

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

IACP

Operations & Management Study



**Long Beach,
California**

**POLICE
DEPARTMENT**

November 2018

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

A Study by the International Association of Chiefs of Police



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT SUMMARY 1

METHODOLOGY 1

SCOPE OF WORK 4

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... 4

CHAPTER I. DESCRIPTION OF CITY OF LONG BEACH 5

CHAPTER II. 21ST CENTURY POLICING 7

CHAPTER III. CULTURE, LEADERSHIP, AND COMMUNICATION 12

CHAPTER IV. OPERATIONS/STAFFING 17

CHAPTER V. COMMUNITY POLICING 28

CHAPTER VI. POLICY REVIEW 30

CHAPTER VII. DATA, TECHNOLOGY, AND EQUIPMENT..... 40

CHAPTER VIII. TRAINING AND EDUCATION..... 47

CHAPTER IX. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION 51

CHAPTER X. INTERNAL AFFAIRS, USE OF FORCE, DISCIPLINE 55

CHAPTER XI - SUPPORT SERVICES..... 58

CHAPTER XII: CONCLUSION..... 70

APPENDIX A: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION..... 72

AGENCY/CITY DESCRIPTION..... 72

CONDITIONS –OPERATIONS/STAFFING 76

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL DATA..... 81

CRIME AND ARREST DATA 81

TRAFFIC Data..... 89

CAD DATA 92

APPENDIX C: STAFF PERFORMANCE MEASURES 98

APPENDIX D: LBPD AUTHORIZED STAFFING 101

APPENDIX E: CRIME MEETING RECOMMENDATIONS..... 105

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

PROJECT SUMMARY

The City of Long Beach, California, contracted with the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) to conduct a study of the Long Beach Police Department (LBPD). The IACP team conducted an onsite visit and initiated a series of interviews with staff and select community members identified by the LBPD. Members of the public had the opportunity to provide feedback through two community forums and through an online portal while staff from the LBPD completed an in-house workforce survey. Additionally, the IACP conducted significant analysis of existing data and new data generated as a part of this study. This report outlines the IACP's findings and recommendations.

This report identifies how the study was conducted, establishes a framework of nine core areas of focus, describes the general conditions found during the study, and offers recommendations for consideration in each of these core areas. An exceptionally large amount of data was processed and analyzed during this study. These data are found together in a companion section for ease of review and additional consideration.

METHODOLOGY

This study included the analysis of information and statistical data provided by the LBPD, to include interviews, surveys, and interaction with members of the department across all ranks and citizens of Long Beach.

IACP conducted an onsite visit to conduct one-on-one interviews, participated in patrol "ride-alongs," and attended community meetings. During the on-site visits, 62 individual interview sessions were conducted with both sworn and non-sworn staff. Additionally, professional and community stakeholders were interviewed in small groups and two community forums attended by over 90 community members were promoted by LBPD and run by IACP staff.

IACP, through LBPD, distributed a survey to the community through a link on LBPD's website. IACP received 287 responses from the community through this online survey. The response rate was not sufficient in size to produce generalizable recommendations. Community responses were narrative in format with many commending the work of the LBPD, and others noting specific incidents or concerns such as lack of patrol in certain areas and officer interactions with the public. Three other surveys, a workforce survey and two workload surveys were distributed within the department. A Workforce Survey was sent to all LBPD employees resulting in 262 responses, representing 21.6 percent return rate based on 1,212 full-time, authorized personnel allocations.^{[CM1][CM2][KO3][CM4]} An additional survey was distributed to patrol officers and another to investigators/detectives. The purpose of these

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

surveys was to track actual shift workload duties, which contribute to the determination of staffing numbers. One hundred sixty-four surveys were received from patrol officers, and 33 from investigators/detectives^[SL5]. The responses from these surveys were considered when formulating some of the recommendations within this study.

Throughout this study, staff at all levels within the LBPD exhibited a high level of commitment and pride in their work. They communicated that they want what is best for the community and the agency. LBPD demonstrates a visible commitment to community policing, collaborative problem-solving efforts, and already implements leading practices for policing strategies.

This study examined the entire department with specific focus on eight core areas:

1. Culture, Leadership, and Communication
2. Operations, Staffing; Patrol, Special Operations, Investigations (including Traffic, K-9, School Police)
3. Community Policing/Crime Victim Services
4. Policy Review
5. Data, Technology, and Equipment
6. Training and Education
7. Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion
8. Internal Affairs, Use of Force, Discipline

The analysis determined that several areas within the police department require adjustment to meet service demands and improve relationships and trust between the police department and the community.

The approach used was informed by 21st century policing. The goal of this review, including the focus on nine core areas within the department, is to improve services to the residents of Long Beach through recommendations provided to improve and enhance operations within the LBPD. IACP posits that the analysis represented here is balanced and that it fairly represents the conditions, expectations, and desired outcomes that prompted Long Beach to solicit outside assistance.

A summary of recommendations includes, but is not limited, to:

- Establish a strong climate of vertical, horizontal, and diagonal communication within the agency and improve departmental communications and information flow.
- Build a Leadership Development, Mentoring, and Succession Planning Program
- Re-establish Mission, Vision, core values, and core policing strategies.
- Develop a career development program that includes rotating all or a portion of specialized assignments.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

- Develop procedures to structure and standardize the specialized assignment selection process in a manner that officers perceive as transparent and equitable.
- Rotate patrol shift assignments - especially days off - through a structured system.
- Evaluate the personnel time commitment for in-custody filings. If the process cannot be streamlined, then consider alternatives that will not interfere with the investigators' primary job function.
- Conduct a trend temporal analysis to modify investigator work schedule to include weekends and evening shifts.
- Utilize geographic policing to make community policing part of each officer's responsibility.
- **Incorporate all department policies in one department-wide manual.**
- Establish policies for recruiting, selecting, and hiring of personnel.
- Develop a culture of intelligence-led policing at all levels.
- Create a centralized Crime Analysis Unit or coordinate department-wide crime analysis functions.
- Acquire business intelligence or predictive policing software tools to support Crime Analysis Unit efforts.
- Establish a Real Time Operations Center.
- Reorganize and refocus the department crime meeting.
- Develop a Telephone Response Unit (TRU).
- Update the fleet, develop a fleet management system that allows for ongoing maintenance, cost, use analysis, revise squad assignment policy, and establish a spare fleet to address periodic shortfalls.
- Reduce the field training program length and/or modify Phase III (final six months).
- Evaluate the current training budget and how well the training needs of employees are met.
- Establish a full-time department recruiting function/team/office and integrate the background and recruiting sections under one division.
- Open application process year-round and expand direct communication with candidates.
- **Revise policy and procedures to provide structure for graduated discipline (or progressive discipline) such as a discipline matrix, opportunity for education-based discipline, and enhanced communication flow.**

A summary of staffing recommendations includes:

- Determine desired patrol obligated time from models 40% (current), 35%, and 30%.
- **Add two additional investigators to the Internal Affairs Unit.**
- Fill vacancies in the Detention Watch Unit.
- Add officers to Metro Section to reduce the use of patrol officer overtime to fill shift vacancies.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

- Analyze staffing needs for Business Desk and Live Scan based on increased services provided.
- To expand the services provided locally by the Crime Lab, consider adding AudioVisual, DNA, and Toxicology experts.
- Increase staffing in Evidence Control to expand hours and add Quality Assurance staff.
- Add an additional K-9 handler to increase schedule flexibility for the unit.

SCOPE OF WORK

This report for the LBPD focuses on the principles consistent with 21st century policing overlaid on critical cultural, operational, and policy elements of the LBPD. IACP has framed the study with the following eight core areas of focus:

1. Culture, Leadership, and Communication
2. Operations, Staffing; Patrol, Special Operations, Investigations (including Traffic, K-9, School Police)
3. Community Policing/Crime Victim Services
4. Policy Review
5. Data, Technology, and Equipment
6. Training and Education
7. Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion
8. Internal Affairs, Use of Force, Discipline

Recommendations are also provided regarding ancillary matters linked to these core areas of focus. The purpose of this report is not to tell LBPD what is already known about their agency and operations, but to make cogent and relevant recommendations to assist in continuing to transform the department in areas critical to 21st century policing. Substantial data analysis was fundamental to this study and is found in [Appendix A and B](#).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

IACP would like to thank Chief Robert Luna, Commander Michael Lewis, and the entire LBPD agency for their assistance and cooperation in this effort. We would also like to thank the residents of Long Beach for their involvement in this process.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CHAPTER I. DESCRIPTION OF CITY OF LONG BEACH

The City of Long Beach is located in southern California and it is positioned in the southernmost section of the Los Angeles metropolitan area. The City of Long Beach is roughly 50 square miles. It is the seventh largest city in California and the third largest in the Los Angeles area (behind Los Angeles and San Diego). The position of Long Beach in relation to Los Angeles is significant, because the population and constituency of Long Beach is not limited by the geographical confines of the city limits. Due to its proximity to Los Angeles, Long Beach is an active hub of the greater Los Angeles area. This includes various metropolitan amenities, as well as the volume of police services that tend to be associated with larger urban communities, and those that often spill over into adjacent areas.

Since the 2010 census, population growth has continued at a slowed rate, with projections for 2020 indicating a 1.6 percent increase over 2010 levels. Although estimates suggest a population of about 469,793 by the year 2020, it is possible that this number could be greater. In addition to examining general population numbers, it is also important to consider the demographics of the community.

Data provided show that the population of Long Beach is approximately 46 percent white, while African Americans make up 13.5 percent, Asians 12.9 percent, and those who identified as "Other" are the largest minority population at 20.3 percent. Although not considered a separate race, those who identify as Hispanic or Latino make up a 40.8 percent of the population within Long Beach. These factors are important as police agencies work toward hiring, recruiting, and staffing police departments that are representative of the communities they serve. This is also an important consideration in terms of the number of people within the community for whom English may be a second language.

The LBPD has authorization for 868 sworn positions. At the time of this study the LBPD had a total of 868 sworn officers and 344 non-sworn civilian positions, for a total of 1,212 employees. There are 454 officers assigned to support Patrol Operations, 142 as investigators, and 102 officers in support services. There are 397 officers assigned the primary responsibility of responding to Calls for Service (CFS), with an additional 57 officers assigned supervisory responsibilities within patrol.

The main purpose of any police agency is to ensure public safety within the community. This objective is accomplished primarily through the function of those in the patrol division, who have the responsibility to maintain order, respond to CFS, conduct traffic enforcement, maintain high visibility to deter criminal activity, and to have positive interactions with those in the community. These public contacts are essential to help establish good rapport, build relationships, and bolster and ensure ongoing community trust. Additional patrol officer responsibilities include conducting preliminary investigations, identifying, pursuing, and

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

arresting suspects; rendering aid to victims, including psychological, emotional, and physical care; preparation of cases for court, including testimony, and writing reports that document accurate accounts of events.

In furtherance of the public safety mission, the LBPD also allocates personnel to investigations, jail, port, transit, and a variety of other positions and roles which support the patrol division and the needs of the department and the community.

DRAFT

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CHAPTER II. 21ST CENTURY POLICING

In 2015, the U.S. Government convened a task force to determine the best and most contemporary standards and practices and “ways of fostering strong, collaborative relationships between local law enforcement and the communities they protect.”¹ The recommendations were organized around six main topic areas, or pillars:

1. Building Trust and Legitimacy
2. Policy and Oversight
3. Technology and Social Media
4. Community Policing and Crime Reduction
5. Training and Education
6. Officer Wellness and Safety

In any agency review, attention to these six areas provides a roadmap and a useful foundation for a grounded and focused approach that may identify more specific areas for improvement. This is the case here as well; these six core areas provide an effective overview of the more detailed components of this review. These areas are applicable to any department, regardless of how it may be organized, and regardless of size.

BUILDING TRUST AND LEGITIMACY

It is now readily accepted that building the trust and legitimacy of a police agency is perhaps the most necessary and critical endeavor of any agency as they move forward to serve their communities. Without trust, credibility, and legitimacy, crimes go unreported, information from the public is not shared, and the critical symbiotic relationship between the community and the police is lost. Lack of trust results in less effective policing and continues to build an “us against them” mentality that the best and most enlightened departments strive to eradicate. It has been repeatedly shown that departments and communities who engage in long term relationship building not only are better able to combat crime and foster a collective sense of trust and good will but are also able to produce positive outcomes including an increase in cases solved and reduced civil discord when use of force and other incidents occur. Because of the relationships developed, communication is stronger and mutual understanding is deeper. Building trust and legitimacy with communities served is the lifeblood of good policing. It requires a high level of transparency both internally and externally so that personnel within the department know and can articulate how and why the department is engaging in policing efforts and so that residents can understand and support these efforts.

¹ https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/taskforce_finalreport.pdf

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

POLICY AND OVERSIGHT

How agencies operate and how they go about providing police services is a test of the professionalism of the agencies and their leaders. Critical questions relevant to all police departments help focus on key issues: Is the department organized most effectively to prevent and respond to crime, to put residents first while maximizing the best use of resources? Is the department organized so that it is most responsive to the needs and issues within the community it serves? Are areas of geography clearly defined using natural and neighborhood boundaries so that issues and concerns unique to those neighborhoods are most effectively addressed? Are officers and supervisors assigned so that ownership and responsibility is clear, and accountability is effective? Does scheduling effectively maximize the personnel provided for the agency? Are there enough, or too many, specialized units and is a balance achieved which allows units to focus on critical issues while still providing the ability to serve day-to-day patrol functions?

TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIAL MEDIA

Are use of technology and social media maximized so that internal and external communication are highly functioning and satisfying to officers and residents? Can residents communicate effectively with the department, and is that communication two-way? Can officers effectively communicate internally, and are they linked with their community? Is crime information being shared in a timely manner throughout the department and with the community? Is technology being effectively used across the department to improve efficiencies and to track training, complaints, use of force, and other critical data? Is the department well linked to the city police, school police, state police, port police, and other agencies?

COMMUNITY POLICING AND CRIME REDUCTION

Is the department engaging in community policing to most effectively impact crime rates by making use of all available resources to identify problems and prioritize them? Is the department collectively working with the community in creating plans to address these issues? Are regular meetings held in each geographic area, and are officers and supervisors assigned so that they are responsible for specific geography? Is geography taken into consideration the same way by officers and residents alike, and are regular community meetings held where information is shared both ways; crime plans are discussed; and approaches are jointly built, measured, and celebrated? Are community resources built into these policing strategies? Do these approaches work to help reduce crime and ensure that minority communities and vulnerable populations are treated fairly? Do members of the community have access to direct contact with line officers and supervisors, and do they know which officials and officers are responsible for their neighborhoods? With whom and how do residents make contact when

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

there is a neighborhood concern? Are the Long Beach School Police, social service agencies, mental health agencies, and other resources integrated into the LBPD strategy to reduce crime and improve quality of life? Are outside police agencies used to investigate police shootings to provide professional outside perspective and reduce perception of favoritism or lack of transparency?

TRAINING AND EDUCATION

Does the department send a strong message regarding the sanctity of human life and does training and policy regarding use of force reinforce this message? Do officers have clear direction regarding use of force and use of force reporting, so that minimal force, deconfliction, and safety of residents and officers remain paramount in all situations?

Do members of the department understand the disciplinary policy and feel that it is fair and equitable? Likewise, do the rank and file as well as residents feel internal investigations are fair and unbiased?

Does the department reflect in its makeup the community it serves? Is the department regularly providing necessary training and education to their officers, so they feel confident, informed, and well equipped to serve their residents? Are members of the command staff engaging in leadership training and are all members not only meeting in-service training requirements, but also engaging in training and education to broaden their views and experience, build succession within the department, and continually view and assess best practices? Are training records electronically tracked so that they are up to date and easily retrieved and reviewed?

OFFICER WELLNESS AND SAFETY

Do officers not only have the necessary equipment to provide maximum safety, but do they also feel that communication is maximized within the divisions and throughout the department so that they know and understand priorities, strategies, direction, and goals? Do they feel included and heard? Are they well served during and after critical incidents and is there a regular review of critical performance matters which might indicate that training or education, and/or counseling might be appropriate and beneficial? Do they feel invested in the agency and positive about internal practices, promotions, and career opportunities? Is there a high rate of turnover, and if so, has the department assessed why this might be the case? Do officers and civilians have faith in the promotional and disciplinary processes?

The six topics highlighted in 21st century policing document intersect with all critical issues regarding how police departments operate and function, and more importantly, how they do these things with maximum effectiveness. Key aspects of agency operations include leadership

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

and culture, agency organization and staffing, policies and procedures, use of technology, disciplinary policy, unbiased policing, internal investigations and discipline, use of force, selection and hiring, promotions, special operations and investigations, officer wellness, responding to calls where potentially residents are suffering from mental illness, LGBTQ+ polices, community policing strategy, response to victims of crime, juvenile programs and crime prevention efforts, and training and education.

Moreover, these areas are inextricably linked with the philosophy, methods, and effectiveness with which police services are provided, how residents are served and treated, and how members of the agency, both sworn and civilian, are served and treated internally. Do residents of all backgrounds feel that they are heard and “seen” by the LBPD? Do they feel that the LBPD is responsive to their needs? Is the model of policing one primarily focused on arrests, or is the prevention of crime and building of trust, relationships, and communication also of primary focus, in concert with intelligence led crime fighting efforts? Do residents trust the agency to provide fair, impartial, and effective policing, as well as fair and impartial review of complaints and use of force incidents? Do officers feel informed, included, and confident in the role, direction, philosophy, and strategy of the department? Do they view all residents as customers? Is the agency accountable both internally and externally? Are officers properly cared for after traumatic events?

As part of this study, IACP assessed the application of the 21st century policing core areas, as practiced by the LBPD, through an internal survey with the command staff. Results indicated that there were several areas in which continued improvement was possible. An overlay of these broader, yet critical, topics which highlight the commonly accepted 21st century best practices with a focus on the internal critical areas identified further assists in improving the direction of the department.

TABLE 1: 21ST CENTURY POLICING SURVEY

Area	Max. Possible	Average Score	Pct. of Max.
Pillar One: Building Trust and Legitimacy	18	12.75	70.83%
Pillar Two: Policy and Oversight	28	21.5	76.79%
Pillar Three: Technology and Social Media	10	6.75	67.50%
Pillar Four: Community Policing and Crime Reduction	34	27.75	81.62%
Pillar Five: Training and Education	18	12	66.67%
Pillar Six: Officer Wellness and Safety	12	9	75.00%
Totals	120	89.75	74.79%

Source: LBPD Provided Survey Data

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

The survey provided by the IACP consists of 60 questions, separated within the six pillar areas. For each question, command staff were asked to independently assess whether the department regularly engages in practices that are consistent with the task force recommendation area, or whether the department inconsistently does so, or not at all. Below is a list of the sections from the survey in which command staff indicated that the department has not achieved one of the task force recommendations.

- 2.2.6 Have a serious incident review board that includes community members, for all force use incidents that could deteriorate public trust. The review board should have the ability to identify administrative, supervisory, training, tactical, or policy issues requiring attention.
- 2.6 Collect, maintain, and analyze all detentions (stops, frisks, searches, summons, and arrests).
- 2.10 Develop policies that require that officers should seek written consent for any searches that are not based on probable cause or a warrant.
- 3.3 Develop standards for use, retention, and dissemination of auditory, visual, and biometric data by law enforcement.
- 6.3 U.S. Department of Justice should encourage and assist departments in the implementation of scientifically supported shift lengths by law enforcement. "It has been established by significant bodies of research that long shifts can not only cause fatigue, stress, and decreased ability to concentrate, but also lead to other more serious consequences."²

² https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/taskforce_finalreport.pdf



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CHAPTER III. CULTURE, LEADERSHIP, AND COMMUNICATION

The LBPD is comprised of dedicated members, both sworn and civilian, who take their mission seriously and take pride in their organization. Community members provided positive feedback regarding the dedication of officers and agency responsiveness. Law enforcement in Long Beach seems well respected and communication between officers within LBPD is reported as good.

CULTURE – CONDITIONS

The main purpose of any police agency is to ensure public safety within the community. LBPD's stated vision is *A Safe City for All People* and its mission is *Public Safety Through Partnerships*. LBPD has three main priorities: Principles, Practices, and Partnerships; as well as three core values of ethics (Doing the Right Things), Intelligence (Doing Things Right), and Respect (Treating People Right). Community-oriented policing and problem-oriented policing rely upon building relationships with community members and groups to identify problems that cause community distress then working directly with the community to devise collaborative solutions that reduce or eliminate the problems.

The chief repeatedly and passionately expressed that community policing is a formal and well-communicated priority to LBPD and that building and maintaining community relationships and working with community members to solve problems is a core departmental value. Conversations with staff revealed a different perspective. At the operational level, traditional police practices are perceived as the guiding model, instead of the community focused approach stated in the agency's mission and vision.

CULTURE - RECOMMENDATIONS

Re-establish Mission, Vision, core values, and core policing strategies

- Include internal and external stakeholders in the re-imagination, reinterpretation, and communication of the Mission, Vision, core values, and core policing strategies.
- Develop a department-wide and a community-wide marketing plan for Mission, Vision, core values, and core policing strategies.
- Incorporate Mission, Vision, core values, and core policing strategies into strategic plan and all formal training, promotion, and career development opportunities.

LEADERSHIP - CONDITIONS

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Professional development that prepares employees for leadership and career progress is both a professional best practice and a trait of a healthy, vibrant organization. Training does not have to be external or expensive. Mentor programs require little more than vision and support from the leadership team. Modern policing organizations develop unique internal programs to develop leaders who behave consistent with the department's core values. LBPB has many experienced officers of all ranks including multiple FBI National Academy Graduates who could help develop an internal program to develop, mentor, and prepare leaders. Local colleges and universities can partner with the department to offer leadership training development. The City of Long Beach likely provides general supervision and leadership training for all managers that could be incorporated into such a program.

There has been and continues to be a tremendous amount of research about the impact of first line supervisors in police work. While it is the chief executive officer (CEO) that sets the vision for the agency to follow, it is the first line supervisor who ensures that the vision, goals and objectives are carried out.

A 2003 NIJ report titled How Police Supervisory Styles Influence Patrol Officer Behavior by Robin Shepard Engel identified how a sergeant's leadership style can influence the work performance and behavior of patrol officers:

The most important finding was that style or quality of field supervision can significantly influence patrol officer behavior, quite apart from quantity of supervision. Frontline supervision by sergeants and lieutenants can influence some patrol officer behavior, but the study found that this influence varies according to the style of supervision. An "active" supervisory style— involving leading by example—seems to be most influential despite potential drawbacks. Indeed, active supervisors appear to be crucial to the implementation of organizational goals.

If LBPB is to become the transformational department that the chief, command staff and community want then effective first line supervisors will be its mainstay. Given the fact that LBPB is facing a major retirement bubble in the near future, mentoring and development new leaders is critical.

Succession planning is vital for LBPB and it needs to be a major component of its operational and strategic planning. As identified in an article in the IACP publication Big Ideas, Fall 2008³;

Succession planning is more than merely selecting someone to succeed the chief or another leadership position in the agency; it also requires investing in

³ <https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/all/s/Succession%20Planning.pdf>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

the development and training of those individuals. Effective succession planning includes:

- *Conducting internal agency surveys to determine areas of strength and areas for improvement*
- *Encouraging and providing leadership training for command staff and line supervision*
- *On-the-job training in special-duty assignments such as acting shift commander and allowing line officers to rotate preparing and conducting roll call briefing*
- *In-service situational leadership training*
- *Courses on budgets, computer skills, writing, and instructor training*
- *Mentoring staff by discussion, training, and formal presentations with the chief to city administrators and businesses*

Additionally, lieutenants at LBPD experience a gap between responsibility and authority that makes their responsibility to translate policy into practice challenging. LBPD should re-imagine the role of lieutenants as vital members of the Command Staff and include them in command-level training, conversations, planning, and decision making including regular command meetings up to the Division or Bureau level.

LEADERSHIP – RECOMMENDATIONS

Build a Leadership Development, Mentoring, and Succession Planning Program.

Leadership development could incorporate succession planning to provide opportunities for supervisors to prepare a successor for an assignment. Provide more developmental opportunities to prepare employees in anticipation of promotion.

Explore using the equalization of experience and KSAs instead of solely on seniority when assigning personnel to temporal and geographic shifts.

The permanency of an officer's assignment (temporal and geographic) is key to building trust and partnership with the community. Beyond supporting the geographic beat and performance evaluation recommendations, the deployment of officers with all levels of knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) is very important to improve the department's effectiveness and efficiency as well as developing well rounded officers. The benefit to the department's overall effectiveness, should be closely weighed against any impacts on morale or employee contracts.

Explore greater utilization of senior officers through the creation of a corporal or master police officer rank to fully utilize the experience and knowledge of senior officers on patrol squads.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

With training and mentorship, senior officers are capable of temporarily supervising the squad and provide a strong cadre of potential future leaders. In addition to mentoring and developing these future leaders, the department will offload some of the patrol sergeants' workload, provide a higher level of on-scene supervision, and reduce burnout of sergeants.

Establish the rank and role of Lieutenant as vital component of Command Staff.

Develop policies, procedures, and systems to include lieutenants in command level leadership activities with particular focus on those lieutenants in assignments with little opportunity for interaction with Command Staff. The successful integration of lieutenants into Command Staff will help address departmental concerns about workloads for the commander rank and also complement recommendations identified elsewhere in this report such as enhanced communications systems and leadership development.

COMMUNICATION - CONDITIONS

Active vertical, horizontal, and diagonal communications are the hallmark of a healthy organization. This is especially true in organizations that require employees to work a variety of shifts 24-hours a day, 7-days a week, year-round in geographically dispersed assignments. Effective communication rarely, if ever, develops without deliberate effort. Modern organizations with temporally and geographically dispersed teams utilize communication technology aids that promote two-way communication and feedback opportunities. Such aids include electronic suggestion boxes, regular surveys, 360-degree evaluations, video streaming tools, intradepartmental TV networks, social media, internal web sites, etc.

During the course of interviews with staff, a global theme among all ranks and divisions regarding internal organizational communications was identified. Overall, employee responses suggested that Executive Staff truly cares about them and tries to behave in a manner that is consistent with the department's expressed values. Employees observed that the way decisions are communicated often undermines these feelings and beliefs of support from top leadership.

