



Office of the
**INDEPENDENT
POLICE AUDITOR**

BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

MONTHLY REPORT

February 2019

Issue date: March 11, 2019

This report is filed pursuant to the BART Citizen Oversight Model, Chapter 1-05 (B), which requires the Office of the Independent Police Auditor (OIPA) to submit reports to the BART Police Citizen Review Board (BPCRB). This report provides information for the period **February 1, 2019 through February 28, 2019.**¹

The Quantitative Report includes all complaints received and administrative investigations initiated by both OIPA and the BART Police Department (BPD) Internal Affairs Bureau.

QUANTITATIVE REPORT

	Cases Filed ²	Open Cases ³	OIPA Investigations Concluded ⁴	Cases Appealed to OIPA ⁵	Cases Appealed by BPCRB ⁶
February 2018	10	34	0	1	0
March 2018	6	35	1	0	0
April 2018	13	49	0	0	0
May 2018	6	51	1	0	0
June 2018	10	56	0	0	0
July 2018	8	54	0	0	0
August 2018	14	64	1	0	0
September 2018	9	69	1	0	0
October 2018	10	69	1	0	0
November 2018	13	69	1	0	0
December 2018	5	62	0	0	0
January 2019	15	64	1	0	0
February 2019	12	60	1	0	0

TYPES OF CASES FILED

Citizen Complaints (Formal)	6
Informal Complaints ⁷	6
Administrative Investigations	0
TOTAL	12

CITIZEN COMPLAINTS RECEIVED PER DEPARTMENT⁸

OIPA	1
BART Police Department	5
TOTAL	6

COMPLAINTS/INVESTIGATIONS INITIATED DURING REPORTING PERIOD

During February 2019, **1 Citizen Complaint** was received by OIPA:

Complaint # (IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Action Taken	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed
1 (OIPA #19-06) (IA2019-017)	Officer #1: • Performance of Duty	OIPA notified BPD, which initiated an investigation.	33

During February 2019, **4 Citizen Complaints (Formal)** were received by BPD:

Complaint # (IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Action Taken	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed
1 (IA2019-020)	Employee #1: • Bias-Based Policing	BPD initiated an investigation.	19
2 (IA2019-021)	Officers #1-2: • Force	BPD initiated an investigation.	28
3 (IA2019-024)	Officer #1: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated an investigation.	22
4 (IA2019-025)	Officer #1: • Force • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated an investigation.	18

During February 2019, **6 Informal Complaints** were received by BPD:

Complaint # (IA Case #)	Nature of Allegations	Action Taken	Days Elapsed Since Investigation Initiated
1 (IA2019-016)	Officers #1-2: • Performance of Duty	BPD initiated a Supervisor Referral. ⁹	34
2 (IA2019-018)	Officer #1: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated a Supervisor Referral.	31
3 (IA2019-022)	Employee #1: • Conduct Unbecoming	BPD initiated a Supervisor Referral.	25
4 (IA2019-023)	Officer #1: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated a Supervisor Referral.	19
5 (IA2019-026)	Unknown Employees: • Performance of Duty	BPD initiated a Service Review ¹⁰	13
6 (IA2019-027)	Officer #1: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated a Supervisor Referral.	13

COMPLAINTS/INVESTIGATIONS INITIATED DURING A PRIOR REPORTING PERIOD

During January 2019, **1 Citizen Complaint (Formal)** was initiated by BPD but not previously reported:

Complaint # (IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Action Taken	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed
1 (IA2019-019)	Officers #1-2: • Force Officer #2: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated an investigation.	52

COMPLAINTS/INVESTIGATIONS CONCLUDED DURING REPORTING PERIOD

During February 2019, **1 Citizen Complaint Investigation** was concluded by OIPA:

Investigation # (IA Case #)	Nature of Allegations	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Investigation Initiated	Days Taken to Address Allegation
1 (OIPA #18-37) (IA2018-077)	Officers did not respond appropriately to a request for assistance and did so based on race.	Officers #1-2: • Bias-Based Policing – Unfounded • Performance of Duty – Exonerated	185	151

During February 2019, **8 Citizen Complaints (Formal)** were concluded by BPD:

Complaint # (IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed	Days Taken to Complete Investigation
1 (IA2018-024)	Officer and employee did not provide identification to complainant upon request.	Officer #1: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer – Unfounded Employee #1: • Conduct Unbecoming – Sustained	332	321

