



ROBERT G. LUNA, SHERIFF

LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

Stops and Detentions Audit Santa Clarita Station North Patrol Division Project No. 2025-21-A

Prepared By:

Audit and Accountability Bureau



2025

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

**Stops and Detentions Audit:
North Patrol Division
Santa Clarita Valley Station
Project No. 2025-21-A**

AUDIT REPORT

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 Santa Clarita Sheriff's Station (SCT) adhered to the Department's Manual of Policy and Procedures (MPP), and the Field Operations Support Services (FOSS) Newsletters associated with the stops and detentions of individuals within the SCT community.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The objective of this audit was to determine whether SCT was in compliance with Department policies as they relate to Body Worn Camera (BWC)¹ procedures, California Assembly Bill (CA-AB) 2773², consent searches, probation or parole searches, and the treatment of individuals detained in the back seat 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 SCT. 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 (OIG) for input prior to the start of the audit.

The AAB conducted this audit under the guidance of Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS)³. The AAB determined the evidence obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a reasonable basis for the findings based on the audit objectives.

¹ A BWC is a video and audio recording device worn by a Department member which allows an event to be recorded and saved as a digital file.

² CA-AB2773 - 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.

³ 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.

Audit Scope

The scope of this audit focused on stops and detentions⁴ (vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle) conducted by SCT Department members.

The auditors evaluated the legality of consent searches, probation or parole searches, and backseat detentions (BSDs)⁵, as well as the accuracy of documenting contacts and subjects in the Mobile Digital Computer (MDC)⁶ and the Sheriff Automated Contact Reporting (SACR)⁷ system. The auditors also reviewed whether SCT practices aligned with relevant Department policies as well as compliance with CA-AB 2773. Furthermore, patterns of legal or policy errors were identified and documented.

The table below outlines the audit objectives.

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 (CA-AB 2773)</i>
1(c)	<i>Completeness of Body-Worn Camera Recordings</i>
2	CONSENT SEARCHES
2(a)	<i>Consent Search Reasonableness (Person Searches)</i>
2(b)	<i>Consent Search MDC Documentation (Person Searches)</i>
2(c)	<i>Consent Search Reasonableness (Vehicle Searches)</i>
2(d)	<i>Consent Search MDC Documentation (Vehicle Searches)</i>
3	PROBATION OR PAROLE SEARCHES
3(a)	<i>Knowledge of Probation or Parole Search Conditions</i>
3(b)	<i>Probation or Parole Search MDC Documentation</i>
4	BACKSEAT DETENTIONS
4(a)	<i>Explanation of Backseat Detentions to Subjects</i>
4(b)	<i>MDC-Documentation of Backseat Detentions</i>
5	MOBILE DIGITAL COMPUTER and SHERIFF AUTOMATIC CONTACT REPORTING
5(a)	<i>Documentation of reason for contact in the MDC Narrative</i>
5(b)	<i>Accuracy of Stop and Detentions Data</i>

⁴ The data request involved all "Stops" clearance codes (840, 841, 842, and 843) retrieved from the Regional Allocation of Police Services (RAPSNET) application.

⁵ A BSD occurs when an individual's freedom is restrained by placing that individual in the back seat of a patrol vehicle for investigative purposes for any period of time.

⁶ A computer system installed in patrol vehicles, enabling Department members to access Department databases, communicate with dispatch, and perform operational tasks in the field.

⁷ The SACR is a stand-alone system and will run independently of the Computer-Aided Dispatch CAD) system. The SACR is a data entry system designed to collect 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, or arrest.

Audit Population and Sampling

The selected audit period was November 1, 2024, to December 31, 2024, focusing on a single population from which samples were extracted. This population included:

- Stops and Detentions data related to consent searches, probation or parole searches, and BSDs.

A data request for SCT Stops and Detentions was obtained from the Data Systems Bureau for the audit period, resulting in a total of 3,400 stops and detentions.

The following search or detention codes were selected to identify the population for this audit: MDC Contact Type code of "B" (Backseat Detention: Vehicle, Pedestrian, Bicycle Stops) and MDC search authority codes of "C" (Consent Searches), and "R" (Condition of Probation or Parole).

Additionally, auditors reviewed each MDC clearance narrative to identify any BSDs, consent searches, and probation or parole searches that may have been improperly coded in the MDC clearance field but should have been included in the audit population. This process resulted in a population of 115 stops and detentions. Using a one-tailed statistical test with a 95% confidence level and a 4% error rate, for Consent Searches, auditors selected a statistically valid, random sample of 49 stops and detentions for the audit period.

Given the minimal sizes of the resulting populations, for Backseat Detentions and Probation or Parole searches, auditors evaluated the entire audit population pertaining to these two specific MDC search authority codes.

The table below summarizes the audit population of stops and detentions for SCT and the total population sample to be evaluated for this audit.

Audit Population and Sample

Category	"B"- Backseat Detentions	"C"- Consent Searches ⁸	"R"- Probation or Parole Searches ⁹	Total
Audit Population	8	97	10	115
Audit Sample	8	49	10	67

⁸ The population and sample totals for consent searches include person and vehicle searches.

⁹ The population and sample totals for probation and parole searches include person and vehicle searches.

Audit Procedures

The auditors reviewed the relevant BWC recordings of the primary Department members involved in each stop and detention within the audit sample, focusing on those who engaged in enforcement or investigative actions involving 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 the 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.

Summary of Findings

This audit consisted of five main objectives, with a total of 13 sub-objectives. The table below outlines each audit objective and its corresponding compliance percentage for SCT.

Summary of Compliance Findings

Obj. No.	Audit Objectives	Compliance Percentage
1	INITIATING STOPS AND DETENTIONS	
1(a)	<i>Proper Activation of Body-Worn Camera</i>	86%
1(b)	<i>Stating the Reason for the Stop (CA-AB 2773)</i>	80%
1(c)	<i>Completeness of Body-Worn Camera Recordings</i>	87%
2	CONSENT SEARCHES	
2(a)	<i>Consent Search Reasonableness (Person Searches)</i>	100%
2(b)	<i>Consent Search MDC Documentation (Person Searches)</i>	43%
2(c)	<i>Consent Search Reasonableness (Vehicle Searches)</i>	100%
2(d)	<i>Consent Search MDC Documentation (Vehicle Searches)</i>	71%
3	PROBATION OR PAROLE SEARCHES	
3(a)	<i>Knowledge of Probation or Parole Search Conditions</i>	100%
3(b)	<i>Probation or Parole Search MDC Documentation</i>	63%
4	BACKSEAT DETENTIONS	
4(a)	<i>Explanation of Backseat Detentions to Subjects</i>	15%
4(b)	<i>MDC Documentation of Backseat Detentions</i>	1%
5	MOBILE DIGITAL COMPUTER and SHERIFF AUTOMATIC CONTACT REPORTING	
5(a)	<i>Documentation of reason for contact in the MDC Narrative</i>	78%
5(b)	<i>Accuracy of Stop and Detentions Data</i>	19%

Detailed Findings

This report provides a detailed summary of the audit findings

Objective No. 1 – Initiating Stops and Detentions

This objective included an evaluation of the initiation of stops and detentions by SCT Department members as it related to the proper activation of the BWC, required advisement provided to detained persons, and the completeness of BWC recordings as specified in the Department policy, and CA-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...*

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 3-06/200.58 - Guidelines for Administrative Reviews of Body Worn Camera Recordings, (August 2020), states:

90-Day Transition Period

During the first 90 days a member is assigned a BWC, following completion of training, unintentional deviations in policy and procedure in the use and deployment of a BWC will be considered training issues. During the transition period, Department employees should receive non-documented counseling and training only. Performance log entries should not be generated.

Procedures

The auditors evaluated 67 stops and detentions for SCT and identified 100 BWC recordings of Department members who interacted with a member of the public. Each BWC recording was reviewed to determine whether the BWC was activated prior to initiating, or upon arrival at, any enforcement or investigative contact involving a member of the public.

Findings

Eighty-six (86%) of the 100 BWC activations reviewed met the criteria because Department members activated their BWC prior to initiating, or upon arrival at, any enforcement or investigative contact involving a member of the public. The remaining 14 (14%) of the 100 BWC activations did not meet the criteria for this objective, because Department members failed to activate their BWC upon arrival at any enforcement or investigative contact with a member of the public.

The table below demonstrates the 14 late activations by Department members in 10 second increments.

BWC Late Activations – Time Duration Breakdown

Time Duration (Seconds)	Number of Activations
1-10	3
11-20	2
21-30	2
31-40	0
41-50	1
51-60	0
61 and above	6
Total	14

Recommendations

It is recommended the Department revise the current BWC policy (*MPP 3-06/200.08, Body Worn Cameras – Activation*), enabling patrol station supervisors to conduct routine audits of BWC recordings. This revision is proposed to ensure Department members comply with Department policy requirements. It is imperative for Department members to activate their BWCs, prior to initiating, or upon arrival at, any enforcement or investigative contact, to capture the entirety of the contact with the public as defined in the Department policy. Furthermore, SCT supervisors should consider implementing corrective action plans to address Department members who frequently fail to comply with BWC policy. Such measures may include documenting these violations in a Performance Log Entry (PLE) or initiating an Administrative Investigation, when applicable.