Internal communications mostly occurred in electronic format and were directive and transactional, with little in the way of explanation. Command staff reported that it readily shares information about decisions. Most employees understand and appreciate that Command Staff works hard and acknowledge that one of their scarcest resources is their own time. Employees reported the Chief and Deputy Chiefs do significant outreach to the community. There was an expressed desire that Executive Staff make a concerted effort to engage more with the employees, similar to the effort employed towards the community. If LBPD integrates the lieutenant position into a leadership role, some of the community outreach could be dispersed to these ranks and the Chief and Deputy Chiefs may have more opportunity to interact with staff.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Employees described ineffective communications between the investigative and patrol bureaus. While this is not unusual in police agencies it seems to be a particular concern for LBPD employees. The comments about this communication challenge crossed ranks and assignments. Employees expressed a clear interest in seeing investigators attend squad meetings in the divisions to provide opportunity for meaningful two-way information exchange.

Many modern organizations, including police agencies, engage organizational development professionals who specialize in organizational communications to conduct assessments and help build intra-departmental communications training and mechanisms that focus on active, in-person, and collaborative communication versus passive and directive communication. LBPD should consider several options to improve communication within the agency including performing an internal inventory and assessment of all communication strategies, methods, and platforms; provide formal customized communications training for all levels and all assignments which should start with top leadership visibly participating; and utilizing technological aids to assist with internal communication.

COMMUNICATION – RECOMMENDATIONS

Establish strong climate of vertical, horizontal, and diagonal communication within the agency and improve departmental communications and information flow.

- Perform an internal inventory and assessment of all communication strategies, methods, and platforms.
- Provide formal customized training communications training for all levels and all assignments which should start from top down with top leadership visibly participating.
- Utilize technological aids to assist with internal communication.

Establish a program of quarterly Executive Staff visits to squad meetings and supplement with ride-alongs with patrol.

Establish a climate of communication and cooperation between patrol and investigative bureaus including periodic required appearances in patrol briefings by investigations and investigations participation in crime meetings.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CHAPTER IV. OPERATIONS/STAFFING

PATROL – CONDITIONS

The purpose of the Patrol Section is law enforcement, crime prevention, reducing the fear of crime, and to use proactive problem-solving methods in conjunction with the citizens of Long Beach. This is accomplished through active patrol, traffic enforcement, DUI enforcement, criminal investigations, evidence/crime scene processing, and drug enforcement. The Patrol Section responds to emergency and non-emergency calls for service. When not responding to these calls, officers in this section use non-obligated time to actively patrol their beats.

IACP recognizes that personnel allocation is an imperfect process. The analysis here involves only one calendar year and looking at prior years may provide a different distribution. In addition, despite the best efforts of the department, it is likely that there will always be some variances between CFS workloads and personnel distributions. However, larger deviations suggest an ongoing condition that demands additional scrutiny. This type of analysis should occur at least annually, and agency leaders should consider this analysis against personnel allocations.

Geographic Policing is a proactive, decentralized approach, designed to reduce crime, disorder, and fear of crime, by intensively involving the same officer in the same area of the community on a long-term basis, so that citizens develop trust, thereby enhancing cooperation with police officers. Geographic policing encourages assigning police officers to defined geographic boundaries on a permanent basis, to work directly with citizens to resolve problems. The concept involves collaboration, communication, and accountability. It is a strategy designed to make individual police officers responsible for the community's policing needs in a defined geographical area, with a service customized to each individual locality, insuring the policing needs of local areas are met. Geographic deployment plans fulfill this principle, enhance customer service, and facilitate more contact between police and community members, thus establishing a strong relationship and mutual accountability. Geographic policing also implies a shift within the department that grants greater autonomy to line officers, which implies enhanced respect for their judgment as police professionals.

IACP patrol staffing models are determined by evaluating the total workload in hours against hours of officer availability. Officers are not able to work for a variety of reasons including days off, vacation, sick leave, holiday time, and training obligations. To define staffing needs, deploy officers properly, and evaluate productivity, it is necessary to calculate the actual amount of time officers are available to work. To assist in these calculations, IACP obtained detailed leave data from the LBPD (average hours used by patrol, investigations, and sergeants, in 2016).

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

Table 2 below, helps to demonstrate the amount of time patrol officers have available for shift work. This table starts with the assumption that officers work a 40-hour work week. This computation is 52 weeks x 40 hours = 2,080 hours per year. However, in order to have a more accurate picture of how many hours per year the average officer is available to work, various leave categories must first be deducted from this total. The table below shows that after subtracting leave categories from the total, the average officer is actually available to work 1,653 hours per year not 2,080 hours, as is often thought (understanding that this represents the cumulative average – and individual availability can vary greatly).

TABLE 2: PATROL AVAILABILITY (HOURS)

Total Annual Hours	2,080
Leave Category	
Annual Leave	104.84
Holiday Time Off	101.96
Sick Leave	57.58
FMLA Leave	5.02
Military Leave	5.89
Leave Without Pay	3.96
Injury Leave	71.34
Bereavement Leave	1.21
Banked Overtime	32.65
Donning and Doffing	2.02
Executive Leave	0.43
Training Hours (estimated annual)	40.00
<i>Sub-total (minus)</i>	<i>426.91</i>
Average Annual Availability (Hours)	1,653

Understanding the actual amount of work time available for officers is central to building a work schedule, and for ensuring that adequate shift coverage is attained in relation to CFS needs. It is also a critical component in calculating staffing demands, based on an examination of workload against worker capacity.

Workload Model and Analysis

Measurement standards make it possible to evaluate and define patrol staffing and deployment requirements and IACP uses a specific model for doing this. The workload analysis model starts with the total hours in CAD for 2016 and includes both community- and officer-

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

initiated activity data from multiple categories and units. This model includes only the patrol and K-9 officers (sergeants and below), and it excludes the traffic officers.

TABLE 3: OBLIGATED WORKLOAD

Patrol Workload Calculation	
Total 2016 CAD Hours	655,701
Removal of Officer-Initiated Activity	-346,375
Removal of Non-Patrol workload	-9,579
Removal of Supplemental Patrol Activity	-8,134
Remove Traffic Hours	-4,807
Add Officer-Initiated Criminal CFS	11,038
Add Officer-Initiated Service CFS	1,064
Add Officer-Initiated Crash CFS	3,588
Add Patrol Supplemental Hours	418
Adjusted patrol workload, excluding reports	302,914


Because the IACP workload staffing model excludes data from other staff that do not represent the obligated workload for patrol, several reductions were made in the original number of hours represented in CAD. All officer-initiated data was removed from both patrol and non-patrol units, as was community-initiated data that relates to non-patrol and supplemental patrol units. Additionally, traffic related data was removed.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

FIGURE 1: PATROL SHIFT DOCUMENTED WORKLOAD



After these reductions were made, certain hours were added back into the totals, as these hours represent part of the obligated workload. Using the data examined from CAD, and using the calculations and model described above, IACP created Table 4 (below). IACP uses a patrol workload allocation model of 30% obligated, 30% unobligated, 30% administrative, and 10% flexible time. Obligated time includes all of the community generated calls for service (CFS). Unobligated time is the portion reserved for officers to be proactively engaged in problems solving activities, community outreach, discretionary enforcement, etc. Administrative time encompasses report completion and other administrative tasks associated with documenting

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

the delivery of police services. The flexible time affords officers additional capacity to focus on the other three uses as needed.

Applying this model to the LBPD the current allocation of patrol officers spends 39% of their time handling obligated workloads. While this is within the recommended range of 30% obligated time combined with the 10% flexible time, the workload distribution should be reviewed by senior leadership to determine if a more flexible time is desired. Ultimately, this is a leadership decision as the current workload distribution is stable. If the LBPD desires to increase the flexible time afforded to patrol officers two complimentary models have been completed for comparison. An increase of 70 patrol officers would reduce the obligated time to 35%. An increase of 157 patrol officers would reduce the obligated time to 30%. However, there are other factors to be considered to redistribute the workload. By itself the workload model requires an increase of patrol officers to redistribute the workload of patrol officers. Other significant factors to consider are related workloads associated with evidence collection and crime scene processing, investigative follow ups, crash investigation and traffic control.

TABLE 4: OBLIGATED WORKLOAD – PATROL MODELS

	Current	Better	Ideal
A. Total Obligated Time	302914	302914	302914
B. Available Hours/Officer	1653	1653	1653
C. Authorized Strength	454	454	454
D. Current Patrol Availability [B*C]	750462	750462	750462
E. Current % Dedicated to Obligated Time [A/D]	40.36%	40.36%	40.36%
F. Target Obligated Workload*	40%	35%	30%
G. Officer Workload Hours at 30% [B*F]	667.15	578.55	495.90
H. Patrol Officers Required to Meet Target Workload [A/G]	454	524	611
I. Additional Officers Needed [H-C]	0	70	157

*30% obligated time offers greatest flexibility

Patrol Shifts

Based on interviews conducted by IACP, the shift (temporal) assignments are assigned via seniority. If this is the policy, it can result in senior officers most likely working the day or evening shifts and/or having the best days off and the more junior officers working the overnight shifts and/or having the least desirable days off. While workload may be less for the overnight shift, the degree of command presence is far less. Clearer policies around shift assignments will help alleviate the perception of clearer expectations. Long Beach Police had a

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

reduction in force size and a hiring freeze from about 2008 until recently. As such the patrol force has senior officers and junior officers. The cohort of officers with experience ranging from five to ten years is very limited.

TABLE 5: EXPERIENCE PROFILE

Less than 1 year	Years of Service for Sworn LBPD								Total
	1 to 5 years	6 to 10 years	11 to 15 years	16 to 20 years	21 to 25 years	26 to 30 years	31 to 35 years	More than 36 years	
0	128	65	195	149	187	80	7	2	813

Source: LBPD provided

	Less than 1	1 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15	16 to 20	21 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 35	Over 36
Patrol - N,S,E,W		60	50	125	67	48	25	1	1
Patrol - All		126	57	133	82	72	39	4	2

PATROL – RECOMMENDATIONS

Determine desired patrol obligated time from models 40% (current), 35%, and 30%.

The base IACP model recommends patrol officer time being distributed in the following proportions: 30% unobligated, 30% obligated, 30% administrative, and 10% flexible model. While the LBPD is currently staffed in accordance with this model an incremental increase in patrol officers would free the 10% of their flexible time currently being used as obligated time and afford them additional capacity within their workload to apply as needed.

Rotate patrol shift assignments - especially days off - through a structured system.

It is considered a best practice to allow employees opportunity for weekends off to support a well-balanced family and personal life and to prevent an atmosphere of isolation. There are a multitude of ways to accomplish this including rotating shifts, regular shift allocation opportunities, shift preference periods, shift bidding, etc. This is an opportunity for employees to work with Command Staff to offer suggestions to improve work conditions regarding schedules.

Develop a career development program which includes rotating all or a portion of specialized assignments.

Develop procedures to structure and standardize the specialized assignment selection process in a manner that officers perceive as transparent and equitable.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Develop a policy and process for line-level supervisors to approve a limited amount of overtime.

Flexibility in authorizing limited overtime will ensure proper staffing levels during critical situations.

CRIME SCENE PROCESSING – CONDITIONS

Currently, patrol officers do not process property crime scenes and if a Crime Scene Investigator is not available then a request is logged into the RMS system. When the Crime Scene Investigator returns to work, they call the victim to see if they still want the scene processed. It may take 24 to 48 hours to process a crime scene.

Most of a law enforcement officer's contact with citizens is through traffic and property crimes. Maintaining the integrity of the crime scene is essential. The National Forensic Science Technology Center created a guide for crime scene investigations, which notes that at no time is a crime scene left unattended.⁴ However, based off interviews at LBPDP, leaving a minor crime scene unattended is a current practice.

Most larger agencies, such as the LBPDP do have specialty evidence units for processing crime scenes. Even when there are specialized evidence units, there are often limitations to what these units will process, which should be documented in the standard operating procedures. Crime scenes that are not processed by the Crime Scene Unit still need to be processed for evidence, whether by patrol or another investigative component.

CRIME SCENE PROCESSING – RECOMMENDATIONS

Establish clear guidelines on crime scene processing to eliminate confusion and ensure uniformity in response.

Clearly defined policies and protocols for crime scene processing by officers will help alleviate the workload for Crime Scene Unit and improve their response times to more critical scenes. In many cases with a minor crime scene, the patrol officer could most likely process the scene faster than it would take for the Crime Scene Unit to respond and process the scene.

⁴ <https://www.nist.gov/sites/default/files/documents/forensics/Crime-Scene-Investigation.pdf>



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

INVESTIGATIONS - CONDITIONS

The primary function of the Investigations Section is the follow-up and investigation of criminal cases, with the objective of identification, apprehension, and successful prosecution of criminals, while providing high quality, professional, and compassionate service.

At LBPD, investigators work four-day work weeks, Monday through Friday. Based on a normal work schedule, investigators are scheduled to work 2,080 hours per year. However, negotiated leave and vacation time, holidays, sick and injured time off, training requirements, and compensatory time off, mean that in actuality, investigators are only available to conduct work assignments for about 1,746.01 hours per year.

TABLE 6: INVESTIGATIONS AVAILABILITY

Annual Hours Worked	2080
Leave Category	
Vacation	113.5
Holiday Time Off*	98.0
Sick Leave	38.7
FMLA Leave	10.0
Military	0.5
LWOP	1.6
Injury	58.3
Bereavement	1.7
Banked Overtime	8.6
Donning & Doffing	3.1
Executive Leave	0.4
Training*	30.0
<i>Sub-Total</i>	<i>334.0</i>
Average Annual Availability	1,746.01

Source: LBPD provided data

*30 hours of in-service training only

In-Custody Filings

The current practice of the LBPD is that when patrol officers make an arrest, the appropriate investigative unit will follow up with the District Attorney (DA) within the 24 or 48-hour allotted time frame. While having the investigative unit that would normally investigate that type of crime handle the filings is an excellent way to ensure that the unit is aware of the arrest which may help solve other crimes, investigators pointed out that these in-custody filings consume 1 to 2 days of follow-up each week. This is equivalent to approximately 6 days a month. Given the 4-day work weeks, 1.5 weeks out of the month are spent conducting follow up to in-custody

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

arrests, leaving only 2.5 weeks to actively work their own investigations (not taking into account leave, training, etc., as shown in the table above).

Investigation Schedule

By removing in-custody filings from the investigators' responsibilities, shift plans in investigations can be tailored more to crime patterns. The largest hurdle explained by investigators for not having evening or weekend shifts is that they claim they must be available Monday through Friday to handle in-custody filings for the DA's Office. With this barrier removed, LBPd can conduct a detailed crime analysis and identify crime patterns and create a varied schedule allowing more investigators to work when crimes are occurring.

Vice Unit

Currently Vice operates under the Detective Division. However, interviewees advised that many of the operations conducted by Vice and Gang and Violent Crimes Division are often inter-related, and the units mutually request assistance between one another quite often. Gang investigators have often found that subjects of their investigations are involved in drugs and human trafficking. Therefore, these units often work together on operations to apprehend suspects.

INVESTIGATIONS – RECOMMENDATIONS

Evaluate the personnel time commitment for in-custody filings. If the process cannot be streamlined, then consider alternatives that will not interfere with the investigators' primary job function.

- Track the number of in-custody filings LBPd handles each year and adjust investigators in each patrol unit to handle in-custody filings as their core job function.
- Create a new unit within Patrol Bureau to submit all patrol in-custody filings for the DA. This new unit would also be a good unit for vetting new investigators to determine if investigations would be a good fit for them.

Conduct a trend temporal analysis to modify investigator work schedules to include weekend and evening shifts.

Rotating shifts will allow more flexibility with contacting victims, witnesses, and suspects. The supervisor should have the authority to flex the investigators schedule to accommodate needs for court, DA's Office, etc., to minimize the usage of overtime, while also ensuring that there are still others in the unit working so an entire shift is not unstaffed.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Additionally, more investigators available in the evenings and on weekends can alleviate personnel shortages in patrol. Investigators responding to a crime scene, can free up patrol officers to answer calls for service. This analysis can be supplemented with special analysis as well to further target staffing needs.

Examine the interactions of both these components and determine if it will be beneficial to have Vice and Gang units under the same chain of command.

Examine ancillary duty assignments in the Investigations Bureau.

Many police departments have officers that work a secondary position outside of their primary job assignment. These secondary positions play a vital role to the agency. The LBPB has ancillary duty assignments including training instructors, SWAT, and hostage negotiations. During the on-site visit to LBPB, there were times that multiple staff in the same investigative unit could have simultaneously been called out or sent to training. This scenario would be detrimental to the function and efficiency of the unit. The LBPB should examine the number of ancillary duties in a single unit and determine if there could be re-assignments to minimize the impact to any one unit. Another option would be to develop a contingency plan with other investigative units, to assist during times of personnel shortages due to ancillary duties.

Fill current vacancies in the property warehouse and clear the backlog of property.

Currently there are over five hundred thousand items of evidence stored in the property warehouse. The property tracking system requires that each detective manually clear cases and assign a disposition to each piece of evidence so the warehouse staff knows when property can be destroyed. One of the greatest obstacles with this system is tracking the dispositions. For example, if an investigator moves or retires, their cases must be reassigned in order to be cleared; this does not usually occur.

A more efficient way to purge unnecessary property needs to be instituted. Until that time, it is recommended that the property warehouse send at least a biannual property report to investigators requesting disposition statuses of property that can be disposed. Additionally, a protocol for officers separating from LBPB should be developed in which property items are marked as purged or cases are reassigned to another investigator or specific unit. Initially this will be labor intensive, but over time the amount of backlog of property will decline which will ease the workload.

For this system to be effective, the property warehouse needs to be sufficiently staffed. Currently there are vacancies and the current staff cannot track these dispositions with their current workload. IACP recommends filling all current vacancies in the property warehouse and proceeding with the recommendation for enhancing their process of purging property; once all

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

vacancies are filled and a new process is instituted, the LBPB should reevaluate staffing in the unit.

DRAFT

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CHAPTER V. COMMUNITY POLICING

Community-oriented policing and problem-oriented policing are considered 21st century policing standards in core policing strategies. A progressive policing model holds internal and external stakeholders as partners in the actual development and adoption of core policing strategies. This is a basic hallmark of a police agency evolving from a traditional police services agency to a problem-solving organization.

As discussed in Chapter III, as an effective way to support the implementation of COP, POP, and other modern policing strategies, LBPD should re-establish its vision from the top and deliberately cascade it down through command staff to the front lines through dialogue, training, empowerment, and inclusion. This will require convening and empowering working groups that include representatives from all ranks, all assignments, and from the community to work together to establish (or interpret) a common vision and to identify core policing strategies. These groups should utilize independent facilitators to help them explore and understand recognized best practices for core policing strategies such as community-oriented policing, problem-oriented policing, intelligence-led policing, focused deterrence, etc. LBPD should explore the concept of co-production policing and how it can support COP and POP and other policing strategies in collaboration with department and community stakeholders.

Once the Mission, Vision, core values, and policing strategies are established they must be disseminated to the department in such a way that socializes the organization and its members to their meaning and function. A robust implementation plan should include deliberate marketing and training. Training should start at senior levels and as each rank is trained they should be expected to incorporate the mission, vision, core values, and strategies in their messages, operations plans, and behavior. Marketing should include multiple formats ranging from publication, to promotional testing, to social media, to performance evaluations. The mission, vision, core values, and strategies should be reinforced at every opportunity, particularly by top leadership and Command Staff.

Traffic Complaints

The LBPD traffic officers handle crashes as do patrol officers; there is no specific crash investigation dispatch protocol. There has been a significant increase in neighborhood traffic complaints. While some of these neighborhood complaints are handled by patrol units, the majority are handled by traffic units. The traffic commander stated that as more and more of the traffic section's time is being devoted to dealing with neighborhood traffic issues, they have less time and resources to handle crash investigations.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Traffic complaints are the predominate complaints in most neighborhoods and this holds true for Long Beach. For many residents these traffic issues are major public safety issues that deserve swift and significant police action. Failure to deliver this action can result in community distrust and disillusionment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Utilize geographic policing to make community policing part of each officer's responsibility.

Geographic Policing is a proactive, decentralized approach, designed to reduce crime, disorder, and fear of crime, by intensively involving the same officer in the same community on a long-term basis, so that citizens develop trust enhancing cooperation with police officers. Geographic Policing assigns police officers to defined boundaries on a permanent basis to work directly with citizens to resolve problems. The concept involves collaboration, communication, and accountability. It is a strategy designed to make individual police officers responsible for the community's policing needs in a defined geographical area with a service customized to each individual locality insuring the policing needs of local areas are met.

In keeping with the community ownership fostered by the geographic policing concept, it makes sense that patrol officers should be the first level of response to community traffic complaints.

DRAFT

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CHAPTER VI. POLICY [SL6] REVIEW

As part of the LBPD management study, an overall review of the LBPD's policy manual was requested. This was not to be a detailed review of each document in the manual, but rather a cursory review to:

1. Ensure the manual is well-organized
2. Ensure it contains appropriate and typical guiding policies
3. Determine if there are any redundant policies,
4. Determine if there are any conflicting policies,
5. Identify policies related to external review boards,
6. Identify policies related to internal review committees
7. Determine if the manual has policies related to 15 specific categories, listed below, and whether they are consistent with best practices.

Policy Manual Organization

According to LBPD policy **1.1 Department Manual**:

"The Department Manual describes the Police Department's organizational structure, sets the policy and procedures, and identifies Bureau responsibilities. The objectives, principles, policies, procedures, rules and regulations set forth in the Department Manual are guides to the actions of all Department employees."

201.22 *"The Long Beach Police Department shall utilize written directives for the purpose of defining policy, operational guidelines, and rules and regulations for all personnel within the Department."*

The Manual of the Long Beach Police Department has a detailed Table of Contents and was presented in one PDF file that allows for searches of topics or words. Additionally, there are links built into the table of contents which allows the reader to directly move to the desired policy. Both tools allow for easy means to locate the appropriate policies. While the review for this study was only of the Manual of the Long Beach Police Department, the IACP also reviewed sections of the Training Bulletin Manual and did note that there are a number of other publications that provide guidance, instruction and direction to department personnel. They are:

1.4 POLICE DEPARTMENT PUBLICATIONS

Official publications of the LBPD issued under authority of the Chief of Police are as follows

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

- **Bureau Orders** – issued by a Bureau Chief/Manager
- **Division Manuals** - issued by a Division Commander/Administrator
- **Divisional Orders** - issued by a Division Commander
- **Legal Information Bulletins** - issued by the Training Division Commander
- **Training Bulletins** - issued by the Training Division Commander
- **Manual of the Long Beach Police Department** - issued by the Training Division Commander
- **Uniform and Equipment Specifications Manual** - issued by the Training Division Commander
- **Personnel Orders** - issued by the Personnel Division Administrator
- **Special Orders** - issued at the Division or Bureau level

Each policy in the Manual of the Long Beach Police Department has a title, section/policy number, and where applicable a revision date and a responsible audit department; the title page of the manual does have an effective date which apparently applies to the entire manual. The LBPD manual is organized into eight sections:

- Section 1 - General Provisions
- Section 2 – Structure, Rank and Responsibilities
- Section 3 – Personal Conduct
- Section 4 – Chief of Police
- Section 6 - Administration
- Section 7 - Patrol Bureau
- Section 8 - Investigations
- Section 9 - Legal

In general, it appears that the Manual of the Long Beach Police Department policies are organized and grouped homogenously; however, some of the sections appear to be based upon organizational structures (Internal Investigations, Discipline are under Section 4 Chief of Police rather than Section 6 Administration) rather than topical.

The large number of official LBPD publications issued under authority of the Chief of Police can complicate implementation. Having the multitude of manuals and orders that are present in the LBPD can create confusion, conflict and difficulty in finding the appropriate department policy. While IACP supports the concept of Training Bulletins, Legal Updates, and unit specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), best practices agencies have one manual that establishes department-wide policies. IACP recommends that the LBPD revise its process of recording and disseminating policies and place all department policies in one department wide

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

manual. Other manuals such as Training Bulletins should be more topical, and information based instead of establishing policy.

Based upon a cursory review of the manual, the LBPB policies are appropriate and typical. They cover a wide range of key law enforcement topics and provide clear guidance to the officers and employees. There are several policies that IACP recommends LBPB review and consider potential revisions. These are identified at the end of this chapter.

As there are so many documents/manuals that establish policy it is difficult to say if there are redundant policies. In general, Manual of the Long Beach Police Department does not contain redundant policies. While there is some repetition, it appears that it occurs because of similarity of function among multiple units or policies. Similarly, there were no conflicting policies were found in the Manual of the Long Beach Police Department, but due to the volume of other documents/manuals, it is likely that there are conflicting policies between the various documents.

Policy Review Committees

There were no policies specifically relating to external review boards, the LBPB has several advisory committees that provide input and guidance to the Chief of Police and the department. They include:

- Academic Education and Action Research Advisory Committee
- Black Advisory Committee
- Hispanic Advisory Committee
- Asian Advisory Committee
- Gay and Lesbian Advisory Committee
- Youth Advisory Committee
- Chaplain Advisory Committee

To improve community relations, perception and organizational transparency, IACP recommends that LBPB evaluate adding non-police department members to some of its review committees that provide policy and department oversight beyond just advisory roles.

Several sections were found that contained provisions for internal review of police policies, practices and specific conduct. Some of the more significant boards and committees are:

- 7.4.1.5 Vehicle Accident Review Board
- 8.1.6 Firearms Shooting Review Board
- 8.1.7 In Custody Review Board
- 6.1.8 Commendation Board
- 6.1.11 Employee Recognition Committee

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

- 6.5.15.7 Reviews and Audits
- 6.9.7 Uniform Equipment Committee
- 7.1.2.13 Tactical operations Committee
- 7.5.2.5 Critical Incident Debrief Committee

Critical Policies

There are 15 categories listed below, described as critical policy areas. Of the documents reviewed, IACP found policies that were either directly titled similar to 12 of the categories or had sections that contained policies specific to the identified critical policies. IACP was unable to find policies that specifically discussed LGBTQ+ issues, Selection and Hiring, and policies governing rules of Search and Seizure. These are important topics that need to be addressed. In general, the policy manual and Training Bulletin Manual contain policies that cover the myriad of topics needed for a modern police department. However, there were several policies that need to be evaluated and updated to address current issues in law enforcement. These are listed under the specific topical areas below and are identified through specific recommendations at the end of the chapter.

Impartial Policing (Unbiased Policing)

IACP did not identify a specific policy dealing with Biased Based Policing. There is a section of the Personal Conduct chapter that sets forth officers' responsibility to treat all with an impartial attitude (3.4).

