

Joplin Police Department

Annual Report



PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The main purpose of this information is to get as much information as possible out to the members of the Department and the public to avoid unnecessary rumors, which have a negative effect on the Department. The annual report will provide a statistical analysis of the lethal, less lethal, and non-lethal force used by the JPD Officer and JPD Detention Officers; and enhance transparency between the Department and its stakeholders within the City of Joplin.

MISSION STATEMENT

Our mission is to provide professional service and protection through leadership and partnership with the community.

VALUE STATEMENT

Honor - without compromise
Courage - with compassion
Commitment - to community
Service - with understanding

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Use of Force Policy and Definitions..... | 4 |
| Use of Force Overview..... | 5 |
| 2019 Type of Force Tally..... | 6 |
| Taser Usage..... | 7 |
| Yearly Type of Force Comparison..... | 7 |
| Type of Force Comparison Graph..... | 8 |
| Citizen Resistance Tally..... | 9 |
| Arrests and Charges..... | 10 |
| Injuries..... | 11 |
| Reason for Use of Force and Type of service being rendered at the time..... | 12 |
| Detention Officer Use of force..... | 13 |
| Detention Use of Force Continued..... | 14 |
| Injuries (Detention Officers)..... | 14 |
| Internal Affairs Report..... | 15 |
| Complaints Received..... | 16 |
| Early Warning System..... | 17 |
| Investigations (Monthly Breakdown)..... | 18 |
| FIRST QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS..... | 18 |
| SECOND QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS..... | 19 |
| THIRD QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS..... | 20 |
| FOURTH QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS..... | 21 |
| Biased Based Complaints (Breakdown)..... | 22 |
| Types of Discipline..... | 23 |
| Crashes and Pursuit Policy..... | 24 |
| Crashes..... | 24 |
| Pursuits..... | 25 |

Use of Force Policy and Definitions

Officers are confronted daily with situations requiring the use of force to affect an arrest or ensure public safety. The degree of force used depends on what the officer perceives as reasonable and necessary under the circumstances at the time he or she decides to use force. Except for deadly force, the application of any degree of force is justified only when the officer reasonably believes that it is necessary:

- To prevent the escape from custody, make an arrest or an investigative detention of a person the officer believes has committed a crime.
- To defend him or herself or another from what the officer believes is the use of force while trying to arrest another, prevent the suspect's escape, or otherwise lawfully take the person into custody.
- To disperse persons participating in an unlawful assembly.

Deadly force: Any force applied in any manner by any means that could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical injury. (RSMo 563.011)

Non-deadly force: Force employed which is neither likely nor intended to cause death or serious physical injury.

Firearms: Any weapon from which a projectile is forcibly ejected by an explosive.

Reasonable belief: When facts or circumstances the officer knows, or should know, are such as to cause an ordinary and prudent person to act or think reasonably in a similar way under similar circumstances.

Serious physical injury: Bodily injury which creates a substantial risk of death or which is likely to cause serious permanent disfigurement or loss, or extended impairment of the function of anybody member or organ.

Objectively Reasonable Force: The "reasonableness" of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight. The calculus of reasonableness must embody allowance for the fact that police officers are often forced to make split-second judgments - in circumstances that are tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving - about the amount of force that is necessary in a particular situation. The question is whether the officers' actions are "objectively reasonable" in light of the facts and circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation. Because "the test of reasonableness under the Fourth Amendment is not capable of precise definition or mechanical application," however, its proper application requires careful attention to the facts and circumstances of each particular case, including the severity of the crime at issue, whether the suspect poses an immediate threat to the safety of the officers or others, and whether he is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight.

Use of Force Overview

In 2020 Joplin Police Officers employed some level of force 154 times to effect an arrest or assist with a prisoner/medical patient. There were 310 officer involvements, meaning that in some arrests more than one officer was involved. Comparatively speaking during 2019 Joplin Police Officers employed some level of force 167 times to effect an arrest or assist with a prisoner/medical patient.

The analysis provided is based upon averages. The actual use of force by individual officers can be influenced by several factors such as assignment, patrol area, shift, number of hours worked and other variables.

