

LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

AUDIT AND ACCOUNTABILITY BUREAU



Stops and Detentions Audit East Patrol Division

Project No. 2024-42-A



**Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
Audit and Accountability Bureau**

**Stops and Detentions Audit:
East Patrol Division
Project No. 2024-42-A**

PURPOSE

The Audit and Accountability Bureau (AAB) conducted the Stops and Detentions Audit under the authority of the Sheriff of Los Angeles County. The purpose of the audit was to evaluate the extent to which the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD or the Department) patrol personnel at the East Patrol Division (EPD) Stations adhered to the Department's Manual of Policy and Procedures (MPP), as well as the Field Operations Support Services (FOSS) Newsletters, associated with the stops and detentions of individuals within the EPD community.

This audit involved a performance evaluation of all EPD Stations, which include Altadena Station (ALD), Crescenta Valley Station (CVS), Industry Station (IDT), San Dimas Station (SDM), Temple Station (TEM), and Walnut Station (WAL).

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The objective of this audit was to evaluate the Body-Worn Camera (BWC) recordings and associated documentation to determine whether EPD is in compliance with Department policies and directives as they relate to BWC procedures, California Assembly Bill (AB) 2773¹, consent searches, probation or parole searches, and the treatment of individuals detained in the backseat of patrol vehicles.

The Department recognizes the importance of evaluating Department members' actions when engaging with members of the public. These interactions are essential to developing and maintaining community trust within EPD. This audit provided an opportunity to identify areas for process improvement and implement corrective actions where necessary. The audit work plan was submitted to the Office of Inspector General for input prior to the start of the audit.

¹ Assembly Bill No. 2773 - This bill began on January 1, 2024, and requires a peace officer making a traffic or pedestrian stop, before engaging in questioning related to a criminal investigation or traffic violation, to state the reason for the stop, unless the officer reasonably believes that withholding the reason for the stop is necessary to protect life or property from imminent threat.

The AAB conducted this audit under the guidance of Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS).² The AAB determined whether the evidence obtained was sufficient and appropriate to provide a reasonable basis for the findings based on the audit objectives.

Audit Scope

This scope of this audit evaluated the initiation of stops and detentions³ (vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle), searches, backseat detentions⁴ (BSD), and the accuracy of the Mobile Digital Computer⁵ (MDC) data entries. In addition, the auditors reviewed the Sheriff's Automatic Contact Reporting (SACR)⁶ system data to determine whether each stop and detention, along with the corresponding detained subjects, were properly documented in the SACR system.

The table below outlines the audit objectives.

Summary of Audit Objectives

Obj. No.	Audit Objectives
1	INITIATING STOPS AND DETENTIONS
1(a)	<i>Proper Activation of Body-Worn Camera</i>
1(b)	<i>Stating the Reason for the Stop (AB 2773)</i>
1(c)	<i>Completeness of Body-Worn Camera Recordings</i>
2	CONSENT SEARCHES
2(a)	<i>Consent Searches Request and Response</i>
3	PROBATION OR PAROLE SEARCHES
3(a)	<i>Knowledge of Probation or Parole Search Conditions</i>
4	BACKSEAT DETENTIONS
4(a)	<i>Explanation of Backseat Detentions to Subjects</i>
4(b)	<i>MDC Articulation of Backseat Detentions</i>
5	MOBILE DIGITAL COMPUTER AND SHERIFF AUTOMATIC CONTACT REPORTING
5(a)	<i>Accuracy of MDC Contact Data Reported</i>
5(b)	<i>Documentation of Reason for Contact in the MDC Narrative</i>
5(c)	<i>Accuracy of SACR Data</i>

² The GAGAS, also known as the Yellow Book, is issued by the Comptroller General of the United States through the U.S. Government Accountability Office and refers to *Government Auditing Standards*, July 2018 Revision, Technical Update April 2021.

³ The data request involved all "Stops" clearance codes (840, 841, 842, and 843) retrieved from the Regional Allocation of Police Services (RAPSNET) application.

⁴ A BSD occurs when an individual's freedom is restrained by placing that individual in the backseat of a patrol car for investigative purposes for any period of time.

⁵ A computer system installed in patrol vehicles, enabling Department members to access Department databases, communicate with dispatch, and perform operational tasks in the field.

⁶ The Sheriff's Automated Contact Reporting (SACR) system application is a database used to record all documented stop data related to detained subjects.

The auditors evaluated the BWC recordings and associated documentation to determine whether EPD was in compliance with Department policies and directives as they relate to BWC procedures, California Assembly Bill (AB) 2773⁷, consent searches, probation or parole searches, and the treatment of individuals detained in the backseat of a patrol vehicle. In addition, auditors evaluated the accuracy of documenting contacts and subjects' entries in the MDC and SACR system. Furthermore, patterns of legal or policy errors were identified and documented.

Audit Population and Sampling

The selected audit period was from July 1, 2024, through July 31, 2024. The audit focused on a single population from which audit samples were extracted. This population included:

- Stops and Detentions involving Initiation of Stops and Detentions related to consent searches, probation or parole searches, and backseat detentions.

A data request for the EPD Stops and Detentions was obtained from the Data Systems Bureau (DSB) for the audit period, resulting in a total of 2,871 stops and detentions with clearance codes 840, 841, 842, and 843.

Audit Population for EPD

EPD Stations and Designated Department Acronyms	Number of Stops and Detentions
Altadena/Crescenta Valley (ALD/CSV) ⁸	420
Industry (IDT)	539
San Dimas (SDM)	371
Temple (TEM)	966
Walnut (WAL)	575
EPD Total	2,871

The following MDC search or detention codes were selected to identify the population for this audit: Contact Type code "B"- Backseat Detention, Search Authority Codes "C"- Consent Searches and "R"- Condition of Probation or Parole.

Additionally, the auditors conducted a keyword search for "BSD" within the initial 2,871 MDC clearance narratives to identify BSD incidents during the audit period. This method ensured that any BSDs not coded with "B" in the MDC clearance field were still captured in the audit population.