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

Criteria

Field Operations Support Services (FOSS) Newsletter 23-06, Stating and Documenting the Reason for the Stop (December 2023), 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 evaluated 67 stops and detentions for SCT. One of the 67 stops was excluded from this objective because it involved a consensual encounter that did not transition into detention. Therefore, 66 stops and detentions were reviewed for this objective. The auditors reviewed each Department member's BWC recording to determine whether Department members conducting a traffic or pedestrian stop advised the subject of the reason for the stop and detention prior to engaging in questioning related to a criminal investigation or a traffic violation.

Findings

Fifty-three (80%) of the 66 stops and detentions reviewed for SCT met the criteria because the Department members advised the subjects of the reason for the stop and detention prior to engaging in questioning related to a criminal investigation or a traffic violation.

The remaining 13 (20%) did not meet the criteria for this objective. In eight of these instances, the Department members engaged in questioning the subjects before providing the reason for the stop and detention. In two instances, the Department members did not advise the subjects of the reason for the contact. For the remaining three stops and detentions, the auditors were unable to determine whether the Department members advised the subject of the reason for stop and detention because the BWC was activated late, preventing a complete assessment of the interactions.

Specifically:

SCT-1¹⁰: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member contacted the subject but did not state the reason for the stop before asking questions related to the traffic violation.

SCT-3: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop. According to the MDC data and narrative, the stop was for an unsafe lane change. Auditors were unable to determine whether the Department members advised the subject of the reason for the stop due to the late activation of the BWC.

SCT-4: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a pedestrian stop. According to the MDC data, the stop was for loitering. Auditors were unable to determine whether the Department members advised the subject of the reason for the stop due to the late activation of the BWC.

SCT-8: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a traffic stop for red light violations. The Department members contacted the subject but did not state the reason for the stop before asking questions related to the traffic violation.

SCT-10: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop. According to the MDC data and narrative, the stop was for failure to display license plates. Auditors were unable to determine whether the Department members advised the subject of the reason for the stop due to the late activation of the BWC. In addition, when the Department members activated their BWC, they were observed asking investigative questions regarding the subject's front license plate.

SCT-11: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop. According to the MDC data, the stop was for a probation compliance check. Auditors were unable to determine whether the Department member advised the subject of the reason for the stop due to the late activation of the BWC.

SCT-12: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The Department members contacted the subjects but did not state the reason for the stop. The Department members immediately recognized the subjects in the vehicle as one being on probation and the other on parole and initiated their investigation.

SCT-15: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a possible stolen vehicle investigation. The Department member contacted the subject but did not state the reason for the stop before asking questions related to the criminal investigation.

¹⁰ SCT refers to Santa Clarita Station and the number corresponds to the selected sample within the audit population.

SCT-20: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a traffic stop. According to the MDC data, the stop was for illegal possession of drug paraphernalia in plain view. Auditors were unable to determine whether the Department members initially advised the subject of the reason for the stop due to late activation of the BWC. When the Department member activated his BWC, he was observed taking the subject into custody while simultaneously asking the subject investigative questions. Only after the questioning did the Department member provide the reason for the stop.

SCT-22: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a pedestrian stop. According to the MDC data, the stop was for trespassing on posted property. Auditors were unable to determine whether the Department members advised the subject of the reason for the stop due to the late activation of the BWC. When the Department member activated his BWC, he was observed asking investigative questions of the subject.

SCT-25: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a pedestrian stop. According to the MDC data, the stop was a consensual encounter. During the encounter the Department members obtained consent to search, discovered concealed weapons, handcuffed and placed the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. Therefore, the consensual encounter transitioned into a detention. Neither Department member advised the subject of the reason for the detention.

SCT-29: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a traffic stop for a stolen vehicle investigation. The Department member contacted the subject but did not state the reason for the stop. The Department member immediately began asking questions related to the criminal investigation.

SCT-34: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a pedestrian stop for trespassing on posted property. The Department members contacted the subject but did not state the reason for the stop. The Department member immediately began asking questions related to the criminal investigation.

Recommendations

It is recommended SCT supervisors regularly brief Department members on *CA-AB 2773 (effective January 1, 2024,)* and document these briefings in the Stations' Watch Commander's Log. During the Daily Stop Audits¹¹, SCT supervisors must ensure Department members are stating the reason for the stop. If a stop and detention is dynamic at the initiation of a stop, it is important to provide the subject with the reason for the stop once the situation has de-escalated. Department members must be reminded the reason for the stop must be clearly stated prior to engaging in questioning related to a criminal investigation or traffic violation. Department members who repeatedly fail to comply should be held accountable through verbal counseling and/or appropriate written documentation, when applicable.

SCT must develop and implement a record log to ensure the Watch Commanders and Watch Sergeants conduct the Daily Stops Audit as directed by the Assistant Sheriff of Patrol Operations. The record log will serve as a tool for supervisors to reference if written corrective action is needed. Maintaining a detailed record log will ensure that audits are conducted to promptly address corrective actions. Additionally, the log will provide a record for review and analysis over time.

¹¹ The Daily Stops Audit is a directive from the Assistant Sheriff of Patrol Operations. It requires the Watch Commander and the Watch Sergeant to each conduct an audit of one stop per day by reviewing BWC recordings to ensure Department members are stating the reason for the stop prior to engaging the detained subject(s) in questioning related to a criminal investigation or a traffic violation, as required per CA-AB 2773.

Objective No. 1(c) – Completeness of Body-Worn Camera 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.

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 3-06/200.58 - Guidelines for Administrative Reviews of Body Worn Camera Recordings, (August 2020), states:

90-Day Transition Period

During the first 90 days a member is assigned a BWC, following completion of training, unintentional deviations in policy and procedure in the use and deployment of a BWC will be considered training issues. During the transition period, Department employees should receive non-documented counseling and training only. Performance log entries should not be generated.

Procedures

The auditors evaluated 67 stops and detentions for SCT and identified 100 BWC recordings involving Department members who interacted with a member of the public. Each Department member's BWC recording was reviewed to determine whether the BWC recording continued until the enforcement or investigative contact involving a member of the public had ended. Additionally, if the enforcement or investigative contact resumed after the BWC recording had stopped, the auditors assessed whether the Department member properly stopped and reactivated the BWC as required by policy and continued recording.

Findings

Eighty-seven (87%) of the 100 BWC recordings met the criteria because the Department members continuously recorded their interaction until the enforcement or investigative contact involving a member of the public had ended or, if the enforcement or investigative contact resumed after the BWC recording had stopped, the Department member reactivated the BWC as required by policy and continued recording.

The remaining 13 (13%) of the 100 BWC recordings did not meet the criteria for this objective because the Department members deactivated their BWC prior to the end of the stop and while the subjects were still detained.

Specifically:

SCT-1: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member deactivated his BWC to debrief with assisting units and failed to reactivate it to conclude the citation and release of one subject. This resulted in an incomplete recording of the entire contact.

SCT-12: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. Both Department members deactivated their BWCs to debrief. One Department member reactivated approximately 24 minutes later, which resulted in missed interactions with the detained subjects. The second Department member did not reactivate his BWC. This resulted in an incomplete recording of the entire contact for both Department members.

SCT-13: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. Both Department members conducted a search of the vehicle, deactivated their BWCs to debrief and failed to reactivate them. This resulted in an incomplete recording of the entire contact for both Department members.

SCT-20: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for illegal possession of drug paraphernalia in plain view. One Department member deactivated his BWC at the conclusion of the stop. The second Department member deactivated his BWC to wash his hands after spilling a narcotic substance. He briefly reactivated his BWC but deactivated it again to re-wash his hands and failed to reactivate afterward. This resulted in an incomplete recording of the entire contact for one Department member.

SCT-28: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member had the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle and deactivated his BWC. It appeared he deactivated his BWC to make a phone call. The Department member failed to reactivate his BWC to the conclusion of the stop. This resulted in an incomplete recording of the entire contact.

SCT-30: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. Both Department members deactivated their BWCs several times during the stop. Although the Department members reactivated their BWC, the BWC recordings showed both the Department members still engaging in conversation during the deactivations, as well as a delay in the secondary reactivations of the BWC. This resulted in an incomplete recording of the entire contact for both Department members.

SCT-34: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a pedestrian stop for trespassing on posted property. Both Department members deactivated their BWCs to debrief with the sergeant via cell phone. One Department member reactivated his BWC appropriately. However, the second Department member did not reactivate her BWC in a timely manner, resulting in missed dialogue between her and the subject. This resulted in an incomplete recording of the entire contact for one Department member.