Impartial Attitude

Employees shall remain impartial toward all individuals with whom they come in contact. All citizens are guaranteed equal protection under the law. Exhibiting partiality for or against a person because of race, sex, national or ethnic origins, age, influence, or for any other reason, is considered conduct unbecoming an officer. Similarly, unwarranted interference in the private business of others when not in the interests of justice is also considered conduct unbecoming an officer.

IACP recommends that a separate impartial policing policy be developed and that it incorporate topics such as implicit bias and the importance of procedural justice in police operations and community relations.

Off-duty Conduct

There are several policies in the manual that touch on off-duty conduct. Most deal with reporting requirements if an off-duty officer is involved in an incident, discharges a weapon, or is injured. Others deal with the call back procedures for off-duty personnel. IACP was not able to identify a specific policy or sections of specific policies that delineate the authority, conduct

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

or duties and responsibilities of off duty officers. This policy should be strengthened to incorporate topics that delineate the authority, conduct and duties, and responsibilities for off-duty officers.

Sexual Harassment-Discrimination

The LBPD Manual has a specific policy (3.10 Unlawful Harassment Complaints) that spells out a strong department policy against harassment and cites the appropriate City Rules and Regulations that prohibit Sexual Harassment and other forms of discrimination. The policy is very detailed in identifying duties and responsibilities throughout the Department.

Selection/Hiring

IACP was not able to identify any policies concerning selection and hiring of personnel in the Manual of the Long Beach Police Department. This indicates that the policies governing the hiring and selection of personnel are established in locations other than the department's policy manual; perhaps the policies are established by the Long Beach Civil Service Department/Commission. It is a critical shortfall when police departments do not have policies governing the recruiting, hiring, and selection of officer candidates. The IACP strongly recommends that the LBPD establish policies for recruiting and the selection of department personnel.

Internal Affairs

LBPD has a complete series of policies (4.1.1 to 4.1.5.8) that lay out the process used for receiving and investigating complaints. The policy outlines the investigative and hearing processes in detail including when the department provides feedback to the complainant and public information release. Long Beach uses the "Blue Team" software to document inquiries and complaints. The Manual of the Long Beach Police Department at one time had a policy (4.1.4) covering an Early Warning System. The current policy manual indicates that this policy was deleted September 2, 2014. Early Warning Systems are important tools in the police disciplinary process and Long Beach PD should consider reinstating an Early Warning policy and incorporate the practice into operations.

Special Operations

The LBPD Policy Manual contains several separate policies dealing with both special units and special situations. These policies are done in accordance with best practices. The Special Operations policies are:

- Emergency operations/critical incidents
- Critical incident contingency planning & reporting
- Unusual occurrences
- Special deployment

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

- Call-out procedures
- Tactical alert stages
- Incident debriefing
- Critical incident debrief committee
- Emergency mobilization
- Hazardous materials
- Special weapons & tactics (swat)
- Barricaded suspect – search warrant requirement

Responding to the Mentally Ill

The Long Beach Police Training Bulletin number 62, Mentally Ill Persons, outlines the comprehensive approach that LBPD uses in handling situations involving the mentally ill. The document outlines policies and procedures for dealing with voluntary committals, involuntary committals, as well as intoxicated persons. LBPD uses a Mental Evaluation Team (MET) which is a unit comprised of a sworn police officer and a licensed clinician that specializes in dealing with the mentally ill. If on-duty and available, a MET unit will be dispatched to calls involving persons with possible mental illness. If a MET unit is not available, patrol units will handle such calls. While the policy is complete and in accordance with best practices, the IACP recommends LBPD evaluate whether it would be better placed in the Manual as opposed to a Training Bulletin.

Use of Force

The Long Beach PD has a detailed Use of Force policy (7.1.2) revised in October 2015. The policy statement is 7.1.2.3 Use of Force Policy revised October 2015

Department personnel will attempt to achieve control through direction, forewarning, or reasonable physical force. Officers are permitted to use only that force necessary, based on reasonableness and the totality of circumstances to:

- 1) Effect a lawful investigative detention or arrest;*
- 2) Control a resistive, combative or threatening subject;*
- 3) Protect themselves, the subject or another person from injury, death or destruction of property; and*
- 4) Stop a subject who is attempting to flee or escape a lawful detention or arrest.*

The reasonableness of a particular use of force will be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer possessing the same information and faced with the same circumstances as the officer who actually used force.

The policy identifies various levels of resistance and the appropriate level of police force to be used in response, and it includes a reporting requirement for all uses of force.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Training Bulletin 67, Arrest and Control Techniques, is the only section that discusses de-escalation.

It is perfectly acceptable, and encouraged, to lessen the amount of force being used when compliance is achieved. Attitude and choice of the proper technique allows officers the flexibility to escalate and de-escalate the amount of force used as the circumstance calls for it. Officers are held responsible in deciding whether to escalate or de-escalate the amount of force needed to arrest a violator.

The policy did not specifically mention the sanctity of life. This and de-escalation techniques should be incorporated into the Use of Force Policy. These topics are critically important, given the public judgement that is used in police force situations.

Pursuit/EVOC

The LBPD has a comprehensive series of pursuit policies, 7.1.7. The policy provides the factors that are to be used in making the decision to initiate a pursuit as well as those that should be considered when terminating a pursuit. The policy outlines the specific duties and responsibilities of all involved in the pursuit, such as the supervisor and the communication center. In the Training Bulletin manual there are specific bulletins describing use of pursuit ending techniques such as Tire Deflation Devices (TB 221), and the Precision Immobilization Technique (PIT) [TB220].

Search/Seizure-Arrest

The Manual of the Long Beach Police Department has a specific policy about Search, Seizure, and Arrest (7.1.2); however, it focuses primarily on the action of the second officer when two officers are present for arrest. Training Bulletin 169 discusses Pat Searches and sections of other policies in both investigations and SWAT policies discuss search warrant procedures. Lacking is a policy that spells out legal requirements and procedures for the different types of searches that officers may encounter ranging from search warrants to exigent circumstances.

The importance of officers constantly staying abreast of legal findings and cases cannot be over-emphasized, as search and seizure is both vital to successful law enforcement and constantly changing. The IACP recommends that LBPD develop a complete policy that explains the legal requirements and procedures for the different types of searches that officers may encounter ranging from search warrants to exigent circumstances.

Care, Custody, Control, Restraint of Prisoners

There is a policy (7.1.23.6 Care of In Custody Prisoners) that provides a cursory overview of officer's responsibility in dealing with arrested persons. There are additional policies and training bulletins that deal with the proper methods for officers to use in searching, handcuffing and transporting prisoners.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Domestic Violence

There is a specific policy (8.1.14 Domestic Abuse Response Team (DART) regarding domestic violence investigations.

The Domestic Abuse Response Team (DART) offers greater assistance to victims of domestic abuse by providing immediate support, screening and resource referrals. Officers dispatched to or encountering a domestic abuse situation shall adhere to the following procedures.

Additionally, Training Bulletin 153, Domestic Violence, outlines officer's responsibilities in domestic violence cases.

*The Department **will** respond to all calls involving domestic violence. Domestic violence is criminal conduct that must be investigated, and arrests made when appropriate. Dispute mediation **SHALL NOT** be used as a substitute for appropriate enforcement action (arrests or reporting) in domestic violence cases.*

LBPD has a series of policies that cover many issues related to domestic violence investigations. However, there is no mention of the use of a lethality assessment as a part of the domestic violence investigation process. The LBPD should consider including this within their policy, and in operational practices.

Property-Evidence

There are several policies dealing with property and evidence that cover the collection, handling, documentation, storage, accountability, disposal, etc., of recovered property for evidentiary purposes. The relevant policies include:

- 8.2 Disposition of Property and Evidence
- Training Bulletin 166 Report of Property

Officer Wellness

LBPD has several policies that deal with officer wellness, particularly those who face trauma, including a policy on department psychologist and police chaplains and a Training Bulletin (50) that establishes physical fitness standards and testing applicable to all officers.

- Training Bulletin 50 Wellness/Fitness Program
- 4.3 Department Psychologist
- 6.1.7 Chaplaincy Program

LGBTQ+ Policies

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

No policies were found using the LGBTQ+ acronym or any variation, nor were policies found using specific words that make up this acronym. The Department does have a Gay Lesbian Advisory Committee to the Chief, but no policy or training bulletin was found outlining policies or procedures for this topic. LBPB should consider a policy on this topic within the manual.

RECOMMENDATIONS

IACP is making 12 policy manual related recommendations. LBPB has a strong set of policies, and these recommendations are meant to enhance and update the policy manual.

Incorporate all department policies in one department-wide manual. The current system, with no less than nine policy-setting manuals, establishes the strong likelihood of conflicting policies, out-of-date policies, and policies that are contrary to the best practices in law enforcement. Other manuals such as Training Bulletins should be topical, and information-based instead of establishing policy.

Evaluate adding non-police department members to some of the review committees that provide policy and department oversight beyond just advisory roles, in order to improve community relations, perception, and organizational transparency.

Add a separate impartial policing policy that incorporates topics such as implicit bias and procedural justice in police operations and community relations.

Incorporate topics that delineate the authority, non-approved conduct, and duties and responsibilities for off-duty officers.

Establish policies for recruiting, selecting, and hiring of all department personnel.

Reinstitute an Early Warning policy and incorporate the practice in operations. An early warning system is a data-informed system designed to identify officers whose behavior or patterns of behavior are problematic and provide proactive intervention to correct performance. This enables a department to intervene before a situation warrants formal disciplinary action.

Consider incorporating the Mentally Ill Training Bulletin into the Policy Manual.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Include a statement on the department's commitment to the sanctity of all life and de-escalation techniques as part of Use of Force policy. These topics are critically important, given the public judgement that is used in police force situations.

Develop a comprehensive policy that explains the legal requirements and procedures for the different types of searches ranging from search warrants to exigent circumstances.

Evaluate and incorporate in both policy and practice the use of a lethality assessment as part of the domestic violence investigation process.

Create a policy regarding the specific issues concerning LGBTQ+ discrimination and investigations.

Establish a pattern of periodic policy review. LBPD assigns an "audit" agency for each policy. To ensure that policies are consistently and properly reviewed, specific review dates should also be assigned.

DRAFT

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CHAPTER VII. DATA, TECHNOLOGY, AND EQUIPMENT

DATA AND TECHNOLOGY CONDITIONS

Intelligence-Led Policing

It is important that modern police departments utilize available technology appropriately, use intelligence in decisions and problem-solving strategies, and organize in such a way as to support the use of technology and intelligence. This report includes recommendations about developing core policing strategies in collaboration with internal and external stakeholders. One of those core policing strategies that should be aggressively explored is intelligence-led policing which, since the start of the 21st century, is becoming a law enforcement standard for most mid-sized or larger police agencies. It is commonly understood that intelligence is defined as information plus analysis. That is, information – or data – is collected or observed. The application of critical analysis by practitioners with relevant expertise converts that information to intelligence. Intelligence can then be utilized to focus finite resources on appropriate problems in a rational, effective, and efficient way. At its core, intelligence-led policing requires the development of intelligence which requires the acquisition of information and the professional application of analysis.

The Pareto Principle, derived from economics, is being found increasingly relevant to crime problems. Broadly stated, this concept suggests that a relatively small proportion of inputs result in an inversely large proportion of results. It is often paraphrased as the 20/80 rule such that 20 percent of inputs drive 80 percent of results. Police research is increasingly showing the relevance of this theory. Dr. David Weisburd's "law of crime concentration" at places which posits that crime converges on specific geographic locations. "Indeed, because the convergences, activity spaces, and choices that fundamentally lead to crime at relatively few micro places are generally, albeit not perfectly, stable over time, crime- and place-specific crime prevention activities have theoretical and empirical support. By focusing on these generally-stable high crime places that generate the bulk of crime and disorder, the benefit-to-cost ratios of crime prevention efforts can be expected to be high."⁵ Using these principles to determine where a majority of crime occurs in a small fraction of the jurisdiction's geographic area and what small portion of the population is driving a significant portion of overall crime within Long Beach, will provide guidance on focus areas. Intelligence-led policing acknowledges this reality, along with the finite resources and the concept of procedural justice, to inform complementary policing strategies that require police to learn who is committing crimes and when and where they are committing them. This allows the department to intelligently deploy resources that address the problem efficiently while not treating entire neighborhoods victimized by

⁵ <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10940-017-9342-0>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

criminality as criminal themselves. This is often stated as policing behavior versus policing people.

Crime and Data Analysis

The Crime Analysis Unit (CAU) is decentralized with analysts reporting to individual division commanders. In addition to the patrol analysts, there is a grant-funded analyst for investigations (gangs) and there will be another analyst position under the new metro contract. The four patrol analysts coordinate information among themselves, but there is no coordination or information sharing with the other two analysts or with other units throughout the department.

Most analysts publish a weekly crime report and specific crime information bulletins when warranted but advised that few patrol officers directly seek information from them. Occasionally, some property detectives may seek information, but it is not a regular occurrence. The LBCOP^[SL7] program (use of department, city and private cameras as part of a real Time Crime Center) has the potential to be a valuable tool but it is rarely monitored or used; currently only for special events.

While the patrol analysts have and use Crime View and Arc GIS products, their primary means of data collection and analysis are self-developed excel programs. Most products are produced 'ad hoc' by request of the commander or others within the division. There is no commonality among the programs used and sharing information can be challenging. LPBD is currently reviewing and considering a new CAD/RMS system; the input from analysts on needs and functionality should be critical in this process. Since this is a department-wide issue its needs to focus on all areas and units of the department. As an example, administrative crime analysis is performed, thus beat and district boundaries have not been changed in several years.

Another area of concern is the report review process. By patrol sergeants' estimates, patrol officers spend 90% of their time answering calls for service and writing reports. Yet sergeants do not review or even see reports so they have little direct knowledge of how calls are handled and the completeness of an officer's investigation. Complete and timely reports are essential data elements for successful and robust crime analysis programs. While this will clearly require some re-engineering of the report process, it will result in improved investigations, documentation, speed of data collection, and validation which will far outweigh the re-engineering costs and time. Properly developed and organized intelligence and data that are consistently disseminated can be used to support and direct both strategic department activities and tactical officer behavior during available uncommitted time. Calls for Service as a data source is more indicative of emerging quality of life and crime issues than RMS data. While RMS is more robust with crime factors, CFS is immediate and informative for patrol operations.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Performance Measurement and Accountability Management

A robust and comprehensive performance measurement and accountability management function is a basic standard for a modern police agency and one that supports and complements intelligence-led policing. Most agencies seeking to employ best practices utilize a system based on the model published by the Bureau of Justice Assistance.⁶ The purpose of such a system and meetings is to support agency-wide strategic and tactical problem-solving and intelligence-led policing.

LBPD conducts monthly crime meetings in which the crime analysts play a major role. Currently, the Deputy Chief of Patrol advises one or more division commanders what two crimes they need to report on for the next meeting. This process does not provide a complete or representative picture of the problems facing the community, the department, or a particular division, more importantly, it does not provide a mechanism for evaluation or follow-up regarding the success or failure of proposed crime prevention and reduction strategies.

Real Time Crime Center

Real Time Crime Centers are generally the domain of agencies much larger than LBPD. Many smaller and similar sized agencies, such as the Chattanooga Police Department, are seeing the value in RTCCs and their ability to leverage resources. While it is not yet standard practice for a department the size of LBPD to employ a RTCC, it is a real opportunity since much of the core infrastructure currently exists. In order to stand up a functioning RTCC, LBPD needs formal support, organization, and staffing.

Some possibilities for creatively staffing a RTCC include using crime analysts in a centralized location as staffing and support for the RTCC while LBPD improves staffing to provide sworn officers during peak hours. Other alternatives to provide staffing for a RTCC include using paid or volunteer retired officers, CPA alumni volunteers, the new LBPD intern program, light duty officers, etc. in coordination with minimal sworn staffing, especially during peak demand hours. A RTCC would serve as a natural focal point for gathering and disseminating intelligence and, as such, would strongly support and complement the development of intelligence-led policing as a core policing strategy. Alternatively, LBPD could consider a dashboard application that automates much of the process and frees analysts and commanders to focus on emerging, complex issues. Any new system should have a robust forecasting component and capitalize on the GIS data that Long Beach currently has available.

⁶ <https://www.bja.gov/programs/crpepe/performance-measures.html>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Record Management System

The IACP's research indicated that the current RMS system has not been adequately updated and tailored to support the LBPD workflows. Few investigative units utilize solvability factors and choose to assign every case. This is expected in some units such as Homicide but is overwhelming in other units. LBPD should review its configuration and capabilities as well as determine whether revision/upgrade are needed or a replacement system.

The "suspend" designation for without leads is not used, [SL8][CM9] resulting in numerous open cases per investigator. Investigators are inundated with case assignments making it difficult to filter which cases are deemed a priority. Thus, investigators fall behind on most cases. Additionally, supervisors do not know on which cases investigators are actively focusing.

Nearly all interviewed investigators advised that they are carrying a caseload of 100-200+ cases, except for homicide investigators. On average, an investigator should actively be working no more than 8 to 12 cases per month depending on the type of case and amount of detail involved in each case. LBPD should review the use of the "suspend" function and other potential RMS tools to properly identify, prioritize, and quantify Investigators' workloads.

Alternative Response

An observation at the communications center indicated that there was a significant problem with the way calls were stacked or held. Communications staff advised that it was not unusual for priority 2 calls to be stacked from 8 minutes to 97 minutes; for priority 3 calls the range was from 2 minutes to 106 minutes. IACP could not identify protocols regarding stacking of calls, or to prompting sergeants about calls being held in queue for a long period, and no procedure to advise the complainant of the delay in response.

Differential police response (DPR) is a management tool that extends the range of options for responding to requests for police service, intended to optimize the match between the service required and the response made. Rather than dispatching a patrol unit to every call, on an as-available basis, police agencies that practice DPR allow for systematically scheduling responses by patrol units to some types of calls and for "relief" responses, which do not involve a patrol unit, to other types of calls. This practice is based on research that has shown that much of the time an immediate response by patrol units does not improve the prospects for desirable outcomes: the apprehension of suspects, the prevention of injuries, the collection of evidence, or even the satisfaction of callers. Furthermore, the time saved or restructured through the use of DPR is a resource that can be put to more productive uses.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

DPR systems may include a number of response options. One of those is a scheduled response by patrol or support units. For any of the types of calls to which a rapid response is not essential—when neither lives nor property are in jeopardy and neither serious offenders nor evidence will vanish—a dispatcher can place the call in a queue, awaiting the availability of the unit assigned to the beat in which the call originated. Response may be deliberately delayed for a specific time period established by department policy or be handled by alternate means. Options may involve callers being asked to give reports over the phone, to mail a report to the police, to come to the police station to complete a report, to complete a report over the Internet, or to schedule an appointment with an officer. Examples of these types of calls are reports of minor motor vehicle accidents or of minor crimes—typically, offenses in which the loss (for example, from theft) or damage (for example, from vandalism) is under a specified dollar threshold and in which no physical evidence or other leads are available. Research has shown that in such cases, the likelihood of apprehending offenders is very low, and in many departments cases with such low solvability are not assigned for follow-up investigation.

DATA AND TECHNOLOGY RECOMMENDATIONS

Develop a culture of intelligence-led policing at all levels.

Intelligence-led policing calls for officers at all levels to use intelligence to make tactical as well as strategic decisions, to solve crimes, and to address community problems. Instead of waiting for intelligence reports to be supplied by a third party, like a crime analyst, an intelligence-led police officer uses readily available information and intelligence to drive problem-solving. The department is obligated to make that information and intelligence readily available and consumable by all employees as necessary.

Centralize the Crime Analysis Unit or coordinate department-wide crime analysis function

Acquire business intelligence or predictive policing software tool to support Crime Analysis Unit efforts.

Crime intelligence analysis is the analysis of data about people involved in crimes, particularly repeat offenders, repeat victims, and criminal organizations and networks. Processes and techniques of crime intelligence analysis include:

- Repeat offender and victim analysis
- Criminal history analysis
- Link analysis
- Commodity flow analysis
- Communication analysis
- Social media analysis

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Tactical crime analysis is the analysis of police data directed toward the short-term development of patrol and investigative priorities and deployment of resources. Processes and techniques of tactical crime analysis include:

- Repeat incident analysis
- Crime pattern analysis
- Linking known offenders to past crimes

Strategic crime analysis is the analysis of data directed toward development and evaluation of long-term strategies, policies, and prevention techniques. Its subjects include long-term statistical trends, hot spots, and problems. Processes and techniques of strategic crime analysis include:

- Trend analysis
- Hot spot analysis
- Problem analysis

Acquire business intelligence or forecasting software tool to support Crime Analysis Unit efforts.

Create Crime Analysis subject matter experts by assigning them in a matrix approach so that each crime analyst bears responsibility for both a specific geographic area as well as specific types of crimes

Establish a Real Time Operations Center.

LBPD possesses an impressive physical infrastructure (video wall, access to cameras across city, sophisticated work stations with access to CAD) to establish a RTOC. The RTOC could improve the efficiency and effectiveness of limited department-wide resources.

Reorganize and refocus the department crime meeting as detailed in APPENDIX B.

Assess the records management system to determine if an update, reconfiguration or replacement is required that will simplify case assignments, how cases are tracked and managed, and assist supervisors with conducting periodic monthly reviews.

LBPD needs the ability to track statistical data and provide real-time feedback on the status of investigations. The LBPD requires a system that can integrate or be a part of the new RMS system they are considering.

Establish solvability factors to ensure that investigators focus on crimes that can be solved and prosecuted.

Solvability factors will lessen the caseload for each detective, providing more time to focus on cases that can be prosecuted successfully.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Explore the use of Differential Police Response (DPR) to provide officers with more useable proactive time.

Differentiated responses reallocate calls in productive ways. Studies have shown that the free time that patrol officers have are typically in blocks too small to be constructive. When DPR principles and protocols are used to manage low priority calls, officers are better able to go out of service to engage in activity at their initiative, uninterrupted by low priority calls. Patrol supervisors will be the key elements in this. They will need to remain aware of calls and evaluate the calls to determine whether it is eligible for DPR.

Encourage the public to use alternative methods of reporting and route appropriate CFS to these methods, as appropriate.

Revise practices relating to holding CFS and complainant notification.

When citizens expect an immediate response, they tend to be dissatisfied with anything less. But when they are told that police will arrive in a specified time period and the police do arrive in that time, they tend to be satisfied. It is recommended that for calls held in queue longer than 30 minutes, dispatchers notify patrol supervisors who in turn will make the decision to continue to hold in queue or dispatch. Patrol supervisors need to understand that the goal is not to answer calls, but to manage call response by specific strategies. Beyond supervisor approval, protocols must also be established to inform citizens of the delay.

Develop a Telephone Response Unit (TRU).

In April of 2017, the LBPD implemented an online reporting system. LBPD also uses personnel at the front desk at headquarters to engage some lobby calls. Calls for service can be routed to online reporting, the TRU, or even through lobby kiosks.

EQUIPMENT CONDITIONS

Fleet

After years of no new cars, LBPD has started to receive new vehicles; however, LBPD needs to significantly increase the purchase of new and replacement vehicles. There is no assignment of patrol vehicles to specific officers. Some officers take care of their police vehicles while others do not. The cars are equipped with a computer and a wireless air-card for Internet connectivity. However, they are moving away from license plate readers, because they are XP based and that system is no longer supported.

In discussions with division commanders, unit commanders and watch commanders, there is evidence that increased procurement is needed to meet operational needs of the LBPD with respect to patrol operations, special details, available spare vehicles. This demand, coupled

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

with the fact that there are no operationally ready units to put into service should a vehicle be out-of-service for maintenance, accident, etc., causes strain on the operational effectiveness and availability of the patrol fleet.

Management of and maintenance of the fleet is one of the largest non-personnel costs for any police agency. To properly manage that operation, a department must employ a system that accurately tracks the quantity and type of vehicles, how many are in use at any one time, as well as mileage, wear and tear, and costs associated with each vehicle. LPBD was not able to provide IACP with sufficient data about these factors. This data is necessary to monitor the fleet and enhance the operational effectiveness of the entire department.

EQUIPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Update the fleet, develop a fleet management system that allows for ongoing maintenance, cost and use analysis, revise squad assignment policy, and establish a spare fleet to address periodic shortfalls.

IACP recommends that patrol officers be assigned specific vehicles to operate based upon the care they exhibit in care of the vehicle. This will improve management of the fleet by increasing accountability, improve maintenance of the vehicles, even out the mileage, and improve efficiencies. If an officer's assigned vehicle is out of service, then an alternate will be assigned by a sergeant.

The practice of assigning specific cars to specific officers creates a sense of ownership and responsibility. Cars are generally cleaner, better maintained and in fewer accidents, all of which help offset additional cost for the department if the fleet needs to be expanded. Just as important is the improvement in accountability. Failure to conduct operator maintenance, crash damage, etc., can be more easily traced to the offender.

LBPD needs to ensure that it has the systems in place to properly manage its fleet. There are many effective software systems that can provide the fleet management data the LBPD currently is unable to track. This should include at a minimum the ability to:

- Maintain inventory
- Manage proper maintenance
- Identify and analyze high-cost vehicles
- Develop reports for regulatory compliance
- Monitor vehicle use

CHAPTER VIII. TRAINING AND EDUCATION

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CONDITIONS

Training Academy and Firing Range

LBPD hosts its own police academy and trains its own police recruits. The training academy is co-located with the police firing range inside the city limits in a convenient, central location. The location of the training academy and firing range are ideal because they are in the middle of the jurisdiction which eliminates costly travel time and keeps officers inside the jurisdiction for timely response to emergencies. The co-location of the firing range with the academy also provides flexibility in the type and manner of training, particularly the ability to combine classroom instruction, physical training, simulator training, and de-escalation options all congruent with live-range training.

The firing range recently experienced design flaws that caused bullet fragments to leave the facility and affect non-police personnel. The training academy is in a former private pistol range supplemented by portable temporary buildings assembled together into a makeshift training facility. While it is impressive what LBPD staff have accomplished with these facilities, the buildings are not a modern police training facility and have demonstrated shortcomings – like no restroom or locker facilities - which directly impact the efficiency, if not the effectiveness, of training operations.

Field Training

The original “San Jose Field Training Program Model” consisted of approximately seventy days of training or, based on eight-hour days, approximately fourteen weeks. San Jose currently uses a program that is four to five months long. Most modern field training programs consist of twelve to twenty weeks of field training, often with the remainder of probation spent in an unaccompanied observation and evaluation mode. While some other agencies - notably Los Angeles Police - utilize longer training periods, these agencies often have an extensive history of deploying two-officer patrol units and the bulk of the training period consists of the training pair operating as a full beat unit.