⁷ Assembly Bill No. 2773 - This bill would, beginning on January 1, 2024, require a peace officer making a traffic or pedestrian stop, before engaging in questioning related to a criminal investigation or traffic violation, to state the reason for the stop, unless the officer reasonably believes that withholding the reason for the stop is necessary to protect life or property from imminent threat.

⁸ The data for Altadena and Crescenta Valley Stations was collected from the same monthly DSB report and could not be separated, as both stations use the same prefix (CSV) followed by a numerical incident number. Both units were evaluated as one station for this audit.

From the overall EPD audit population, the auditors selected a total sample of 60 stops and detentions. The number of stops and detentions for each station was based on the “Volume %”⁹ of stops occurring at each station.

The volume of stops was converted to a percentage which was then applied to the total number of stops and detentions based on the statistical codes B, C, and R as indicated in the table below.

Audit Population

EPD Stations	Stops and Detentions based on statistical codes: B, C, and R	Volume % of Stops and Detentions
ALD/CVS	16	5%
IDT	75	23%
SDM	73	23%
TEM	133	42%
WAL	22	7%
EPD Total	319	100%

Summary of EPD Selected Stops and Detentions Audit Sample

EPD Stations	No. of Samples Selected
ALD/CVS	3
IDT	14
SDM	14
TEM	25
WAL	4
EPD Total	60

Throughout the audit report, the selected audit samples are identified by the designated Department patrol station acronym and enumerated to represent the numbering sequence in which the sample was selected for that station.

During the audit process, sample IDT-3¹⁰ was found to be a call for service involving a medical rescue. The sample was excluded and replaced with a new sample that met all the criteria related to this audit.

⁹ In terms of extracting sample numbers based on volume, this is more appropriately referred to as a “Stratified Sample” defined as a sample that is drawn from several separate strata of the population, rather than at random from the whole population, in order that it should be representative.

¹⁰ IDT refers to Industry Station. The number represents the selected sample referred to of the 14 samples reviewed for Industry Station.

Audit Procedures

The auditors reviewed all relevant BWC recordings for each stop and detention within the audit sample utilizing the Department's digital evidence management system, LASD.Evidence.com. The auditors focused on Department members involved in enforcement or investigative actions which included contact with a subject. The auditors evaluated the Department members' actions as captured on the BWC recordings to determine whether they complied with applicable MPP policies and directives.

The BWC recordings were compared to the MDC log entries, and specific data from the SACR system associated with stops and detentions to ensure proper documentation and consistency with what was observed in the BWC recordings. The auditors conducted additional audit procedures, which are described in greater detail under each audit objective.

Detailed Findings

The summary of compliance for each EPD Station is outlined in the table below.

Summary of EPD Compliance Findings

Obj. No.	Audit Objectives	ALD / CVS	IDT	SDM	TEM	WAL	EPD Total
1	INITIATING STOPS AND DETENTIONS						
1(a)	<i>Proper Activation of Body-Worn Camera</i>	80%	50%	83%	82%	83%	76%
1(b)	<i>Stating the Reason for the Stop (AB 2773)</i>	67%	29%	64%	54%	50%	53%
1(c)	<i>Completeness of Body-Worn Camera Recordings</i>	20%	32%	59%	62%	67%	48%
2	CONSENT SEARCHES						
2(a)	<i>Consent Searches Request and Response</i>	67%	9%	43%	20%	67%	41%
3	PROBATION OR PAROLE SEARCHES						
3(a)	<i>Knowledge of Probation or Parole Search Conditions</i>	NIN ¹¹	NIN	100%	0%	100%	67%
4	BACKSEAT DETENTIONS						
4(a)	<i>Explanation of Backseat Detentions to Subjects</i>	50%	44%	20%	40%	0%	31%
4(b)	<i>MDC Articulation of Backseat Detentions</i>	0%	14%	0%	7%	0%	4%
5	MOBILE DIGITAL COMPUTER AND SHERIFF AUTOMATIC CONTACT REPORTING						
5(a)	<i>Accuracy of MDC Contact Data Reported</i>	33%	21%	14%	8%	25%	20%
5(b)	<i>Documentation of Reason for Contact in the MDC Narrative</i>	33%	14%	35%	40%	25%	29%
5(c)	<i>Accuracy of SACR Data</i>	100%	86%	71%	79%	100%	87%

This report provides a summary of the audit findings for those objectives which did not meet the MPP standards and mandates. The Addendum following this report contains the detailed audit findings for each incident.

¹¹ No Incidents Noted.

Objective No. 1 – Initiating Stops and Detentions

This objective included the evaluation of the Department members' actions during the detention of subjects, including adherence to MPP BWC policies and compliance with AB 2773.

Objective No. 1(a) – Proper Activation of Body Worn Camera

Criteria

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 3-06/200.08, Body Worn Cameras – Activation, (August 2020), states:

Department personnel shall activate their body worn camera (BWC) prior to initiating, or upon arrival at, any enforcement or investigative contact involving a member of the public, including all:

- *Vehicle stops;*
- *Pedestrian stops (including self-initiated consensual encounters);*
- *Searches;*
- *Arrests;*
- *Any encounter with a member of the public who is or becomes uncooperative, belligerent, or otherwise hostile...*

Procedures

The auditors reviewed 60 stops and detentions conducted by EPD Stations. Of the 60 stops, a total of 96 Department members were evaluated. The auditors reviewed all relevant BWC recordings in the audit sample to determine whether Department members activated their BWC prior to initiating, or upon arrival at any enforcement or investigative contact involving a member of the public.

Findings

Of the 96 Department members reviewed, 72 (75%) met the criteria for this objective because they activated their BWC prior to initiating or upon arrival at an enforcement or investigative contact involving a member of the public. The remaining 24 (25%) did not meet the criteria for this objective because they did not activate their BWC prior to initiating or upon arrival at an enforcement or investigative contact involving a member of the public.

The table below summarizes the compliance rate for each EPD station.

Objective No. 1(a) - Summary of EPD Compliance

ALD/CVS	IDT	SDM	TEM	WAL	EPD Total
80%	50%	83%	82%	83%	76%

The table below specifically details the sample numbers for each EPD station with findings for Objective No.1(a).