SCT-35: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a pedestrian stop for trespassing on posted property. Both Department members consistently deactivated and reactivated their BWCs to debrief amongst each other and to make a phone call to the station secretary. One Department member was late for one of the reactivations, however deactivated at the conclusion of the stop. The second Department member did not reactivate her BWC to capture the citation and release of the subject. This resulted in an incomplete recording of the entire contact for both Department members.

SCT-50: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member deactivated his BWC without any narration. He reactivated his BWC to conduct a search of the vehicle with assisting units. At the conclusion of the search, the Department member deactivated his BWC and did not reactivate it for the remainder of the stop. This resulted in an incomplete recording of the entire contact.

Recommendations

It is recommended Department members make a concerted effort to consistently keep their BWC activated during a stop and detention, from beginning to end. SCT Department members must be reminded to narrate the reason for any BWC deactivations during the stop and detention. SCT supervisors should continue to conduct practical application exercises to ensure Department members understand the proper procedures for activating and deactivating their BWCs. Supervisors must also include training on the guidelines for BWC deactivation. 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 emphasize how the completeness of BWC recordings can mitigate risk for both the Department and its members.

During the Daily Stop Audits, station supervisors must check to ensure the completeness of Department members' BWC recordings. Department members who demonstrate a pattern of noncompliance must be held accountable through verbal counseling and/or appropriate written documentation, as applicable.

Objective No. 2 – Consent Searches

This objective included the evaluation of consent searches (person and vehicle searches) conducted by SCT 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 Search Reasonableness (Person Searches)

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

The auditors examined 67 stops and detentions for SCT that occurred during the audit period and identified 24 stops and detentions in which a consent search of a person(s) had occurred. Auditors obtained this data by analyzing MDC data entered by Department members during their conducted stops and detentions and verified the information by viewing all BWC recordings pertaining to each individual incident, to identify all consent searches that occurred during the audit period classified as "Consent."

Out of the 24 stops and detentions, auditors determined a total of 28 consent searches occurred. Auditors reviewed each BWC recording for the 24 stops and detentions to determine whether the request to conduct the search was reasonable. A total of 28 consent searches were reviewed for this objective.

The auditors determined a request to conduct a search to be reasonable if the search was conducted under sound judgment¹², contained a valid reason(s)¹³ under the law or policy for the stop, was consensual, remained within the boundaries of what was consented to, and did not involve any misconduct or persuasion by the Department member.

¹² Sound judgment is the ability to assess situations and circumstances objectively, using relevant information to make decisions or draw conclusions.

¹³ A valid reason is reasonable suspicion to believe that the search will produce evidence of a crime.

Findings

All 28 (100%) consent searches that occurred met the criteria because the request to conduct the search was determined to be reasonable.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the auditors determined that all 28 of the consent person searches were reasonable.

Objective No. 2(b) – Consent Search MDC Documentation (Person Searches)

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 examined the 67 stops and detentions for SCT that occurred during the audit period and based on auditor's review of BWC recordings, auditors identified 24 stops and detentions in which 28 consent searches occurred. Additionally, auditors analyzed MDC data entered by Department members during their conducted stops and detentions and identified 49 MDC log entries in which a consent search was documented with the search authority code "C" (Consent Search). The auditors noted twenty-one additional consent searches were documented in the MDC data.

Based on the above, the auditors evaluated 56 consent searches that were identified to determine whether the Department members identified each subject on whom a consent search was conducted and whether they documented the appropriate search authority code.

Findings

Twenty-four (43%) of the 56 documented consent searches met the criteria because Department members accurately identified each subject on whom a consent search was conducted and documented the appropriate search authority code. The remaining 32 (57%) did not meet the criteria for this objective because the documented consent searches did not occur, and in these cases, Department members did not use the appropriate search authority code to document the search.

Specifically:

SCT-3: This stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for an unsafe lane change. The Department members utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department members should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-4: This stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a pedestrian stop for trespassing on posted property. The Department members utilized search authority code "A" (Incident to Arrest) in the MDC data field; however, during the detention consent was obtained. The Department members should have documented the contact using the search authority code "C" (Consent Search).

SCT-7: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for tinted windows. The Department member utilized search authority code "X" (See Narrative) in the MDC data field. In the narrative of the MDC the Department member stated he conducted a search based on consent. Since a consent search occurred, the Department member should have documented the contact using the search authority code "C" (Consent Search).

SCT-9: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for disobeying traffic signals. The Department member conducted a weapons pat-down of the subject; however, the Department member utilized the search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "W" (Weapons Pat down).

SCT-20: This stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a pedestrian stop for possession of illegal paraphernalia in plain view. The Department members contacted the subject outside of his vehicle and detained him immediately. While detaining the subject the Department member overheard the subject was on probation. The Department member verbally confirmed the subject's status and conducted a search based on his status. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field instead of search authority code "R" (Condition of Probation/Parole).

SCT-23: This stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for window tint. The Department member contacted the person who was seated in his vehicle and issued a warning. The subject was never searched. The Department member utilized the "C" (Consent Search) authority code instead of search authority code "N" (Not searched).

SCT-24: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for an unsafe lane change. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-26: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for speeding. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-29: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a vehicle theft investigation. The Department member contacts the subject, removes him from the vehicle, and conducted a weapons pat-down. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) instead of search authority code "W" (Weapons Pat down).

SCT-30: This stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member received consent to search the subject's vehicle. During the search, the subject located narcotics. After locating the narcotics, the Department member returned to the subject and stated he was going to search him. No consent was requested or clearly given. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search); however, search authority code should have been "A" (Incident to Arrest).

SCT-32: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving while holding a cell phone. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-33: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights during hours of darkness. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-37: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for speeding. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-38: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights during hours of darkness. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-39: This stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights during hours of darkness. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-41: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for lane straddling. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-43: This stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for tinted windows. The Department members utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department members should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-45: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights during hours of darkness. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-49: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-50: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. During the stop, the Department member conducted a pat down for weapons after the subject stated he had a knife on him. The sergeant on scene stated they were also searching for identification, as the subject claimed he did not have one. The Department member subsequently conducted a search of the subject. The Department member documented the search under authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data; however, no request for consent was heard. Additionally, the Department member incorrectly input the number of subjects detained and incorrectly documented the subject's name in the MDC data field.

SCT-51: This stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department members utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no request for consent was heard on review of BWC. The Department member was in the middle of a "W" (Weapons Pat down) with the subject when she retrieved multiple items from his jacket pocket. The subject was not asked for consent to retrieve the items.

SCT-52: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for lane straddling. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-53: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights during hours of darkness. The Department member conducted a weapons pat-down of the subject; however, the Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search). The Department member should have documented the contact using the search authority code "W" (Weapons Pat down).

SCT-54: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for disobeying traffic signals. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-55: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights during hours of darkness. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-56: The stop consisted of a one-person unit with an on-duty Department member ride-along conducting a consensual encounter of two subjects. During the encounter, the Department members learned one subject had an out of state warrant and initiated a detention. The Department members utilized search authority code "X" (See Narrative). In the narrative the Department member stated he conducted a search of the subject regarding a weapons pat-down. The MDC data and narrative do not identify the second subject that was searched with consent. The Department member should have added the additional subject and used search authority code "C" (Consent).

SCT-58: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for speeding. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-60: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for speeding. The Department member conducted a weapons pat-down of the subject; however, the Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search). The Department member should have documented the contact using the search authority code "W" (Weapons Pat down).

SCT-63: This stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a broken license plate lamp. The Department members conducted a weapons pat-down of the subject; however, the Department member utilized the search authority code "C" (Consent Search). The Department member should have documented the contact using the search authority code "W" (Weapons Pat-down).

SCT-65: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failing to yield to oncoming traffic. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-66: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a traffic stop for speeding. The Department member utilized search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred on review of BWC. The Department member should have documented the contact using search authority code "N" (Not Searched).

Recommendations

It is recommended SCT implement a training program which emphasizes the importance of accurate documentation of searches. The training should focus on articulating clear and consistent documentation in the MDC log clearance and SACR entries. Specifically, it should include providing detailed reasons in the narrative section for seeking consent, utilizing the correct search authority codes, and ensuring documentation is consistent with corresponding BWC recordings. Additionally, Department members need to be aware of the differences between a weapons pat-down search and a consensual search. This training should be documented in either an Automated Personnel In-Service (APIS) roster or an acknowledgment of training form.

Objective No. 2(c) – Consent Search Reasonableness (Vehicle Searches)

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

The auditors examined 67 stops and detentions for SCT that occurred during the audit period. Of these, the auditors identified 14 stops and detentions in which a consent search of a vehicle occurred. Auditors obtained this data by analyzing MDC data entries made by Department members during their conducted stops and detentions. To verify the accuracy of the information, auditors reviewed all BWC recordings that pertained to each incident, to identify all consent searches that occurred during the audit period and were classified as "Consent."