Joplin Police Officers arrested 5,501 people on a total of 12,422 criminal charges during 2020.
Joplin Police Officers arrested 6,885 people on a total of 15,373 criminal charges during 2019.

- When at full strength the Joplin Police Department has 110 officers.

Use of force occurred an average of once in every 36 arrests during 2020.
Use of force occurred an average of once in every 41 arrests during 2019.

- Use of Force Incidents broken down by race:

White-140
Black-25
Hispanic-4
Asian-0
Native American-0
Other-0
Unknown-0

*Comments: Some use of force incidents involved multiple subjects

Profile of Use-of-force Incidents received between January 1st, 2020 and December 31st, 2020

| | |
|---|------------|
| Total number of use-of-force incidents: | 154 |
| Total number of officers involved: | 310 |

2020 Type of Force Tally

The following statistics are a comprehensive breakdown of individual use of force events. As such, they are representative of the dynamic and fluid nature of such events wherein a single use of force event is comprised of phases of escalation and de-escalation. Several levels of force and methods of force are utilized to bring about a successful resolution to the event. The following numbers reflect the multiple efforts in use of force events and do not represent a change in the total use of force events listed above.

| Type of Force | | Total # | Type of Force | | Total |
|---------------|---------------------------|---------|---------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| 1 | Active Pointing of Weapon | 63 | 21 | Knee Strike(s) | 20 |
| 2 | Alternative Impact Weapon | 5 | 22 | Knife | |
| 3 | Arm bar | 2 | 23 | Lateral Vascular Neck Restraint | |
| 4 | ASP | | 24 | Leg Strike(s) | 1 |
| 5 | Canine | 14 | 25 | OC Spray | 5 |
| 6 | Clamp | | 26 | Open-Hand Strike | |
| 7 | Come Along | 3 | 27 | Pepper ball Gun | |
| 8 | Control Hold | 28 | 28 | Physical Restraint | 30 |
| 9 | CS Gas | 5 | 29 | Pressure Point(s) | 5 |
| 10 | Elbow Strike(s) | 8 | 30 | Push | 13 |
| 11 | Empty Hand Control | 41 | 31 | Rifle | |
| 12 | Escort | 11 | 32 | Shotgun | |
| 13 | Fist | 17 | 33 | Strike(s) | 30 |
| 14 | Foot | 1 | 34 | Strikes in Furtherance | 4 |
| 15 | Handgun | | 35 | Take to Ground | 34 |
| 16 | Headlock | 1 | 36 | Taser | 64 |
| 17 | Hobble Restraints | | 37 | Taser Arc Display | |
| 18 | Impact Munitions | 3 | 38 | Thrust Kick | |
| 19 | Joint Lock | 3 | 39 | Tinsley | 4 |
| 20 | Kicks | 6 | 40 | Verbal Direction | 154 |

Taser Usage

Tasers were deployed 64 times in 2020.

Tasers were deployed 67 times in 2019.

Tasers were deployed an average of once in every 85.95 arrests in 2020.

Tasers were deployed an average of once in every 102.76 arrests in 2019.

The average number of Taser deployments was 5.33 times per month in 2020.

Yearly Type of Force Comparison

It should be noted that there were 154 use of force events in 2020. There were 167 Use of Force events in 2019. The numbers on the chart below will show a higher number. One should take into consideration that many force events have more than one type of force used. For example, if verbal direction is given, and the party still fails to comply with the officer, that officer will move to a different type of force.

See following page for Graph

Citizen Resistance Tally

Types of Resistance;

Psychological Intimidation – Verbal and Non-Verbal cues indicative of a subject’s mental or physical preparedness to resist and/or assault the officer or others.

Non-Compliance - Noncompliance or verbal responses or threats of non-compliance to officer’s directions.

Passive Resistance - Dead weight; no active participation, not influencing, not exerting any force (internal or otherwise)

Active Resistance - Clinging to objects to prevent the officer from gaining control, exerting influence by physical effort or action. (i.e. using muscle tension to prevent movement.)