Summary of Audit Findings

OBJECTIVE 1(a) - PROPER ACTIVATION OF BODY-WORN CAMERA					
EPD Stations	Total Department Members Reviewed	Number of Compliant	Number of Non-Compliant	% of Department Members in Compliance	Incident Numbers with Findings
ALD/CVS	5	4	1	80%	3
IDT	22	11	11	50%	1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12
SDM	29	24	5	83%	7, 9, 11
TEM	34	28	6	82%	1, 2, 9, 10, 16, 24
WAL	6	5	1	83%	2
EPD Total	96	72	24	76%	

See the Addendum for a synopsis of each incident, highlighting all relevant actions and findings related to this objective.

Recommendations

It is recommended Department supervisors continue to conduct recurrent briefings with Department members regarding the use of BWC policies outlined in the MPP, as frequently as possible. Additionally, supervisors should make redacted Department records available to Department members, highlighting BWC MPP violations which resulted in disciplinary action. This should be done with the goal of raising awareness of the Department's critical stance to ensure attempts to digitally record incidents. Finally, EPD supervisors must create a corrective action plan to address Department personnel who frequently fail to comply with the BWC policy. This must include addressing these violations through verbal counseling and/or appropriate written documentation as applicable.

Objective No. 1(b) – Stating the Reason for the Stop (AB 2773)

Criteria

Field Operations Support Services (FOSS) Newsletter 23-06, Stating and Documenting the Reason for the Stop, states:

Assembly Bill 2773 requires that an officer(s) conducting a traffic or pedestrian stop advise the detainee of the reason for the stop prior to engaging them in questioning related to a criminal investigation or a traffic violation. This requirement does not apply when the officer reasonably believes that withholding the reason for the stop is necessary to protect life or property from imminent threat, including, but not limited to, cases of terrorism or kidnapping.

Procedures

The auditors reviewed 60 stops and detentions conducted by the EPD Stations. One sample (TEM-10¹²) was excluded from this objective population after it was determined to be a consensual encounter, and therefore not subject to the criteria of AB 2773.

The auditors reviewed the remaining 59 stops and detentions, including all relevant BWC recordings, in the audit sample, to assess whether Department members advised the subject of the reason for the stop prior to engaging them in questioning related to a criminal investigation or a traffic violation.

Findings

Of the 59 incidents, 30 (51%) met the criteria for this objective because the Department members advised the subject of the reason for the stop prior to engaging them in questioning related to a criminal investigation or a traffic violation. The remaining 29 (49%) did not meet the criteria for this objective because the Department members failed to advise the subject of the reason for the stop prior to engaging them in questioning related to a criminal investigation or a traffic violation.

¹² TEM refers to Temple Station. The number represents the selected sample referred to of the 25 samples reviewed for Temple Station.

The table below summarizes the compliance rate for each EPD station.

Objective No. 1(b) - Summary of EPD Compliance

ALD/CVS	IDT	SDM	TEM	WAL	EPD Total
67%	29%	64%	54%	50%	53%

The table below specifically details the sample numbers for each EPD station having findings for Objective No. 1(b).

Summary of Audit Findings

OBJECTIVE 1(b) - STATING THE REASON FOR STOP (AB 2773)					
EPD Stations	Total Incidents Reviewed	Number of Compliant	Number of Non-Compliant	% of Incidents in Compliance	Incident Numbers with Findings
ALD/CVS	3	2	1	67%	1, 3
IDT	14	4	10	29%	1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
SDM	14	9	5	64%	1, 6, 7, 13, 14
TEM	24	13	11	54%	1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 13, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24
WAL	4	2	2	50%	1, 3
EPD Total	59	30	29	53%	

See the Addendum for a synopsis of each incident, highlighting all relevant actions and findings related to this objective.

Recommendations

It is recommended Department supervisors regularly provide briefings to Department members on AB 2773, and the BWC MPP policies. Additionally, EPD supervisors must emphasize the timely activation of the BWC to capture recorded evidence of the Department members stating the reason for the stop to the subject. Department members must be reminded that the reason for the stop must be clearly stated prior to engaging subjects in questioning related to a criminal investigation or traffic violation. These briefings should be documented in the Stations' Watch Commander's log. Department members who repeatedly fail to comply should be held accountable through verbal counseling and/or appropriate written documentation, as applicable.

Objective No. 1(c) – Completeness of BWC Recordings

Criteria

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 3-06/200.13, Recording of the Entire Contact, (August 2020), states:

The body worn camera (BWC) shall continue recording until the enforcement or investigative contact involving a member of the public has ended. If an investigative or enforcement contact involving a member of the public resumes after the video has stopped, the Department member shall reactivate the BWC device and continue recording.

Procedures

The auditors reviewed 60 stops and detentions conducted by EPD Stations. Of the 60 stops and detentions, a total of 96 Department members were evaluated. The auditors reviewed all relevant BWC recordings in the audit sample to determine whether the Department members recorded the incident until the enforcement or investigative contact involving a subject had ended. The end of a contact with a member of the public was determined once all necessary investigative information had been gathered, and the presence of the subject was no longer required.

Findings

Of the 96 Department members reviewed, 50 (52%) met the criteria for this objective because the Department members recorded the entire enforcement or investigative contact with the subject. The remaining 46 (48%) did not meet the criteria for this objective because the Department members did not record the entire enforcement or investigative contact with the subject.

The table below summarizes the compliance rate for each EPD station.

Objective No. 1(c) - Summary of EPD Compliance

ALD/CVS	IDT	SDM	TEM	WAL	EPD Total
20%	32%	59%	62%	67%	48%

The table below specifically detailing the sample numbers for each EPD station with findings for Objective No. 1(c).

Summary of Audit Findings

OBJECTIVE 1(c) - COMPLETENESS OF BODY-WORN CAMERA RECORDINGS					
EPD Stations	Total Department Members Reviewed	Number of Compliant	Number of Non-Compliant	% of Department Members in Compliance	Incident Numbers with Findings
ALD/CVS	5	1	4	20%	1, 2, 3
IDT	22	7	15	32%	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13
SDM	29	17	12	59%	2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14
TEM	34	21	13	62%	2, 6, 11, 13, 16, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24
WAL	6	4	2	67%	3
EPD Total	96	50	46	48%	

See the Addendum for a synopsis of each incident, highlighting all relevant actions and findings related to this objective.