All 14 vehicle consent searches were reviewed. Auditors examined each BWC recording to determine whether the request to conduct the search was reasonable.

The auditors applied the same methodology used for Objective No. 2(a) – Consent Search Reasonableness (Person Searches) to evaluate the reasonableness of the vehicle search requests. A request to conduct a vehicle search was deemed reasonable if the search was conducted under sound judgment, contained valid reasons under the law or policy for the stop, was consensual, remained within the boundaries of what was consented to, and did not involve any misconduct or persuasion by the Department member.

Findings

All 14 (100%) of the vehicle consent searches that occurred met the criteria for this objective.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the auditors determined that all 14 of the vehicle consent searches were reasonable.

Objective No. 2(d) – Consent Search MDC Documentation (Vehicle Searches)

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 Departmental personnel taking some form of constructive action, e.g. requesting a tow truck for a stranded motorist.*

Procedures

The auditors examined the 67 stops and detentions for SCT that occurred during the audit period, and based on auditors' review of BWC recordings, auditors identified 18 stops and detentions in which 15 vehicle consent searches occurred or were documented.

The 18 vehicle consent searches were evaluated to determine whether Department members properly identified each vehicle search conducted and documented the appropriate search authority code.

Findings

Twelve (67%) of the 18 vehicle consent searches met the established criteria, as the Department member properly documented the vehicle consent search and used the appropriate search authority code. The remaining six (33%) vehicle consent searches did not meet the criteria due to inaccurate or lack of documentation in the MDC clearance.

Specifically:

SCT-7: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for tinted windows. The Department member requested and obtained consent to search the vehicle; however, the vehicle search was only documented in the MDC narrative. The Department member used search authority code "N" (Not searched) in the MDC data field.

SCT-20: This stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a pedestrian stop for possession of drug paraphernalia in plain view. The Department members used search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no consent was heard on review of BWC. The Department members had the authority to search the vehicle under search authority "R" (Condition of Probation/Parole).

SCT-28: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member requested and obtained consent to search the vehicle; however, the Department member used search authority "N" (Not Searched).

SCT-36: This stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a vehicle theft investigation. The Department member detained the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle and assisting units began to search the subjects vehicle. The Department member used search authority code "C" (Consent Search); however, he did not ask for consent to search the vehicle. The Department member should have used search authority "A" (Incident to Arrest).

SCT-57: This stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department members used search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field; however, no search occurred.

SCT-62: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The subject in the stop spoke limited English, and the Department member had difficulty communicating with the subject. The Department member requested several times consent to conduct a search of the vehicle. The subject continually displayed ambiguous consent and confusion. Once the Department member had the subject in the patrol vehicle, he contacted a Spanish translator via cell phone. The Department member relayed to the translator to inform the subject that he would be searching the vehicle. The translator relayed the information, and the subject stated, "Ok". Auditors believed the question of obtaining consent was not clearly presented to the subject, nor was consent clearly given to the Department member. The Department member should have specifically instructed the translator to request consent for searching the vehicle.

Recommendations

It is recommended SCT implement a training program emphasizing the importance of accurate documentation of consent searches. The training should focus on articulating clear and consistent documentation in the MDC log clearance and SACR entries, including providing detailed reasons in the narrative section for seeking consent, utilizing the correct search codes, and ensuring documentation is consistent with review of BWC recordings. This training should be documented in either an APIS roster or an acknowledgment of training form.

Objective No. 3 – Probation or Parole Searches

This objective will include the evaluation of probation or parole searches conducted by SCT 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 (May 2017), 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 examined 67 stops and detentions for SCT that occurred during the audit period. Based on review of BWC recordings, the auditors identified 9 stops and detentions in which a probation or parole search had occurred.

Out of the 9 stops and detentions, auditors determined a total of 19 probation or parole searches occurred, consisting of 10 searches of a person and 9 vehicle searches.

Auditors reviewed each BWC recording for the 9 stops and detentions to determine whether, in instances when a search of a subject was conducted pursuant to probation or parole conditions, Department members had knowledge of the subjects' search conditions prior to conducting the search.

Prior knowledge of the subject's probation or parole status may be established through the MDC, radio communication with Dispatch, the Department member's prior knowledge or contact with the subject, the subject's statement regarding their probation or parole search conditions, documents, or communication from a probation or parole official.

Findings

Nineteen (100%) of the 19 probation or parole searches met the criteria because the Department members had established knowledge of the subjects' search conditions prior to conducting the search.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the auditors determined that, in all 19 probation or parole searches, Department members had prior knowledge of the subjects' search conditions prior to conducting the search.

Objective No. 3(b) – Probation or Parole Search MDC Documentation

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 examined the 67 stops and detentions for SCT that occurred during the audit period, and based on the auditors' review of BWC recordings, auditors identified 10 stops and detentions in which 19 probation or parole searches occurred.

Of these, 10 probation or parole searches were of subjects, and 9 were probation or parole searches of a vehicle.

The auditors evaluated 19 probation or parole searches. The purpose of this evaluation was to determine whether Department members accurately identified each subject for whom a probation or parole search was conducted and documented the appropriate search authority code.

Findings

Twelve (63%) of the 19 probation or parole searches met the criteria because the Department members identified each subject and/or vehicle for whom a probation or parole search was conducted and documented the appropriate search authority code. The remaining seven (37%) did not meet the criteria for this objective because the Department members did not use the appropriate search authority code for the subject and the vehicle.

Specifically:

SCT-10: (Person/Vehicle) The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. Two subjects were detained on the outside of the vehicle. The Department members asked the male subject if he was on probation or parole and the subject stated he was. The female subject remained on the outside of the vehicle and was not searched. The Department member conducted a compliance check of the male subject and his vehicle.

The Department members did not use the appropriate search authority code "R" (Condition of Probation or Parole) to document the searches. The search was inaccurately documented as "A" (Incident to Arrest) for the subject and "X" (Other- See Narrative) for the vehicle. The MDC narrative stated "probation compliance check"; and not the specific designated code for condition of probation or parole.

SCT-11: (Vehicle) The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a probation compliance check. Numerous assisting units were on scene during the stop. The MDC data stated a bicycle stop occurred; however, the subject was outside of his vehicle. The Department member had prior knowledge of the subject's probation status. A probation compliance check was conducted on the subject, his vehicle, and residence. An assisting unit conducted the search of the subject's vehicle.

The Department member did not use the appropriate search authority code "R" (Condition of Probation or Parole) for the subject's vehicle. The search was inaccurately documented as "N" (Not searched).

SCT-12: (Person) The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The Department members immediately recognized the three subjects and had previous knowledge of their probation or parole status. One male subject was on probation, one male subject was on parole, and the female subject has no status. The Department members detained the three subjects and conducted a probation/parole compliance check of both their persons and the vehicle.

All three subjects are listed in the MDC narrative. The Department members accurately documented the searches for two subjects and the associated vehicle in the MDC data. However, the third searched subject who was on probation is not listed in the MDC data.

SCT-14: (Person) The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for lane straddling. The Department members recognized the subject from previous contacts. After conducting a records check, the Department member confirmed the parole status of the subject. The Department member returned to the subject's vehicle, provided a warning to the traffic violation and ended the contact.

In the MDC data the Department member indicated the subject was searched under authority code "R" (Condition of Probation or Parole). The Department member should have documented search authority code "N" (Not searched).

SCT-20: (Person/Vehicle) The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for possession of drug paraphernalia in plain view. Department members detained two subjects standing outside of their vehicle. While Department members were speaking to the female subject, she spontaneously stated the male subject is on probation. During the detention the Department member verbally confirmed with the male subject and conducted a compliance check of his person and vehicle.

The Department members did not use the appropriate search authority code "R" (Condition of Probation or Parole) to document the search. The search authority code for the subject and his vehicle were inaccurately documented with search authority code "C" (Consent Search) in the MDC data field.

Recommendations

It is recommended SCT implement a training program which emphasizes the importance of accurate and consistent documentation of probation or parole searches. The training should focus on correct use of search authority codes in the MDC log clearances, accurate documentation in the SACR entries, alignment between documentation and BWC recording, and reinforcing verification of search conditions prior to conducting searches. This training should be documented in either an APIS training roster or an acknowledgment of training form.

Objective No. 4 – Backseat Detentions

This objective evaluated the BSDs conducted by SCT 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 (July 2018) 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 back seat. 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.

In instances where an individual is provided the option of sitting in the back seat due to weather conditions or the individual's desire for privacy, the deputy will make clear this placement is a courtesy, and that the individual is free to exit the patrol car at any time.