Escape Resistance - Fleeing, pushing or pulling away from the officer to avoid control, however, not attempting to harm the officer.

Active Aggression - Physical actions of assault.

Deadly Force Threat – Assaults with the perceived intent and apparent ability to cause death or great bodily harm.

| Reason | Count | Percent of total |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------------|
| Active Aggression | 57 | 13.16% |
| Active Resistance | 91 | 21.02% |
| Deadly Force Assault on Citizen | | |
| Deadly Force Assault on Officer | 2 | 00.46% |
| Escape Resistance | 56 | 12.93% |
| Felony Car Stop | 10 | 02.31% |
| Handgun | 5 | 01.15% |
| Knife | 4 | 00.92% |
| Non-Compliance | 115 | 26.56% |
| None | 8 | 01.85% |
| Passive Resistance | 37 | 08.55% |
| Psychological Intimidation | 26 | 06.00% |
| Self-Harm | 6 | 01.39% |
| Showed Great Strength | 13 | 03.00% |
| Spit | 3 | 00.69% |
| Total | 433 | |

Arrests and Charges

Citizen arrested in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

| | Count | Percent of total |
|--------------|------------|------------------|
| No | 31 | 07.01% |
| Yes | 132 | 92.99% |
| Total | 442 | |

Tally of charges against involved citizens:

| Charge | Count | Percent of total |
|---|------------|------------------|
| 96-hour Mental Commit | 16 | 04.68% |
| Assault | 13 | 03.80% |
| Assault on Officer | 19 | 05.56% |
| Compliance with request for information by Ofc. | 4 | 01.17% |
| Domestic Assault | 11 | 03.27% |
| DWI/DUI | 12 | 03.51% |
| Felony Resisting Arrest | 38 | 11.11% |
| Felony Warrant | 23 | 06.73% |
| Misdemeanor Warrant | 12 | 03.51% |
| Not Arrested/Charged | 11 | 03.27% |
| Obstructing service of Officer/Resisting | 40 | 11.70% |
| Other Felony PC | 30 | 08.77% |
| Other Misdemeanor PC | 27 | 07.89% |
| Peace Disturbance | 5 | 01.46% |
| Possession of Controlled Substance | 7 | 02.05% |
| Possession of Drug Paraphernalia | 9 | 02.63% |
| Possession of Marijuana | 4 | 01.17% |
| Resisting Arrest | 50 | 14.62% |
| Safe Keep | 4 | 01.17% |
| Traffic Violations | 6 | 01.75% |
| Violation of Ex-Parte/Full Order of Protection | 1 | 00.29% |
| Total | 342 | |

Injuries

Injury-The Missouri Criminal Code defines injury in Chapter 565.070 as *physical pain, illness, or any impairment of physical condition*. Our current category for injuries only includes injured or not injured. For the purpose of reporting injuries, Injuries will include visible injuries such as contusions and bruises, lacerations, punctures, scratches and abrasions. It will also include any complaint of physical pain, illness, or any impairment of physical condition which may not be clearly visible, however an Officer reasonably believes is caused from the type of force that was used on the Officer or Subject. Officers and subjects may have more than one visible injury (i.e. a contusion and an abrasion) however these are only counted as one “injury” in relation to the use of force event. This data will not include pre-existing injuries in relation to the use of force event.

Taken to Hospital- Subject or Officer was taken to hospital for treatment as a result of the use of force event. This may occur for several reasons and may sometimes be required by Departmental Policy due to the type of force that was used.

Citizen was injured in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

| | Count | Percent of total |
|--------------|------------|------------------|
| No | 81 | 51.59% |
| Yes | 76 | 48.41% |
| Total | 157 | |

Citizen taken to hospital in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

| | Count | Percent of total |
|--------------|------------|------------------|
| No | 115 | 73.25% |
| Yes | 42 | 26.75% |
| Total | 157 | |

Officer injured in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

| | Count | Percent of total |
|--------------|------------|------------------|
| No | 164 | 95.35% |
| Yes | 8 | 04.65% |
| Total | 172 | |

