to the chaotic scene of a large fight with multiple individuals and parade goers, and a rapidly tense situation, the above officers' body-worn cameras were not activated. Sergeant spoke with Platoon Commander, who advised that he would review the NOPD Policy Chapter 41.3.10, Body-Worn Cameras, with the officers and read at roll calls.

PSAB Response:

- No action required for the specified item.

Re-evaluation 2:

- **Question# 4: BWCs Complete (BWCs Found/BWCs Expected) - 80%.** Sergeant reviewed the Use of Force Report Draft Audit report, which listed the item number. Sergeant also reviewed the Scorecard spreadsheet. Item occurred during Mardi Gras. Sergeant attempted to locate body-worn cameras for the above-listed officers and was unable to locate any body-worn cameras; however, due to the chaotic scene of a large fight with multiple individuals and parade goers, and a rapidly tense situation, the above officers' body-worn cameras were not activated. According to the spreadsheet, the auditor reviewed the BWCs based on Chapter 41.3.10, paragraph 12, which states, notwithstanding the above directives on Manual Activation requirements, when officers are conducting strip searches or body cavity searches, they shall follow the requirements of Chapter 1.2.4 - Search & Seizure regarding consent and recording requirements. However, no officer or supervisor conducted a strip search or body cavity search. Also, according to the spreadsheet on the L1-L4 Checklist, SC question #4 was cited in the Consent Decree Ch 41.3.11. However, there is no page in the consent decree that refers to this chapter.

PSAB Response:

- Reference made to Consent Decree Ch 41.3.11 in the NOPD Policy column of the scorecard was updated to reflect Chapter 41.3.10 p11. No further action was required.

Re-evaluation 3:

- **Question# 7: BWC's Labelled Correctly - 80%.** Sergeant reviewed the Use of Force Report Draft Audit report, which listed the item number. Sergeant also reviewed the Scorecard spreadsheet. Item number occurred during Mardi Gras. NOPD Policy Chapters Ch 1.3.6, paragraph 33, which states Reporting and investigating unreported or unreasonable force, when anyone reports to a supervisor an unreasonable or previously unreported use of force, the supervisor will conduct a preliminary investigation into the allegation, including responding to the scene of the incident to identify and interview witnesses and preserve evidence. The supervisor also shall inform PIB immediately of the allegation of unreported or unreasonable force; PIB shall complete an appropriate investigation pursuant to Chapter 52.1- Employee Misconduct Complaints and Internal Disciplinary Investigations. However, there was no unreported use of force or any employee misconduct.

PSAB Response:

- PSAB updated the summary scorecard reference to 41.3.10 p35. Supervisors shall review any BWC recording that may have been automatically activated when the signal performance power magazine of the Taser is activated. (See: Chapter1.7.1 – CEW). All automatically triggered recordings will have to be reviewed by a supervisor, **labeled as appropriate** to the incident recorded and within the guidelines of this Chapter. No additional action required.

Re-evaluation 4:

- **Question# 18: Supervisor GIST Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4) - 80%.** Sergeant reviewed the Use of Force Report Draft Audit report. Sergeant also reviewed the Scorecard spreadsheet. The following incident occurred during Mardi Gras. The NOPD Policy Chapters Ch 1.3.6: Reporting of Use of Force paragraph 28, which states the supervisor will initially complete

and document the preliminary investigation information into Blue Team Use of Force System by ETOD of the supervisor's NEXT Tour of Duty. The supervisor will have 72 hours to complete and input the remainder of the information into Blue Team and submit it through his/her chain of command to PIB. A District/Division Commander may authorize an extension to the 72-hour deadline, but this extension must be documented in the Blue Team application or Form 105 before the initial deadline. The sergeant submitted the use of force report timely because he was instructed via email by DSA sergeant that the Lt. from FIT was requesting a use of force report be completed on March 5, 2025. I have attached the email to this correspondence.

PSAB Response:

- PSAB changed the item to compliant giving the district a 100% score regarding the 72-hour submission deadline.

Re-evaluation 5:

- **Question# 21: Supervisor's approved use of force report submitted to FIT within the required 21 Days from Incident Date - 80%.** The sergeant reviewed the Use of Force Report Draft Audit report. The DSA sergeant also reviewed the Scorecard spreadsheet. Incident occurred during Mardi Gras. The sergeant submitted the use of force report timely because he was instructed via email by DSA sergeant that Lt. from FIT was requesting a use of force report be completed on March 5, 2025. I have attached the email to this correspondence.
- On Sunday, March 2, 2025, Officers and Supervisors were working the Mardi Gras parade schedule, and the ETOD was on Monday, March 3, 2025, at 12:10 am.

PSAB Response:

- PSAB updated the score to 100% from 80% regarding the 21-day submission deadline.

Re-evaluation 6:

- **Question# 32: Officer Force Statement(s) Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4) - 80%.** DSA sergeant reviewed the Use of Force Report Draft Audit report which listed three items. DSA Sergeant also reviewed the Scorecard spreadsheet. Item numbers 1&2, according to the spreadsheet, were investigated by SOD, and item number 3 was investigated by the 7th District. Sergeant learned from the Blue Team Reports on the NOPD web application management dashboard that neither item number belonged to the 5th District, and the 5th District should not have been audited on the use of force reports. Sergeant submitted the use of force report timely because he was instructed via email by sergeant that Lt. from FIT was requesting a use of force report be completed on March 5, 2025. I have attached the email to this correspondence. On Sunday, March 2, 2025, Officers and Supervisors were working the Mardi Gras parade schedule, and the ETOD was on Monday, March 3, 2025, at 12:10 am.

PSAB Response:

- PSAB sent the items to the appropriate units and updated the district score regarding the

ETOD submission deadline. Score improved from 80% to 100%.

4th District Re-evaluation:

Re-evaluation 1:

- **Question #32: Officer Force Statement(s) Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4) - 75%.** The sergeant in response to an incident involving the State Police and a subsequent deployment of the canine unit by that division initiated a report. Sergeant did not receive the related statements from the canine division prior to her ETOD, which resulted in a deficiency for the Fourth District. It is my belief that this was beyond the control of the Fourth District supervisor, as the officers involved were not under her command. The deficiency did not belong to the Fourth District.

PSAB Response:

- PSAB has changed the designation to Yes from No since involved officers were outside agency connected. This resulted in district score improving to 100% from 75%.

Attachments: Excel Raw Data Spreadsheets Jan 2025-june 2025.

Timothy A. Lindsey

**Innovation Manager, Auditing
Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau**

Appendix C – Report Distribution

NOPD Superintendent

NOPD Assistant Superintendent

Deputy Supt. PSAB Bureau

Captain PSAB Bureau

Deputy Supt. PIB Bureau

Deputy Sup. FOB Bureau

Deputy Sup. ISB Bureau