2 (IA2018-037)	Employees were rude and unprofessional and did not provide assistance to complainant.	Employees #1-2: • Conduct Unbecoming – Unfounded Employee #1: • Performance of Duty – Unfounded Employee #2: • Performance of Duty – Sustained	314	297
3 (IA2018-042)	Employee grabbed complainant's property.	Employee #1: • Conduct Unbecoming – Administratively Closed	283	252
4 (IA2018-061)	Employee improperly cited complainant and refused to provide identification.	Employee #1: • Conduct Unbecoming – Unfounded • Performance of Duty – Exonerated	228	195
5 (IA2018-065)	Employee contacted complainant based on race and was rude to complainant.	Employee #1: • Bias-Based Policing – Unfounded • Conduct Unbecoming – Unfounded	216	184
6 (IA2018-083)	Employee pushed subject, blocked subject's path, argued with subject and challenged subject to fight.	Employee #1: • Conduct Unbecoming – Sustained • Force – Unfounded	161	150
7 (IA2018-101)	Employee failed to return complainant's fare card.	Employee #1: • Conduct Unbecoming – Administratively Closed	143	130
8 (IA2019-017)	Officer acted unprofessionally and was aggressive during a call for service.	Officers #1: • Performance of Duty – Supervisor Referral	33	14

During February 2019, **6 Informal Complaints** were addressed by BPD:

Complaint # (IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed	Days Taken to Complete Investigation
1 (IA2018-050)	Officers intentionally shamed crime victim.	Officers #1-2: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer – Supervisor Referral	269	257
2 (IA2018-067)	Employee mocked and intentionally delayed complainant.	Employee #1: • Conduct Unbecoming – Administratively Closed	207	190

3 (IA2018-111)	Officer improperly detained subject.	Officer #1: • Arrest/Detention – Supervisor Referral	87	69
4 (IA2019-018)	Officer recklessly operated patrol vehicle.	Officer #1: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer – Supervisor Referral	31	3
5 (IA2019-022)	Employee was rude to complainant and refused to provide identification.	Employee #1: • Conduct Unbecoming – Supervisor Referral	25	6
6 (IA2019-023)	Officer did not take appropriate enforcement action during a call for service.	Officer #1: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer – Supervisor Referral	25	6

During February 2019, **1 Administrative Investigation** was concluded by BPD:

Investigation # (IA Case #)	Nature of Allegations	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Investigation Initiated	Days Taken to Address Allegation
1 (IA2018-063)	Officer created a hostile work environment by making an inappropriate statement regarding race.	Officer #1: • Racial Animus – Sustained	214	197

Also during the month of February 2019, BPD classified #IA2019-028 as an **Inquiry** and forwarded the complaint to the Proof of Payment citation processing center for clerical corrections. Though not previously reported, BPD classified #IA2019-019 as an **Inquiry** in January 2019 after making a determination that the complainant no longer sought an investigation.¹¹

COMPLAINTS/INVESTIGATIONS CONCLUDED DURING PREVIOUS REPORTING PERIODS

During January 2019, **1 Informal Complaint** was concluded by BPD:

Investigation # (IA Case #)	Nature of Allegations	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Investigation Initiated	Days Taken to Address Allegation
1 (IA2018-082)	Employee was rude to complainant.	Employee #1: • Conduct Unbecoming – Unfounded	164	124

During November 2018, **1 Informal Complaint** was concluded by BPD:

Investigation # (IA Case #)	Nature of Allegations	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Investigation Initiated	Days Taken to Address Allegation
1 (IA2018-098)	Officers shone vehicle lights on complainant and laughed at complainant.	Unknown Officers #1-2: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer – Supervisor Referral	124	17

DISCIPLINE ISSUED DURING REPORTING PERIOD

During February 2019, BPD took the following actions in cases where one or more allegations of misconduct were sustained:

Case #	Nature of Sustained Allegation(s)	Classification of Sustained Allegation(s)	Action Taken
1	Officer used excessive force and violated BPD policy regarding the proper use of the TASER.	Officer #1: • Force • Policy/Procedure	Officer #1: • Suspension Held in Abeyance

ADDITIONAL NOTES

In accordance with the BART Citizen Oversight Model (Model), OIPA investigates certain complaints, conducts complainant-initiated appeals, and also monitors and/or reviews complaint investigations conducted by BPD. Though potentially work-intensive, some complaint investigation reviews are completed informally, with any concerns being addressed through a conference with BPD's Internal Affairs investigators. Noting the various kinds of work that OIPA undertakes with regard to complaints and investigations, the following chart includes some of the pending cases in which OIPA is involved as of the end of this reporting period.