Officer taken to hospital in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

| | Count | Percent of total |
|--------------|------------|------------------|
| No | 170 | 98.84% |
| Yes | 2 | 01.16% |
| Total | 172 | |

Reason for Use of Force and Type of service being rendered at the time

Reason for use-of-force:

| Reason | Count | Percent of total |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------------|
| Jail cell extraction | 2 | 01.25% |
| Jail failure to comply | 6 | 03.75% |
| Jail inmate movement | 2 | 01.25% |
| Jail to enforce jail rule | 1 | 00.63% |
| Felony car stop | 1 | 00.63% |
| To assist another agency | 5 | 03.13% |
| To defend another officer | | |
| To defend another person | 4 | 02.50% |
| To defend self | 16 | 10.00% |
| To disperse an unlawful assembly | | |
| To effect arrest | 100 | 62.50% |
| Investigative detention | 12 | 07.50% |
| To prevent a violent felony | 5 | 03.13% |
| To prevent a violent misdemeanor | 1 | 00.63% |
| To restrain for subject's safety | 5 | 03.13% |
| Transport Prisoner | | |
| Total | 160 | |

Type of service being rendered at time of use-of-force:

| Service type | Count | Percent of total |
|-------------------------|------------|------------------|
| (Jail) detention | 12 | 07.50% |
| Accident investigation | 2 | 01.25% |
| Attending court | | |
| Bar check | | |
| Call for service | 26 | 16.25% |
| Criminal investigation | 11 | 06.88% |
| Disturbance | 35 | 21.88% |
| Felony car stop | 5 | 03.13% |
| Foot pursuit | 11 | 06.88% |
| Medical assistance call | 3 | 01.88% |
| Mental | 10 | 06.25% |
| Off duty | | |
| Pedestrian check | 12 | 07.50% |
| Prisoner handling | 2 | 01.25% |
| Prisoner transport | 1 | 00.63% |
| Suspicious activity | 5 | 03.13% |
| Traffic Stop | 7 | 04.38% |
| Vehicle Pursuit | 8 | 05.00% |
| Warrant Service | 10 | 06.25% |
| Total | 160 | |

Detention Officer Use of force

During the end of 2012, the Joplin Police Department began to track Police Officer use of force stats separate from Detention Officer use of force stats. This was to give the most practical data for officers working in a street environment vs. inside a jail. Detention Officer stats no longer reflect such data such as; Officer use of force vs. arrest, Officer use of force vs. use of force rate, Taser deployments vs. arrest, reason force was used, and type of service being rendered. This data will be documents separately in order to give the most accurate number.

In 2020 Joplin Detention Officers employed some level of force 20 times to defend themselves, enforce a jail rule, or move a prisoner. In 2019 Detention Officers used force 19 times.

The analysis provided is based upon averages. The actual use of force by individual detention officers can be influenced by several factors such as assignment, shift, number of hours worked and other variables.

The following statistics are a comprehensive breakdown of individual use of force events. As such, they are representative of the dynamic and fluid nature of such events wherein a single use of force event is comprised of phases of escalation and de-escalation. Several levels of force and methods of force are utilized to bring about a successful resolution to the event. The following numbers reflect the multiple efforts in use of force events and do not represent a change in the total use of force events listed above.

Profile of Jail Use-of-force Incidents received Between January 1st 2020 and December 31th 2020

Total number of use-of-force incidents: **20**
 Total number of officers involved: **41**

| <u>Type of Force</u> | <u>Total #</u> | | <u>Total #</u> |
|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Alternative Impact Weapon | | Lateral Vascular Neck Restraint | |
| Arm bar | | Leg Strike(s) | |
| ASP | | Open-Hand Strike | 2 |
| Clamp | | Physical Restraint | 2 |
| Come-Along | | Pressure Point(s) | 2 |
| Control Hold | 6 | Push | 4 |
| Elbow Strike(s) | 1 | Strike(s) | |
| Empty Hand Control | 9 | Strikes in Furtherance | |
| Escort | 6 | Take to Ground | 1 |
| Fist | 4 | Taser | 13 |
| Foot | | Taser Arc Display | 1 |
| Headlock | | Thrust Kick | 2 |
| Hobble Restraints | | Tinsley | 2 |
| Joint Lock | | Verbal Direction | 21 |
| Kicks | 2 | Wrist Lock | 1 |
| Knee Strike(s) | 1 | | |