Recommendations

It is recommended Department members make a concerted effort to consistently keep their BWC activated throughout the entirety of a stop or detention. They must be reminded to clearly narrate the reason for any deactivation of their BWC at any point during the stop or detention. The EPD Stations supervisors should continue conducting practical application exercises to ensure Department members fully understand the proper procedures for activating and deactivating their BWCs. Supervisors must also include training on the specific guidelines for BWCs deactivations.

Objective No. 2 – Consent Searches

This objective included the evaluation of consent searches (person and vehicle searches) conducted by EPD Department members as specified in the MPP. A consent search is a search conducted by a law enforcement officer after obtaining voluntary and informed consent from an individual to search their person, property and/or belongings without a warrant.

Objective No. 2(a) – Consent Searches Request and Response

Criteria

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 5-09/520.05 - Stops, Seizures, and Searches (May 2017), states:

The request to conduct a consent search must be reasonable, and a deputy must be able to articulate a valid reason under law and policy for initially having stopped the individual.

Procedures

Auditors reviewed 60 stops and detentions conducted by EPD Stations. Of the 60 stops, the Department members' actions towards 51 subjects were evaluated. The 51 subjects were identified through either the BWC recordings, which reflected whether the subject did or did not offer consent to be searched, or through the subject's corresponding MDC Search Authority Field indicating the subject consented to a search. Auditors reviewed all BWC recordings in the audit sample to determine whether the consent search of a subject (driver or passenger) or their property (vehicles included) were reasonable. A search was evaluated as reasonable if the subject freely volunteered consent, either in response to a clearly stated request by the Department member or by offering consent on their own without a Department member's request.

Additionally, auditors reviewed each BWC recording in the audit sample to determine whether the reason for the stop was valid under the law and/or LASD policy, as articulated in the MDC clearance, and whether it was consistent with the BWC recording, if depicted.

While auditing the samples in the population, auditors identified incidents when the Department member documented the C-Code in the MDC Search Authority field, which contradicted what was seen on the BWC recording. Through reviewing the relevant BWC recordings, auditors observed there was no evidence the subject consented to a search. However, in such incidents, it was evident from the BWC recordings the subject had been arrested for a crime before a search was initiated. Examples of these incidents included, but were not limited to, the discovery of the subject having narcotics prior to the Department member conducting the search.

In such instances, auditors evaluated whether the search of the subject occurred before or after evidence of a crime was present. If the subject was searched after evidence of a crime became apparent, auditors evaluated the Department member's actions under the belief the subject was searched incident to arrest. The auditors then evaluated the Department member's actions as "N/A" and identified them as potential documentation errors under Objective No. 5 (MDC documentation), specifically the improper documentation of the search as a consent search. Finally, auditors attempted to verify whether the subject was arrested for the perceived crime at the conclusion of the stop and detention, either by reviewing BWC recordings or confirmation of the arrest on the MDC clearance.

Findings

Of the 51 subjects, the Department members' actions toward 15 (29%) subjects met the criteria for this objective because there was evidence the subjects freely and voluntarily consented to a search of their person or property and the Department members articulated a reason for the stop that was valid under the law and/or LASD policy in the MDC clearance. The Department members' actions toward the remaining 36 (71%) subjects did not meet the criteria for this objective because there was no evidence the subjects freely and voluntarily consented to a search of their person or property, or the Department member did not articulate a reason for the stop that was valid under the law and/or LASD policy, in the MDC clearance.

The table below summarizes the compliance rate for each EPD station.

Objective No. 2(a) - Summary of EPD Compliance

ALD/CVS	IDT	SDM	TEM	WAL	EPD Total
67%	9%	43%	20%	67%	41%

The table below specifically details the sample numbers for each EPD station with findings for Objective No. 2(a).

Summary of Audit Findings

OBJECTIVE 2(a) - CONSENT SEARCHES REQUEST AND RESPONSE					
EPD Stations	Total Subjects Reviewed	Department Members' Actions: Number of Compliance	Department Members' Actions: Number of Non-Compliant	Department Members' Actions: Compliance %	Incident Numbers with Findings
ALD/CVS	3	2	1	67%	3
IDT	11	1	10	9%	1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13
SDM	14	6	8	43%	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 12
TEM	20	4	16	20%	2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24
WAL	3	2	1	67%	3
EPD Total	51	15	36	41%	

See the Addendum for a synopsis of each incident, highlighting all relevant actions and findings related to this objective.

Recommendations

It is recommended Department supervisors conduct recurrent briefings to reinforce the importance of obtaining clear consent before conducting a search of the subject. These briefings should also emphasize that requests must not be phrased in a leading manner which could cause subjects to not understand the scope of the search and allow them an opportunity to freely offer consent. The Department members should be reminded to phrase consent requests in a simple, straightforward, and clear way to ensure the subject fully understands the request. These briefings should also emphasize the importance of consistency between what is documented in the MDC and what is viewed on BWC recordings.

Objective No. 3 – Probation or Parole Searches

This objective included the evaluation of probation or parole searches conducted by EPD Department members as specified in the MPP.

Objective No. 3(a) – Knowledge of Probation or Parole Search Conditions

Criteria

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 5-09/520.05- Stops, Seizures, and Searches states:

Department members shall only conduct searches of individuals based on probation or parole status when knowledge of a probation or parole search condition has been established.

Procedures

The auditors reviewed 60 stops and detentions conducted by EPD Stations. Of the 60 stops, the Department members' actions toward three subjects were evaluated. The three subjects were identified through either the BWC recordings, which reflected whether the subjects had probation or parole conditions which appeared to be the basis for the search or through the subject's corresponding MDC Search Authority Field, which reflected the subject was searched pursuant to probation or parole search conditions.