Investigations Being Conducted	6
Complainant-Initiated Appeals	0
BPD-Initiated Appeals	0
Investigations Being Monitored	23
Investigations Reviewed During Current Month	25†

†This number does not include all OIPA reviews, as OIPA commonly looks at a variety of cases in the Internal Affairs database to obtain updates on both pending and completed investigations.

The Model provides that OIPA shall have authority to require follow-up investigation into any citizen complaint or allegation that is handled by BPD. The OIPA Monthly Report will reflect information regarding monitored cases with detail not to exceed that which is allowable under state law. The investigations reviewed by OIPA during the period did not generate any notable recommendations for revisions or additional investigation.¹²

¹ In addition to reporting on complaints received by the BART Police Department, the Citizen Oversight Model requires reporting on all complaints received by the “Citizen Board, Office of the District Secretary, and other District departments.” As complaints received by the BART Police Citizen Review Board are customarily directed to OIPA for further action, such complaints are included in the Quantitative Report above; OIPA is also made aware of additional complaints about the BART Police Department by the Office of the District Secretary or other District departments.

² This number includes all Citizen Complaints filed against members of the BART Police Department, as well as Administrative Investigations generated internally by BART Police Department members (as opposed to being filed by a citizen). This number also includes previously completed cases that have been re-opened during the current reporting period.

³ This number indicates all investigations that are open as of the end of the reporting period. It includes Citizen Complaints (regardless of whether the investigation is being conducted by OIPA, the BART Police Department, or both) and Administrative Investigations.

⁴ This number includes all cases completed by OIPA during the reporting period for which OIPA’s findings are required by the BART Citizen Oversight Model to be submitted to the BART Police Citizen Review Board. It therefore includes independent investigations, as well as reviews of completed BART Police Department investigations initiated via appeal from a complainant. Unless otherwise noted, it does not include reviews of BART Police Department investigations initiated at the discretion of OIPA, which happen commonly and do not always generate a formal report; it also does not include reviews conducted by OIPA of complaint investigations where the complaint was filed with OIPA but did not fall under OIPA’s investigative jurisdiction.

⁵ This number refers to appeals filed with OIPA by complainants who have been issued the findings of the BART Police Department’s internal investigation into their complaint regarding on-duty incidents. OIPA has a responsibility to review such appeals pursuant to the BART Citizen Oversight Model, Chapter 1-04 (E).

⁶ This number refers to all appeals initiated by the BART Police Citizen Review Board after receiving and reviewing the findings issued by OIPA in a given case. The routes of all such appeals are described in detail in the BART Citizen Oversight Model, Chapter 1-04 (B) (iv-v).

⁷ The BART Police Department defines an Informal Complaint as, “A comment on the actions of a Department employee, where the reporting party expressly states that he or she does not feel that the matter should be formally investigated with the understanding that an Informal Complaint does not hold the potential to result in disciplinary action against the employee.” (BART Police Department Policy Manual, Policy 1020.1.1(d)).

⁸ It is important to note that OIPA does not separate citizen complaints it receives into “Formal” and “Informal” classifications. This chart reflects all citizen complaints received by OIPA and all Formal Complaints received by the BART Police Department.

⁹ A Supervisor Referral refers to an instance involving an Inquiry or an Informal Complaint. An assigned supervisor addresses the issue informally with the involved employee and documents the content of the conversation with a memorandum to IA.

¹⁰ A Service Review refers to an instance when a citizen/patron raises a concern pertaining to a global practice throughout the Department such as Department policies, procedures and/or tactics. When appropriate, a Service Review may be conducted by Internal Affairs or by a designated review committee, who in turn will make recommended changes to the Chief of Police for approval.

¹¹ Administrative Closure refers to allegations that are received and documented; however the Chief of Police or his/her designee determines, based on a preliminary investigation, that further investigation is not warranted. Under these circumstances, the complaint will be Administratively Closed and documented in a summary memorandum to the case file. Employees will be documented as witnesses only, not as subjects to the complaint. Internal Affairs will send a letter to the complainant notifying them that the case was closed following a preliminary investigation.

¹² OIPA may submit recommendations to IA regarding minor clerical or record-keeping adjustments which are intended to maintain the integrity of the data collection and record-keeping processes at BPD. These are not considered by OIPA to be substantive recommendations requiring reporting herein.