Detention Officer Use of Force Continued

| Citizen | resistance | tally: |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Reason | Count | |
| Active Aggression | 17 | |
| Active Resistance | 14 | |
| Deadly Force Assault on Citizen | 1 | |
| Deadly Force Assault on Officer | | |
| Escape Resistance | 1 | |
| Handgun | | |
| Knife | | |
| Non-Compliance | 18 | |
| None | | |
| Passive Resistance | 1 | |
| Psychological Intimidation | 8 | |
| Self-Harm | | |
| Showed Great Strength | 10 | |
| Spit | 3 | |
| Total | 73 | |

Injuries (Detention Officers)

Citizen was injured in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

| | Count |
|--------------|--------------|
| No | 19 |
| Yes | 1 |
| Total | 20 |

Citizen taken to hospital in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

| | Count |
|--------------|--------------|
| No | 19 |
| Yes | 1 |
| Total | 20 |

Officer injured in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

| | Count |
|--------------|--------------|
| No | 24 |
| Yes | 1 |
| Total | 25 |

Officer taken to hospital in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

| | Count |
|--------------|--------------|
| No | 25 |
| Yes | 0 |
| Total | 25 |

Internal Affairs Report

During the year of 2020, 75 cases were forwarded to the Office of Internal Affairs for investigation. There were 44 cases that involved 44 sworn personnel and 31 cases that involved 31 non-sworn personnel. Comparatively, for the year of 2019, 83 cases were forwarded to the Office of Internal Affairs for investigation. There were 64 cases that involved sworn personnel and 26 cases that involved non-sworn personnel.

The 75 cases involving department personnel are broken down by month and graphs are completed to give an indication of how many complaints have been investigated, where the complaints were generated from, how many have been sustained and what types of disciplinary actions have been handed out for those violations.

In 2020, the Joplin Police Department was authorized for 110 sworn officer and 12 civilian positions in the police department. There are currently 18 jail employees and 22 dispatch employees. This makes 162 authorized employees that fall under the Police Department.

The main purpose of this information is to get as much information as possible out to the members of the Department to avoid unnecessary rumors, which have a negative effect on the Department. The Office of Internal Affairs understands and respects each individual employee's right to confidentiality and will uphold that standard. However, it is important that generic information be shared Department wide to provide expectations and equality for every employee. The Office of Internal Affairs will assure you that each complaint will be investigated in accordance with department policy and as expeditiously as possible.

As illustrated in SOG 2-08, Internal Affairs, I have listed the disposition classifications of internal investigations for your convenience. Disposition classifications are as follows:

1. Unfounded - no truth to allegations.
2. Exonerated - allegations true but result of adherence to proper and appropriate procedures and techniques.
3. Not sustained - unable to verify the truth of the matters under investigation.
4. Sustained - allegations true.
5. Policy Failure - The allegation is true, but employee's action was not inconsistent with policy and there is an indication of a need for policy review and revision.
6. Withdrawn – Complainant withdraws their complaint.
7. Inactivated – There is not enough information to investigate and no way of obtaining more information. The case may have to be inactivated until more information is available.

Complaints Received

The following is a breakdown of all complaints received by Internal Affairs for 2020:

- 43 complaints were received.
- 16 complaints were generated by citizens
- 27 complaints were generated within the agency
- 24 complaints were sustained or partially sustained
- 19 complaints resulted in findings that were other than sustained
- JPD received an average of 1.33 citizen complaints per month
- JPD received an average of 2.25 internal complaints per month

During the year of 2020 the Joplin Police Department responded to 81,727 calls for service. Included in that number is 11,867 vehicle stops. JPD Officers made 5,501 arrests resulting in 12,422 charges.

During the year of 2019 the Joplin Police Department responded to 85,918 calls for service. Included in that number is 13,909 vehicle stops. JPD Officers made 6,885 arrests resulting in 15,373 charges.