The auditors reviewed each BWC recording in the audit sample to determine whether, in instances where a search was conducted pursuant to probation or parole conditions, Department members had knowledge of the subjects' search conditions prior to conducting the search.

The auditors reviewed the related BWC recordings and MDC documents, to determine whether the Department member's knowledge of the subject's probation or parole status was established through an evaluation of the MDC, radio communication with Dispatch, prior contact with the subject, the subject's statement regarding their probation or parole search conditions, documentation, or communication from a probation or parole official.

Findings

The auditors examined a total of 60 stops and detentions conducted by the EPD Stations Department members and determined three subject searches for probation or parole conditions were conducted. Of the three searches, two (67%) met the criteria for this objective because the Department members verified probation or parole search conditions prior to conducting a search of the subjects. The remaining one (33%) search did not meet the criteria for this objective because the Department members did not verify probation or parole search conditions prior to conducting a search of the subject.

The table below summarizes the compliance rate for each EPD station.

Objective No. 3(a) - Summary of EPD Compliance

ALD/CVS	IDT	SDM	TEM	WAL	EPD Total
N/A	N/A	100%	0%	100%	67%

The table below specifically details the sample numbers for each EPD station with findings Objective No. 3(a).

Summary of Audit Findings

OBJECTIVE 3(a) - KNOWLEDGE OF PROBATION OR PAROLE SEARCH CONDITIONS					
EPD Stations	Total Subjects Reviewed	Department Members' Actions: Number of Compliance	Department Members' Actions: Number of Non-Compliant	Department Members' Actions: Compliance %	Incident Numbers with Findings
ALD/CVS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
IDT	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SDM	1	1	0	100%	No Finding
TEM	1	0	1	0%	25
WAL	1	1	0	100%	No Finding
EPD Total	3	2	1	67%	

See the Addendum for a synopsis of each incident, highlighting all relevant actions and findings related to this objective.

Recommendations

It is recommended Department supervisors continue to brief Department members on the MPP policies regarding search procedures for probationers and parolees. These briefings should specifically address the verification of probation or parole search conditions prior to conducting a search, and the proper articulation of how the Department members obtained that knowledge in the required documentation.

Objective No. 4 – Backseat Detentions

This objective will evaluate the BSDs conducted by EPD Department members as specified in the MPP.

Objective No. 4(a) - Explanation of Backseat Detentions to Subjects

Criteria

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 5-09/520.10- “Backseat Detentions” states:

Deputies shall not conduct backseat detentions as a matter of course during routine traffic stops or domestic violence situations.

Deputies shall explain to the individual, in a professional and courteous manner, why they are being detained in the backseat of a patrol car.

Procedures

The auditors reviewed 60 stops and detentions conducted by EPD Stations. Of the 60 stops, the Department members’ actions towards 44 subjects were evaluated. The 44 subjects were identified through either the BWC recordings, which reflected whether the subject was BSD, or through the MDC Contact Type Field, which reflected the subject was BSD.

Auditors reviewed each relevant BWC recording in the audit sample to determine if Department members explained to subject(s) in a professional and courteous manner, the reason they are being detained in the backseat of a patrol vehicle.

In evaluating whether detentions were conducted as “matter of course”, auditors ensured actions related to BSD were not explained to subjects as a standard method of operation without justification to the subject. If in extreme circumstances, the subjects were provided with a reason for the BSD that was indicative of a “matter of course” explanation, then auditors attempted to identify whether the Department member documented a sufficient reason for the BSD in Objective No. 4(b).

Findings

Of the 44 BSDs, 15 (34%) met the criteria for this objective because the Department members explained to the subject in a professional and courteous manner, the reason for the BSD and the BSD was not conducted as a matter of course. The remaining 29 (66%) did not meet the criteria for this objective because the Department members did not explain to the subject in a professional and courteous manner, the reason for the BSD or the BSD was conducted as a matter of course.

The table below summarizes the compliance rate for each EPD station.

Objective No. 4(a) - Summary of EPD Compliance

ALD/CVS	IDT	SDM	TEM	WAL	EPD Total
50%	44%	20%	40%	0%	31%

The table below specifically details the sample numbers for each EPD station with findings for Objective No. 4(a).

Summary of Audit Findings

OBJECTIVE 4(a) - EXPLANATION OF BACKSEAT DETENTIONS TO SUBJECTS					
EPD Stations	Total Subjects Reviewed	Department Members' Actions: Number of Compliance	Department Members' Actions: Number of Non-Compliant	Department Members' Actions: Compliance %	Incident Numbers with Findings
ALD/CVS	2	1	1	50%	1
IDT	9	4	5	44%	4, 5, 7, 9
SDM	10	2	8	20%	1, 2, 4, 8, 11, 12, 14
TEM	20	8	12	40%	2, 6, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25
WAL	3	0	3	0%	1, 2, 3
EPD Total	44	15	29	31%	

See the Addendum for a synopsis of each incident, highlighting all relevant actions and findings related to this objective.

Recommendations

It is recommended Department supervisors conduct recurrent briefings with station personnel regarding the MPP BSD policy to stress the importance of the Department's stance on BSDs and how the Department differentiates BSDs from other methods of detention. Department supervisors should also remind Department members they are required to clearly explain to subjects the reason they are being placed in the backseat of a patrol vehicle either immediately or shortly after the subject is safely secured in the backseat. The explanation must include valid and appropriate reasons for the BSD. Discussion points must include alternative options rather than BSD, when safe and feasible, such as having individuals stand nearby, sit on a curb, or remain in their vehicle.

Objective No. 4(b) – MDC Articulation of Backseat Detentions

Criteria

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 5-09/520.10- “Backseat Detentions” states:

Backseat detentions shall not be used except when the deputy has individualized reasonable suspicion that justifies a detention and an articulable reasonable belief that the detained person may pose a threat of physical harm or is an escape risk unless detained in the backseat. Backseat detentions are not permitted when based on unreasonable or factually unsupported assertions of deputy safety. Deputies shall not conduct backseat detentions as a matter of course during routine traffic stops or domestic violence situations.

The factual justification for the backseat detention “seizure” shall be articulated in the narrative portion of the deputy’s log.