LBPD’s new officer training program consists of three phases:

- Phase I is the actual cadet training academy
- Phase II is the first six months of field training
- Phase III is the final six months of field training

LBPD officers are subject to a probationary period which ends at the same time as the end of the entire training program. Twelve months of field training is well over double the standard seen in the profession. Staff reported very few – if any – trainees fail out of the training program during Phase III, the final six months of field training. This indicates the training program likely

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

reached maximum effectiveness during Phase II, the first six months of field training after the academy.

Because field training and the new employee probation end simultaneously, there is no substantive mechanism to evaluate how new officers will perform in solo status without support and oversight from an FTO before they complete probation. This exposes LBPD to some risk if after the probationary period they discover an employee who is unwilling to engage without oversight or who cannot display work that is consistent with department values. Additionally, twelve months of field training reduces effective staffing significantly. LBPD reports loses thirty-five officers per year to regular attrition; this equates to approximately three per month. Phase III of field training last six months, so LBPD loses approximately eighteen officers to normal attrition during Phase III. This results in an approximate average of nine staffing vacancies during Phase III. These vacancies are compounded by the fact that Phase III officers are not filling a beat, causing additional effective patrol vacancies.

Training Budget

Outside standard agency training is a resource that many agencies utilize to further educate an enhance the knowledge, skills and abilities of their employees; which has a side effect of improving morale. Much of this training is geared towards a specific job function, such as investigations, interrogations, supervision, administration and many other job specialty functions. Ensuring that employees are properly trained for their assigned tasks is essential for making sure that the LBPD is meeting the needs of their citizens.

Training Requests

All training requests must be approved by the deputy chief. Line-level supervisors stated that when they submit training requests for final approval, they have already taken into account minimum staffing demands. Line-level supervisors expressed an interest in having the authority to approve some training requests, as they think it would improve the overall process, give them more control on how they run their unit, and help fulfill employee satisfaction needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Address environmental/physical structure issues of the firing range facility with repairs, renovations, or rebuilding. Develop a strategic plan to build a modern training academy.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

LBPD should prepare a long-term plan for a modern training facility and remediate its firing range with the intent to maintain both in their current location.

Reduce the field training program length and/or modify Phase III (final six months).

LBPD should explore ways to reduce the twelve-month field training program or modify the program so the training pair can serve as a fully functioning two-officer unit. By eliminating or reconstituting Phase III of the field training program, LBPD could improve staffing and reduce risk exposure to the department while not substantially impair training effectiveness.

The field training program is a meet-and-confer contract item, which could be a bargaining issue. It is an issue that affects union members directly as it is members themselves who report the most direct negative consequences from reduced staffing to which the extended field training program contributes.

Evaluate the current training budget and how well the training needs of employees are met.

Address any shortfalls with the city council as to what the financial needs are regarding training and how the additional training will benefit the officer(s) and the community. There are resources for acquiring funding for training beyond the local government. There are federal grants, universities, corporate donations, and agency hosted training where the agency provides the facility and outsource training to other entities/agencies that usually will give free spots to the hosting agency.

Consider empowering the line-level supervisor to approve a standard set of outside agency training hours per employee per year. Requests beyond the allotted hours would require further approval. Formal policies will keep the process fair for all employees.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CHAPTER IX. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

CONDITIONS

Recruiting

LBPD does not have anyone directly responsible for recruiting. There are several people/units who have ancillary recruiting duties, but no centralized coordination.

Diversity in hiring is emphasized by the chief and command staff; however, department staff was not able to provide specific plans on recruiting strategies to improve diversity hiring. 2012 was the first new hiring process since the reduction in the force began in 2008. The department had lost almost 200 sworn officer positions and an equal number of non-sworn staff.

Staff advised that the department is not considering an over hire program but is considering an early hire program for the next class.

It takes about six months to recruit and process a new police officer hire. The hiring of non-sworn varies by position but there is a significant problem in hiring jail personnel. A major source of hiring for the jail division are from police officer candidates who drop out of academy or the FTO program. These hires take 70-90 days. They are required to go through a second complete background investigation even though their hire is essentially a position transfer.

LBPD needs a concerted effort to improve its recruiting; it needs a coordinated central effort. In the competitive hiring market, the effort currently in place cannot and will not succeed. The current system of secondary functions to a few officers and/or relaying on another city department simply will not work in today's marketplace. Today's hiring situation is a buyer's market with potential recruits being the buyer. Unless the department is willing to invest in hiring, the department will not meet its hiring needs. While every agency wants the highest quality candidates, effective agencies that are committed to community policing want the highest quality candidates who are reflective of their community. To achieve this, LBPD needs to have a clear recruiting strategy.

In February 2017, IACP published a Best Practices Report titled Recruiting for Diversity in the 21st Century: Lessons Learned from 10 Cities. In analyzing the best practices from the study, the following common core themes emerged as critical to their success in recruiting and hiring the most qualified personnel as sworn police officers, who are both reflective of their communities, and possess the skills and abilities needed for 21st century policing.

- Efficient and effective hiring process
- Significant police department involvement in all phases of hiring process
- Extensive use of social media and electronic recruiting

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

- Tracking applicant sources of interest

Traditional police hiring practices tend to disqualify candidates with negative issues discovered through the hiring process. We believe that to hire 21st century officers, departments need to change their orientation and focus hiring on those candidates that model the values and vision of the community and the police department. This new focus and orientation requires police departments to establish and publish their visions and values. More importantly, these visions and values need to become the core of their daily operations, as well as their recruiting and hiring programs.

Some of the hiring and background requirements that were identified during the interviews are strangling the organization's ability to hire. By having a centralized recruiting and hiring function the department can also address organizational roadblocks in hiring such as the one the jail experiences with transfer hiring.

With the strong possibility of 200 plus officers retiring within the next five years, it is critical that the department also develop a retention plan to effectively manage the retirements in concert with a recruiting and hiring plan for new hires. Given the competitive nature of hiring for police officer candidate positions, agencies must institute an early hire program. The positions already have a dedicated FTE and when one considers the cost of hiring a new officer, the early hire makes both operational and fiscal sense.

Performance Evaluations

The primary purpose of employee performance evaluations is to inform employees as to how well they are performing their duties and responsibilities and to offer suggestions, assistance, and support in aiding employees in improving job performance. Another effective tool of a properly designed performance evaluation is the opportunity to ensure that the employee is aware of the Agency's mission, goals, and objectives to help focus the employee on what is expected of them. Employee performance evaluations may also be used as a tool to assist management in making key decisions concerning promotions, disciplinary action, training, and determination of eligibility for permanent appointment.

Evaluations are an effective resource for facilitating the professional development of personnel. Performance evaluations can be used to alter the service expectations, policing styles, and responsibilities of patrol officers. If management can enhance and improve the KSAs of officers, these officers will be able to provide a wider array of quality services within neighborhoods. The challenge is to develop evaluations that accurately reflect the work officers are expected to do. The need to develop such evaluations is neither new nor unique to policing.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

At the time of the onsite interviews, the current Annual Personnel Performance Evaluation system was created by the Civil Service Department and City was reportedly considering putting this online and revamping the processes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Establish a full-time department recruiting function/team/office and integrate the background and recruiting sections under one division. IACP's Best Practices Report recommended that:

Police organizations should not delegate the process of recruiting and selecting officers to an outside organization. They should seek advice and support, but ultimately the police department will be held accountable for the individuals hired, trained, and sent into the community to serve its citizens. Because of this, it is critical that agencies be intricately involved in the entire process of recruiting, hiring, and training of new officers.

Designate a commander as a liaison to community groups such as African American, Hispanic, Asian, LGBTQ+, etc. The IACP Best Practices Report showed that:

Agencies with a higher representation of minorities throughout their organization are the result of targeted recruiting efforts in the underrepresented communities, and intentional efforts to build trust and legitimacy within these communities. This process takes a long time to occur and must be based upon a foundation of core values of respect, equality, and service.

Open application process year-round and expand direct communication with candidates.

Many or most applicants will maintain patience if they know the timeline and their status within it, especially if they receive resources to improve their chances of success in the hiring and training process. The internship program recently started by LBPD is an excellent opportunity to retain applicants who might otherwise leave the recruiting and hiring process for employment elsewhere.

Enhance recruiting presence on the web and social media in order to attract diverse high-quality candidates. Today's candidates use the internet and social media as their principal source for job information. An agency's web and social media recruiting information is a critical component of an overall recruiting strategy.

LBPD and City Human Resources Department establish a working group involving stakeholders from across ranks and assignments and to include Human Resource professionals, and the Police Officers Association (POA) to develop a new and effective evaluation system.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

The implementation of this recommendation will be neither easy nor fast for Long Beach. If allowable, the LBPD should implement their own specific Performance Appraisal for the LBPD. The department, City Civil Service Department, and labor organizations should establish a working group to develop a new evaluation system. The system should be reflective of the employee's KSAs. The new evaluation process should also include the establishment of specific objectives, reflective of city and department goals that the employee strives to achieve within the coming year. Quarterly reviews should provide feedback on the employee's progress and the yearly evaluation should measure the success of the employee in achieving the objectives. Additional information on developing performance evaluations is provided in Appendix C.

DRAFT

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CHAPTER X. INTERNAL AFFAIRS, USE OF FORCE, DISCIPLINE

CONDITIONS

Overall, LBPD employees seemed pleased with the structure of the Internal Affairs unit and the manner in which cases are investigated, with the exception of the timeliness of IA investigations. The Police Officer's Bill of Rights (POBAR) allows the department one year to administratively charge an employee. The agency has an excellent record of charging people within that time frame, although many investigations are not completed until the twelve-month deadline.

Completed IA investigations are initially reviewed through that employee's chain of command, then by the Lieutenant and Commander in IA, and then by executive staff where an initial finding is determined. Sustained findings go to that Bureau Chief and Division Commander. The employee's Lieutenant then reviews the material with the Commander, before sending the file back to the Bureau Chief for review. The file then goes back to IA, to the chief, executive staff, and division commander. If all parties agree that the findings are sustained, they will discuss the discipline to be imposed; the final discipline decision is made by the Chief of Police.

IA Staffing

Internal affairs investigations must be completed within the guidelines of the POBAR; it is imperative that investigations are completed within the one year allotted. The current staff in IA has been able to complete all investigations within the 12-month time frame, but only with the use of overtime to ensure no deadlines are missed. Currently there are six full-time sergeants/investigators, two non-career part-time investigators, and one administrative analyst. At any given time, the unit is carrying approximately 125 cases with a total intake of about 240-260 per year.

~~If the unit receives 250 complaints a year, that averages about 36 cases per FTE per year. Because of their complexity IA cases should be distributed in lower caseloads per FTE, similar to a homicide investigators caseload. If the unit receives 250 complaints a year, that averages about 36 cases per FTE per year and allows for approximately 40-50 hours for each case. IA investigators caseloads are more closely in line to that of a homicide investigator. Thirty six IA cases per year is considered a large caseload.~~

Discipline Process

Discipline is most effective when it is reasonable, equitable, timely, and clearly understood. Discipline exists to dissuade both the involved officers and other officers from engaging in the proscribed conduct. To be most effective, the reasons for discipline should be clearly

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

communicated to employees as appropriate to ensure transparency and understanding which promotes credibility and equity. A comprehensive discipline program includes positive, as well as negative, reinforcement to influence behavior. Such a comprehensive discipline program will include some form of articulated discipline structure such as a discipline matrix, a system of clearly structured graduated (or progressive) discipline, an education-based discipline component developed collaboratively with employees and their union representation, and a system for communication discipline decisions department-wide. Such a sophisticated, intentional, and transparent discipline system will increase support for the discipline process and improve its effectiveness.

Early Warning System (EWS)

The EWS currently utilized by the LBPD occurs when an IA investigation is completed and under review. While under review for that violation, a general review on the officer is conducted to identify any potential problems. This is not a true EWS, as an EWS would be implemented prior to any IA investigations and would have a preventative component in addition to a reactionary component. A system that starts after an IA complaint will miss many issues that could easily be tracked through the record management system. Accurately tracking this information and due diligence on the agency to be proactive in preventing officers from infractions, could potentially protect or minimize legal liability.

IA Reports

As part of a community policing focus, many agencies are increasing transparency regarding internal investigations. The basis for this transparency is to build public trust and confidence. Transparency can also build trust internally. Employees will appreciate procedural justice that is fair and impartial. The LBPD already has the Citizen Police Complaint Commission (CPC) that issues its own publicly available report to investigations. Reports from the CPC do not contain the sustained discipline, which is not required for the public report. The LBPD should compare the findings of the CPC to their own internal investigations. Inconsistent findings should be further examined to explain the disparities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Add two additional investigators to the Internal Affairs Unit.

This will make the workload more manageable and reduce the amount of overtime. As an alternative, if IA investigators must be at the rank of sergeant and the LBPD does not receive authorization to create two new Sergeant positions, consider moving two sergeants from the Criminal Intelligence Section task forces which do not require staffing at the sergeant level.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Revise policy and procedures to provide structure for graduated discipline (or progressive discipline) such as a discipline matrix, opportunity for education-based discipline, and enhanced communication flow.

A discipline matrix provides structure, decreases the perception of preferential treatment, and provides transparency. A matrix will expedite the time for the review process when determining disciplinary action. Additionally, a discipline matrix will eliminate the need for those types of cases to be reviewed by the Chief. Types of cases where disciplinary matrices can be utilized include: departmental accidents; secondary employment violations; uniform violations; traffic violations; and frequent procedural violations.

When devising a matrix, there should be collaboration between the LBPB, POBAR, City Manager, and the city council to ensure fairness. This collaborative effort will help ensure that employee disputes will only be for the finding, not the discipline imposed. A discipline matrix should incorporate education-based discipline as well. Should LBPB utilize a discipline matrix, IACP recommends making it publicly available to show transparency to the citizens and employees.

Establish an Early Warning System and Track Complaints using an IA tracking software.

Internal Affairs tracking software offers the ability to enter a host of information by line-level supervisors such as: uses of force, departmental accidents, vehicle pursuits, field-level discipline or counseling, complaints that are resolved at the field level, and injured officers. Tracking these items will ensure that when patterns are recognized by the system, the agency is notified and can review the information in a timely manner. This will facilitate identifying potential problems, so the agency can then determine the best course of action for the officer or issue.

Make IA reports publicly available.

Publicly available IA reports should be posted on LBPB's website. In addition to offering transparency to the community, employees will benefit from seeing how discipline is imposed within the agency. To maintain anonymity with regards to imposed discipline, LBPB should work with the POA to develop a report with redacted employee information or other key identifiers. If applicable, the POA could release the report to its members on a quarterly or semi-annual basis.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CHAPTER XI - SUPPORT SERVICES

Organizational Structure

The structure of the LBPD is similar to the majority of the police departments across the United States, in that it follows a hierarchical chain of command. The department is split into five bureaus; Patrol, Investigation, Support, Administration, and Financial. The head of each bureau reports directly to the Chief of Police. At the time of this study, the Patrol Bureau [SL10] included the four geographic divisions and field support services. The Investigation Bureau includes the major sections of detectives, gang and violent crimes, forensic science services, and criminal intelligence. The Support Bureau includes the jail, training, port police, and security services with details assigned to transit, airport, marine patrol, and parks.

The administration [SL11] section of the LBPD is comprised of the Police Chief and Chief of Staff, along with support from the executive assistant, clerk typist, administrative analyst, administrative aide, and one sergeant. The Police Chief provides overall guidance, policy direction, and management for all police department operations, programs, and police services in the community. The chief also ensures high ethical and professional standards and promote the mission of the City of Long Beach, as the underlying foundation for all actions undertaken by department personnel.

SUPPORT SERVICES, SPECIALTY PROGRAMS, AND ASSIGNMENTS

This section provides a description of the various units and programs within the LBPD that provide the resources for officers to do their job and meet the demands of the public. This section will briefly overview the operational divisions and section which exist for the purpose of supporting the core mission of effectively policing the City of Long Beach. Much of the information from this section was provided directly from the supervisors and command staff within the LBPD, based on a data request from IACP. [SL12]

Support services and specialty programs and assignments within LBPD are spread amongst several bureaus, specifically, Support Bureau, Administration Bureau, and Patrol Bureau. A Deputy Chief or Bureau Chief oversees each of these areas, and each area is broken into several sub-Units (Divisions). LBPD has a Financial Bureau headed by the Chief Financial Officer and responsible for budget management, grants and contracts administration, purchasing, accounting, and facilities.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

SUPPORT BUREAU

This Bureau provides a variety of services to the department and includes the Jail Division, Port Police, Training, and Security Services.

Jail Division

The Jail Division is responsible for the daily operations of the jail and care of inmates. Duties in the jail division include booking and processing inmates, issuing court subpoenas, transporting inmates to and from the courts and county jail, as well as public safety in the courts and civic center complex. The division includes both sworn and non-sworn personnel, with the Division Administrator being a civilian position. In addition to the Jail Administration, the division consists of Court Affairs, and Detention Watch.

Administration Unit

This unit is responsible for the daily functions of the Jail Division. The Administrative Sergeant provides support to the Jail Division Administrator and is responsible for the daily operations of the jail, recruits and interviews personnel, and serves as the acting Administrator during times of absence. In addition to the Administrator, the non-sworn personnel include the Division Secretary, Training and Compliance staff, and the Medical Unit supervisor.

Training and Compliance staff ensure that the jail remains in compliance with all federal, state, and department regulations, including state training regulations. This two-person civilian sub-unit is also responsible for updates to the jail manual and scheduling all mandatory training for the Jail Division.

One non-sworn Medical supervisor sees to the health needs of inmates while at the jail. This person supervises contract nurses and liaises with contract doctors regarding medical formularies and ordering of medications for inmates. The supervisor is also responsible for interviewing and approving contract nurses.

Court Affairs Unit

The Court Affairs Unit works with other city departments as part of the electronic subpoena system, as well as security in and around City Hall. The unit includes City Hall Security Detail and Bailiff and Transportation Detail. The Unit is supervised by a Sergeant who is responsible for 2 clerk typists, approving Court-related overtime, ensuring subpoena compliance of Officers, and serving as a liaison between the Department, District Attorney's Office, and the Office of the City Prosecutor. The Sergeant also supervises the City Hall Security and Bailiff and Transportation Details.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

The City Hall Security Detail provides public safety in and around the Civic Center complex, which includes City Hall. It is also responsible for security at City Council and various commission meetings. This unit is comprised of five non-sworn staff.

The Bailiff and Transportation Detail is responsible for transporting inmates to and from court, as well as transferring inmates from Long Beach jail to county jail facilities. This unit is comprised of seven non-sworn staff.

Detention Watch Unit

The Detention Watch Unit is configured into four shifts. Each shift is supervised by a sworn Sergeant and includes 12 non-sworn Detention Officers and Clerk Typists. Each Sergeant is responsible for supervising the activities of the Detention Supervisor and Officers on their shift. The Detention Supervisor is responsible for jail-related activities, and the Officers are responsible for the care and custody of all inmates. The Clerk Typists are responsible for booking prisoners, recordkeeping, and paperwork related to inmate transfers to and from the jail.

Each unit has one or two vacancies for Detention Officers. It is important to maintain proper staffing levels of Detention Officers to maintain officer safety, comply with state regulations regarding inmate-to-staff ratios, and reduce overtime demands.

Port Police Division

The Port Police Division was established in response to terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, and is the second busiest port in the country, and borders neighboring Port of Los Angeles. The Port Police Division partners with the Port of Long Beach and other state, local, and federal agencies to provide land, air, and sea-based law enforcement protection to critical infrastructure and assets in the port. Port Police Division personnel administer maritime security and training, Port Security Program grant processes, and participate in various regional task forces. In 2017, the Division received a \$1 million grant for maritime training, Public Safety Dive Team equipment, training, and equipment maintenance.

The Port Police Division is led by a Commander who is responsible for divisional administration, facility and operational logistics, and serves as the liaison on task forces and with other partner agencies. The administration team includes a non-sworn Divisional Secretary.

The Port Police Division consists of three Watches which provide the following key services: call for service response, proactive patrol (on land and water), traffic safety within the port, proactive enforcement/problem solving, and addressing quality of life issues. All work is conducted by sworn personnel. A lieutenant or sergeant supervises the watch units. The watch units work 12-hour shifts or four 10-hour days.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

The Port Police Division also has a Dive Team, in addition to the Long Beach Public Safety Dive Team, which focuses on security for the Port of Long Beach. The Port Police Division Dive Team consists of two sergeants and 10 officers on collateral assignment.

Training Division

The Training Division has several functions in addition to officer and recruit training. The division has one Commander who oversees division administration and the following units within the division: (1) Background Investigations, (2) Police Officers Standards and Training (POST) Basic Academy training, (3) Advanced Officer Training, (4) Range Operations, and (5) Manuals, Orders, Policies, and Legal Updates. In addition to the Commander, the Academy Administration Unit consists of a sworn Lieutenant, non-sworn Clerk Typist, and non-sworn Assistant Administrative Analyst.

Background Investigations conducts POST-compliant background investigations of police applicants, as well as background investigations of potential civilian employees and volunteers of the Police Department. Additionally, this unit conducts background investigations for Long Beach Firefighter recruits. This unit consists of one Sergeant, one non-sworn Clerk Typist, and 16 part-time investigators.

The Basic Academy provides training through a 27-week academy to police recruits. The Basic Academy has one Sergeant, one part-time Clerk-Typist, and five Recruit Training Officers.

Advanced Officer Training provides sworn officers with continuing professional training in skills such as firearms, driving, arrest and control, and implicit bias, as well as POST training updates, on topics such as homelessness, mental health, and cultural diversity. This unit consists of one Sergeant and six Training Officers.

Range Operations provides ongoing firearms training to sworn police officers, as well as police recruits. The Range Operations Unit provides tactical training, weapons manipulation, and shoot/don't shoot decisional training. The unit also maintains the LBPD's records for weapons and ammunition. Range Operations consists of one Sergeant and two Range Safety Officers.

The Manuals, Orders, Policies and Legal Updates Unit is the responsibility of one sworn officer. This sub-unit provides legal updates, policy project management, creation of special orders, in-service training and training bullets, policy auditing, and compliance tracking. This unit also administers the Wellness program which consists of approximately 330 departmental participants annually.

Security Services Division

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

The Security Services Division consists of three sections: (1) Homeland Security, (2) Long Beach City College, and (3) Metro. The Division Commander oversees the operations of this division.

The Homeland Security Section provides contract policing services to Long Beach Airport, Long Beach Transit, Marine Patrol, Park Rangers, and Homeland Security Grant Management (Urban Area Security Initiative). The unit consists of 24 sworn officers and 23 non-sworn personnel under the following breakdown. Airport: 15 sworn; Transit: eight sworn; Marine: one sworn Sergeant, 20 non-sworn; Park Rangers: one non-sworn peace officer; one Analyst; and one Clerk-Typist.

The Long Beach City College Section consists of five sworn and 13 non-sworn personnel. Sworn personnel provide contract police services to the community college, and non-sworn Special Service Officers provide armed security service, limited misdemeanor enforcement, and safety escorts.

The Metro Section provides contract police services to the Metro Blue Line focused on buses and passengers. The seven officers in this unit work four 10-hour shifts. The Metro Section cannot provide coverage for policing the Metro 24/7. The section pays qualified patrol officers overtime to fill shift vacancies.

ADMINISTRATION BUREAU

The Administration Bureau supports the Department and provides a variety of services to the public. The bureau is headed by a Bureau Chief and consists of three Divisions: (1) Records, (2) Personnel, and (3) Community Engagement. Each division is led by an Administrator responsible for division activities and staff. All staff within this bureau are civilian positions.

Records Division

The Records Division operates 24 hours per day/7 days per week and is composed of four sections: (1) Reporting, (2) Police Systems-Auto Records, (3) Inquiry, and (4) Data Analysis Unit. The Records Division is responsible for requesting and providing access into various database systems such as California Law Enforcement Telecommunication System(CLETS), National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System (NLETS), and National Crime Information Center (NCIC). The Division maintains the safety and security of documents and distributes crime reports generated by the Department.

TABLE 7: RECORDS DIVISION [SL13] METRICS - MAY 2016-MAY 2017

Section	Metric	Total
Reporting	Reports Finalized within 24 hours	(incidents) 128,707

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

		(violent crimes) 7,546
Auto Records	Vehicle Entries Completed	24,904
Inquiry	Imaged Reports	268,281
Inquiry	Requested Report Copies (Public)	23,696

Source: LBPD Command Data Worksheets

The Reporting Section is responsible for the receipt, processing, and distribution of all police report-related documents delivered to the Records Division from each filing station and authorized filing unit throughout the City. This section is also the Report Review Unit for the Department and ensures accuracy and completeness for entry of all persons, vehicles, crime classifications, crime elements, and hierarchy of crimes are in accordance with the Federal Bureau of Investigations Uniform Crime Reporting Criteria. The Reporting Section consists of 11 full-time positions including two supervisors. Staff work four 10-hour shifts to allow for 24-hour access.

The Police Systems and Auto Records Section is responsible for data entry of documents such as traffic citations; field interview cards and [pawn \[SL14\]\[CM15\] cards](#) (including Amber Alerts); lost, stolen, and recovered property and guns; stolen and recovered vehicles and parts; criminal impound; and stored, private, and repossessed vehicles. This section oversees the processes for access, entry, and interpretation of crime and arrest data from local, state, and national law enforcement information and databases such as CLETS, NLETS, and NCIC. This section operates on 24 hours day and consists of 23 non-sworn positions including four supervisors. One of the Clerk-Supervisor positions will be converted to an Analyst position in 2018.

The Inquiry Section provides the following services: records requests, imaging, warrants, and fingerprint comparisons. The Warrants [area—section](#) is responsible for processing traffic citations for court and database entry, processing warrant abstracts, and updating the Wanted Person entries and subpoena requests. The Inquiry Section consists of 26 civilian positions including two supervisors.

Data Analysis is a new section which will consist of three full-time non-sworn positions. Data Analysis will be responsible for a variety of areas: administration of grants, reporting crime statistics to the [FBI \[SL16\]\[CM17\]](#), custodian of records for the department; department liaison to the Office of the City Clerk, data and records requests from internal and external customers, and coordinating access to the RMS system. This section includes three non-sworn positions.