Early Warning System

In addition, a comprehensive Personnel Early Warning System is an essential component of a well-managed law enforcement agency. The Joplin Police Department is committed to this concept and I have implemented threshold limits into our Internal Affairs software (IA Pro) to manage this process. As a result of threshold limits recommended by the officers of the department and set by the Chief of Police, officers activities will be reviewed (by their immediate supervisor) when threshold limits are met. The threshold limits have been set as follows, to cover a twelve (12) month period; Citizen Complaints = 3, Use of Force = 12, Pursuits = 4, Bias Based Profiling = 1, and Vehicle Accidents = 2. The purpose of the Personnel Early Warning System shall be a means to identify and assess employees' performance in high-risk incidents and intervene where appropriate.

Investigations (Monthly Breakdown)

FIRST QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS

January 2020

4 Investigations (3 internal complaints received, 1 citizen complaints received)

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Absenteeism | Sustained | IA |
| Failure to Perform Duty | Unfounded | IA |
| Improper Procedure | Unfounded | IA |
| Mishandled Property | Unfounded | IA |

February 2020

3 Investigations (2 internal complaint received, 1 citizen complaints received)

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Moral Turpitude | Sustained | IA |
| Language | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Body Camera Violation | Sustained | Supervisor |

March 2020

5 Investigations (3 internal complaint received, 2 citizen complaints received)

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Failure to Perform Duty | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Mishandled Property | Unfounded | IA |
| Mishandled Property | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Neglect of Duty | Sustained | IA |
| Moral Turpitude | Not Sustained | IA |

SECOND QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS

April 2020

10 Investigations (8 internal complaints received, 2 citizen complaints received)

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Inmate Release Procedure | Sustained | IA |
| Failure to Perform Duty | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Lost Property | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Response to Resistance | Unfounded | IA |
| Misconduct | Sustained | IA |
| Absenteeism | Unfounded | IA |
| Failure to Perform Duty | Unfounded | IA |
| Failure to Perform Duty | Sustained | IA |
| Absenteeism | Unfounded | IA |
| Safety Violation | Sustained | Supervisor |

May 2020

4 Investigations (2 internal complaint received, 2 citizen complaints received)

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Inmate Control | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Improper Arrest | Unfounded | IA |
| Absenteeism | Sustained | IA |
| Discourteous | Not Sustained | IA |

June 2020

7 Investigations (3 internal complaint received, 4 citizen complaints received)

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Probationary Conduct | Sustained | IA |
| Response to Resistance | Unfounded | IA |
| Response to Resistance | Unfounded | IA |
| Discourteous Behavior | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Discourteous Behavior | Unfounded | IA |
| Social Media Violation | Sustained | IA |
| Improper Driving | Sustained | Supervisor |

THIRD QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS

July 2020

2 Investigations (1 internal complaints received, 1 citizen complaints received)

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Criminal Misconduct | Unfounded | Supervisor |
| Safe Keep Property | Sustained | Supervisor |

August 2020

7 Investigations (6 internal complaint received, 1 citizen complaints received)

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Lost Property | Sustained | IA |
| Criminal Misconduct | Sustained | IA |
| Response to Resistance | Sustained | IA |
| Attendance | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Call Response | Exonerated | Supervisor |
| Legal Process | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Evidence Management | Sustained | Supervisor |

September 2020

0 Investigations (0 internal complaint received, 0 citizen complaints received)

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|

FOURTH QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS

October 2020

5 internal complaints received, 0 citizen complaints received.

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Improper Bonding Procedure | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Evidence Management | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Excessive Absenteeism | Sustained | IA |
| Conduct Unbecoming | Sustained | IA |
| Inefficient Duty | Inactivated | IA |

November 2020

3 internal complaint received, 2 citizen complaints received.