Procedures

The auditors reviewed 60 stops and detentions by EPD Stations. Of the 60 stops, 35 were evaluated. The 35 stops and detentions were identified through either the BWC recordings, which reflected the subject was BSD, or the MDC Contact Type Field reflected the subject was BSD.

Auditors viewed the BWC recordings and compared them to the MDC log narratives related to BSDs. The auditors evaluated whether Department members accurately and sufficiently documented the BSDs, whether the reasons provided for the BSDs were consistent with the MPP, and whether the BWC recordings supported the reasons articulated by the Department member.

Findings

Of the 35 stops and detentions reviewed, two (6%) met the criteria for this objective because the Department members documented a factual justification consistent with MPP for detaining the subject(s) in the backseat of the patrol vehicle. The remaining 33 (94%) incidents did not meet the criteria for this objective because the Department members did not document a factual justification consistent with MPP for detaining the subject(s) in the backseat of the patrol vehicle.

The table below summarizes the compliance rate for each EPD station.

Objective No. 4(b) - Summary of EPD Compliance

ALD/CVS	IDT	SDM	TEM	WAL	EPD Total
0%	14%	0%	7%	0%	4%

The table below specifically details the sample numbers for each EPD station with findings for Objective No. 4(b).

Summary of Audit Findings

OBJECTIVE 4(b) - MDC ARTICULATION OF BACKSEAT DETENTIONS					
EPD Stations	Total Incidents Reviewed	Number of Compliant	Number of Non-Compliant	% of Incidents in Compliance	Incident Numbers with Findings
ALD/CVS	2	0	2	0%	1, 2
IDT	7	1	6	14%	4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11
SDM	8	0	8	0%	1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 14
TEM	15	1	14	7%	2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25
WAL	3	0	3	0%	1, 2, 3
EPD Total	35	2	33	4%	

See the Addendum for a synopsis of each incident, highlighting all relevant actions and findings related to this objective.

Recommendations

During the review, auditors found the compliance percentages for this objective to be extremely low. This indicates a significant lack of awareness among Department members in EPD regarding the MPP stipulation requiring them to document a clear and factual reason for BSDs in the MDC narrative, consistent with an articulable reasonable belief that the detained person may pose a threat of physical harm or is an escape risk unless detained in the backseat.

It is recommended supervisors frequently and thoroughly brief Department members on the BSD policy. These briefings should reinforce the MPP requirements, emphasizing the need to document the factual justification for BSDs in the MDC narrative. This justification must align with officer safety concerns or the subject's perceived escape risk, as mandated by policy.

Objective No. 5 – Mobile Digital Computer and Sheriff Automatic Contact Reporting

This objective included the evaluation of the MDC and SACR stop data entered by EPD station personnel as specified in the MPP.

Objective No. 5(a) - Accuracy of MDC Contact Data Reported

Criteria

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 5-09/520.25, Logging Field Activities, (May 2017), states:

All significant public contacts and activity shall be appropriately logged on the Mobile Digital Computer's Deputy's Daily Work Sheet (DDWS). The Mobile Digital Computer's DDWS logs shall contain only accurate information including, but not limited to, the race of each individual detained or searched, the result of the stop, and the date, time, and location of the stop. For the purposes of this policy, "significant public contacts and activity" are defined as:

- *Calls for service;*
- *Self-initiated activity that results in arrest or citation;*
- *Self-initiated activity that is enforcement/investigative in nature but does not result in arrest or citation;*
and/or
- *Self-initiated activity which is not enforcement/investigative in nature but results in Department personnel taking some form of constructive action, e.g., requesting a tow truck for a stranded motorist.*

Procedures

The auditors reviewed 60 stops and detentions conducted by EPD Stations. The auditors evaluated each BWC recording and compared it to the corresponding MDC records to confirm the accuracy of the contact information data entered by the Department members. This data included the identification of all the subjects involved in the incident and additional data related to the appropriate sub-categories (C, R, and B codes) for each detained subject and their vehicles (wherever applicable).

The auditors verified if all the detained subjects seen on the BWC recordings were documented on the MDC clearance. Additionally, auditors verified if the MDC Search Authority codes, and the MDC Contact Type code were appropriately entered in the MDC for all corresponding subjects and vehicles.

Findings

Of the 60 stops and detentions reviewed, nine (15%) met the criteria for this objective because the Department members documented the correct number of detained subjects and the corresponding MDC Search Authority and Contact Type codes. The remaining 51 (85%) did not meet the criteria for this objective because the Department members failed to document the correct number of detained subjects or improperly documented the required corresponding MDC Search Authority and Contact Type codes.

The auditors identified several incidents where the Department members discovered evidence of a crime and arrested the subject. However, Department members often documented the searches as consent, despite BWC recordings showing no evidence of consent being given.

The table below summarizes the compliance rate for each EPD station.

Objective No. 5(a) - Summary of EPD Compliance

ALD/CVS	IDT	SDM	TEM	WAL	EPD Total
33%	21%	14%	8%	25%	20%

The table below specifically details the sample numbers for each EPD station with findings for Objective No. 5(a).

Summary of Audit Findings

OBJECTIVE 5(a) - ACCURACY OF MDC CONTACT DATA REPORTED					
EPD Stations	Total Incidents Reviewed	Number of Compliant	Number of Non-Compliant	% of Incidents in Compliance	Incident Numbers with Findings
ALD/CVS	3	1	2	33%	1, 2
IDT	14	3	11	21%	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,
SDM	14	2	12	14%	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14
TEM	25	2	23	8%	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25
WAL	4	1	3	25%	1, 3, 4
EPD Total	60	9	51	20%	

See the Addendum for a synopsis of each incident, highlighting all relevant actions and findings related to this objective.

Recommendations

The compliance percentages for this objective were notably low due to a lack of awareness amongst Department members in EPD regarding specific MPP stipulations. Specifically, Department members are not properly documenting the appropriate MDC Search Authority and Contact Type as they relate to the varying conditions under which the subjects were searched or detained.

It is recommended Department supervisors frequently brief Department members on proper MDC documentation and more specifically address the critical areas related to accurate documentation of consent searches and accounting for all the subjects detained during a stop.