Personnel Division

The Personnel Division consists of three sub-units. The Personnel Section is responsible for the administrative functions of the Personnel Division, which includes monitoring and evaluating human resource activities for the Department such as processing injury reports; publishing staffing level reports, assisting employees with leave requests (i.e., catastrophic, FMLA,

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Extended Leave, Department Leave, Temporary Leave); and all personnel requisitions. The Personnel Section consists of four non-sworn positions, supervised by an Administrator. A Hiring Center that focuses on hiring, background investigations, and pre-employment activities would expand the scope of the Personnel section and would need additional staffing. Currently Background Investigations take approximately 40 hours to complete and the section uses retired officers and private contractors to supplement the background investigators.

The Payroll Section is responsible for preparing and distributing the biweekly paychecks and processing associated documents for all Police Department employees. This section consists for five full-time non-sworn positions including one supervisor.

The Facilities Maintenance Section is responsible for maintaining and refurbishing 16 police department facilities. Specific responsibilities include custodial maintenance, responding to emergency safety issues and reported problems, conducting annual fire evacuation drills, conducting inspections, and coordinating renovations. Facilities Maintenance consists of five full-time and 10 part-time civilian employees including one supervisor. Facilities staff work Monday – Friday with the majority of employees working 6:30 am – 1:00 pm or 6:30 am – 3:00 pm, and one employee working a 2:30-11:00 pm shift.

Community Engagement Division

This Division serves to inform and engage the community with the LBPB and public safety activities. The Administrator oversees five sub-units. The Division consists of three sworn, and 13 full-time and five part-time non-sworn positions. Additional staffing is requested throughout the Division due to increased demand, particularly in the Business Desk and Live Scan details. Employees in Community Engagement are cross-trained [SL18] to assist with work volume [SL19]. Additionally, staff from other departments are borrowed to assist with work load [SL20], when possible.

The Media Relations [SL21] Detail engages in social media posts through Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Nixle, maintains the LBPB website, and community event planning. This Detail has 24/7 on-call responsibilities for media inquiries and/or responses to the scene of critical incidents for media management. The Media Relations Detail coordinated over 30 large department/community events, and over 50 small events, responded to 15 PIO call-outs, issued 166 news releases, and made over 1,200 social posts [SL22]. Currently, a [REDACTED] is assigned to the unit, however, there is a new proposed structure that eliminates the use of a sworn officer or supervisor and provides for two civilian positions. This area should be monitored and evaluated to ensure the success of the function.

Volunteer Services coordinates activities of the various volunteer programs within the department including Community Police Academy, Senior Police Partners, Internship Program, Police Explorers, and Civilian Volunteers. One Administrative Analyst supervises approximately

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

45 volunteers with the Senior Police Partners, College Interns, and Civilian Volunteers programs. One officer supervises the 35-45 youth in the Police Explorer Program (ages 14-19). (Note: The sworn Explorer Advisor is supervised by a Police Sergeant that assists the program as a collateral assignment due to the need for sworn input into the Explorer Program curriculum and training.) In 2016, LBPD volunteers logged almost 42,000 hours (excluding Reserve Officers).

The Business Desk provides customer service, reporting, bail processing and video visitation scheduling services to walk-in and telephonic customers. This detail is located in the lobby of Police Headquarters and is staffed 24 hours a day. They also assist with communicating after-hours media inquiries to the Watch Commander for response. This detail consists of one supervisor and six Customer Service Representatives, all non-sworn. The Business Desk staff processed 9,044 reports, answered 103,411 incoming calls, and processed 1,578 bail payments. [SL23]

Live Scan Fingerprinting and ID Card Services provides digital fingerprint services for applicants and newly hired city employees and volunteers. This is a single non-sworn position which also manages all citywide ID card access services and ID card printing. The Live Scan Office processed 1[SL24],624 digital fingerprinting requests and approximately 1,500 ID card related requests. [SL25]

FORENSIC SCIENCE SERVICES DIVISION

This Division, which is part of the Investigation Bureau, consists of two units and multiple sub-units that provide forensic services and evidence control. A non-sworn Administrator provides oversight for this division.

Crime Laboratory

The Crime Laboratory consists for five sub-units: Crime Scene, Drug Chemistry, Toxicology, Firearms, and Latent Prints. The Crime Laboratory provides forensic testing, responds to crime scene service requests, and supplies testimony in criminal cases. In addition to crime scene processing, the unit performs firearms testing, blood alcohol/toxicology services, narcotics analysis, and processes evidence for latent prints and potential DNA. The Crime Scene Unit assists Patrol by processing property crimes. The Crime Laboratory consists of 16 non-sworn FTE personnel, including two supervisors, who work four 10-hour shifts Monday through Friday. Crime Scene personnel rotate on-call shifts for nights and weekends.

TABLE 8: CRIME LABORATORY CASES

Unit	2016 Completed Cases
Crime Scene (Field)	1,488
Crime Scene (Lab)	371
Drug Chemistry	1,579

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

Toxicology – Blood Alcohol	437
Firearms	592
Latent Prints	551

Source: LBPD Command Data Worksheets

The workload for the Crime Laboratory is outlined in Table 8 above. In order to provide additional services to the Department, the Crime Laboratory needs to increase staffing and create additional sub-units. Currently, all DNA and Drug Toxicology samples are sent to the Los Angeles County Crime Laboratory, which causes long turnaround times (6 to 9 months in many cases). An in-house DNA Unit would require a new facility with clean spaces. An Audio/Visual Analysis Unit would allow departmental processing of video. Below are the personnel needs for these additional services:

- Audio/Visual: 2 FTE
- DNA: 3 FTE and 1 FT Supervisor
- Toxicology: 1 FTE

Evidence Control Unit

This Unit is located in two facilities. There are two supervisors, one sworn Sergeant, and a non-sworn Property Clerk, as well as 11 full-time and one part-time non-sworn personnel. The Sergeant is responsible for overall operations and facility issues, as well as being a liaison with the court and the Investigations Bureau. There are no sub-units focused on specialty work (i.e., firearms, narcotics, auction) within Evidence Control. The unit also lacks Quality Assurance staff which would provide auditing daily entries and monitoring inventories.

Currently, Evidence Control is open from 0730-1600 [SL26] hours during the week for department personnel and open to the public at the warehouse from 1000-1500 hours, four days a week. Additional positions would allow for expanded hours for Patrol and Detectives to access evidence, as well as the public to retrieve belongings. The Sergeant is on-call nights and weekends for Department needs.

FIELD SUPPORT DIVISION

As part of the Patrol Bureau, the Field Support Division is the largest and most diverse division, consisting of sworn and non-sworn personnel. The division consists of two sworn officers and one non-sworn staff. Administrative duties for the Division include distribution of projects, purchasing equipment/services, divisional logistics, and coordination with other Departmental divisions and City entities. The Division is organized into three sections: (1) Traffic, (2) Event Planning and Management, and (3) Special Enforcement. The Special Enforcement Section includes several specialized tactical support teams. The Division’s

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

resources are designed to augment patrol units by providing specialized support services and equipment that enhance the overall effectiveness of units in the field.

Traffic Section

This Section consists of six sub-units that provide support services to the four Patrol Divisions. Thirty-six sworn and 28 non-sworn (25.2 part-time) report to this unit which includes one Lieutenant and four Sergeants.

Watch 2 and Watch 3 Motor Details investigate traffic collisions, write citations, educate the public on traffic safety, and provide traffic specific services to numerous events throughout the city. Watch 2 generally works from 0600-1400 hours and Watch 3 works from 1200-2200 hours. Each Watch is supervised by a Sergeant and has six sworn officers.

The DUI Team provides traffic enforcement, with a specific emphasis on enforcing DUI laws, and providing assistance with DUI arrests. The team works from 1700-0300 hours. The team is supervised by a Sergeant and has two sworn officers.

The Commercial Enforcement Detail enforces commercial traffic laws and conducts safety inspections on commercial vehicles. The Detail provides support to patrol officers in traffic enforcement and commercial enforcement issues, particularly with overweight commercial vehicles. There is no set work schedule, as shifts vary based on need. A Sergeant (shared duty) and one sworn officer are assigned to this detail.

Collision Investigation Detail investigates DUI cases, hit and runs, traffic fatalities, and other traffic-related crimes. This unit consists of five sworn and two non-sworn personnel, including one Sergeant.

The Traffic Administration/Grant Management Detail is responsible for grant administration received from the Office of Traffic Safety. This Detail is staffed by one Sergeant who writes, tracks, plans, and schedules all activity related to grant administration. This detail also tracks motor officer productivity, coordinates staff training, and purchases equipment for the Traffic Section.

The School Crossing Guard Detail provides safety at more than 50 elementary schools for students going to and from school. Shift hours coincide with school arrival and departure times. The detail consists of one full-time civilian Special Services Officer and 25.2 FTE part-time non-sworn crossing guards.

Event Planning and Management Section

The Event Planning Section is charged with all events that are outside the normal course and scope of police department business. The Event Planning Section also provides planning,

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

training, and support of the department's response to natural and man-made disasters. This section consists of three sub-units. One Lieutenant and one Sergeant provide supervision to the section.

The Special Events Detail coordinates staffing, security, logistics, and traffic mitigation for any special event (concert, race, etc.) that requires Police Department staffing. The detail routinely liaisons with other City departments and outside vendors to ensure the safety and efficient running of events and provide a safe environment for participants. This detail consists of two sworn and one non-sworn positions.

The Incident Management Team consists of one sworn officer. The officer instructs or attends training related to disaster management, response, and recovery. The officer works closely with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Emergency Operation Bureau, Long Beach Fire Department, California State Office of Emergency Services, local hospitals, and other non-government organizations to increase disaster mitigation and improve response and recovery during critical incidents.

The Mental Evaluation Team consists of six sworn officers who are partnered with clinicians from the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health (DMH). The team provides additional resources to patrol by responding to and handling calls involving the mentally ill and homeless. Members of the Mental Evaluation Team include officers who are trained as crisis negotiators and serve on the SWAT team.

Special Enforcement Section

This section provides specialized support services to Patrol and other areas throughout the department. Specifically, the section provides K-9 Units, Air Support Units, and the Special Weapons and Tactics Team (SWAT). There are 19 sworn officers in this section, including one Lieutenant and two Sergeant supervisors.

Air Support duties include patrol operations, search and rescue, surveillance, tactical operations, transportation, aerial photography, training, fire suppression aid, disaster response, and all other flights at the direction of the Chief of Police or their designee. There are six sworn officers in this unit.

The Police Service Dog Unit supports all police field operations. This team of officers works with their canine partners to search dangerous or inaccessible locations and apprehend hidden suspects. The dogs are trained with different capabilities such as narcotics, guns, and explosives detection, and working in high-risk searches. This unit consists of one sergeant and seven handlers (authorized for eight). Each handler has a dog and three handlers also have explosive detection dogs. The handlers work ten-hour shifts, Monday-Sunday. Wednesday is the overlap day when the unit conducts training. The additional handler would provide more flexibility with

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

scheduling. Additionally, four dogs are assigned to SWAT, two drug detection dogs are assigned to Narcotics and the Long Beach Airport has three explosive detection dogs. An overview of the workload for this unit is illustrated in Table 9 below.

TABLE 9: POLICE SERVICE DOG UNIT ACTIVITY

Canine Activity	2016
Training Days	640
Days Worked	610
Calls for Service	2,376
C-6’s/Ast	357
DR’s/Rpts	81
Felony Arrests	46
K-9 Deployed	156
Detection	50

SWAT is a specialized unit of officers that is comprised of tactical teams, a negotiation team, police service dog teams, a technical team, and paramedics. Officers are trained and equipped to respond to hostage situations, skyjackings, terrorism, active shooter incidents, dignitary security, and sniper incidents. SWAT is a collateral assignment for team members, who work other areas of the Department, and is supervised by a Sergeant.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CHAPTER XII: CONCLUSION

The analysis of LBPD by IACP reveals a department that is in a state of transition. IACP found that the staff at the LBPD take great pride in providing service to the public and is working hard to respond to increasing service demands.

IACP made many positive observations regarding LBPD throughout the analysis process, but as the recommendations within this report suggest, there are opportunities for improvement. The most notable areas for improvement include establishing a clear Mission, Vision and core values. These values should reflect an emphasis on community policing and be supported by data-informed efforts to ensure resource management is reflective of the community's public safety needs. The Mission, Vision and values should be communicated, supported and demonstrated by leadership through enhanced internal communications systems.

IACP examined LBPD's staffing levels in the Patrol Division. Currently, LBPD operates at 39% obligated workload within patrol, which is within the desired range of IACP's model, however at the higher end. If LBPD determines that it would like patrol officers to have more flexible time spent on community policing efforts or training, then LBPD should consider moving toward a 35% or 30% obligated workload model (illustrated within the report). This is a leadership decision which should be informed by the IACP workload model- not determined by it. It is the chief's prerogative to make this decision and balance workload factors, internal operational needs of the organization, and community expectations.

There is significant opportunity to improve LBPD's policies and procedures by centralizing these into one document. Currently, there is a manual as well as multiple publications, orders or documents that guide officer's actions. It is difficult to determine if there are any redundant or conflicting policies due to the nature and quantity of these documents.

By establishing a full-time recruiting function/team/department, LBPD can improve the hiring and retention of staff. This department should be integrated with the background unit and guided by policies around recruiting, hiring and selection to ensure quality officers are being hired and retained within the department. The recruitment process should have a year-round application process with ongoing communication with candidates to minimize drop-off. Creating a career development path for officers, including leadership development, mentoring, and specialized assignments to broaden officer's experiences will create more well-rounded officers and enhance retention of quality officers.

It is the sincere hope of the IACP that this report and the associated recommendations service to provide positive guidance and that it is viewed as a valuable resource, not only for the LBPD,

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

but also the government officials for Long Beach, who work together on behalf of the public to provide policing excellence to the City. It was an honor and privilege for IACP to conduct this study and serve LBPD.

DRAFT

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

APPENDIX A: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

These tables and charts support the information provided within the conditions and recommendations sections of the report. Much of the content provided within this section is repeated here for contextual purposes.

AGENCY/CITY DESCRIPTION

TABLE A-1: POPULATION TRENDS

Population	1980 Census	1990 Census	2000 Census	2010 Census	2016 ACS Est.	2020 Projected
Population	361,498	429,433	461,522	462,257	470,130	469,793
Increase		67,935	32,089	735	7,873	7,536
% Change		18.79%	7.47%	0.16%	1.70%	1.63%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

The population estimates above show substantial growth between 1980 and 2000, with the population increasing by more than 100,000 people during that period, which represents a 27.67% increase. Between 2000 and 2010, population growth slowed significantly, and estimates out to 2020 predict a modest 1.8% increase.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

TABLE A-2: COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics	Total	Percent
White	213,066	46.1%
African American	62,603	13.5%
American Indian and Alaska Native	3,458	0.7%
Asian	59,496	12.9%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	5,253	1.1%
Other	93,930	20.3%
Multiple Races	24,451	5.3%
Total	462,257	
Hispanic or Latino	188,412	40.8%
Not Hispanic or Latino	273,845	59.2%

Source: www.americanfactfinder.gov 2010 Census data

Table A-2 shows the demographic breakdown of the City of Long Beach, based on the 2010 census. Long Beach is a diverse community with 46% of the population white, 14% African American, 13% Asian, and 20% identifying as “Other.” Table A-2 also shows the breakdown of the Hispanic or Latino population. Although not considered a separate race, those who identify as Hispanic or Latino make up a significant portion of the diversity of the population within Long Beach. These factors are important as police agencies work toward hiring, recruiting, and staffing police departments that are representative of the communities they serve. This is also an important consideration in terms of the number of people within the community for whom English may be a second language. The diversity profile for sworn staff is provided in Table A-3 below as a comparison to the community demographics.

TABLE A-3: DIVERSITY PROFILE

Rank	Asian	African American	Hispanic	Native American	White	Grand Total
Chief	0	0	1	0	0	1
Deputy Chief	0	1	0	0	2	3
Commander	0	0	2	0	10	12
Lieutenant	1	2	2	1	26	32
Sergeant	12	7	19	0	64	102
Corporal	0	1	0	1	5	7
Officer	65	31	247	2	311	656
Totals	78	42	271	4	418	813
Percentage	9.59%	5.17%	33.33%	0.49%	51.41%	

Source: LCPD provided data

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

TABLE A-4: SWORN STAFFING LEVELS

Category	2017
Chief	1
Deputy Chief	3
Commander	12
Lieutenant	32
Sergeant	102
Corporal	7
Officer	656
Total	813

Source: LBPB provided data

TABLE A-5: AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL ALLOCATIONS

Authorized Personnel								Non-	Non-			Non-	
	Chief	Deputy Chief	Cmdr.	Lieut.	Sgt.	Cpl.	Off.	Sworn Spvsr.	Sworn Staff	Sworn Totals	Sworn Totals	All Staff	
Administration								15	96.5	2	107.5	109.5	
Executive Office								0	7	12	7	19	
Financial								2	10	0	12	12	
Investigations								4	49	178	53	231	
Patrol								1	45	538	46	584	
Support								10	120	137	119	256	
Totals	1	3	12	29	112	7	702			867	344.5	1,212	

Source: LBPB provided data

*Includes vacancies.

This table provides a detailed breakdown of the allocations of staff by section and based on the number of supervisory personnel in each area (a detailed list of all authorized personnel is provided in Appendix D). This type of breakdown helps to assess the organizational structure and span of control for the department. Although there is no hard and fast rule, a general rule of thumb regarding span of control is one supervisor for every five followers, although some

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

have suggested this ratio could be higher, at one supervisor for eight to 10 followers.⁷ Based on the data provided above, the overall span of control for sworn staff is one to 4.28, while the overall non-sworn span of control is one to 12.

DRAFT

⁷ http://highered.mheducation.com/sites/007241497x/student_view0/part2/chapter4/chapter_outline.html

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

CONDITIONS –OPERATIONS/STAFFING

TABLE A-6: PATROL WATCH SHIFT HOURS

Shift	Begins	Ends	Hours
Watch 1	2200	0800	10
Watch 2	700	1700	10
Watch 3	1500	0100	10

TABLE A-7: PATROL ALLOCATIONS BY SHIFT AND AREA

Division	Watch 1	Watch 2	Watch 3
East	24	28	31
North	24	26	34
South	24	27	34
West	23	27	29

Source: LBPD Provided Data

As mentioned previously, the LBPD uses a four-on, three-off work schedule, which includes an overlap day for each of the shifts. These shift overlaps are reflected in Table A-6 above, ~~shown as the shaded areas.~~ [AB27]

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

TABLE A-8: AUTHORIZED PATROL STAFFING

Bureau	Chief	Dep. Chief	Cmdr.	Lt.	Sgt.	Cpl.	Off.	Non-Sworn	Non-Sworn	Sworn Totals	Non-Sworn	All Staff
								Spvsr.	Staff		Totals	
Patrol								0	46	538	46	584
<u>Deputy Chief</u>								0	3	4	3	
Deputy Chief Patrol		1		1	1				3	3		
Field Training Officer					1					1		
<u>East Division</u>								0	3	121	3	
East Division Patrol			1	3	11	4	102		3	121		
<u>North Division</u>								0	3	114	3	
North Division Patrol			1	3	11		97		3	112		
Carmelitos Projects							2			2		
<u>South Division</u>								0	3	116	3	
South Division Patrol			1	3	11		91		3	106		
Community Policing						1	8			9		
Tidelands CVB Patrol							1			1		
<u>West Division</u>								0	3	116	3	
West Division Patrol			1	4	11		100		3	116		
<u>Field Support</u>								0	31	67	31	
Air Support						1	5			6		
Collision Investigation Detail					1		4		2	5		
Crossing Guards									27	0		
Event Planning					1		2		1	3		
Field Support			1	1			1		1	3		
K-9					1	1	8			10		
Mental Evaluation Team							6			6		
Special Enforcement				1						1		
SWAT					1		1			2		
Traffic Motors				1	3		17			21		
Traffic Services Prop H Funds							10			10		

Source: LBPD Provided Data

This table reflects *authorized* staffing levels, not *actual* staffing levels, so actual staffing numbers may be slightly out of alignment with respect to the current conditions within the report.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

TABLE A-9: INVESTIGATIONS BUREAU STAFFING - SUMMARY

Rank	Invest. Bureau Admin	Detective	Forensic Science	GVC	Criminal Intelligence	Youth Services	Total
Deputy Chief	1						1
Commander		1		1			2
Lieutenant		3		3	1		7
Sergeant	1	10	1	10	3	1	26
Detective		56		71	6	9	142
Non-Sworn Staff	1	14	25	7		2	49
Non-Sworn Supervisor			3			1	4
Totals	3	84	29	92	10	13	231

Source: LBPD provided data

DRAFT

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

TABLE A-10: INVESTIGATIONS BUREAU STAFFING - DETAILED

	Chief	Dep.	Cmdr.	Lt.	Sgt.	Cpl.	Det.	Non-	Non-	Sworn Totals	Non-	All Staff
		Chief						Sworn Spvsr.	Sworn Staff		Sworn Totals	
Investigations Bureau								4	49	178	53	231
<i>Deputy Chief</i>								0	1	12	1	
Criminal Intelligence				1	3		6			10		
Deputy Chief Detectives		1			1				1	2		
<i>Detective Division</i>								0	14	70	14	
Adult Investigation			1	1					1	2		
Auto Theft					1		4		1	5		
Auto Theft Task Force							1			1		
Burglary					1		10			11		
Child Abuse					1		5		1	6		
Computer Crimes					1		4			5		
Domestic Violence					1		8		1	9		
Financial Crimes					2		10		1	12		
MCI									5	0		
Sex Crimes					1		7		2	8		
Special Victims				1						1		
Vice Investigations				1	2		7		2	10		
<i>Forensic Science</i>								3	25	1	28	
Crime Lab								3	14	0		
Property Detail					1				11	1		
<i>Gang & Violent Crimes</i>								0	7	85		
C-CAT (Crime Suppression)					1		11			12		
Drug Investigation				1	2		15		1	18		
Gang & Violent Crime Division			1		1		2		1	4		
Gang Enforcement				1	2		13		1	16		
Homicide				1	2		16		2	19		
Robbery					1		6		1	7		
Violent Crimes					1		8		1	9		
<i>Youth Services</i>								1	2	10	3	
School Resource Officers							4			4		
Youth Services Investigations					1		5	1	2	6		

Source: LBPD provided data

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Tables A-9 and A-10 reflect the staffing for the Investigations Bureau, which includes 178 full-time sworn officers/detectives and 53 non-sworn positions. A Deputy Chief oversees this Bureau.

DRAFT

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL DATA

CRIME AND ARREST DATA

TABLE B-1: PART 1 CRIMES

Crime Type	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5 Year Average	Variance from Avg.	2013-2017 Trend
Homicide	33	23	36	33	22	31	-9	10.00%
Rape	102	110	179	197	203	141	62	71.30%
Robbery	1,117	888	1,055	1,138	1,237	1,087	150	-8.08%
Aggravated Assault	1,094	1,248	1,483	1,480	1,642	1,325	317	11.80%
Burglary	3,775	3,478	3,099	2,988	2,765	3,428	-663	-21.33%
Larceny	6,866	6,876	8,424	8,377	7,103	7,649	-546	8.78%
Auto Theft	2,347	2,034	2,788	2,840	2,708	2,526	182	9.04%
Arson	96	61	56	89	108	82	26	10.38%
Totals	15,430	14,718	17,120	17,142	15,788	16,268	-480	1.51%

Source: <http://www.longbeach.gov/police/crime-info/crime-statistics>

Within the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) standards set by the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), crimes are separated into two categories; Part I Crimes (more serious), and Part II Crimes (all others). Part I Crimes for the LBPD are shown above, for the period from 2013 to 2017.

There was a significant increase in rape, robbery, and arson between 2016 and 2017. Rapes were up 10%, robberies up nearly 8%, and arson increased nearly 59% although this might be an anomaly based on the six-year trend. Rape totals also increased over the same period [SL28] by 8.55%. Overall, Part I crime rates in 2017 were significantly lower than in 2015 and 2016.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY**

TABLE B-2: PART II CRIMES

Crime Type	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5 Year Average	Variance from Avg.	2013-2017 Change
Simple Assault	3,301	3,015	3,080	3,364	4,212	3,394	818	27.60%
Forgery	458	449	464	504	457	466	-9	-0.22%
Fraud	425	396	455	457	553	457	96	30.12%
Embezzlement	60	44	51	32	42	46	-4	-30.00%
RSP	40	41	49	37	49	43	6	22.50%
Vandalism	2,156	2,339	2,892	3,015	2,623	2,605	18	21.66%
Weapons	352	334	371	446	453	391	62	28.69%
Prostitution/Vice	69	62	46	31	53	52	1	-23.19%
Sex, All Other	406	369	344	278	338	347	-9	-16.75%
Narcotics-Sales/Mfg. Marijuana	222	101	75	47	31	95	-64	-86.04%
Narcotics-Sales/Mfg. Synthetic	98	48	32	8	42	46	-4	-57.14%
Narcotics-Dangerous Non Narco	5	8	3	1	0	3	-3	-100.00%
Narcotics-Poss Opium/Coke	25	11	18	3	4	12	-8	-84.00%
Narcotics-Poss Marijuana	348	286	222	162	51	214	-163	-85.34%
Narco-Poss Synthetic Narco	372	332	214	191	753	372	381	102.42%
Narco-Poss Dangerous Non Narco	705	766	505	570	586	626	-40	-16.88%
Gambling	1	5	5	1	0	2	-2	-100.00%
Family/Child	732	814	919	938	1,061	893	168	44.95%
DUI	786	735	583	549	674	665	9	-14.25%
Liquor	42	15	20	9	2	18	-16	-95.24%
Drunkeness	1,061	1,085	828	751	733	892	-159	-30.91%
Disorderly	381	438	258	275	197	310	-113	-48.29%
All Other	4,923	4,816	5,231	5,666	4,572	5,042	-470	-7.13%
Runaways	2	3	2	1	0	2	-2	-100.00%
Totals	16,970	16,512	16,667	17,336	17,486	16,994	492	3.04%

Source: <http://www.longbeach.gov/police/crime-info/crime-statistics>

Part II crimes for the City of Long Beach are provided for 2013-2017. In analyzing the data, there is relative consistency from year to year with a recent increase in Part II crimes after 2015. Looking at the combined data for Part I and Part II crimes, in 2013 there were 32,400 crimes reported, and in 2017 there were 33,274 crimes.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY**

TABLE B-3: PART 1 CASE CLEARANCE RATES

Part 1 Offenses vs. Cleared	2014 Cases	2014 Cleared	2014 Pct. Clr.	2015 Cases	2015 Cleared	2015 Pct. Clr.	2016 Cases	2016 Cleared	2016 Pct. Clr.	3 Year Avg.	15-'16 Change
Homicide Offenses	23	14	60.87%	36	19	52.78%	33	24	72.73%	61.96%	37.80%
Sex Offenses (Rape)	104	59	56.73%	177	86	48.59%	197	97	49.24%	50.63%	1.34%
Robbery	889	216	24.30%	1,054	260	24.67%	1138	294	25.83%	24.99%	4.73%
Aggravated Assault	1,282	736	57.41%	1,499	645	43.03%	1478	745	50.41%	49.92%	17.15%
Burglary	3,482	572	16.43%	3,094	333	10.76%	2988	310	10.37%	12.70%	-3.60%
Larceny	6,875	764	11.11%	8,413	843	10.02%	8377	739	8.82%	9.91%	-11.96%
Auto Theft	2,081	205	9.85%	2,830	280	9.89%	2859	342	11.96%	10.64%	20.90%
Arson	78	10	12.82%	69	14	20.29%	117	30	25.64%	20.45%	26.37%
Total	14,814	2,576	17.39%	17,172	2,480	14.44%	17,187	2,581	15.02%	15.53%	3.98%

Source: FBI UCR Data

The clearance rates for all Part I crimes from 2014 to 2016 are provided above. When examining Part I Crimes, and clearance rates in particular, it is important to note that although there are eight crimes in this category, these are split into two sub-categories: violent crime and non-violent crime. The violent crimes category includes homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. In addition to being more serious in nature, *violent crimes* are also crimes against a person, and accordingly, there is usually a witness and/or substantial forensic evidence available for investigators. Due to their serious nature and these other factors, violent crimes usually have a higher clearance rate than non-violent crimes.