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

Per the criteria for this objective, BSDs shall only be used when:

- The detained person may pose a threat of physical harm.
- The detained person is an escape risk.
- There is a risk of the officer's safety.
- An individual is provided the option of sitting in the back seat due to weather conditions or the individual's desire for privacy.

Procedures

The auditors examined 67 stops and detentions for SCT that occurred during the audit period. Based on the auditor's review of the BWC recordings, the auditors identified 17 stops and detentions in which 20 BSDs occurred.

Auditors reviewed each BWC recording to determine whether the Department member explained to the subject(s), in a professional and courteous manner, the reason for their detention in the back seat of the patrol vehicle.

In identifying the term, "matter of course"¹⁴, the auditors ensured actions related to BSD were not conducted or explained to subjects as a standard method of operation without any justification provided to the subject.

Findings

Three (15%) of the 20 BSDs met the criteria because the Department member explained to the subject(s), in a professional and courteous manner, the reason for being detained in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The remaining 17 (85%) BSDs did not meet the criteria for this objective because the Department member did not explain to the subject(s), in a professional and courteous manner, the reason for being detained in the back seat of the patrol vehicle.

Specifically:

SCT-1: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member recognized the subject from a previous contact where the subject fled from him. The Department member advised the subject that he was a flight risk prior to the BSD. The Department member escorted the second subject from the vehicle and placed her in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The Department member did not provide the second subject with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-4: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a bicycle stop for loitering on public property. During the detention, the subject began to reach for something in his pocket. The Department members escorted him to the patrol vehicle to conduct a search. After the search concluded, the Department member escorted the subject to the back of the patrol vehicle and stated, "I'm going to have you have a seat over here." The subject agreed and was placed in the back seat. The Department member did not provide the subject with a reason for the BSD.

¹⁴ In identifying the term "*matter of course*", the auditors assessed whether the actions related to BSDs were neither conducted, explained, nor documented as a standard method of operation without legitimate justification. The auditors also evaluated whether any such actions were presented to subjects as routine without providing an explanation or basis

SCT-6: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The subject's primary spoken language was Spanish. The Department member acknowledged the language barrier, continued to communicate with the subject, and escorted him from the vehicle. The subject was cooperative and asked the Department member why he was being detained. The Department member advised the subject it was due to not having a license. After the Department member conducted a weapons pat-down, he advised the subject he was going to place him in the back seat of the patrol vehicle and the subject agreed. The Department member did not provide the subject with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-7: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for tinted windows. The subject's primary spoken language was Spanish. The Department member acknowledged the language barrier, continued to communicate with the subject, and advised him he was going to have him step out of the vehicle to verify his license. The Department member conducted a consent search of the subject and placed him in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The Department member did not provide the subject with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-8: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to stop at a stop sign. As the Department members approached the vehicle, they saw the subject reaching around inside of the vehicle. The Department member immediately escorted the subject from the vehicle, conducted a weapon pat down, and asked him why he drove away at the sight of the patrol vehicle. The subject denied the action, and the Department member stated, "For now have a seat in the back of my car." The Department member did not provide the subject with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-12: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The Department member immediately recognized two of the three subjects as being on probation and parole. The Department members escorted the three subjects from the vehicle, conducted a weapons pat down, and placed them in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The Department members discussed amongst each other the subjects' previous evading; however, they did not provide the subjects with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-13: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The Department members escorted the subject from the subject's vehicle, conducted a probation search of his person and then placed him in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The Department member did not provide the subject with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-15: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a vehicle theft investigation. The subject advised the Department member of his probation status. The Department member escorted the subject from the vehicle and conducted a probation search. After the search concluded the Department member stated, "I'm just going to have you have a seat in the back of my car," and the subject agreed. The Department member did not provide the subject with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-21: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department members escorted the subject from the vehicle and conducted a consent search of his person. After the search, the Department member began to explain the reason for the BSD, but the subject interrupted and stated, "you're good, I don't care." The Department member did not provide the subject with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-28: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. Since the subject did not have his license on him, the Department member had the subject step out of the vehicle. The Department member conducted a search of the subject and placed him in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The Department member did not provide the subject with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-36: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a vehicle theft investigation. The Department member was late in activating his BWC and, at the time of activation, the Department member had already escorted the subject and placed him in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. Once the Department member activated his BWC and began a vehicle theft investigation, he told the subject he was "back here" because the vehicle was reported stolen. Due to the late activation and the Department members' statement, auditors were unable to determine if the subject was provided with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-50: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. Assisting Department members arrived at the traffic stop and placed the subjects in custody. During the detention, the Department member advised one of the subjects "we are going to find out who you are" and placed him in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The other Department member instructed the second subject to take a seat in the patrol vehicle. The Department members did not provide the subjects with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-62: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member told the subject to sit in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. When the subject asked why, the Department member stated, "Because you don't have a license and also the registration." The Department member did not provide the subject with a reason for the BSD.

SCT-64: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for misuse of vehicle registration. The Department members removed the unlicensed subject from the vehicle and conducted a consent search. After the search concluded, the Department member told the subject "Sit back here" and continued his investigation. The Department member did not provide the subject with a reason for the BSD.

Recommendations

SCT management must conduct formal briefings to reinforce BSDs should only be used when necessary and fully justified. The briefings should include scenarios in which the use of BSDs would be appropriate, such as flight risk, officer safety, weather conditions, or the subject's desire for privacy or personal safety. Alternatively, scenarios when BSDs would be inappropriate should also be briefed such as instances where the detention is used as a routine investigative practice, based solely on probation/parole status or lack of identification.

In addition, it is recommended the Department implement an MDC/CAD and Sheriff's Automated Contact Report system (SACR) function requiring Department members to digitally attest that they have clearly explained to subjects the reason for being placed in the back seat of a patrol vehicle. This procedure is also stipulated in the *Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 5-09/520.10, Backseat Detentions*.

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

Criteria

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 5-09/520.10 - Backseat Detentions (July 2018) 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 back seat. 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.

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.*

Per the criteria for this objective, BSDs shall only be used when:

- The detained person may pose a threat of physical harm.
- The detained person is an escape risk.
- There is a risk of the officer's safety.
- An individual is provided the option of sitting in the back seat due to weather conditions or the individual's desire for privacy.

Procedures

The auditors examined 67 stops and detentions for SCT that occurred during the audit period. Based on BWC recordings, the auditors identified 17 stops and detentions in which 20 BSDs occurred. Additionally, the auditors analyzed MDC data entered by Department members during these stops and detentions, identifying one (1) MDC log entry where a BSD was documented using contact type "B" (BSD: Vehicle, Pedestrian, or Bicycle stops). A review of the BWC recording indicated a BSD occurred for the corresponding MDC log entry. As a result, it was part of the 20 BSDs the auditors identified through the BWC recordings.

The auditors evaluated the 20 BSDs identified to determine whether the Department member appropriately identified each subject placed in a BSD and documented the correct contact-type code.

Additionally, the auditors determined whether the Department members articulated a factual justification for placing the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The auditors also evaluated whether the justification was based on reasonable or factually supported assertions that the subject posed a threat of physical harm or was considered an escape risk.

Findings

One (1%) of the 21 BSDs occurred met the criteria for this objective because the Department member, appropriately identified in the MDC data, each subject on whom a BSD was conducted, articulated a factual justification, and documented the appropriate contact type code. The remaining 20 (99%) of the 21 BSDs which occurred did not meet the criteria for this objective because the Department member did not identify in the MDC data, each subject on whom a BSD was conducted, the factual justification was not articulated, and the incorrect contact type code was documented.

Specifically:

SCT-1: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member placed the subjects in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. Both subjects were documented in the MDC data; however, one subject was listed as contact type code "D" (Detainee- Driver) and a factual justification for the BSD was not articulated in the MDC narrative for either subject, resulting in two findings.

SCT-4: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for loitering on public property. Department members placed the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. They identified and documented the subject in the MDC data; however, they did not articulate a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative.

SCT-6: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The Department member placed the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The subject was identified in the MDC data; however, the subject was listed as contact type code "D" (Detainee- Driver) and a factual justification for the BSD was not articulated in the MDC narrative.

SCT-7: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for tinted windows. The Department member placed the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The subject was identified in the MDC data; however, the subject was listed as contact type code "D" (Detainee- Driver) and a factual justification for the BSD was not articulated in the MDC narrative.

SCT-8: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to stop at a stop sign. Department members placed the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The subject was identified in the MDC data; however, the subject was listed as contact type code "D" (Detainee- Driver) and a factual justification for the BSD was not articulated in the MDC narrative.

SCT-10: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The Department members did not identify in the MDC narrative or data fields a BSD occurred. The BSD length of time was also inaccurate. The data stated the subject was detained for approximately 10 minutes; however, the BSD length based on auditors reviewing BWC recordings was 30 minutes. Additionally, the subject was listed as contact type "A" (Suspicious Circumstance- Family Abuse) and search authority code "A" (Incident to Arrest) was used. The Department members also did not provide a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative.