Objective No. 5(b) - Documentation of Reason for Contact in the MDC Narrative

Criteria

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 5-09/520.30 – “Statistical Codes for Traffic, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Stops” as it related to the MDC clearance log states:

The narrative portion of the logged incident shall also include the reason for the contact and a brief description of the action taken by deputies.

Procedures

The auditors reviewed 60 stops and detentions conducted by EPD Stations. The auditors evaluated all relevant BWC recordings and compared them to the corresponding MDC clearance narratives to determine whether Department members documented the reason for the contact and a brief description of the actions taken.

Findings

Of the 60 stops and detentions, 19 (32%) met the criteria for this objective because Department members documented in the MDC clearance narrative the reason for the contact and a brief description of the actions taken. The remaining 41 (68%) did not meet the criteria for this objective because the Department members did not document in the MDC clearance narrative the reason for the contact and a brief description of the actions taken.

The table below summarizes the compliance rate for each EPD station.

Objective No. 5(b) - Summary of EPD Compliance

ALD/CVS	IDT	SDM	TEM	WAL	EPD Total
33%	14%	35%	40%	25%	29%

The table below specifically details the sample numbers for each EPD station with findings for Objective No. 5(b).

Summary of Audit Findings

OBJECTIVE 5(b) - DOCUMENTATION OF REASON FOR CONTACT IN THE MDC NARRATIVE					
EPD Stations	Total Incidents Reviewed	Number of Compliant	Number of Non-Compliant	% of Incidents in Compliance	Incident Numbers with Findings
ALD/CVS	3	1	2	33%	1, 3
IDT	14	2	12	14%	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14
SDM	14	5	9	35%	2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13
TEM	25	10	15	40%	6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25
WAL	4	1	3	25%	2, 3, 4
EPD Total	60	19	41	29%	

See the Addendum for a synopsis of each incident, highlighting all relevant actions and findings related to this objective.

Recommendations

It is recommended Department supervisors regularly brief the MPP requirement directing the Department members to properly document the reason for the stop and a brief description of the actions taken in the MDC clearance narrative. Supervisors should emphasize the importance of accurate and complete documentation to ensure compliance with Department policy.

Objective No. 5(c) - Accuracy of SACR Contact Data

Criteria

Field Operations Support Services (FOSS), Newsletter 18-07-Sheriff's Automated Contact Reporting (SACR) System states:

AB 953 mandates each state and local agency employing peace officers to submit specific information, referred to as "stop data," to the California State Attorney General regarding policing practices pertaining to racial and identity profiling.

The SACR system is a stand-alone system and will run independently of the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system. The process of clearing a call in CAD will neither automatically generate a SACR entry, nor preclude a deputy from entering stop data into SACR.

*AB 953 requires stop data reporting when: "**Any detention** by a peace officer of a person, or any peace officer interaction with a person in which the peace officer conducts a **search**, including a **consensual search**, of the person's **body** or **property** in the person's possession or control."*

Procedures

The auditors reviewed 60 stops and detentions conducted by EPD Stations. Of the 60 stops and detentions, 59 were evaluated. Sample TEM-10 was removed from this objective sample due to it being a consensual encounter, and it did not meet the criteria to be audited. Auditors compared the SACR data against the BWC recordings and the MDC Contact data and checked for accuracy pertaining to the number of detained subjects, and their identifying information.

Findings

Of the 59 stops and detentions evaluated, 48 (81%) met the criteria for this objective because Department members completed a SACR entry consistent with the number of subjects observed on BWC recordings and the subject contact data documented in the MDC. The remaining 11 (19%) did not meet the criteria for this objective because Department members did not complete a SACR entry consistent with the number of subjects observed on BWC recordings and the subject contact data documented on the MDC.

The table below summarizes the compliance rate for each EPD station.

Objective No. 5(c) - Summary of EPD Compliance

ALD/CVS	IDT	SDM	TEM	WAL	EPD Total
100%	86%	71%	79%	100%	87%

The table below specifically details the sample numbers for each EPD station with findings for Objective No. 5(c).

Summary of Audit Findings

OBJECTIVE 5(c) - ACCURACY OF SACR CONTACT DATA					
EPD Stations	Total Incidents Reviewed	Number of Compliant	Number of Non-Compliant	% of Incidents in Compliance	Incident Numbers with Findings
ALD/CVS	3	3	0	100%	No Finding
IDT	14	12	2	86%	4, 7
SDM	14	10	4	71%	3, 12, 13, 14
TEM	24	19	5	79%	6, 11, 12, 13, 24
WAL	4	4	0	100%	No Finding
EPD Total	59	48	11	87%	

See the Addendum for a synopsis of each incident, highlighting all relevant actions and findings related to this objective.

Recommendations

It is recommended Department supervisors conduct routine audits at the station level, to ensure the MDC documentation of all detained subjects in an incident matches the data recorded in SACR, including the number of subjects and their identifying information.

CONCLUSION

Overall, most Department members engaged in professional, polite, and courteous interactions with the public. The auditors observed Department members exercised good tactics and treated the public in a manner consistent with Department policies.

Findings related to the most critical objectives were reported to each EPD station supervisor. Auditees stated they would immediately follow up with their staff and summarize the audit findings in a corrective action plan.

Additionally, EPD station supervisors stated they would immediately brief Department members regarding the MPP, and the directives outlined in the audit objectives through training briefings, demonstrating that they have already begun implementing corrective measures.

Lastly, a subsequent audit in 2025 will be initiated to evaluate the effectiveness of the EPD unit corrective action plans for improvement.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the progress of the EPD Department members as it relates to the objectives. It also provides recommendations aimed at reducing risk for the Department and most importantly, improving communication and trust within the community.