In reviewing the Part I clearance rates for LBPD, the 2016 clearance rates are similar to the three-year patterns. In some cases, there have been some significant changes in clearance rates.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

TABLE B-4: SELECTED CRIME CLEARANCE RATES (SECTION 1)

Incident Type	2012			2013			2014		
	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved
Assault; Not Firearm	533	400	75.05%	489	339	69.33%	475	287	60.42%
Assault with Firearm	140	87	62.14%	110	43	39.09%	100	33	33.00%
Death Threat/Great Bodily Threat; Verbal, Written, etc.	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
Inflict Corp. Injury; Spouse/Cohabitant	1339	1232	92.01%	1132	980	86.57%	1407	1234	87.70%
Battery	1071	588	54.90%	1010	530	52.48%	1030	538	52.23%
Battery Non-consent from Spouse, Cohabitant, Date	583	505	86.62%	553	454	82.10%	412	319	77.43%
Sexual Battery	107	61	57.01%	106	40	37.74%	92	51	55.43%
Child Cruelty; Possible Injury/Death	41	36	87.80%	34	31	91.18%	100	97	97.00%
Willful Cruelty to Child	139	105	75.54%	110	106	96.36%	79	78	98.73%
Lewd Act with Child Under 14	110	84	76.36%	102	88	86.27%	101	78	77.23%
Auto Burglary	2470	120	4.86%	1993	103	5.17%	1792	79	4.41%
Petty Theft: From Auto	913	24	2.63%	894	24	2.68%	952	26	2.73%
Grand Theft: From Auto	354	4	1.13%	364	13	3.57%	389	7	1.80%
Attempt Burglary - Residential	153	24	15.69%	131	17	12.98%	163	23	14.11%
Burglary - Residential	2220	273	12.30%	2303	254	11.03%	1986	288	14.50%
Burglary - Commercial	662	151	22.81%	673	160	23.77%	714	241	33.75%
Burglary - Garage-Residential	483	43	8.90%	454	34	7.49%	347	22	6.34%
Burglary - Commercial - Shoplift	194	113	58.25%	194	146	75.26%	146	106	72.60%
Grand Theft; Motor Vehicle	2548	236	9.26%	2045	184	9.00%	835	192	22.99%
Vandalism; Damage Property	1326	216	16.29%	1105	157	14.21%	1205	197	16.35%
Vandalism; Deface Graffiti/Inscribed Material	356	127	35.67%	289	92	31.83%	515	98	19.03%
Vandalism; Destroy Others Property	479	74	15.45%	474	56	11.81%	283	41	14.49%
Vandalism (\$400 Or More)	112	21	18.75%	148	37	25.00%	192	65	33.85%
Vandalism Less Than \$400	44	10	22.73%	47	10	21.28%	63	6	9.52%
Disorderly Conduct - Prostitution	235	235	100.00%	188	186	98.94%	218	215	98.62%
Disorderly Conduct - Under Influence -Intoxicated Alcohol/Drugs etc.	1156	1142	98.79%	1040	1028	98.85%	1038	1027	98.94%
DUI Alcohol/Drugs	257	256	99.61%	324	316	97.53%	364	356	97.80%
DUI Alcohol/0.08 Percent	495	493	99.60%	365	362	99.18%	278	273	98.20%
Simple Poss. of Meth/Ecstasy/GHB etc.	459	442	96.30%	669	639	95.52%	710	689	97.04%
Controlled Substance Paraphernalia	309	306	99.03%	288	284	98.61%	313	311	99.36%
Possess Controlled Substance Paraphernalia	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
Possession Marijuana Over 1 Oz/28.5 Grams	211	210	99.53%	156	153	98.08%	109	108	99.08%
Simple Possession: Heroin/Cocaine/Listed Controlled Substance	194	179	92.27%	208	186	89.42%	172	167	97.09%
Crime Threat; Verbally, Electronically, Writing, etc.	361	247	68.42%	343	232	67.64%	336	213	63.39%
Annoying Phone Call/Obscene Matter/Threats	119	43	36.13%	121	43	35.54%	109	54	49.54%

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Incident Type	2012			2013			2014		
	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved
Trespass: Occupy Property without Consent	57	55	96.49%	68	65	95.59%	70	65	92.86%
Trespass: Refuse/Fail to Leave Prop/Land/etc.	51	50	98.04%	54	52	96.30%	145	136	93.79%
Attempt Robbery	102	20	19.61%	98	22	22.45%	87	26	29.89%
Robbery; Person	841	198	23.54%	761	185	24.31%	628	155	24.68%
Robbery; Commercial	226	98	43.36%	204	102	50.00%	133	47	35.34%
Grand Theft; Property	549	53	9.65%	511	41	8.02%	448	38	8.48%
Petty Theft	2203	612	27.78%	2084	506	24.28%	2000	435	21.75%
Petty Theft Bike	749	21	2.80%	519	19	3.66%	419	16	3.82%
Grand Theft; Person	57	12	21.05%	116	17	14.66%	102	11	10.78%
Grand Theft - Bike	87	7	8.05%	96	6	6.25%	86	2	2.33%
Violate Order; Prevent Domestic Violence	191	166	86.91%	152	142	93.42%	271	240	88.56%
Contempt of Court - Violate Protective Order	197	180	91.37%	184	164	89.13%	190	160	84.21%
Contempt of Court - Disobey Court Order	235	215	91.49%	222	199	89.64%	193	162	83.94%
Obstruct Public Officer	210	198	94.29%	165	158	95.76%	190	176	92.63%
Forgery	284	76	26.76%	290	87	30.00%	257	98	38.13%
Unauthorized Use of ID - Obtain Credit/Goods	221	20	9.05%	207	32	15.46%	190	42	22.11%

TABLE B-5: SELECTED CRIME CLEARANCE RATES (SECTION 2)

Incident Type	2015			2016			2017			6 Year	16 '17
	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Average	Change
Assault; Not Firearm	512	296	57.81%	655	371	56.64%	608	305	50.16%	61.57%	-6.48%
Assault with Firearm	160	71	44.38%	160	57	35.63%	179	66	36.87%	41.85%	1.25%
Death Threat/Great Bodily Threat; Verbal, Written, etc.	0	0	0.00%	93	42	45.16%	416	128	30.77%	12.66%	-14.39%
Inflict Corp. Injury; Spouse/ Cohabitant	1282	1116	87.05%	1258	993	78.93%	1263	797	63.10%	82.56%	-15.83%
Battery	1158	542	46.80%	1191	549	46.10%	1362	495	36.34%	48.14%	-9.75%
Battery Non-consent from Spouse, Cohabitant, Date	451	401	88.91%	498	405	81.33%	635	403	63.46%	79.97%	-17.86%
Sexual Battery	107	50	46.73%	121	46	38.02%	101	44	43.56%	46.41%	5.55%
Child Cruelty; Possible Injury/Death	129	116	89.92%	116	90	77.59%	103	55	53.40%	82.81%	-24.19%
Willful Cruelty to Child	84	71	84.52%	84	72	85.71%	86	37	43.02%	80.65%	-42.69%
Lewd Act with Child Under 14	118	99	83.90%	79	61	77.22%	122	52	42.62%	73.93%	-34.59%
Auto Burglary	2059	67	3.25%	2137	79	3.70%	1810	40	2.21%	3.93%	-1.49%
Petty Theft: From Auto	1698	38	2.24%	1898	22	1.16%	1555	30	1.93%	2.23%	0.77%
Grand Theft: From Auto	639	12	1.88%	641	9	1.40%	531	3	0.56%	1.72%	-0.84%
Attempt Burglary - Residential	133	16	12.03%	104	17	16.35%	108	12	11.11%	13.71%	-5.24%
Burglary - Residential	1810	226	12.49%	1852	221	11.93%	1614	131	8.12%	11.73%	-3.82%

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Burglary - Commercial	770	114	14.81%	723	101	13.97%	722	43	5.96%	19.18%	-8.01%
	2015			2016			2017			6 Year	16 '17
Incident Type	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Average	Change
Burglary - Garage-Residential	318	12	3.77%	338	17	5.03%	273	12	4.40%	5.99%	-0.63%
Burglary - Commercial - Shoplift	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	34.35%	0.00%
Grand Theft; Motor Vehicle	2688	295	10.97%	2755	352	12.78%	2446	298	12.18%	12.86%	-0.59%
Vandalism; Damage Property	1681	190	11.30%	1852	228	12.31%	1682	182	10.82%	13.55%	-1.49%
Vandalism; Deface Graffiti/Inscribed Material	503	75	14.91%	508	83	16.34%	380	67	17.63%	22.57%	1.29%
Vandalism; Destroy Others Property	209	31	14.83%	166	33	19.88%	177	30	16.95%	15.57%	-2.93%
Vandalism (\$400 Or More)	251	48	19.12%	271	53	19.56%	231	46	19.91%	22.70%	0.36%
Vandalism Less Than \$400	156	12	7.69%	171	23	13.45%	108	19	17.59%	15.38%	4.14%
Disorderly Conduct - Prostitution	118	116	98.31%	52	50	96.15%	37	37	100.00%	98.67%	3.85%
Disorderly Conduct - Under Influence - Intoxicated Alcohol/Drugs etc.	794	787	99.12%	728	720	98.90%	677	652	96.31%	98.48%	-2.59%
DUI Alcohol/Drugs	293	288	98.29%	269	264	98.14%	313	281	89.78%	96.86%	-8.36%
DUI Alcohol/0.08 Percent	188	188	100.00%	193	192	99.48%	266	256	96.24%	98.78%	-3.24%
Simple Possession of Meth/Ecstasy/GHB etc.	438	434	99.09%	520	508	97.69%	511	481	94.13%	96.63%	-3.56%
Controlled Substance Paraphernalia	368	366	99.46%	45	45	100.00%	24	24	100.00%	99.41%	0.00%
Poss. Controlled Substance Paraphernalia	19	19	100.00%	512	504	98.44%	668	659	98.65%	49.52%	0.22%
Poss. Marijuana Over 1 Oz/28.5 Grams	31	31	100.00%	44	41	93.18%	22	19	86.36%	96.04%	-6.82%
Simple Poss.: Heroin/Cocaine/Listed Controlled Substance	76	73	96.05%	96	95	98.96%	102	96	94.12%	94.65%	-4.84%
Crime Threat; Verbally, Electronically, Writing, etc.	328	179	54.57%	287	127	44.25%	4	0	0.00%	49.71%	-44.25%
Annoying Phone Call/Obscene Matter/Threats	124	48	38.71%	116	42	36.21%	111	16	14.41%	35.09%	-21.79%
Trespass; Occupy Property without Consent	127	119	93.70%	167	153	91.62%	214	194	90.65%	93.48%	-0.96%
Trespass: Refuse/Fail to Leave Prop/Land/etc.	133	128	96.24%	86	83	96.51%	37	33	89.19%	95.01%	-7.32%
Attempt Robbery	93	26	27.96%	103	23	22.33%	115	26	22.61%	24.14%	0.28%
Robbery; Person	707	189	26.73%	784	204	26.02%	817	150	18.36%	23.94%	-7.66%
Robbery; Commercial	207	87	42.03%	233	116	49.79%	262	106	40.46%	43.50%	-9.33%
Grand Theft; Property	523	52	9.94%	502	49	9.76%	467	33	7.07%	8.82%	-2.69%
Petty Theft	2143	358	16.71%	2438	459	18.83%	2410	323	13.40%	20.46%	-5.42%
Petty Theft Bike	572	6	1.05%	450	6	1.33%	298	8	2.68%	2.56%	1.35%
Grand Theft; Person	52	7	13.46%	134	24	17.91%	141	15	10.64%	14.75%	-7.27%
Grand Theft - Bike	132	2	1.52%	82	0	0.00%	48	1	2.08%	3.37%	2.08%
Violate Order; Prevent Domestic Violence	372	354	95.16%	379	332	87.60%	350	201	57.43%	84.85%	-30.17%
Contempt of Court - Violate Protective Order	202	154	76.24%	235	197	83.83%	309	196	63.43%	81.37%	-20.40%

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY


Contempt of Court - Disobey Court Order	171	132	77.19%	163	123	75.46%	204	121	59.31%	79.51%	-16.15%
	2015			2016			2017			6 Year	16 '17
Incident Type	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Cases	Solved	Pct. Solved	Average	Change
Obstruct Public Officer	180	169	93.89%	200	177	88.50%	278	250	89.93%	92.50%	1.43%
Forgery	260	110	42.31%	297	142	47.81%	281	102	36.30%	36.89%	-11.51%
Unauthorized Use of ID - Obtain Credit/Goods	229	58	25.33%	222	45	20.27%	355	34	9.58%	16.96%	-10.69%

Source: LBPDP Provided Data

Includes selected criminal offenses with at least 500 incidents over the six-year period.

Overall Part II clearance rates were the highest in 2012 with an overall clearance rate of 50.04%. Since that time, Part II crime clearance rates have steadily dropped, reaching a low point of 40.70% in 2017. Clearance rates for Part II crimes are also lower in most categories in 2017, as compared to the six-year average.

It is sometimes difficult to draw crime rate comparisons between certain metropolitan population areas, because of the population density variances and other differing factors. However, the crime rate and violent crime rates are relevant factors, as they reflect the likelihood that a person will become a victim of a violent crime, based on a ratio of 100,000 people. For the LBPDP, the IACP selected California cities with similar size population to Long Beach. The data from these communities is reflected in Table B-6 below.



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

TABLE B-6: CRIME RATE COMPARISONS

Metropolitan California Cities	Population	Violent crime	Murder and non-negligent Manslaughter	Rape (revised definition ¹)	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Property crime	Burglary	Larceny-theft	Motor vehicle theft	Arson
Fresno	524,796	3,206	39	158	1,122	1,887	20,523	3,697	13,542	3,284	260
Sacramento	495,471	3,549	41	88	1,136	2,284	15,283	3,070	9,389	2,824	173
Oakland	424,998	6,059	85	277	3,076	2,621	23,952	2,900	14,153	6,899	191
Bakersfield	378,788	1,821	32	67	614	1,108	17,138	3,887	10,203	3,048	332
Anaheim	353,504	1,209	7	123	390	689	9,617	1,469	6,764	1,384	33
Santa Ana	337,419	1,612	23	142	511	936	6,980	1,119	3,913	1,948	42
Riverside	325,896	1,724	10	141	586	987	11,266	1,977	7,355	1,934	57
Stockton	308,348	4,381	49	128	1,185	3,019	11,634	2,251	7,550	1,833	81
Averages	393,653	2,945	36	141	1,078	1,691	14,549	2,546	9,109	2,894	146
Long Beach	476,476	2,846	33	197	1,138	1,478	14,224	2,988	8,377	2,859	117
Long Beach + or -	82,824	-99	-3	57	61	-213	-325	442	-732	-35	-29

Source: www.ucr.fbi.gov

In looking at the data from Table B-6, the overall and violent crime rates for Long Beach are slightly below the average of the comparison communities. There can be myriad factors that contribute to the trends observed, which can include staffing, training, operational areas, increases in the population, or certain community demographics. Analyzing these trends requires additional focus, which is beyond the scope of this study. LBPD staff are encouraged to look at these numbers more closely, by category, to determine whether a specific strategic approach is appropriate.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY****TABLE B-7: ALL ARRESTS BY AGE AND GENDER**

Arrest Category	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	6 Yr. Avg.	Variation from Avg.	% Change '16-'17
Adult Male	18,060	17,007	16,056	13,319	13,520	11,620	14,930	-3,310	-14.05%
Adult Female	4,729	4,591	4,425	3,386	3,254	3,130	3,919	-789	-3.81%
Juvenile Male	1,562	1,358	1,178	887	743	621	1,058	-437	-16.42%
Juvenile Female	527	447	345	286	207	199	335	-136	-3.86%
Gender Not Listed	4	2	11	12	12	7	8	-1	-41.67%
Totals	24,882	23,405	22,015	17,890	17,736	15,577	20,251	-4,674	-12.17%

Source: LBPDP Provided Data

Examining arrest rates provides an understanding of the types of activities in which the department is engaging, and they are also connected to clearance rates for various crimes. Table B-7 provides a summary of adult and juvenile arrests for LBPDP between 2012 and 2017. In relation to the decrease in overall Part I crime, arrests for both juveniles and adults have decreased.

TRAFFIC Data**TABLE B-8: TRAFFIC CRASH REPORTS**

Crash Type	2014	2015	2016	2014-2016 Pct. Change
Collision Injury	1,408	1,501	1,576	12%
Collision Injury - Alcohol and/or Drugs	75	69	82	9%
Collision Non-injury	2,510	2,772	3,053	22%
Collision Non-injury - Alcohol and/or Drugs	168	169	206	23%
Hit-and-Run Injury	182	212	262	44%
Hit-and-Run Injury - Alcohol and/or Drugs	15	16	14	-7%
Hit and Run Non-injury	1,788	2,247	2,366	32%
Hit and Run Non-injury - Alcohol and/or Drugs	70	61	75	7%
Totals	6,216	7,047	7,634	23%

Source: LBPDP provided data

IACP examined various traffic data for this study, and the number and rate of motor vehicle crashes provides one of the most common measures of the success of traffic functions within law enforcement agencies. Table B-8 depicts the various types of motor vehicle crashes responded to by the LBPDP, for which there was some type of a report filed.

The total number of crashes has increased significantly from 2014 to 2016 by 23%. Not surprisingly, reported injuries from crashes are also up. Since Long Beach is a densely populated

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

area with heavy vehicle traffic, this trend is not unexpected. Of particular note, hit-and-run incidents have increased by 38% over the same three-year period.

TABLE B-9: TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT

Violation	2015	2015	2016	2014-2016 Pct. Change
Basic Speeding	4,371	3,403	2,385	-45%
Use of Cell Phone While Driving	2,161	1,433	977	-55%
All Other Traffic Violations	22,517	18,010	14,791	-34%
Totals	29,049	22,846	18,153	-38%

Source: LBPD provided data

The number of motor vehicle crashes is an important consideration from a public safety perspective, but it is also important in terms of the time officers must engage in order to manage those incidents.

In Table B-9, the enforcement statistics for the LBPD traffic unit are shown for the past three years. The volume of activity is down significantly in each of the categories shown.

DRAFT

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY**

TABLE B-10: FREQUENT TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS

Violation	2014	2015	2016
Basic Speed Law	4,371	3,403	2,385
Use of Cell Phone While Driving	2,161	1,433	977
Unregistered Vehicle	2,324	1,845	1,867
Circular Red or Red Arrow	2,020	1,644	1,304
Stop Requirements	1,555	989	1,136
Obedience by Driver/Traffic Control Device	1,483	1,169	736
Driver, Unlicensed	938	943	976
Mandatory Seat Belt Law	440	675	316
Public Transportation - Evade Pay of Fare	583	318	190
Equipment Requirements - Lighting	728	667	512
Lighting/Maintain in Good Working Order	724	412	371
Driving-Suspended/Revoked License	557	513	552
Turning Movements and Required Signals	615	521	440
Display of License Plates-Two Plates	399	349	392
Loiter on Street During Certain Hours	417	193	114
Material Obstructing/Reducing Drivers View	270	184	133
Juvenile Loitering Between 0830 and 1330	281	111	92
Circular Red or Red Arrow-Pedestrian	333	220	116
Minimum Speed Law	310	334	216
Driving; Laned Roadways	357	273	241
Pedestrian; Walk, Wait or Don't Walk	310	307	146
Right-of-Way; Left Turn or U Turn	264	262	220
Right-of-Way Street Crosswalks	208	344	185
Sound Amplification Devices	186	81	44
Maximum Speed Limit; 65 Miles Per Hour	200	110	51
Bicycles; Riding on Sidewalk	274	216	100
Bicycle Operated Roadway/Highway Shoulder	233	252	145
Regulation of Turns at Intersection	203	103	110
Driving; Designated Traffic Direction	182	145	95
Use of Cell Phone/Text Messaging: Driving	134	140	78
Sub-Totals	23,060	18,156	14,240
Total Violations	29,049	22,846	18,153
Percentage of Total Violations	79.38%	79.47%	78.44%

Source: LBPD provided data

The table above provides a breakdown of the most common traffic violations for the City of Long Beach.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

CAD DATA

TABLE B-11 PATROL AND SUPPLEMENTAL PATROL UNIT HOURS (FULL)

Unit Categories	Community-Initiated		Officer Initiated		Total Event Count	Time HH:MM:SS
	Events	Time	Events	Time		
	Count	HH:MM:SS	Count	HH:MM:SS		
Non-Patrol	9429	9579:00:32	110276	122301:40:02	119705	131880:40:34
Airport-	4062	1342:13:10	39917	46526:08:29	43979	47868:21:39
Support-Marine Patrol	1401	1801:13:49	20218	11270:21:06	21619	13071:34:55
Patrol-Admin	558	1021:00:57	6027	9670:22:25	6585	10691:23:22
Support-Port Boat	220	619:13:58	4367	7290:32:04	4587	7909:46:02
Support-Port Vehicle	805	2267:12:50	7055	5429:14:29	7860	7696:27:19
Invest-Juvenile	54	160:52:10	1753	5427:29:21	1807	5588:21:31
Support-LBCC Carson	1100	891:35:55	9641	4513:06:59	10741	5404:42:54
Support-Transit	347	348:16:19	7607	4857:15:54	7954	5205:32:13
Admin-Community Policing	59	168:28:26	2295	3820:23:33	2354	3988:51:59
Support-Jail Trans	6	56:43:52	483	3606:17:22	489	3663:01:14
Patrol-PRCS	16	102:02:15	1090	2559:54:25	1106	2661:56:40
Support-LBCC PCH	456	266:40:53	3586	2166:01:02	4042	2432:41:55
Invest-Narcotics	1	2:09:49	491	1595:26:05	492	1597:35:54
Invest-Gang	2	3:23:14	510	1572:32:34	512	1575:55:48
Invest-CCAT	1	2:16:51	212	1464:04:37	213	1466:21:28
Fire-Arson	51	42:39:11	600	1370:18:21	651	1412:57:32
Patrol-Decoy			333	1280:22:36	333	1280:22:36
_PSA's	126	117:54:40	1089	875:24:17	1215	993:18:57
Invest-Lab			807	916:39:05	807	916:39:05
COP-Command Staff	44	45:18:20	357	787:43:41	401	833:02:01
Invest-Vice	1	0:19:53	94	672:49:40	95	673:09:33
Invest-Burglary	9	39:15:36	143	575:22:54	152	614:38:30
Support-City Hall Security	61	83:58:27	254	518:44:00	315	602:42:27
Admin-Senior Partners	2	6:55:50	388	551:31:45	390	558:27:35
Invest-Identity Theft			91	457:23:33	91	457:23:33
Invest-Domestic Violence	1	7:45:30	184	443:07:18	185	450:52:48
Invest-Sex Crimes	3	35:51:20	140	322:44:22	143	358:35:42
Invest-Homicide	5	21:30:42	79	330:37:26	84	352:08:08
Disaster-Commo Supervisor	21	42:51:12	123	304:54:14	144	347:45:26
Invest-Auto Theft	2	2:01:05	35	222:22:23	37	224:23:28

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Invest-Mayors Security Detail			24	191:39:10	24	191:39:10
Invest-Arson	6	11:33:46	78	175:12:01	84	186:45:47
Invest-Warrants	1	15:20:47	61	128:11:08	62	143:31:55
Invest-Child Abuse	1	16:16:32	39	114:22:41	40	130:39:13
Support-METRO	1	3:10:40	15	53:43:01	16	56:53:41
Patrol-Maritime Emerg. Ops Ctr			3	49:35:34	3	49:35:34
Invest-Criminal Intel Section			10	49:17:24	10	49:17:24
Patrol-Mobile Eye			8	37:40:21	8	37:40:21
Patrol-Collision Invest			21	32:51:19	21	32:51:19
Admin-Info Tech	2	1:11:31	32	30:41:25	34	31:52:56
Outside Agency-	1	1:40:25	4	21:51:51	5	23:32:16
Invest-Forgery	1	17:13:05	4	3:46:57	5	21:00:02
Support-Admin	2	12:47:32			2	12:47:32
COP-Internal Affairs			3	8:42:29	3	8:42:29
Patrol-Hostage Negotiator			2	3:14:07	2	3:14:07
Support-Academy			2	1:30:31	2	1:30:31
Invest-Computer Crimes			1	0:04:03	1	0:04:03
Patrol	192542	286805:03:29	195405	144681:05:07	387947	431486:08:36
Patrol-Division South	80514	129204:41:43	72257	61744:17:54	152771	190948:59:37
Patrol-Division East	57843	78165:59:12	59645	40586:03:08	117488	118752:02:20
Patrol-Division North	40095	60039:34:42	49375	31886:20:14	89470	91925:54:56
UNKNOWN	13868	18977:26:08	13392	9132:16:37	27260	28109:42:45
Patrol-Walking Beat	222	417:21:44	737	1332:07:14	959	1749:28:58
Supplemental Patrol	3765	8134:04:17	34129	62823:56:57	37894	70958:01:14
Patrol-Direct Enforcement	498	1098:00:24	15303	23330:17:12	15801	24428:17:36
Patrol-Meet & Greet	753	1634:17:56	5896	12912:03:08	6649	14546:21:04
Patrol-Helicopter	294	469:16:57	4213	9258:19:06	4507	9727:36:03
Patrol-Bicycle	254	603:08:38	2874	6227:21:53	3128	6830:30:31
Patrol-Mental Evaluation	1004	3012:17:47	1404	1768:21:48	2408	4780:39:35
Patrol-Special Events	23	13:07:40	726	4190:23:27	749	4203:31:07
Patrol-K9	459	463:38:55	1597	2678:37:41	2056	3142:16:36
Patrol-Felony	196	397:19:28	1490	1492:41:14	1686	1890:00:42
Patrol-Watch Commander	272	418:46:07	226	364:55:44	498	783:41:51
Patrol-Reserves	3	1:12:33	50	224:31:27	53	225:44:00
Patrol-Special Enforcement	2	8:25:39	136	171:58:02	138	180:23:41
Patrol-Beach	7	14:32:13	184	105:17:24	191	119:49:37
Patrol-SWAT			13	81:23:34	13	81:23:34
Patrol-Team White			4	8:59:42	4	8:59:42
Patrol-Team Red			6	4:16:16	6	4:16:16