SCT-12: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. Three subjects were placed in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. All three subjects were listed in the MDC narrative; however, only two were documented in the MDC data. The two that were identified in MDC data were incorrectly documented as contact type code "D" (Detainee – Driver). Additionally, the Department members did not provide a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative, resulting in 3 findings.

SCT-13: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The subject was placed in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The Department members identified the subject in the MDC data; however, they documented the subject as contact type code "D" (Detainee- Driver). The BSD length of time was also inaccurate. The data stated the subject was detained for approximately 10 minutes. The duration is unknown due to the Department members deactivating their BWC prior to the completion of the stop. Additionally, the Department members did not provide a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative.

SCT-15: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a vehicle theft investigation. The subject was placed in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The subject was identified and documented in the MDC narrative and data; however, the Department member documented the subject as contact type code "D" (Detainee – Driver). Additionally, the Department member did not provide a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative.

SCT-21: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department members identified the subject in the MDC data; however, they documented the subject as contact type code "D" (Detainee – Driver). Additionally, the Department member did not provide a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative.

SCT-25: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a consensual encounter. During the encounter a detention occurred, and the Department members placed the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The Department members did not identify the BSD in the MDC narrative or data. The subject was also incorrectly documented as contact type code "C" (Backseat detention: Call for Service). Additionally, the Department member did not provide a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative.

SCT-28: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member placed the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The Department member did not identify the BSD in the MDC narrative or data field. The subject was also incorrectly documented as contact type code "D" (Detainee - Driver). Additionally, the Department member did not provide a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative.

SCT-36: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a vehicle theft investigation. The subject was placed in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The Department did not identify the BSD in the MDC narrative or data field. The subject was incorrectly documented as contact type code "A" (Suspicious Circumstance – Family Abuse). Additionally, the Department member did not provide a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative.

SCT-50: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. Two subjects were detained and placed in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. Both subjects were listed in the MDC narrative, however, only one was listed in the MDC data field. The Department member incorrectly documented the contact type code as "D" (Detainee – Driver) and did not provide a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative, resulting in two findings.

SCT-62: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The Department member placed the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The subject was identified in the MDC Data field; however, the Department member incorrectly documented as contact type "D" (Detainee – Driver). Additionally, the Department member did not provide a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative.

SCT-64: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for misuse of vehicle registration. The Department members placed the subject in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. The subject was not identified as a BSD in the MDC narrative or data field. Additionally, the Department member incorrectly documented the subject as contact type "D" (Detainee – Driver) and did not provide a factual justification for the BSD in the MDC narrative.

Recommendations

It is recommended SCT supervisors frequently and thoroughly brief Department members on the BSD policy to reinforce the MPP requirements. Supervisors must emphasize the need to document the factual justification for BSDs in the MDC narrative and SACR entries. The justification must include, either the detained person may pose a threat of physical harm, the detained person is an escape risk, there is a risk of the officer's safety, or the individual was provided the option of sitting in the back seat due to weather conditions or the individual's desire for privacy.

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

This objective included the evaluation of the MDC and SACR stop, and detention data entered by SCT Department members as specified in the MPP.

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

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...

Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 5-09/520.30 – Statistical Codes for Traffic, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Stops (March 2015), 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 evaluated the MDC clearance narratives of the 67 stops and detentions to determine whether the reason for the contact was included, and a brief description of the action taken by the Department member was documented. In addition, auditors determined whether the reason for the contact stated by the Department member in the BWC recording and the action taken by the Department member depicted on the BWC recording aligned with what was documented in the MDC narrative.

Findings

Fifty-two (78%) of the 67 stops and detentions met the criteria because the Department member documented the reason for the contact and gave a brief description of the action taken by the Department member. In addition, the reason for the contact stated by the Department member in the BWC recording and the action taken by the Department member as depicted on the BWC recording, aligned with what was documented in the MDC narrative. The remaining 15 (22%) did not meet the criteria for this objective.

Specifically:

SCT-1: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC narrative corresponded with the BWC recording; however, it did not provide the reason for the stop, nor account for the second subject.

SCT-3: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for unsafe lane change. The MDC narrative corresponded with the BWC recording; however, it did not provide the action taken by the Department members.

SCT-4: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a bicycle stop for loitering on public property. The MDC narrative corresponded with the BWC recording; however, it did not provide the reason for the stop.

SCT-12: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The MDC narrative corresponded with the BWC recording; however, it did not provide the reason for the stop.

SCT-13: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The MDC narrative included the reason for the stop and a brief description of the action taken by the Department members. However, auditors were unable to determine if the BWC matched due to the Department members deactivating their BWC prior to the release of the subject.

SCT-23: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for tinted windows. The MDC narrative corresponded with the BWC recording; however, it did not provide the subjects information or outcome of the stop.

SCT-25: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a consensual encounter. The consensual encounter transitioned into a detention. The MDC narrative corresponded with the BWC recording; however, the reason for the detention and outcome of the stop was not provided.

SCT-28: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC narrative stated the reason for the stop and provided a brief description; however, the BWC recording did not match. The Department members conducted a vehicle search and a BSD of the subject.

SCT-33: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights during hours of darkness. The reason for the contact corresponded with the BWC recording. However, the brief description of the action taken by the Department member was not completely accurate. The Department member issued a notice of suspension to the subject.

SCT-36: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a vehicle theft investigation. The BWC recording corresponded with the MDC narrative; however, the brief description did not include the reason for the stop.

SCT-39: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights during hours of darkness. The MDC narrative corresponded with the BWC recording and included the reason for the stop. However, it did not provide a brief description of the action taken by the Department members.

SCT-43: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for tinted windows. The MDC narrative corresponded with the BWC recording and included the reason for the stop. However, it did not provide a brief description of the action taken by the Department members.

SCT-56: The stop consisted of a one-person unit with a Department member ride along engaging in a consensual encounter. The consensual encounter transitioned into a detention when the Department member discovered the subject had a warrant. The MDC narrative included the reason for the stop and provided a brief description of the action taken by the Department member. However, it did not match the BWC recording. The BWC recording depicted a second subject that was contacted and searched by the Department members.

SCT-57: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC narrative corresponded with the BWC recording and provided a brief description of the stop. However, the brief description did not include the reason for the stop.

SCT-61: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for non-operating lights. The MDC narrative corresponded with the BWC recording and provided a brief description of the stop. However, the brief description did not include the reason for the stop.

Recommendations

It is recommended Department supervisors regularly brief the MPP stipulation directing the Department members to properly document the reason for the stop along with a brief description of the action taken by the Department member in the MDC clearance narrative.

Objective No. 5(b) Accuracy of Stops and Detentions Data

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...

The auditors noted there is currently no written policy or directive requiring SACR entry data to be accurate. However, it is essential for the Department to prioritize accuracy to ensure the information collected and reported, as mandated under *California Assembly Bill 953*¹⁵ (CA AB 953), is reliable. As of June 26, 2025, the Department implemented a new policy, Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 3-01/140.00, Deputy Stops – Government Code Section 12525.5, which explicitly requires sworn personnel to “ensure the data input into the CAD and SACR system are consistent and accurate.” This new policy requirement will be used in future audits.

Procedures

The auditors evaluated 67 stops and detentions to determine the type of stop, length of time of all BSDs, and the duration of each stop and detention, and compared it to the corresponding BWC recording to ensure accuracy.

In addition, for the 67 stops and detentions, the auditors evaluated all SACR entry data including, but not limited to, the type of stops, the number of subjects detained, and the length of time of all BSDs. The SACR entry data was compared with the corresponding BWC recording to ensure accuracy.

Findings

Thirteen (19%) of the 67 stops and detentions met the criteria because auditors determined the SACR entry data corresponded with the BWC recordings. The remaining 54 (81%) stops and detentions did not meet the criteria for this objective, because the Department members did not accurately document the stop and detention in the SACR entry.

¹⁵ CA - 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

Specifically:

SCT-1: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The BWC recording was deactivated prior to the release of the second subject. Auditors were unable to determine the length of the BSD from the MDC data. Furthermore, the SACR entry did not reflect a BSD had occurred.. The BWC recording showed a BSD occurred with the second subject and a search of the primary subject's person and vehicle was conducted.

SCT-2: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC data stated a bike stop occurred. The SACR entry has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The search of the subject and the BSD was not documented.

SCT-3: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for unsafe lane change. The MDC data has the name of the subject entered incorrectly. Auditors are unable to determine the entire accuracy of the SACR entry data due to the late activation of BWC.

SCT-4: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a stop for loitering on public property. The MDC data stated the stop was a bicycle stop; however, the subject was seated at a table when contacted. The search was articulated as search authority code "A" (Incident to Arrest) however the knowledge of the warrant occurred after the search.