Objective No. 1 – Initiating Stops and Detentions

- (a) Proper Activation of Body Worn Camera:** It is recommended Department supervisors continue to conduct recurrent briefings with Department members regarding BWC-Activation MPP policies as frequently as possible. Additionally, supervisors should make redacted Department records available to Department members, highlighting BWC MPP violations which resulted in disciplinary action. This would be done with the goal of raising awareness of the Department's critical stance on ensuring all attempts to digitally record incidents are made. Finally, EPD supervisors must create a corrective action plan to address Department personnel who frequently fail to comply with the BWC policy. This must include addressing these violations through verbal counseling and/or appropriate written documentation as applicable.
- (b) Stating the Reason for the Stop (AB 2773):** It is recommended that Department supervisors regularly brief Department members on AB 2773, and the BWC MPP policies. Additionally, EPD supervisors must emphasize the correlation between late BWC activations and capturing recorded evidence of the Department members stating the reason for the stop to the subject. Department members must be reminded that the reason for the stop needs to be stated prior to engaging subjects in questioning related to a criminal investigation or traffic violation. These briefings should be documented in the Stations' Watch Commander's log. Department members who repeatedly fail to comply should be held accountable through verbal counseling and/or appropriate written documentation as applicable.
- (c) Completeness of BWC Recordings:** It is recommended Department members make a concerted effort to consistently keep their BWC activated during a stop or detention from beginning to end. They must be reminded to narrate the reason why they need to deactivate their BWC at any point during the stop or detention. The EPD Stations supervisors should continue to conduct practical application exercises to ensure Department members understand the proper procedures for activating and deactivating their BWCs. Supervisors must include training on the guidelines for deactivating BWCs as well. The MPP 3-06/200.18 – Body Worn Camera Recording Exceptions clearly outlines the three exceptions when Department members are allowed to deactivate their cameras. Supervisors must instill in the Department members the importance of transparency and how the completeness of BWC recordings can mitigate risk for both the Department members and the Department.

Objective No. 2 – Consent Searches

- (a) Consent Searches Request and Response:** It is recommended Department supervisors conduct recurrent briefings to reinforce the importance of obtaining clear consent before conducting a search of the subject. These briefings should also emphasize that requests must not be phrased in a leading manner where the subjects might feel coerced into consenting to the request. The Department members should be reminded to phrase consent requests in a simple, straightforward, and clear way to ensure the subject fully understands the request. These briefings should also emphasize the importance of consistency between what is documented in the MDC and what is viewed on BWC recordings.

Objective No. 3 – Probation or Parole Searches

- (a) Knowledge of Probation or Parole Search Conditions:** It is recommended Department supervisors continue to brief Department members on the MPP policies regarding search procedures for probationers and parolees. These briefings should specifically address the verification of probation or parole search conditions prior to conducting a search and the proper articulation of the Department members procedures for obtaining that knowledge in the required documentation.

Objective No. 4 – Backseat Detentions

- (a) Explanation of Backseat Detentions to Subjects:** It is recommended Department supervisors conduct recurrent briefings with station personnel regarding the MPP BSD policy to stress the importance of the Department's stance on BSDs and how the Department differentiates BSDs from other methods of detention. Department supervisors should also remind Department members they are required to clearly explain to subjects the reason they are being placed in the backseat of a patrol vehicle either immediately or shortly after the subject is safely secured in the backseat. The explanation must include valid and appropriate reasons for the BSD. Discussion points must include alternative options rather than BSD, when safe and feasible, such as having individuals stand nearby, sit on a curb, or remain in their vehicle.
- (b) MDC Articulation of Backseat Detentions:** It is recommended supervisors frequently and thoroughly brief Department members on the BSD policy. These briefings should reinforce the MPP requirements, emphasizing the need to document the factual justification for BSDs in the MDC narrative. This justification must align with officer safety concerns or the subject's perceived escape risk, as mandated by policy.

Objective No. 5 – Mobile Digital Computer and Sheriff Automatic Contact Reporting

- (a) Accuracy of MDC Contact Data Reported:** It is recommended Department supervisors frequently brief Department members on proper MDC documentation and more specifically address the critical areas related to accurate documentation of consent searches and accounting for all the subjects detained during a stop.
- (b) Documentation of Reason for Contact in the MDC Narrative:** It is recommended Department supervisors regularly brief the MPP stipulation directing the Department members to properly document the reason for the stop in the MDC clearance narrative.
- (c) Accuracy of SACR Contact Data:** It is recommended Department supervisors conduct routine audits at the station level, to ensure the MDC documentation of all detained subjects in an incident matches the data recorded in SACR, including the number of subjects and their identifying information.

DEPARTMENT APPLICATIONS

- Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) System Services
- Department's Digital Evidence Management System
- Mobile Digital Computer (MDC)
- Regional Allocation of Police Services (RAPSNET)
- Sheriff's Automated Contact Reporting (SACR) System

REFERENCES

- Manual of Policy and Procedures Sections
 - 3-06/200.08 – Body Worn Cameras – Activation (August 2020)
 - 3-06/200.13 – Recording of the Entire Contact (August 2020)
 - 3-06/200.15 – Documentation Required for Failing to Activate BWC or Duration of the Contact (August 2020)
 - 3-06/200.18 – BWC Recording Exceptions (August 2020)
 - 5-09/520.05 – Stops, Seizures, and Searches (August 2020)
 - 5-09/520.10 – Backseat Detentions (February 2018)
 - 5-09/520.25 – Logging Field Activities (May 2024)
 - 5-09/520.30 – Statistical Codes for Traffic, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Stops (March 2015)
- Field Operations Support Services:
 - 13-12 – New MDC Codes for Logging Field Activity-Deputy Reference Sheet-MDC Codes for Logging Field Activity (December 2016)
 - 14-19 – Seated and Backseat Investigative Detentions (September 2014)
 - 16-16 - New Clearance Requirements for Logging Field Activity (September 2016)
 - 18-07 – Sheriff's Automated Contact Reporting (SACR) System (May 2022)
 - 23-06 – Stating and Documenting the Reason for the Stop (December 2023)

Views of Responsible Officials

On January 21, 2025, the AAB presented the findings to the EPD command staff. The AAB presented the final audit report to the Division Director, Office of Constitutional Policing. Units were given ample time to implement corrective action plans for improvement for subsequent 2025 audits.



7/09/25

GEOFFREY N. CHADWICK DATE
Captain
Audit and Accountability Bureau
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department