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Inefficient Duty | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Fail to Complete Report | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Failure to Notify | Policy Failure | IA |
| Vehicle Operation | Not Sustained | IA |
| Interpersonal Communication | Sustained | IA |

December 2020

8 internal complaint received, 2 citizen complaints received.

| <u>Complaint Type</u> | <u>Results</u> | <u>Investigator</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Incompetent Duty | Sustained | IA |
| Response to Resistance | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Interpersonal Communication | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Vehicle Operations | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Interpersonal Communication | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Improper Bonding Procedure | Sustained | Supervisor |
| Response to Resistance | Unfounded | IA |
| Response to Resistance | Unfounded | IA |
| Incompetent Duty | Withdrawn | Supervisor |
| Incompetent Duty | Withdrawn | Supervisor |

The following is a breakdown of Biased Based complaints received for the year 2020:

- 0 Complaints received based on Race
- 0 Complaints received based on Gender
- 0 Complaints received based on Religion
- 0 Complaints received based on Economic Status
- 0 Complaints received based on Age
- 0 Complaints received based on Ethnicity
- 0 Complaints received based on Sexual Orientation

*****It should be noted that there may be more complaint types and investigations than actual complaints received. This is a result of multiple employees being investigated for one complaint form.**

Types of Discipline

***If you see a disciplinary action that does not seem to fit the violation, keep in mind that it may be due to the severity of the case or it could be a progressive level of discipline.**

Crashes and Pursuit Policy

In case of crash or damage to any department vehicle the driver will immediately request the on-duty supervisor be notified. The supervisor will have an investigation made and the crash investigator will report the crash using the State approved crash form. A Crash/Pursuit Review Board will then review all crashes/pursuits involving Police Department employees and vehicles.

The Crash/Pursuit Review Board- the body responsible for reviewing completed officer involved crash and pursuit reports. The Crash/Pursuit Review Board will review each report to ensure compliance with department policy and forward their findings to the Office of Internal Affairs. The Office of Internal Affairs, or his/her designee, will review the Crash/Pursuit Boards findings and initiate an investigation if appropriate. The Crash/Pursuit Review Board is a panel of three officers consisting of the Traffic Sergeant and two designees.

For tracking purposes crashes in a city vehicle and pursuits are separated from internal and citizen complaints and are categorized in the following manner.

Crash

During 2020 there were 29 officer involved accidents in a city vehicle. Of those accidents, 17 of the officers were determined by the Crash Review Board to be at fault.

First Quarter Crash Discipline

Violation

Emergency Driving
Vehicle Operation
Emergency Driving

Discipline

Written Reprimand
Written Reprimand
To Be Determined

Second Quarter Crash Discipline

Violation

Vehicle Operation
Vehicle Operation
Vehicle Operation
Vehicle Operation

Discipline

Counseling
Counseling
Verbal Reprimand
Counseling

Third Quarter Crash Discipline

Violation

Vehicle Operation
Vehicle Operation
Vehicle Operation
Vehicle Operation
Vehicle Operation
Vehicle Operation

Discipline

Counseling
Counseling
Counseling
Counseling
Counseling
Counseling

Fourth Quarter Crash Discipline

| <u>Violation</u> | <u>Discipline</u> |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Vehicle Operation | Counseling |
| Vehicle Operation | Counseling |
| Vehicle Operation | Counseling |
| Vehicle Operation | Verbal Warning |

Pursuits

During 2020 there were 44 officer involved pursuits. Of the 44 pursuits involving officers, 3 officers were disciplined for policy violations related to the pursuits.

First Quarter Pursuit Discipline

| <u>Violation</u> | <u>Discipline</u> |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Vehicle Pursuit Driving | Written Reprimand |
| Ride Along Policy | Counseling |
| Ride Along Policy | Counseling |

Second Quarter Pursuit Discipline

| <u>Violation</u> | <u>Discipline</u> |
|------------------|-------------------|
| N/A | |

Third Quarter Pursuit Discipline

| <u>Violation</u> | <u>Discipline</u> |
|------------------|-------------------|
| N/A | |

Fourth Quarter Pursuit Discipline

| <u>Violation</u> | <u>Discipline</u> |
|------------------|-------------------|
| N/A | |

***If you see a disciplinary action that does not seem to fit the violation, keep in mind that it may be due to the severity of the case or it could be a progressive level of discipline.**