SCT-5: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The subject was asked if he was on Probation or Parole, his property was seized, he was escorted from the vehicle and both a search of his person and property were conducted.

SCT-7: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving with tinted windows. The MDC data stated no vehicle search occurred; however, a search did occur. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. A BSD occurred and was not documented.

SCT-8: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to stop at a posted sign. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department member asked for consent to search the subject's property.

SCT-9: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for disobeying traffic signals. The MDC data stated one min of a BSD, and a "C" (Consent Search) occurred. However, no BSD occurred and a "W" (Weapons Pat down) search occurred. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-10: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The MDC data did not accurately correspond to the BWC for several data fields. The stat code indicated only one SACR entry was needed when there should have been two. The Department members classified the contact type as "A" (Suspicious Circumstance – Family Abuse) and the search authority type as "A" (Incident to Arrest). The length of the BSD and duration of the stop was stated as ten minutes but according to the BWC, the duration was 30 minutes. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The search of the subject was not indicated.

SCT-11: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a probation compliance check. The MDC data stated a bicycle stop occurred; however, the subject was outside of his vehicle. The vehicle search authority code indicates no search occurred; however, the vehicle was searched by an assisting unit on scene. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-12: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department member inquired about the subjects Probation or Parole status, ran the name of the stopped passenger, and conducted both a search of the subject and the vehicle.

SCT-13: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The MDC data stated the BSD occurred for ten minutes; however, auditors were unable to determine the duration due to the Department members deactivating their BWC prior to the release of the subject. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department member inquired about the subjects Probation or Parole status and indicated the BSD occurred for ten minutes.

SCT-14: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for lane straddling. The MDC data indicated the reason for the stop was due to a warrant on the plate. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Reason for contact" and "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" fields. The fields indicate the stopped person was a passenger in the vehicle. The Department member also inquired about the subjects Probation or Parole status.

SCT-15: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a vehicle theft investigation. The MDC data accurately corresponds to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. A search of the subject and vehicle were not documented.

SCT-17: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failure to display license plates. The MDC data accurately corresponds to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Reason for contact" field. The Department member indicated the stop was due to a consensual encounter.

SCT-19: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC data accurately corresponds to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department member asked for consent to search the subject's property.

SCT-21: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Reason for contact" and "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" fields. The Department member documented both subjects as passengers in the vehicle. Additionally, the Department member did not document the BSD, the search of the subject's property, or the inquiry of the subject's probation or parole status.

SCT-22: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a pedestrian stop for trespassing on posted property. The MDC data accurately corresponded with the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department members did not document the request to conduct a consent search of the subject, or the search conducted.

SCT-23: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for window tint. The MDC data indicated a "C" (Consent Search) occurred; however, no search occurred. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the duration of the stop. The Department member indicated the stop was 29 minutes. The stop was approximately six minutes in length.

SCT-24: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for unsafe lane change. The MDC data stated one minute of a BSD occurred; however, no BSD occurred. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-25: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a consensual encounter with a pedestrian. The MDC data accurately corresponded with the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Reason for contact" and "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" fields. The Department member stated the reason for the stop was for possession of a dirk or dagger. Additionally, the BSD and request to conduct a consent search of the subject were not documented.

SCT-26: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for speeding. The MDC data stated one minute of a BSD occurred; however, no BSD occurred. The SACR entry data matched the BWC recording.

SCT-28: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department member did not document the request to consent search the subject's vehicle or the search conducted on the subject and the vehicle.

SCT-29: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a vehicle theft investigation. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department member documented a request to consent search the subject; however, consent was not requested. The Department member conducted a weapon pat down of the subject. Additionally, the Department member did not document a search was conducted.

SCT-30: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department members did not document the search of the subject.

SCT-31: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a broken taillight. The MDC data stated one minute of a BSD occurred; however, no BSD occurred. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the duration of the stop and the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The duration documented by the Department member is approximately 15 minutes. According to the BWC recording, the duration was 37 minutes. The Department member also did not document his request to search the subject with consent and the inquiry of the subject's probation or parole status.

SCT-32: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving with a cell phone in hand. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department member did not document the inquiry of the subject's probation or parole status.

SCT-33: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights in hours of darkness. The MDC data stated a consent search, one minute of a BSD, and an inquiry of the subject's probation and parole status occurred. However, neither was observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data corresponded accurately to the BWC recording.

SCT-36: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a vehicle theft investigation. The MDC data accurately corresponded with the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Reason for Contact" and "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" fields. The Department member stated a "Traffic Violation" occurred and should have documented "Reasonable suspicion that the person was engaged in criminal activity" field. Additionally, the Department member inquired about the probation or parole status of the subject but did not document it. The duration of the stop could not be determined due to deactivated BWC recordings.

SCT-37: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for speeding. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data corresponded accurately to the BWC recording.

SCT-38: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights in hours of darkness. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry corresponded accurately to the BWC recording.

SCT-41: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for lane straddling. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-42: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for loitering. The MDC data listed the contact type of the subject as "P" (Party – Domestic Violence). According to the BWC recording there was no evidence of a Domestic Violence incident. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-44: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a consensual encounter. The MDC data listed the contact type code of the subject as "C" (BSD – Call for Service) and a one-minute duration for the BSD. According to the BWC recording both are inaccurate. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-45: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights in hours of darkness. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-47: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the duration and "Reason for Contact" field. The Department member stated the duration of the stop was three minutes. According to the BWC recording the duration was approximately 11 minutes. The Department member reversed the subject's personal information on the SACR entries.

SCT-48: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for littering on public property. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department member listed the wrong last name for the male subject and did not document the request to search the subject's property with consent including the search conducted.

SCT-49: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-50: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC data has various inaccuracies to include the contact type, name, date of birth, and search authority code. Additionally, the second subject is not listed at all in the MDC data. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Person Information", "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact", and "Result of Contact" fields. The Department member entered the incorrect name of the subject and stated no force or non-force actions were taken. Auditors were unable to determine the result of the contact due to early deactivation of the BWC recording.

SCT-51: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department members did not document the search of the subject.

SCT-52: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for lane straddling. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-53: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights in hours of darkness. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The Department member conducted a "W" (Weapons pat down). The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-54: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for disobeying traffic signals. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-55: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving without headlights in hours of darkness. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-56: The stop consisted of a one-person unit with a Department member ride-a-long conducting a consensual encounter with a pedestrian. The consensual encounter transitioned into a detention when the Department member discovered the subject had a warrant for her arrest. The BWC recording depicted two subjects that are contacted, and the MDC data indicated one. The SACR entry data had inaccuracies in the "Reason for Contact" and "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" fields. The Department member did not ask for consent to search the subject. The Department member also did not create an entry data for the second subject.

SCT-57: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The BWC recording depicts two subjects that are contacted; however, the MDC data only indicates one subject. The Department member stated no search occurred; however, an "A" (Incident to Arrest) search should be documented. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" and "Basis of the Search" fields. The Department member stated a BSD occurred for 15 minutes along with a request to search the subject. The BWC recording did not depict a consent search occurring. The Department member also did not create an entry for the second subject.

SCT-58: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for speeding. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-60: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for speeding. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-62: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for expired registration. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact", "Basis for Search", and "Result of Contact" fields. The Department member did not document the request to search the subject and their property, along with their answers. The Department member indicated the basis for the search was regarding "incident to arrest." The result of contact ended in an in-field cite and release, however it was not documented.

SCT-63: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for a broken license plate lamp. The MDC data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact", "Result of Contact", and duration of the stop fields. The duration documented is approximately ten minutes. The BWC recording depicts approximately 28 minutes. The Department member inquired about the subject's probation or parole status and conducted a search of the subject, neither were documented on the SACR entry data. The Department member also did not document the in-field cite and release of the subject.

SCT-64: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for misuse of vehicle registration. The MDC data indicates the BSD is ten minutes, according to the BWC the BSD is approximately 20 minutes. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the duration of the stop, "Person Information", and "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" fields. The Department member indicated the length of the stop is five minutes in length. The BWC depicts the length at approximately 35 minutes. The Department members also did not document the BSD or the student status of the subject.

SCT-65: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for failing to yield to oncoming traffic. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department member also inquired about the subject's probation or parole status.

SCT-66: The stop consisted of a one-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for speeding. The MDC data stated a consent search and one minute of a BSD occurred; however, neither were observed on the BWC recording. The SACR entry data accurately corresponded to the BWC recording.

SCT-67: The stop consisted of a two-person unit conducting a vehicle stop for driving under the influence. The MDC data stated a BSD occurred for approximately 30 minutes; however, according to the BWC recording a BSD documentation was not appropriate. The subject was arrested upon detention. The SACR entry data has inaccuracies in the "Actions taken non-force by deputy during contact" field. The Department member indicated a BSD occurred for approximately 30 minutes. As stated, prior, BSD documentation is not appropriate.