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Patrol-Team Blue			3	3:31:14	3	3:31:14
Patrol-Team Green			4	0:58:05	4	0:58:05
Traffic	5743	4807:26:47	24450	16568:57:28	30193	21376:24:15
Patrol-Traffic Reserves	896	449:49:01	15378	5722:27:14	16274	6172:16:15
Patrol-Traffic Motors South	2762	2128:46:15	1701	1843:32:39	4463	3972:18:54
Patrol-Traffic Motors East	1789	1600:58:32	1478	1860:33:33	3267	3461:32:05
Patrol-Traffic Motors Impact	78	271:48:21	2049	3034:09:59	2127	3305:58:20
Patrol-Traffic Motors City Wide	37	67:40:05	873	1256:10:46	910	1323:50:51
Patrol-Traffic Motors DUI	44	200:52:29	869	925:53:10	913	1126:45:39
Patrol-Traffic Sergeants	25	24:01:09	572	1070:39:59	597	1094:41:08
Patrol-Traffic Commercial	27	17:44:44	1476	813:30:48	1503	831:15:32
Patrol-Traffic Motors North	85	45:46:11	54	41:59:20	139	87:45:31
Grand Total	211479	309325:35:05	364260	346375:39:34	575739	655701:14:39

TABLE B-12: INCIDENTS AVERAGING TWO OR MORE UNITS RESPONDING

Incident	Number of Events	Number of Units	Average Units
Officer Involved Shooting	3	134	44.67
Shots @ Dwell/Inhab. Vehicle	46	590	12.83
Murder	29	325	11.21
Person with a Gun	562	5696	10.14
Injury Blue Line Accident	2	19	9.50
Kidnapping	25	234	9.36
Blue Line-No Injury	3	27	9.00
Bomb	23	200	8.70
Robbery	608	5205	8.56
Burglary	1247	9827	7.88
Rape	45	340	7.56
Bomb Threat	12	85	7.08
Explosion	23	160	6.96
Person with a Knife	674	4688	6.96
Arson	35	243	6.94
Stolen Vehicle	298	2054	6.89
Teletrac	7	48	6.86

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Strong Arm Robbery	433	2844	6.57
Violent Mentally Ill Per	290	1872	6.46
Concealed Weapon	130	820	6.31
Fire	16	98	6.13
Auto Burglary	649	3899	6.01
Prowler	479	2860	5.97
Shots	1034	6118	5.92
Injury Hit & Run	207	1184	5.72
Injury City Prop Damage	32	179	5.59
Unknown Trouble	1400	7785	5.56
Felony Spousal Abuse	3649	19960	5.47
Grand Theft Person	81	425	5.25
Injury Traffic Accident	1922	10081	5.25
Attempt Suicide	1782	8971	5.03
Child Annoying or Molest	60	301	5.02
Pac Coast Campus	2	10	5.00
Sex Crime Against Child	14	70	5.00
Gang Disturbance	169	836	4.95
Person Screaming	974	4806	4.93
Silent Robbery Alarm	462	2269	4.91
Battery	3979	19162	4.82
Person Down	99	447	4.52
No Detail Accident	287	1195	4.16
Injury Special Accident	14	58	4.14
927 Unknown Exact Location	1216	4972	4.09
Critical Missing	244	975	4.00
Parole or Probation	126	499	3.96
Fight	1794	6929	3.86
Forgery	278	1070	3.85
Overdose	362	1384	3.82
Open Door or Window	331	1241	3.75
Dead Body	472	1732	3.67
Assist Fire	3115	11226	3.60
Child Abuse or Neglect	303	1087	3.59
Silent Burglary Alarm	146	521	3.57
City Prop Damage-No Injury	270	935	3.46
Incomplete 911	2134	7311	3.43
Shot House-Vehicle Report	63	211	3.35
Trespass	59	189	3.20

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Kidnapping Report	27	86	3.19
Restraining Order Violation	614	1955	3.18
Child Concealment	12	38	3.17
Mentally Ill Person	2501	7919	3.17
Family Disturbance	3365	10615	3.15
Vehicle Tampering	42	132	3.14
Unknown Trouble Panic Alarm	613	1918	3.13
Strike Disturbance	40	124	3.10
Grand Theft	100	308	3.08
Assault w Weapon Report	175	526	3.01
Animal Cruelty Report	4	12	3.00
Elder Abuse	5	15	3.00
Lib Arts Campus	2	6	3.00
PRCS	6	18	3.00
Person w Gun Report	37	110	2.97
Traffic Accident-No Inj.	3652	10824	2.96
Found or Missing Juv.	221	632	2.86
Non-Injury Hit & Run	1833	5113	2.79
Malicious Vandalism	1711	4750	2.78
Assist	1915	5246	2.74
Terrorist Threats	401	1072	2.67
Traffic Stop	3	8	2.67
Dispute	8994	23880	2.66
Rape Report	204	536	2.63
Spousal Abuse Report	533	1346	2.53
Missing-Found Adult	166	412	2.48
Robbery Report	189	468	2.48
Audible Burglar Alarm	6655	16139	2.43
Customer Disturbance	742	1790	2.41
Suspicious Person	12124	29076	2.40
Unlawful Lodging	2271	5387	2.37
Special Accident-No Inj.	295	699	2.37
Indecent Exposure	1296	3057	2.36
Injury Hit Run Report	28	66	2.36
Intoxicated	2106	4929	2.34
Power Outage	3	7	2.33
Graffiti Abatement	41	95	2.32
Sex Crime Child Report	123	285	2.32
Child Concealment Report	63	145	2.30

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Pick Up Prisoner	120	276	2.30
Assist DCS	244	560	2.30
Check Well Being	4057	9219	2.27
Dead Body Report	26	59	2.27
Group Disturbance	5286	11960	2.26
Petty Theft	2638	5964	2.26
Person w Knife Report	43	97	2.26
Intoxicated on Drugs	3087	6950	2.25
Animal Cruelty	46	103	2.24
Transport Prisoner	1108	2466	2.23
Stalking	19	42	2.21
Info Stolen Vehicle	5	11	2.20
Party Disturbance	5454	11952	2.19
Tarrasoff Threat	16	35	2.19
Keep the Peace	1701	3714	2.18
City Property Damage	6	13	2.17
Drug Sales	601	1298	2.16
Unwelcome Guest	19218	41401	2.15
Child Molest Report	43	92	2.14
Neighbor Dispute	1950	4167	2.14
Assist the Citizen	453	951	2.10
Strong Arm Robbery Report	171	356	2.08
Drunk Driving	1084	2253	2.08
Information Gen Broadcast	136	279	2.05
Vehicle Speed Contest	152	310	2.04
Transport (Court/Cruise)	35	71	2.03
Battery Report	1025	2059	2.01
Escort Assist	1	2	2.00
Laser Intrusion	4	8	2.00
LB Transit Call	1	2	2.00
Murder Report	1	2	2.00
Vehicle Tampering Report	21	42	2.00

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

APPENDIX C: STAFF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Designing Performance Measures

Performance measures should be multidimensional to capture the complexity inherent in modern policing. Policing experts have proposed several considerations in developing performance indicators.

A basic consideration in developing performance measures is the difference between outcomes and outputs. Outputs are measures of internal performance that are highly correlated with desirable policing outcomes. Outputs are under the direct control of the police. For example, the number of citations for speeding is an output. A police officer can put more or less effort into conducting speeding enforcement and thereby increase or decrease the number of citations. Outcomes, on the other hand, are societal benefits that the police produce. An example of an outcome would be residents' feelings of safer roads. The officer could potentially influence perceptions of safety through community policing, traffic safety presentations or other actions. Outcomes are desirable because they set a target for the officer but leave it up to the officer to choose the means to achieve the target. However, because outcomes may be influenced by factors outside the control of the police, this may alter the risk/reward ratio for officers. Officers must decide whether it is worth their effort to engage in actions that might increase feelings of safety in the community while reducing their efforts in other areas of performance. Outputs are desirable because the police can directly influence them. Thus, outputs create stronger incentives for officers to behave in certain ways than do performance measures that target outcomes. However, outputs also encourage the officers to "game" the system. For example, setting targets for traffic tickets, may lead to many marginal citations near the end of a reporting period and do little to achieve the desired outcome of improving traffic safety.

An effective evaluation process requires an initial definition of specific job/position descriptions that are based upon job-specific Knowledge, Skills and abilities (KSAs). The next component is the establishment of Key Performance Areas (KPA's).

With these developed, the performance evaluation can then establish specific objective(s) to be achieved within the given time period. The employee's performance s can be based on evaluating outputs and outcomes used in achieving desired objectives. This is the same concept that has been described in developing a department wide intelligence led policing strategy, except it's at the micro or individual employee level.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

FIGURE C-1: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM MODEL

Input (resources) →	Outputs (actions) →	Desirable outcomes
Time	Content -what is done	Did the outputs/ actions taken accomplished the objective (evaluation)
Training	Quantity-how much is done	Did the nature and magnitude of the outcome merited the combination of inputs and outputs required to achieve them (cost/benefit analysis)
Equipment	Quality-how well is it done	
Policy/procedures	Motivation-why it’s done	
Actionable Intelligence		

Inputs are any resources that contribute to the delivery of police service. For a police officer the most significant input is time, others can be training, equipment, actionable intelligence, etc. Inputs are often fixed (same for every employee). Outputs are the actions or strategies used to achieve the objectives within the given inputs, and can be analyzed in terms of content, quantity, quality and motivation. The content (what is done) is the act or set of acts performed or strategies implemented. Quantity (how much is done) refers to the number of specified acts within a given period. Quality (how well the act is done) is a function of the competence with which actions are performed and the style in which they are performed. Competence depends on knowing what needs to be done and how to do it. The style refers to the personal manner of the person(s) conducting the act. Motivation refers to the reason why the act is performed.

Outcomes are the results, effects or consequences of the work that is done. The outcome that is assessed will be determined by the purpose of the work. For the example, appropriate outcomes could include the fact that the targeted drug house was closed, a reduction in the victimization rate in a neighborhood, or action taken by neighborhood residents who worked with the police through organized community meetings. At each stage of the model, the process of analysis requires both documentation, or enumeration, and evaluation. For role definition, the question is whether a decision has been made about how to address an issue. In the case of inputs, one asks what the inputs were (enumeration) and whether they were the right ones and in sufficient quantity (evaluation). For outputs, the questions are what actions were taken (enumeration) and what the quality of the actions was (evaluation). For outcomes, the question is whether the actions taken accomplished the objective (evaluation)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

and whether the nature and magnitude of the results merited the combination of inputs and outputs required to achieve them (cost/benefit analysis)

Those being appraised should also have the ability to add their own feedback should they desire. This feedback can be as simple as an agreement with the appraisal, or a detailed explanation as to why they do not agree and any supporting argument and or facts. When an employee does not agree with their appraisal, there needs to be a system in place for an independent review, then meet with the supervisor and subordinate to come up with a final rating. This will add another layer of accountability to help ensure that appraisals are fair. The issue involving the use of the employee log can be addressed by having watch commanders inspect those logs on a quarterly basis.

The issue created by the shift deployment rotation impact can also be addressed by instituting policies requiring interim evaluations be done when an employee changes supervisor. The most significant failures of the evaluation system will require significant work by both the department and the city. While many jurisdictions use a one size fits all evaluation system, it simply does not provide the information needed to improve the employee’s performance and improve their capabilities.

DRAFT

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

APPENDIX D: LBPD AUTHORIZED STAFFING

Bureau	Chief	Dep. Chief	Cmdr.	Lt.	Sgt.	Cpl.	Off.	Non-Sworn	Non-Sworn	Sworn	Non-Sworn	All
								Spvsr.	Staff	Totals	Totals	Staff
Administration								11	96.5	2	107.5	109.5
<u>Community Engagement</u>								1	13		14	
Business Desk								1	6			
Community Relations			1				1		2	1		
Live Scan									1			
Public Information Office									4			
<u>Deputy Chief</u>								2	14.5		16.5	
Administration Management		1							1			
Facility Operations								2	13.5			
<u>Information Management</u>								7	62		69	
Information Management			1					7	60			
Information Technology				1			1			1		
Police - Fleet									2			
<u>Personnel</u>								1	7		8	
Personnel			1					1	7			
Executive Office								0	7	12	7	19
Chief of Police	1		1		1				4	3		
Internal Affairs			1	1	6		1		3	9		
Financial								2	10	0	12	12
<u>Budget Management</u>		1	1						10			
Investigations								3	49	179	52	231
<u>Deputy Chief</u>								0	1	12	1	
Criminal Intelligence				1	3		6			10		
Deputy Chief Detectives		1			1				1	2		
<u>Detective Division</u>								0	14	70	14	
Adult Investigation			1	1					1	2		
Auto Theft					1		4		1	5		
Auto Theft Task Force							1			1		
Burglary					1		10			11		
Child Abuse					1		5		1	6		

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Bureau	Dep.							Non-Sworn	Non-Sworn	Sworn	Non-Sworn	All
	Chief	Chief	Cmdr.	Lt.	Sgt.	Cpl.	Off.	Spvsr.	Staff	Totals	Totals	Staff
Computer Crimes					1		4			5		
Domestic Violence					1		8		1	9		
Financial Crimes					2		10		1	12		
MCI									5	0		
Sex Crimes					1		7		2	8		
Special Victims				1						1		
Vice Investigations				1	2		7		2	10		
<u>Forensic Science</u>								2	25	2	27	
Crime Lab			1					2	14	1		
Property Detail					1				11	1		
<u>Gang & Violent Crimes</u>								0	7	85		
C-CAT (Crime Suppression)					1		11			12		
Drug Investigation				1	2		15		1	18		
Gang & Violent Crime Division			1		1		2		1	4		
Gang Enforcement				1	2		13		1	16		
Homicide				1	2		16		2	19		
Robbery					1		6		1	7		
Violent Crimes					1		8		1	9		
<u>Youth Services</u>								1	2	10	3	
School Resource Officers							4			4		
Youth Services Investigations					1		5	1	2	6		
Patrol								1	45	538	46	584
<u>Deputy Chief</u>								0	3	4	3	
Deputy Chief Patrol		1		1	1				3	3		
Field Training Officer					1					1		
<u>East Division</u>								0	3	121	3	
East Division Patrol			1	3	11	4	102		3	121		
<u>North Division</u>								0	3	114	3	
North Division Patrol			1	3	11		97		3	112		
Carmelitos Projects							2			2		
<u>South Division</u>								0	3	116	3	
South Division Patrol			1	3	11		91		3	106		
Community Policing						1	8			9		
Tidelands CVB Patrol							1			1		
<u>West Division</u>								0	3	116	3	

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Bureau	Dep.							Non-Sworn	Non-Sworn	Sworn	Non-Sworn	All
	Chief	Chief	Cmdr.	Lt.	Sgt.	Cpl.	Off.	Spvsr.	Staff	Totals	Totals	Staff
West Division Patrol			1	4	11		100		3	116		
<u>Field Support</u>								1	30	67	31	
Air Support						1	5			6		
Collision Investigation Detail					1		4		2	5		
Crossing Guards								1	26	0		
Event Planning					1		2		1	3		
Field Support			1	1			1		1	3		
K-9					1	1	8			10		
Mental Evaluation Team							6			6		
Special Enforcement				1						1		
SWAT					1		1			2		
Traffic Motors				1	3		17			21		
Traffic Services Prop H Funds							10			10		
Support								16	103	137	119	256
<u>Deputy Chief</u>								0	1	2.75	1	
Deputy Chief Support		0.75			1		1		1	2.75		
<u>Jail</u>								9	61	7	70	
Booking Desk					4				8	4		
Civic Center Security								1	5	0		
Court Affairs					1				2	1		
Court Bailiffs								2	4	0		
Detention								6	37	0		
Detention Transport Unit									4	0		
Jail Administration			1	1					1	2		
<u>Port Police</u>								0	1	34.25	1	
Port Police Division		0.25	1	1	5		27		1	34.25		
<u>Security Services</u>								7	38	56	45	
Airport Police					2		12			14		
Homeland Security				1						1		
Long Beach City College Secur.					1		4	1	15	5		
Long Beach Transit					1		7			8		
Marine Patrol					1			5	17	1		
Metro Security - Admin				1	1				2	2		
Metro Security					4		20			24		
Park Rangers								1	3	0		
Security Services Div. Admin.			1						1	1		

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

Bureau	Chief	Dep. Chief	Cmdr.	Lt.	Sgt.	Cpl.	Off.	Non-Sworn	Non-Sworn	Non-Sworn	All	
								Svcsr.	Staff	Totals	Totals	Staff
Training Division								0	2	37	2	
Academy Recruits							17			17		
Academy TAC Staff					1		5			6		
AOTC					1		6			7		
Background Investigations					1					1		
In-Service Training							1			1		
Manuals, Orders, Protocol							1			1		
Pistol Range					1		1			2		
Training Administration			1	1					2	2		
Totals	1	5	18	30	112	7	702			868	343.5	1,212

Source: LBPD Provided Data

DRAFT

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY

APPENDIX E: CRIME MEETING RECOMMENDATIONS

This sub-report provides a basic overview of the development of an overall performance measurement system for the LBPD, and will focus on periodic accountability meetings, which support such a system. Accountability meetings will generally be referred to as *crime meetings* for the purposes of this report. The use of the term *executive staff* in this report refers to the police chief, assistant police chiefs, and their civilian counterparts. The use of the term *command staff* refers to the aggregation of sworn commanders and their civilian counterparts.


I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The LBPD strives to be a best-practices police department, which includes a commitment to intelligence-led policing (ILP). ILP is a department-wide policing strategy considered to be a best practice in modern law enforcement. ILP broadly consists of gathering information or data, converting that information/data into usable intelligence via analysis by trained professionals, and then using that intelligence to guide decision-making by executives and commanders to positively influence public safety objectives that support the mission of the department and the needs of the community. The ILP process can have many variations, but commonly accepted steps include:

1. Establish mission/vision of the department and its intelligence cycle
2. Collect information/data and convert into actionable intelligence via analysis
3. Evaluate intelligence by commanders with responsibility for related objectives
4. Decision-making and action informed by evaluation of intelligence
5. Follow-up/evaluate effectiveness of decision making and action

This process can be further simplified by the following diagram show in Figure E-1 below, as described by J.H. Ratcliffe, *The structure of strategic thinking*, Sydney: Federation Press, 2009. This diagram more completely describes ILP if one imagines the three-part cycle encapsulated by ongoing follow-up and evaluation of effectiveness.

FIGURE APPENDIX E-1: STRUCTURE OF STRATEGIC THINKING



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

An important component of an effective ILP strategy is a comprehensive performance measurement and accountability management system that supports the vital step of regular follow-up and constant evaluation of effectiveness. That system is highlighted by routine performance measurement and accountability meetings frequently referred to as *COMPSTAT* meetings, based on the groundbreaking work at the New York Police Department (NYPD). This sub-report of the operational study for the LBPB contains an overview of these types of meetings, and suggestions for operationalizing them in Long Beach.

II. HISTORY OF PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY MANAGEMENT IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

Use of data and crime statistics is not a new trend or tool for law enforcement. Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) statistics, which are compiled by the FBI, have been used for decades by many departments, both large and small, to measure crime occurrences. However, by the time this type of data is published and available, it is typically at least 6 to 12 months old. This makes finding comparison data from similar communities in a timely manner very difficult. Accordingly, its use in the context of national or regional trends can create a climate of reaction to crime occurrences with no focus on how to prevent crime from happening. With a sole focus on reaction to crime, CFS often dominate the actions and operational workload for field operations (patrol). When this occurs, officers and the department become focused on answering 911 calls with no clear imperative for officers to focus on crime prevention or mitigation strategies, and often a lack of available time to do so. In many police agencies, the operational focus is on responding to crimes that have already been committed, and within this framework, department effectiveness is judged in terms of response times, arrest statistics, and clearance rates. These measures are generally inputs and outputs, not outcomes. Although all have value, this report will discuss the difference between inputs/outputs and outcomes, and the importance of and trend toward focusing on outcomes such as preventing and reducing crime, and actively addressing other public safety and quality of life issues.

The core concept in *COMPSTAT* or other performance measurement and accountability meetings is the commitment to using data to guide its operational, tactical, and strategic decisions. This system empowers police agencies to place a strategic focus on identifying both problems and the solutions to those problems.

By using a performance measurement and accountability management system, departments can not only actively address reducing crime, but also community quality of life issues and other public safety objectives. For this type of system to be effective, the department philosophy must emphasize information-sharing, responsibility and accountability, and improving effectiveness at every level of the organization. Historically, using the NYPD *COMPSTAT* model, these programs focus on four generally recognized fundamental components:

- Timely and accurate information or intelligence

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

- Rapid deployment of resources
- Effective tactics
- Relentless follow-up and evaluation

Essentially, COMPSTAT, as developed by NYPD, requires police to gather timely and accurate information about crime patterns, and to then respond quickly to break up those patterns. COMPSTAT holds many advantages for a law enforcement chief executive who is trying to build an effective agency that enjoys the respect of the community. COMPSTAT fosters accountability by holding commanders and other individuals responsible for knowing the details about the crime in their areas and for devising plans to reduce crime levels. COMPSTAT encourages information sharing within the police department, with other law enforcement agencies, and with partner organizations that can help eliminate the conditions that contribute to crime.

In deciding how the Long Beach version of a COMPSTAT-style or crime meeting performance measurement and accountability process should function, the chief, executive staff, and command staff need to ask the following questions:

- Why are we doing crime meetings?
- What do we want to accomplish?

The answers to these questions should be used to create the agency-wide strategy. The strategy, purpose, and objectives of an agency's program must be clearly articulated and understood, not just by the chief, executive staff, and command staff, but by all personnel within the agency. To ensure employees understand this information it should be deliberately and continuously communicated to all ranks and assignments within the department. Once employees understand the purpose and objectives of the program, it can become an ingrained component of the operational philosophy for the department, and a valuable tool for moving an agency in unison towards shared objectives.

All members of the department need to understand that the crime meeting is both a department philosophy, and an operational methodology. When numbers indicate a concern, such as a negative trend, commanders must consider:

- What is the problem?
- What is the plan?
- What are anticipated results?

It is important to understand that by themselves, crime meetings are not a solution; they are a method to obtain solutions. Departments that fully embrace the crime meeting system often see significant positive changes in the organization in the following areas:

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

- Information-sharing: crime meetings facilitate the flow of information between divisions and units, and this occurs from the top-down. This enables leaders to have a more holistic view of the entire organization.
- Decision-making: crime meetings encourage a move away from a hierarchical bureaucracy; commanders, supervisors, and officers have greater authority, and autonomy, which results in a greater level of critical thinking and problem-solving.
- Organizational culture: crime meetings encourage agency staff to become more creative and flexible; this creates an environment in which staff are better equipped to manage risk and to understand and assume accountability for problems occurring within the community (or the organization).

The success of any performance measurement and accountability system depends on effective crime analysis. Collecting and analyzing data (information) to create actionable intelligence that guides police strategies is key to any successful program. The crime analysts should provide insight on crime patterns and trends and not simply report raw crime numbers. Police leaders should examine whether the department suffers from common problems that hinder effective analysis, including outdated or incompatible information analysis systems, poor record-keeping, a lack of financial resources to purchase needed equipment and software, or insufficient education and training. Leaders must also be aware that the process can be time-consuming for analysts who often are tasked with preparing reports and making sure all participants have necessary crime information prior to the meeting. If organizational leaders are not careful and deliberate, crime analysts can become bogged down in handling administrative tasks, rather than using their skills to perform more in-depth analysis of crime trends and suspects.

The following sections will provide guidance on developing this type of a system and building crime meetings.

III. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

There is no single definitive template for an effective performance measurement and accountability management system. The number of possible system solutions are as numerous and diverse as there are law enforcement agencies. There are, however, fundamental concepts and established processes that support the development of a unique system to serve each department. In fact, the process of developing a solution unique to the agency is a key factor in the ultimate effectiveness of the system.

The basic steps in any performance measurement and accountability management system can be distilled down to its five key components:

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

- A. Objectives
- B. Data Gathering and Intelligence Creation
- C. Hypotheses
- D. Activities
- E. Monitoring

Note that the above steps outlining a performance measurement and accountability management system are roughly analogous to the basic steps discussed previously in the ILP process; this is not a coincidence. The performance measurement and accountability management system mirror the ILP process and provide a framework for executives to convert the broader ILP strategy into specific action.

A. Objectives

The objectives that organizations choose to work towards (and the related data used to measure progress towards those objectives) strongly inform what the organization values and how the department will use the finite organizational resources to support those values. In essence, the objectives and supporting measures that the organization selects, determine the personality of the department, as much as anything else those within the organization do or say. Consequently, identifying the objectives for the performance measurement and accountability management process is fundamentally important. Effective objectives should be clear, concise, and easy to understand at face value. Effective and meaningful objectives should also be - like the data used to measure organizational progress towards them - persistent. That is, they should remain relevant and consistent over many measurement periods, representing a nearly permanent perspective.