Recommendations

It is recommended Department supervisors regularly brief the MPP stipulation directing the Department members to ensure the stop data that is documented in the MDC clearance and SACR entry is accurate and corresponds with what was depicted in the BWC recordings. The accuracy of the stop date in SACR is paramount given the legal obligation the Department has for accurate recording of all stops activity.

CONCLUSION

Stops and detentions are a fundamental aspect of law enforcement and must be conducted with accuracy, impartiality, and transparency to preserve public trust and uphold the integrity of the Department. Auditors approached the evaluation of SCT with an unbiased review, while emphasizing adherence to policy and procedures remains central in all interactions with the community.

Department members have shown genuine concern regarding the activation of BWCs and the importance of informing subjects of the reason for their detention. In two-person units, both Department members must understand they are individually responsible for documenting public contacts, regardless of whether their partner has activated their BWC.

Auditors observed Department members are establishing reasonable grounds when requesting consent to search subjects and property consistent with situational requirements. However, greater diligence is needed in documenting not only the request itself but also the outcomes and correct contact and search authority codes of their stops and detentions. Department members appear to have become routine in their approach to documentation, and it must be emphasized that, while stops and detentions may appear similar, each one is unique and should be recorded accordingly.

Back-seat detentions emerged as an area of concern, particularly regarding Department members' understanding of applicable policies. Procedures and justification for placing individuals in the back seat must be thoroughly re-briefed to ensure Department members are fully aware of the appropriate circumstances and required documentation.

While Department members demonstrate strong operational knowledge, there appears to be a gap, either in understanding or habit, when it comes to documenting stops and procedures with the necessary attention to detail. SCT Supervisors must consistently reinforce to both new and seasoned Department members the critical importance of accurate, thorough documentation. This not only protects the Department member but also ensures transparency for any internal or external review.

All stops and detentions must be documented completely and consistently across both MDC and SACR databases. Relying on a single database, especially when discrepancies arise between systems, invites questions about the accuracy of the report and may infer doubt on the competency of the Department member involved.

With targeted follow-up training and consistent leadership from SCT supervisors, the unit is well-positioned to become an exemplary station within the Department.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the progress of the SCT 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 the Department revise the current BWC policy (*MPP 3-06/200.08, Body Worn Cameras – Activation*), enabling patrol station supervisors to conduct routine audits of BWC recordings. This revision is proposed to ensure Department members comply with Department policy requirements. It is imperative for Department members to activate their BWCs, prior to initiating, or upon arrival at, any enforcement or investigative contact, to capture the entirety of the contact with the public as defined in the Department policy. Furthermore, SCT supervisors should consider implementing corrective action plans to address Department members who frequently fail to comply with BWC policy. Such measures may include documenting these violations in a Performance Log Entry (PLE) or initiating an Administrative Investigation, when applicable.
- (b) **Stating the Reason for the Stop (AB2773):** It is recommended SCT supervisors regularly brief Department members on CA-AB 2773 (effective January 1, 2024,) and document these briefings in the Stations' Watch Commander's Log. During the Daily Stop Audits, SCT supervisors must ensure Department members are stating the reason for the stop. If a stop and detention is dynamic at the initiation of a stop, it is important to provide the subject with the reason for the stop once the situation has de-escalated. Department members must be reminded the reason for the stop must be clearly stated prior to engaging in questioning related to a criminal investigation or traffic violation. Department members who repeatedly fail to comply should be held accountable through verbal counseling and/or appropriate written documentation, when applicable.

SCT must develop and implement a record log to ensure the Watch Commanders and Watch Sergeants conduct the Daily Stops Audit as directed by the Assistant Sheriff of Patrol Operations. The record log will serve as a tool for supervisors to reference if written corrective action is needed. Maintaining a detailed record log will ensure that audits are conducted to promptly address corrective actions. Additionally, the log will provide a record for review and analysis over time.

- (c) **Completeness of BWC Recordings:** It is recommended Department members make a concerted effort to consistently keep their BWC activated during a stop and detention, from beginning to end. SCT Department members must be reminded to narrate the reason for any BWC deactivations during the stop and detention. SCT supervisors should continue to conduct practical application exercises to ensure Department members understand the proper procedures for activating and deactivating their BWCs. Supervisors must also include training on the guidelines for BWC deactivation. 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 emphasize how the completeness of BWC recordings can mitigate risk for both the Department and its members.

During the Daily Stop Audits, station supervisors must check to ensure the completeness of Department members' BWC recordings. Department members who demonstrate a pattern of noncompliance must be held accountable through verbal counseling and/or appropriate written documentation, as applicable.

Objective No. 2 – Consent Searches

- (a) **Consent Search Reasonableness (Person Searches):** There are no recommendations because the auditors determined that all 28 of the consent person searches were reasonable.
- (b) **Consent Search MDC Documentation (Person Searches):** It is recommended SCT implement a training program which emphasizes the importance of accurate documentation of searches. The training should focus on articulating clear and consistent documentation in the MDC log clearance and SACR entries. Specifically, it should include providing detailed reasons in the narrative section for seeking consent, utilizing the correct search authority codes, and ensuring documentation is consistent with corresponding BWC recordings. Additionally, Department members need to be aware of the differences between a weapons pat-down search and a consensual search. This training should be documented in either an Automated Personnel In-Service (APIS) roster or an acknowledgment of training form.
- (c) **Consent Search Reasonableness Documentation (Vehicle Searches):** There are no recommendations because the auditors determined that all 14 of the vehicle consent searches were reasonable.

- (d) **Consent Search MDC Documentation (Vehicle Searches):** It is recommended SCT implement a training program emphasizing the importance of accurate documentation of consent searches. The training should focus on articulating clear and consistent documentation in the MDC log clearance and SACR entries, including providing detailed reasons in the narrative section for seeking consent, utilizing the correct search codes, and ensuring documentation is consistent with review of BWC recordings. This training should be documented in either an APIS roster or an acknowledgment of training form.

Objective No. 3 – Probation or Parole Searches

- (a) **Knowledge of Probation or Parole Search Conditions:** There are no recommendations because the auditors determined that, in all 19 probation or parole searches, Department members had prior knowledge of the subjects' search conditions prior to conducting the search.
- (b) **Probation or Parole Search MDC Documentation:** It is recommended SCT implement a training program which emphasizes the importance of accurate and consistent documentation of probation or parole searches. The training should focus on correct use of search authority codes in the MDC log clearances, accurate documentation in the SACR entries, alignment between documentation and BWC recording, and reinforcing verification of search conditions prior to conducting searches. This training should be documented in either an APIS training roster or an acknowledgment of training form.

Objective No. 4 – Backseat Detentions

- (a) **Explanation of Backseat Detentions to Subjects:** SCT management must conduct formal briefings to reinforce BSDs should only be used when necessary and fully justified. The briefings should include scenarios in which the use of BSDs would be appropriate, such as flight risk, officer safety, weather conditions, or the subject's desire for privacy or personal safety. Alternatively, scenarios when BSDs would be inappropriate should also be briefed such as instances where the detention is used as a routine investigative practice, based solely on probation/parole status or lack of identification.

In addition, it is recommended the Department implement an MDC/CAD and Sheriff's Automated Contact Report system (SACR) function requiring Department members to digitally attest that they have clearly explained to subjects the reason for being placed in the back seat of a patrol vehicle. This procedure is also stipulated in the Manual of Policy and Procedures, Section 5-09/520.10, Backseat Detentions.

- (b) **MDC Documentation of Backseat Detentions:** It is recommended SCT supervisors frequently and thoroughly brief Department members on the BSD policy to reinforce the MPP requirements. Supervisors must emphasize the need to document the factual justification for BSDs in the MDC narrative and SACR entries. The justification must include, either the detained person may pose a threat of physical harm, the detained person is an escape risk, there is a risk of the officer's safety, or the individual was provided the option of sitting in the back seat due to weather conditions or the individual's desire for privacy.

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

- (a) **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 along with a brief description of the action taken by the Department member in the MDC clearance narrative.
- (b) **Accuracy of Stops and Detentions Data:** It is recommended Department supervisors regularly brief the MPP stipulation directing the Department members to ensure the stop data that is documented in the MDC clearance and SACR entry is accurate and corresponds with what was depicted in the BWC recordings. The accuracy of the stop date in SACR is paramount given the legal obligation the Department has for accurate recording of all stops activity.

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 (May 2017)
 - 5-09/520.10 – Backseat Detentions (July 2018)
 - 5-09/520.25 – Logging Field Activities (May 2017)
 - 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 July 29, 2025, the AAB presented the findings to the SCT command staff. The AAB presented the final audit report to the Division Director, Office of Constitutional Policing.



10/03/2025

GEOFFREY N. CHADWICK

DATE

Captain

Audit and Accountability Bureau

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department