Lastly, organizational objectives should be widely supportive of the departmental mission, vision, and values and they should be embraced by those who must achieve them (the department) and by those who are ultimately served by their achievement (the community). The objectives should support the strategy discussed in Section II in which organizational leaders were challenged to answer the questions of, "Why are we doing this?" and "What do we want to accomplish?" In order to be widely embraced, the development of these objectives needs to be a thoughtful, deliberate process that includes a broad and deep representation of internal and external stakeholders (including representatives from community groups, advocacy organizations, other city departments, academia, employee unions, crime analysis, research and planning, executive staff, command staff, first-line supervisors, patrol, civilian staff, and civilian supervisors, etc.). It can also be very helpful to include representatives from community businesses with a strong history of performance measurement and management, for expert advice.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

The process of developing objectives can take on a wide variety of formats ranging from small working groups comprised of representatives from each stakeholder group, larger working groups comprised of representatives from a cross section of all stakeholder groups, or larger town hall type formats. This process may also include surveys and other feedback instruments. Each working group should begin with a brief overview of the mission, vision, and values of the department, and a discussion of the core policing philosophies and strategies of the department. The introduction should include a description of the objective development process and the role of that process in the performance measurement and management function. This process should result in high level objectives that are widely embraced and persistent over time.

B. Information Gathering and Intelligence Creation

Information includes the entire spectrum of material available. This frequently takes the form of data, particularly statistical data. In law enforcement, this core information is provided by sources such as report management systems (RMS), computer-aided dispatch (CAD), traffic citations and local courts, and field interview reports, among others. The possibilities for information sources are quite broad, and generally informed by the chosen objectives. Other sources of information can include surveys, internal affairs reports, department of transportation reports, state and federal crime reports, etc. This information and related data are routinely converted to statistical data in the form of items like crime rates, traffic fatality rates, community satisfaction summaries, etc.

This information, whether raw or statistically compiled, is simply that: information. It becomes actionable intelligence when trained professionals (whether police officers or civilian analysts) apply the insight of their training and experience to make assessments of what the information means in the context of real-world events. The creation of actionable intelligence provides the opportunity for decision makers to formulate hypotheses, build strategies, and suggest actions, as explained in the next two steps. The analysis function (i.e., creation of actionable intelligence) starts with this step. It continues in all the following steps as leaders formulate hypotheses, build strategies and approaches, employ actions, and conduct ongoing monitoring and evaluation.

IMPORTANT NOTE: The quality of available information and data in this process is of critical importance. The data should be immediately available and complete and remain consistent and comparable over numerous time periods and relate predictably to how organizational objectives shift. Timeliness is very important, so that at any moment, commanders can tell exactly how many crimes (or other performance measure items) have occurred and how they compare to prior time periods. Realistically, most departments do not have access to real time or near real time data; many departments have a lag in these data from several days to a month or more before complete data is available. Considering this, a fundamental process is to identify exactly when complete or reasonably complete data is available. This factor, more than anything, will dictate what time periods of data are presented at the performance measurement and management meeting. For example, if it is known that it takes 15 days to achieve 97% complete data, then holding commanders accountable for the 7 days immediately preceding the meeting is unrealistic, and likely harmful, since the department and organizational leaders will be

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

responding to incomplete and misleading data. In the example provided, a more informed process would consist of a meeting in which data is analyzed for the period that ended 15 days before the data to be analyzed in the meeting was available to commanders. This reality only underscores the importance of developing systems, technology, processes, and policies that ensure complete and accurate data is available as quickly as possible, so the department can quickly respond to trends. To illustrate this point, it is well known that a single suspect can cause a spike in thefts from automobile cases, which can affect the crime stats of an entire division, after only a few days of that type of activity. If this data is not available for analysis and response by commanders for several weeks, then the trend and its precipitating factors may no longer exist by the time commanders respond to the data; the proposed responses may well be futile and wasted effort, since the trend has disappeared before the response takes place.

C. Hypothesis

This component of the performance measurement and accountability management function seeks to develop a theory about the cause and effect relationship between each objective and the data and measures the department uses to measure the objective, relative to the entirety of available activities/inputs. That is, those consuming the data try to postulate *why* the data and measures, which support the determined objectives, are moving or behaving as they are. During a typical performance measurement and accountability management meeting, commanders for areas responsible for objectives or sub-goals with noted issues, spikes, trends, etc., will present hypotheses about how the current data reflects changes in the achievement of those objectives by the department, division, or unit. Other meeting participants will ask questions and offer input to more fully explore these relationships. This iterative process allows solutions to be developed in a collaborative environment.

D. Activities

Activities are the strategic and tactical inputs believed to positively affect movement, via the hypothesis, towards the objective. This is an important point of distinction. Activities are inputs (e.g., number of citations, number of arrests) while objectives are outcomes (e.g., reduction in incapacitating crashes). If the organizational focus is solely on measurement of activities/inputs, without linking them to objectives/outcomes through a thoughtful hypotheses and effective monitoring plan, there will be an overvaluing of input over outcomes. This can lead to a failure to meet objectives or fail to connect meaningful activities to successful objective accomplishment. Focusing on objectives and outcomes, over activities and inputs, is vital to successful implementation of problem-oriented and ILP. This is one of the key components of what makes a performance measurement and management system successful; linking inputs (activities) to outcomes (objectives) in a thoughtful, deliberate manner supported by measurable data and metrics.

Activities can be high-level and complex or quite simple. They can be long, short, or medium range. Activities can involve only one division, multiple divisions, or even additional organizations, to include community members. In practice, the most successful activities often combine aspects of all of the preceding factors. During a typical performance measurement

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

and management meeting, the responsible commander and his or her staff will use the activities to lay out their strategy and tactics. Fellow commanders and others will ask questions, provide input, and - ideally - offer suggestions from similar problems previously solved.

E. Monitoring

Monitoring is the component most visibly linked with the performance measurement and management function. Monitoring is what occurs in the periodic command meetings when the group discusses organizational objectives, progress towards them, and the measurable effectiveness of the previously stated hypotheses and activities planned towards achieving a stated objective. However, a successful monitoring component is much deeper and more sophisticated than just holding weekly or monthly meetings. It is a process that permeates the department and each commander within it. Successful monitoring includes regular communication, horizontally and vertically, to all stakeholders, about the broader objectives and sub-goals of the organization, and the hypotheses and activities the department is promoting to pursue those objectives.

The most successful monitoring provides avenues for safe and productive feedback from all levels of the organization regarding the effectiveness of unit, division, and/or department activities. Bureaus and divisions should have their own meetings in anticipation of the department-wide crime meetings, during which they should analyze data, assess measures, formulate hypotheses, devise activities, and perform local monitoring and follow up. Such meetings not only make the performance measurement and management process more effective, they also support the ancillary goals of professional development, improved communication, increased transparency, and widespread support for common organizational objectives.

OBJECTIVES

- Develop objectives which support the mission, vision, and core strategies of the department. Work deliberately to ensure these objectives are understood and accepted by both the department and the community.

For Example:

LBPD's mission is "Public Safety through Partnerships." One objective might be, *Reduce Crime*. This objective supports the first half of the mission. Another objective might be, *Increase Partnerships*, and this objective supports the second half of the mission.

- Identify sub-goals of objectives, rational division of high-level objectives, and assignment of command responsibility.

For Example:

For the objective of *Reduce Crime*, a sub-goal might be *Reduce Violent Crime*, which might be further divided, based on analyses of data and trends, into *Reduce Aggravated Assaults*, and *Reduce Robberies*. These sub-goals may then be divided by geographic or

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

operational responsibility and assigned to responsible commanders to address routinely. The high-level objectives should be more persistent/long-term, and the sub-goals may be more transient/short term as ongoing analysis reveals changing trends.

- Develop performance measures associated with each objective and sub-goal. Is violent crime going to be evaluated absolutely or per capita? Will it be evaluated weekly, monthly, quarterly, or all of the above? Determine specific metrics, units, and time frames. To ensure credibility buy-in with regard to whatever measures are established, it is vital that those being held accountable for achieving them, have a voice in their selection.

For Example:

A performance measure for the objective to *Reduce Crime* might be something like *Reduce Part I Crime as reported to the FBI by 3% annually as compared to last year*. Or it might be something like, *Maintain Part I Crime as reported to FBI below the rolling five-year mean (or median)*.

INTELLIGENCE

Establish what information and data will be necessary, how timely it will be available, how complete and accurate it will be, who will compile it, and how it will be presented for the crime meetings. A single person or unit should handle the preparation of data to be presented for these meetings. This is usually done by a crime analyst, in collaboration with executive and command staff, regarding temporal information to display and share. The Crime Analysis Unit will be vital in this function. As described earlier, these staff are among the primary personnel who have access to information and data, and they have the task of performing the basic analysis that begins the conversion of that data from information to actionable intelligence. The information and intelligence should be presented completely and with great detail, but also as simply as possible. The information and intelligence must be presented consistently over extended timeframes, so everyone is working with similar information. In addition, visual presentations in the form of graphs, charts and maps - when done professionally and consistently - can enhance the ability of everyone to process the information.

It is also vitally important that the department establish a timeline for when this data will be available to commanders. Ideally, commanders and their staff will have access to it constantly, and will be building hypotheses, action plans, and evaluating them routinely. When this condition exists, the crime meetings simply become an occasion to report what is being done, and an opportunity to obtain additional feedback from the broader department. This scenario describes a truly effective performance measurement and management philosophy and system within a department. Realistically, for most departments, complete and accurate data is only available after a certain date. If this is the case, the date for the performance measurement and management meeting should be established at a future time after the data becomes

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

available to the commanders, so they have adequate time to study, analyze, plan, and respond to the data. Although timelines vary with departments, a reasonable timeline is to give commanders at least five business days with access to the information, before they are responsible for presenting their analysis and response to the broader department.

HYPOTHESES, ACTIVITIES, and MONITORING

These are the components that most routinely comprise the actual crime meetings. These crime meetings provide an opportunity for executive staff members, command staff, and other subject matter experts to come together to continue to analyze information, further its conversion into actionable intelligence, and conduct and refine the hypothesis, activity, and monitoring functions. The development of these crime meetings will require numerous decisions that influence the personality of the crime meetings, and ultimately, the manner in which the crime meetings support the mission, core strategies, execution of ILP, the performance measurement and accountability system, and the accomplishment of organizational objectives. Development of an effective meeting process will require numerous decisions regarding the format, which can only be made by the department. Although the list is not all-inclusive, and the department will likely identify other important choices, the most important actions in this development process are highlighted below:

- Establish the frequency of meetings (weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, quarterly, combination)
- Set the timing of events (i.e., the period of intelligence they cover - see previous note above about timeliness of information and intelligence).
- Decide length of events (hour, multiple hours, all day)
- Determine personality/nature of event (antagonistic or supportive)
- Decide attendance (Invite only, open to all department, open to public)
- Establish consistent moderator
- Determine attendance and who manages the meeting (CEO, high ranking executive staff member, rotating, 3rd party like Research & Planning Director, etc.)
- Assign a scribe to take detailed notes (video and audio recording inhibits a safe environment to discuss issues):
 - Scribe should document, at a minimum, the objectives and performance measures discussed, the responses of the commanders regarding hypotheses and intended actions, expected outcomes, and firm dates for follow-up monitoring
- Determine the method of the crime meeting for inquiry and reporting by responsible commanders (surprise, planned/informed, or hybrid presentation):
 - Surprise: Executive staff study the information and intelligence before the crime meetings and then interrogate commanders about trends, conditions, spikes, etc., that raise concern. In this format, only commanders affected by concerns

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

raised by the executive staff, report or respond each time. Commanders would not know who will be responding until the meeting, although they should have adequate time and resources to identify the potential concerns themselves beforehand.

- Planned/Informed: All divisions report based on a schedule known beforehand. In this format, concerns about specific trends, conditions, or spikes, might be communicated by executive staff beforehand, and/or commanders might be expected to identify them on their own and report back
 - In this format, all commanders can report at each crime meeting, or there can be a rotating schedule for successive meetings. This decision will influence (and be influenced by) the frequency and length of crime meetings. For example, it would be impossible for all commanders to provide a detailed report in a monthly meeting that lasts only one hour.
- Hybrid: A combination of one or more of these methods, in which some or all commanders know they will present each week, and the executive staff makes inquiries about trends, conditions, spikes, etc., that concern them.
- Establish a routine agenda:
 - Distribute agenda before crime meeting (at least one full business day)
 - Follow up on action items from prior meeting
 - Discuss current trends concerns
 - Identify action items going forward
- Distinguish clearly between inputs, outputs, and outcomes:
 - This concept was briefly mentioned earlier in this report and deserves extended discussion. What is sought through performance measurement and accountability systems and crime meetings, is a deliberate positive influence on outcomes and not simply changes in inputs and outputs. Outcomes are results (movement towards - or away from - an objective or other change in behavior), whereas inputs are actions. Outputs are the aggregation of the results of the activity or inputs. An example of an input is the decision to address an increase in traffic fatalities by conducting more traffic enforcement. The activity of traffic enforcement - physically writing citations - is an input. In this example, the total number (or even the change in number) of traffic citations is an *output*. Outcomes, however, are the *results* of inputs and outputs on the objective. In this example, the objective was presumably to reduce traffic fatalities, and likely, reducing incapacitating crashes more broadly. Consequently, the change (or even absence of change) in the number of fatalities and incapacitating crashes is an outcome. Inputs and outputs are actions; they are not results. Outcomes are results and they can be positive (it reinforces hypothesis and associated activities) or negative (movement towards objective is not as predicted).
- Establish method of communicating to department:

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

- The trends, conditions, spikes, etc., discussed, analyzed, and acted upon, should be documented and communicated for memorialization, follow-up, and for communication to those who could not attend the crime meeting. More importantly, changes in activities should be detailed and explained so the broader organization understands why they are being asked to change their actions/behavior, and so they can participate in the process more fully.

Keep in mind that an effective and credible performance measurement and management system is a living process that should be continually reevaluated and adjusted to reflect changes in data, strategies, personnel, and processes. According to Lou Anemone, a retired chief at the NYPD, “As the department honed-in on solving crime problems, COMPSTAT became less of a numbers discussion and more of a tactical and strategic discussion. Moreover, leaders realized that COMPSTAT shouldn’t only analyze the performance of precinct commanders, so they began including detectives and representatives from narcotics and other specialized units.”⁸

A good way to ensure constant improvement is to invite external parties, such as performance management experts from business or commanders from other law enforcement agencies, to observe the process and provide feedback. A robust and pervasive performance measurement and management philosophy, combined with an effective and participatory crime meeting function, can provide an opportunity to ensure strong communication, not only among command staff, but also throughout the entire chain of command, including line-officers and other staff. In order to be responsive to the data in a truly ILP fashion, and to be prepared for the periodic performance measurement and management meetings, divisions will, by necessity, need to meet regularly to analyze and respond to the data for which they will be accountable to executive staff. This is also a prime opportunity for the professional development of lieutenants and sergeants, by including them more actively in the planning process and inviting them to participate in the crime meetings.

The best crime meeting programs encourage an uninhibited exchange of ideas and innovative thinking and are constantly challenging commanders to develop new responses to crime problems. Rigorous follow-up and assessment is absolutely necessary to ensure the desired results are being achieved. An effective crime meeting also allows for assessment of tactical and strategic responses and the ability to incorporate that knowledge into revised activities. By knowing how well a particular tactic worked on a particular crime or quality-of-life problem, and by knowing which specific elements of the tactical response worked most effectively, departments are better able to construct and implement effective responses for similar problems in the future. The follow-up and assessment process also permits the redeployment of resources to newly identified strategies, once a problem has abated.

⁸ <https://www.bja.gov/publications/perf-compstat.pdf>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

IV. BEST PRACTICES, RECOMMENDED FORMATS, AND SUGGESTIONS

These types of systems and meetings have been implemented throughout the U.S. at departments large and small, yet there is no *template* that meets the needs of every organization. LBPB may want to visit neighboring or similar-sized cities to observe well-established and productive COMPSTAT-style meetings, in order to evaluate what will work best for the department. Although there is not a specific model that each agency should follow, promising practices have emerged.

Frequency

Many, if not most, practitioners find that weekly meetings work best. A survey conducted by the Police Executive Research Forum and the Bureau of Justice Assistance in 2013 showed that most agencies hold their COMPSTAT meetings on a weekly basis.

Geographic commands such as divisions need to have meetings prior to and more frequently than department-wide meetings. This allows commanders to be knowledgeable about criminal activity trends and strategies on a consistent basis. Weekly meetings are frequent enough to be responsive to emerging trends and to provide meaningful follow-up. This frequency also allows meetings to be shorter and provides an opportunity for more presentations over the course of a month or quarter.⁹

Timing

The timeliness and accuracy of data are key in determining frequency. The ideal timing for crime meetings is as soon as possible after complete and accurate data is available, while also allowing time for executive staff, crime analysts, and commanders to analyze information and intelligence prior to meeting. If possible, commanders should receive data at least five business days before the crime meeting for analysis. Actionable intelligence requires more than just data collection and reporting, it requires analysis, often by multiple sets of experts. Best practices allow for significant analytical work to be done. Often this involves data collection, analysis, and linkage with data outside of the police department, such as city records, social media, etc.

Length

This will vary based on the format and established agenda, and the frequency of meetings. The most common practices range from 60-90 minutes to several hours, with a few outliers taking an entire day. If meetings occur less frequently, they will likely need to be longer.

Setting

Some level of formality is important to ensure all participants treat the process with the gravity it deserves. This means being deliberate about conditions like location, seating, technology,

⁹ <https://www.bja.gov/publications/perf-compstat.pdf>



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

etc. These meetings also provide a great opportunity for mentoring employee skills like public speaking. Consistency in day, time, and location are also important to help ensure participants can prepare and attend without complication. Executive staff should be seated in an area of prominence, with nothing between them and the presenting commanders, since they are going to be conducting the bulk of the inquiry of the commanders. It also often helps to have bureaus or divisions seated together so they can collaborate as the meeting progresses. The ability to graphically display crime and other objectives on maps, and the incorporation of various other visual GIS data, such as bar locations, business licenses, etc., can be critical in facilitating effective problem solving.

Personality/Nature

Generally, a crime meeting can be antagonistic or supportive in nature. This philosophy will dictate how executive staff responds to any identified lack of success or progress. In an antagonistic format, there are negative consequences. Negative consequences may range from visible criticism or formal reprimands, to re-assignment and even removal from a command, or even demotion in extreme cases. In supportive formats, executive staff use these meetings as an opportunity for professional development, mentoring, collaboration, and teamwork.

The overwhelming trend in crime meetings has involved a move away from the original antagonistic format, toward a process that is more supportive and collaborative, and one that values professional development, while remaining serious with an air of accountability. Many leaders explain that the most effective COMPSTAT-style meetings do not embarrass employees or focus on trivial details. In fact, many chiefs speak about the need to establish an atmosphere that is conducive to collaboration and the open exchange of ideas. Effective meeting leaders balance criticism with praise for deserving employees. Leaders should absolutely ask tough questions in a direct manner, but they should do so in a manner that is also professional, respectful, and helpful. The crime meetings should reflect and be supportive of the department philosophy and personality. These meetings are a great opportunity to visually and practically reinforce department mission and vision.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Departments that launch performance measurement and accountability management systems and routine crime meetings are usually very good about studying current and emerging trends and working through the hypothesis and activity stages as they present responses. Law enforcement professionals are comfortable with this, and fairly adept at it. What must not be forgotten is the follow-up and monitoring - perhaps the most vital step - of the suggested hypotheses and related activities launched by commanders from the prior meeting. There are two reasons for this: 1) accountability for stated intended actions; and 2) the need to evaluate if the activities generated by the hypotheses produce evidence of positive movement toward the objective as postulated. This is really the whole point of crime meetings: to analyze, act, assess, and adapt operational actions, if they do not produce desired results. Not all recommended activities will produce the desired result and understanding the need to be adaptable and flexible in the responses is important for finding a solution

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

that has the desired impact.

Clarity of focus

This meeting is for performance measuring and accountability management only. The employees who are present will have a great deal of other important departmental matters to handle together, and this is a great opportunity for such professional collaboration. To ensure the crime meeting stays on track, organizers should make sure to provide an opportunity either before or after the crime meeting for everyone to work on those matters while they are together. It is also important to make it clear to all in attendance, when each portion starts and stops; it also often helps to have a break between the crime meeting and other working discussions.

Attendance

The police chief should be present at all meetings and for the entirety of the meetings. Any absence by the police chief should be clearly explained, and whoever is filling in for the chief should be specifically identified. Attendance by all executive and command staff should be mandatory. Any missing executive or command staff member should appoint an acting delegate. All bureaus and divisions should be required to attend, and the department should give consideration to specific units, such as the intelligence unit. All divisional and geographic commanders should be required to report regularly, as the crime meeting scheduling permits, and all should participate in problem-solving efforts. Attendance by any on-duty mid-level supervisors (e.g. lieutenants) should be mandatory, and off-duty mid-level supervisors should be encouraged to attend (possibly utilizing flex time or overtime as an incentive). Sergeants should be invited and encouraged to attend, and commanders and mid-level leaders should view the crime meetings as an ideal opportunity for mentoring and professional development. The most successful crime meetings often invite external stakeholders as well. These stakeholders could include other local police departments, city performance management or research and planning professionals, representatives from the District Attorney's Office, partners from the United States Attorney's Office, federal law enforcement partners, and business performance management professionals, to name just a few.

Moderator

Ideally, the second in command or another high-ranking member of executive staff should serve as moderator of the meeting, and do so for each meeting, for consistency. The chief should not run the meeting so he or she can ensure the meeting receives their undivided attention. Also, it is important to assign responsibility for the crime meetings to a single, specific person (preferably the moderator), who is supported by crime analyst personnel. This person will be responsible for invitations, agendas, follow-up communications, etc.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Scribe

Audio or video recording generally inhibits the creation of a safe environment to discuss issues. Instead, the department should utilize a scribe to take detailed notes about issues, responses, and follow-up. The detailed summary of the meeting and documentation of assigned responsibility for solutions and their implementation needs to occur for each meeting. This document, a detailed written record of whatever transpired at the meeting, should be distributed to all commanders to ensure that nothing will be missed in subsequent reviews. Executive staff should review these notes before they are disseminated more broadly, to ensure accuracy, and so that no confidential information is inadvertently released. Commanders should be expected to disseminate these meeting notes to their followers, and to use them as an opportunity to develop effective transparency and communication.

Method of inquiry

When faced with choosing between surprise, planned/informed, or hybrid presentations, most departments ultimately utilize a hybrid approach in which all command presentations rotate through meetings over the course of a set timeframe, such as a month or quarter, with some command presentations identified by pre-analysis, along with executive staff inquiries about additional concerns, which executive staff may not have had the opportunity to share with command staff before the meeting.

Agenda

Crime meetings should have a clear agenda that is distributed in advance. Agendas should include, at a minimum:

- Reminder of date, time, location
- Identification of planned command presentations
- Follow up on action items from prior meeting
- Discussion of current week trends
- Time for summary of action items going forward

Documentation

Prepare simple templates associated with the agenda to allow all participants to track all four components (objective, hypothesis, activity, and follow up).

Consistent format

Objectives and performance measures should be displayed the same way each time. Sub-goals that support the objectives will likely change at each meeting, based on information and intelligence. For example, if one objective is to reduce violent crime, then that objective and the current status should be shared and displayed at each meeting. If robberies in a specific division are up significantly for the current crime meeting, and that is an area the department wants to explore in more detail, staff should be prepared to visually display the increase in

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

robberies (and any other useful information) and ask each responsible commander for input. This is where note taking is vital for follow-up. It is critical to memorialize what the current sub-goal was, and the response of the commander regarding the hypothesis and activity, so that follow-up can occur at the next meeting to see if progress has been made.

Branding

This report has noted that “COMPSTAT” is the original name for these meetings, and that term has become somewhat generic. This report has used the term *crime meeting* throughout, as that is the term currently being used by LBPD executive staff. The LBPD is encouraged to use the naming of these meetings as an opportunity to brand this important function in a way that reflects and supports their core mission, vision, and policing strategies. One department, for example, that employs the core policing strategies of Community Policing and Intelligence-Led Policing, branded their meetings “Pre-CIP,” for “Predictive Community and Intelligence-Led Policing.”

Common areas to measure

There are limitless areas/issues that can be measured in this process. It is important, particularly early in the developmental process, to limit the number of objectives measured. The number of objectives can be expected to expand as the process evolves. Below are some of the areas that are typically included, followed by some popular, but less common areas where objectives are developed.

- Crime
- Traffic Safety
- Employee Conduct

Common, but less frequent, areas:

- Community Policing / Community Satisfaction
- Budget
- Recruiting/Training

While flexibility is important for the vast majority of decisions in this process, it is important to note there are some near-absolutes to ensuring a credible and effective system. These items have been discussed previously in this report but, they are repeated here to highlight their importance in an effective performance measurement and accountability management system, and the crime meetings that support them.

- Widely agreed upon and supported objectives, sub-goals, performance measures, and clear assignment of responsibility for those items

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

- Clear, concise, and consistent presentation of intelligence, objectives, and performance measures to be discussed
- Thorough understanding of inputs and outputs, in contrast to outcomes.
- The opportunity for commanders responsible for performance measures under scrutiny, to present their understanding of information and intelligence, suggested hypotheses, and proposed courses of action, in an environment that is safe for all present to ask questions and make suggestions
- Provision for command staff to have access to the same data, analysis, and actionable intelligence, as the executive staff, and in a timely manner
- Explicit communication of expectations to commanders for follow up at the next meeting, based on their stated hypotheses and related courses of action
- Meaningful and regular follow up as communicated above, with the expectation of new course of action if hypothesis and activities did not move toward an objective as predicted or needed
- Clear and detailed notes of discussion and decisions, and consistent communication of this information broadly throughout department
- Commitment to repeat this cycle consistently

Regardless of the number or type of meetings, the most productive performance measuring systems are those where organizational learning occurs and the participants collaboratively engage each other to analyze problems and develop potential solutions.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

COMPSTAT-style accountability meetings are only as valuable and effective as the overall ILP strategy and the performance measurement and accountability management system, which these meetings support. The primary purpose of this document is to provide a platform and outline for building a credible and effective COMPSTAT-style crime meeting. When ILP and a robust performance management and accountability system are working well, and in concert with each other, a routine accountability function such as these crime meetings, will dramatically leverage their effectiveness and provide valuable ancillary benefits, such as improved departmental communications and professional development opportunities.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY