



ROBERT G. LUNA, SHERIFF

LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

Part II of Stops and Detentions Audit:

Supervisory Review of Deputy's Daily Worksheet
Antelope Valley Stations

Project No. 2025-5-A

Prepared By:

Audit and Accountability Bureau



2025

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

**Part II of Stops and Detentions Audit:
Supervisory Review of Deputy's Daily Worksheet
Antelope Valley Stations
Project No. 2025-5-A**

AUDIT REPORT

PURPOSE

The Audit and Accountability Bureau (AAB) conducted the Stops and Detentions Audit under the authority of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD or the Department), pursuant to the United States Department of Justice (US-DOJ) Antelope Valley (AV) Settlement Agreement (Agreement)¹ Paragraph 149, which states:

The Monitor shall... determine whether LASD has implemented and continues to comply with the material requirements of this Agreement... Where appropriate, the monitor will make use of audits conducted by the [Audit and Accountability Bureau] taking into account the importance of internal auditing capacity and independent assessment of this agreement.

The Stops and Detentions Audit was conducted in five separate audits (Part I, II, III, IV, and V) to provide timely feedback to Lancaster and Palmdale Stations (AV Stations). Each of the five audits addresses the requirements of the Agreement. This audit, designated as Part II, specifically focused on the evaluation of supervisory reviews of the Deputy's Daily Worksheet (DDWS)² and the AV Stations' compliance with Section III, paragraphs 58 through 63 of the Agreement.

The Stops and Detentions Audits were conducted in the following manner:

Part	Audit
I	Backseat Detentions
II	Supervisory Review of Deputy's Daily Worksheet
III	Backseat Detentions Related to Domestic Violence
IV	Initiation of Stops and Detentions Related to Consent Searches
V	Initiation of Stops and Detentions Related to Probation or Parole Searches

¹ [Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, No. CV 15-03174, United States v. Los Angeles County et al. \(D.C. Cal. April 28, 2015\)](#)

² The DDWS is a permanent, electronic detailed record of a patrol unit's activities during a shift. DDWS is one of the functions inside the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system, which generates a report based on calls for services assigned to a patrol unit or Observation records created by the patrol deputy.

For this audit, the population time period reviewed was December 1, 2024, through December 31, 2024.

BACKGROUND

On April 28, 2015, the County of Los Angeles, the Department, and the US-DOJ entered into the Agreement with the goal of ensuring police services are provided to the AV community in a manner which fully complies with the Constitution and laws of the United States. The Department is responsible for implementing the mandated stipulations of the Agreement, ensuring both public and Department member safety, while fostering a renewed public confidence in the LASD.

The AAB was authorized by the Sheriff of Los Angeles County, the US-DOJ, and the AV Monitoring Team (MT) to conduct audits of the Department. To improve efficiency and effectiveness, the AAB shifted its audit approach from conducting full-scale audits to limited scope audits. These limited scope audits focus on a narrow set of audit objectives and specific audit populations, which are referred to by the AAB as “mini” audits. The purpose of the mini audits was intended to provide timely feedback to the AV Stations, facilitate opportunities for operational improvements, and demonstrate an increasing commitment toward meeting the established AV Compliance Metrics (compliance metrics).

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The Department recognizes the importance of evaluating Department members' actions when interacting with members of the public. Department members' interactions with the AV community are essential to developing and maintaining community trust. This audit provided an opportunity to identify areas for process improvement and implement corrective actions where necessary. An audit work plan was submitted to the MT and the US-DOJ 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 whether the evidence obtained was sufficient and appropriate to provide a reasonable basis for the findings based on the audit objectives.

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 evaluated the AV Stations' supervisory review of deputies' documentation related to stops, seizures, and searches.

The audit scope focused on the following:

- Sergeants conducted weekly audits of at least one DDWS, involving stops, seizures, and search activities (if applicable) for each deputy under their supervision.
- Sergeants reviewed citations and arrest reports identified in the weekly audit of at least one DDWS and determined whether the supervisor took corrective action for errors and deficiencies.
- Errors identified on the DDWS were documented by sergeants on the DDWS – Log Compliance Checks form.
- Sergeants documented any corrective actions taken in response to errors on the DDWS – Log Compliance Checks form.
- Sergeants reviewed the DDWS for sufficient legal and Department policy justification.
- Watch Commanders reviewed the DDWS audits to ensure they were completed accurately.
- AV Station management tracked repeated violations or deficiencies related to stops, seizures, and search procedures, and documented any corrective actions taken.

Audit Population and Sample

The selected audit period was from December 1, 2024, through December 31, 2024. The auditors selected the first two weeks of December to ensure a relevant population and provide meaningful results to the AV Stations.

Auditors requested the Stations' DDWS – Log Compliance Checks and DDWS for the two-week audit period. The Stations submitted the following documents:

- Lancaster
 - DDWS – Log Compliance Checks = 15
 - DDWS – Two-week audit period = 48
- Palmdale
 - DDWS – Log Compliance Checks = 47
 - DDWS – Two-week audit period = 178

Auditors used the Employee Performance Evaluation Tracking System (EPETS)⁴ Assigned Raters Reports and completed DDWS – Log Compliance Checks to verify the population of sergeants, rated deputies, and DDWS' that were submitted.

Lancaster Station did not submit DDWS – Log Compliance Checks and DDWS' for a cumulative total of 25 sergeants and 196 deputies for the two weeks that were evaluated. A follow-up request was sent to Lancaster Station for the missing documentation, requesting an explanation if the documents were unavailable or not applicable. Lancaster Station did not provide any additional DDWS – Log Compliance Checks.

Palmdale Station did not submit DDWS – Log Compliance Checks and DDWS' for a cumulative total of 8 sergeants and 16 deputies for the two-week audit period. A follow-up request was sent to Palmdale Station for the missing documentation, requesting an explanation if the documents were unavailable or not applicable. Palmdale Station submitted 10 additional DDWS – Log Compliance Checks, which rated six deputies and resulted in six additional DDWS'. As a result, all DDWS – Log Compliance Checks and DDWS' for Palmdale Station were accounted for.

The documents submitted for the two selected weeks resulted in the following final audit sample population:

Audit Population and Sample

AV Stations	Date Range	DDWS Log Compliance Checks	DDWS'
Lancaster	12/01/24 – 12/07/24	8	25
	12/08/24 – 12/14/24	7	23
Palmdale	12/01/24 – 12/07/24	24	91
	12/08/24 – 12/14/24	23	87
AV Total		62	226

Auditors evaluated the total sample population of 62 DDWS – Log Compliance Checks and the corresponding 226 DDWS'.

The compliance check log and DDWS sample populations represented a population of 5 lieutenants, 14 sergeants, and 51 deputies at Lancaster Station; and 12 lieutenants, 34 sergeants, and 192 deputies at Palmdale Station.

⁴ EPETS is a Department-wide mandatory information system application. It is designed to assist units in ensuring annual and probationary performance evaluations of all LASD permanent County employees are completed in a timely manner.

The number of lieutenants and sergeants was established based on administrative documentation submitted and does not represent the number of supervising personnel assigned to the AV Stations. Several personnel were audited multiple times during this audit depending on the number of DDWS submitted.

Audit Procedures

The MT Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) published the “*Antelope Valley Monitoring Team First Stops and Bias-Free Policing Audit*,” report in 2024, which evaluated stops from the third quarter of 2021 and documented compliance metrics. During a meeting on April 2, 2025, the SMEs directed AAB to utilize those compliance metrics, noting they may differ from those used in previous AAB audit reports.

The auditors reviewed the DDWS' and the DDWS - Log Compliance Checks from the audit sample to determine whether the sergeants had audited at least one DDWS with stops, seizures, or search activities for each deputy under their supervision during the selected weeks. If the DDWS included in the sergeant's audit did not contain the required activities, auditors reviewed the deputy's other DDWS' for that week to verify whether relevant activities were performed. If a DDWS with the required activity was identified for that deputy, it was documented as an audit finding, indicating the sergeant did not properly conduct the audit.

Once the population of DDWS' with the required activities was identified, the auditors reviewed them to determine whether the DDWS contained errors related to stops, seizures or search procedures. To identify these errors, the auditors applied the compliance metric requirements outlined in the Agreement Paragraphs 41-57, which require proper documentation in the Mobile Digital Computer⁵ (MDC) system. After identifying potential errors in the DDWS, the auditors evaluated the corresponding DDWS - Log Compliance Checks to determine whether there were discrepancies between the auditors' findings and those documented by the reviewing sergeants. These discrepancies were documented as audit findings.

The auditors also reviewed the DDWS - Log Compliance Checks to evaluate whether the sergeants documented corrective actions for the errors they identified. The lack of corrective actions for identified errors were documented as audit findings.

Additionally, the DDWS - Log Compliance Checks were reviewed to determine whether the Watch Commander or Lieutenant had identified deficiencies in the sergeants' audits. Deficiencies identified by the auditors that were not documented by the Watch Commander were documented as audit findings.

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

Summary of Findings

This audit consisted of four main objectives with a total of seven sub-objectives. The AV Stations were evaluated separately for each sub-objective. The results were combined to assess whether, overall, the AV stations complied with the compliance metrics.

The table below indicates the audit objectives and its corresponding compliance metrics findings:

Summary of Compliance Metrics Findings

Obj. No.	Audit Objectives	Lancaster %	Palmdale %	AV Total	Compliance Metrics %
1	WEEKLY AUDITS OF DEPUTY'S DAILY WORKSHEET				
1(a)	<i>Sergeant's Weekly Audit of Deputy's DDWS</i>	9%	75%	33%	95%
1(b)	<i>Citations and Arrest Reports</i>	0%	0%	0% ⁶	95%
2	DEPUTY'S DAILY WORKSHEET COMPLIANCE CHECKS				
2(a)	<i>Stops, Seizures, and Searches Documentation Errors</i>	95%	90%	91%	95%
2(b)	<i>Review for Sufficient Legal and Department Policy Justification</i>	95%	100%	99%	95%
2(c)	<i>Documentation of Corrective Action</i>	95%	100%	99%	95%
3	WATCH COMMANDER REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE CHECKS				
3(a)	<i>Review of Compliance Checks</i>	53%	49%	50%	95%
4	TRACKING OF REPEATED VIOLATIONS				
4(a)	<i>Documentation of Repeated Violations⁷</i>	0%	0%	0%	N/A

The AAB acknowledges the compliance metrics may be subject to change in the future. The Auditors will adjust their methodology and criteria as necessary to align with any approved modifications agreed upon by all parties.

⁶ The compliance metric is 0% because arrest reports and citations were not reviewed by the assigned rater within the DDWS review process, as required by the Agreement. However, these documents are typically reviewed promptly by a sergeant and, at times, by multiple supervisory levels (e.g., Lieutenants, Detectives) prior to the rater's DDWS review. See Objective 1(b) for further detail.

⁷ The compliance metric percentage has not been established and agreed upon by the Department, US-DOJ, and MT therefore the auditors indicated this as Not Applicable (N/A).

Detailed Findings

This report provides detailed information on the findings noted during the audit for all objectives.

Objective No. 1 – Weekly Audits of Deputy's Daily Worksheet

This objective evaluated if AV sergeants audited at least one DDWS log involving stops, seizures, or search activities for each deputy under their supervision.

Objective No.1(a) – Sergeant's Weekly Audit of Deputy's DDWS

Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, Supervisory Review, Paragraph 59, states:

Sergeants assigned as raters shall regularly audit their assigned deputies' stop, search, and seizure documentation in addition to arrest reports and citations for completeness, accuracy, and legal sufficiency. Sergeants shall audit at least one CAD log for each deputy under their supervision each week. Sergeants shall conduct further review as indicated by weekly audits, PPI information and other indicia.

Lancaster Station Unit Order #69 and Palmdale Station Unit Order #14-06:

Sergeants shall audit at least one DDWS log involving stop, search and seizure activity (if any is conducted) for each deputy under their supervision each week.

The compliance metric for this objective is **95%**, as documented in the MT's "First Stops and Bias-Free Policing Audit," published in 2024.

Procedures

The auditors reviewed the DDWS and the DDWS – Log Compliance Checks in the sample to determine whether sergeants conducted a weekly audit of at least one DDWS involving a stops, seizures, or search activities (if any were conducted) for each deputy under their supervision.

When the sergeants indicated that a DDWS was not reviewed for a deputy due to various reasons (no civilian contacts, vacation, FMLA, desk assignment, etc.), auditors reviewed the Regional Allocation of Police Services⁸ (RAPSNET) to verify whether the deputies had any DDWS logs for that week that included applicable activity⁹ and therefore should have been reviewed by a sergeant.

For those deputies whose DDWS were reviewed as part of a compliance check, the auditors determined a number of DDWS submissions did not have any applicable activities. The auditors also reviewed RAPSNET to determine whether these deputies had any other DDWS' for the week that contained relevant activities and therefore should have been reviewed by a sergeant.

Findings

Lancaster Station did not submit DDWS – Log Compliance Checks and DDWS' for the cumulative total of 25 sergeants and 196 deputies. The Station reported they have experienced delays in completing DDWS audits due to ongoing staffing shortages and a heavy administrative workload. As a result, higher-priority tasks such as use-of force investigations, pursuits, and civil complaints have taken precedence. Command staff are actively working to streamline administrative processes to improve efficiency, and these efforts have already resulted in noticeable improvements in other areas.

The auditors identified 39 deputies from Lancaster Station whose DDWS' were not reviewed by a sergeant for various reasons as specified above. The auditors determined that eight (8) deputies had at least one DDWS with applicable activity that should have been reviewed by a sergeant.

When a deputy's DDWS was reviewed for a compliance check but did not document any applicable activity, the auditors cross-referenced RAPSNET to determine whether the deputy had any other DDWS' for the week which included applicable activity. The review yielded the following findings:

- For Lancaster Station, this applied to 31 deputies. The auditors determined that eight (8) deputies had at least one DDWS with applicable activity that should have been reviewed.
- For Palmdale Station, this applied to 88 deputies. The auditors determined that 30 deputies had at least one DDWS with applicable activity that should have been reviewed.

⁸ The RAPSNET application is an online system containing information that forms the official record of the Sheriff's Department's patrol unit activities generated from the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system.

⁹ Applicable activity are stops, seizures, or search activities.

Based on these findings for Lancaster Station, the auditors determined:

- Sergeants did not perform a review of the DDWS for 196 deputies.
- Sergeants reviewed a DDWS with applicable activity for 20 deputies.
- Sergeants reviewed a DDWS with no applicable activity for eight (8) deputies, even though the deputies had another DDWS with applicable activity that should have been reviewed.
- Eight (8) deputies did not have a DDWS reviewed for the week because the sergeants determined there was no applicable activity for various reasons; however, the deputies did have applicable activity.
- Twenty-three (23) deputies had no applicable activity for the week and were therefore noted as no incidents noted (NIN)¹⁰.

Therefore, for Lancaster Station, 20 (9%) of the 232 DDWS reviews met the criteria for this objective because the sergeants conducted a weekly audit of at least one DDWS involving stops, seizures, or search activities for each deputy under their supervision. The remaining 212 (91%) did not meet the criteria for this objective because the required reviews were not performed.

Based on these findings for Palmdale Station, the auditors determined:

- Sergeants reviewed a DDWS with applicable activity for 100 deputies.
- Sergeants reviewed a DDWS with no applicable activity for 30 deputies, even though the deputies had another DDWS with applicable activity that should have been reviewed.
- Sergeants reviewed a DDWS for the incorrect audit period for three (3) deputies.
- Fifty-Nine (59) deputies had no applicable activity for the week and were therefore noted as NIN.

Therefore, for Palmdale Station, 100 (75%) of the 133 DDWS reviews met the criteria for this objective because the sergeants conducted a weekly audit of at least one DDWS involving stops, seizures, or search activities for each deputy under their supervision. The remaining 33 (25%) did not meet the criteria for this objective because the required reviews were not performed.

For the AV Stations, a total of 120 (33%) of the 365 DDWS reviews were evaluated by the sergeants for the deputy's stops, seizures, or search activities. The AV Stations did not meet the criteria for this objective and are therefore not in compliance with the established compliance metric.

¹⁰ NIN stands for "No Incidents Noted."

Recommendations

The AV Stations should consider streamlining the review of DDWS logs by utilizing the Sheriff's Automated Contact Reporting (SACR) System¹¹ to identify stops, seizures and search activities, as it is less labor-intensive than the current process. In addition, AV Stations management must improve their DDWS log review procedures to ensure sergeants are thoroughly reviewing DDWS logs involving applicable activity. The watch commanders or lieutenants should be required to verify the DDWS logs were properly reviewed by the sergeants. The use of a checklist would be a helpful tool to guide the watch commander to ensure the critical elements such as stop clearance codes, narrative details and contact information were reviewed by the sergeant.

¹¹ 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.

Objective No. 1(b) – Citations and Arrest Reports

Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, Supervisory Review, Paragraph 59, states:

Sergeants assigned as raters shall regularly audit their assigned deputies' stop, search, and seizure documentation in addition to arrest reports and citations for completeness, accuracy, and legal sufficiency. Sergeants shall audit at least one CAD log for each deputy under their supervision each week. Sergeants shall conduct further review as indicated by weekly audits, PPI information and other indicia.

The compliance metric for this objective is **95%**, as documented in the MT's "First Stops and Bias-Free Policing Audit," published in 2024.

Procedures

The auditors utilized the stops, seizures, or search activities reviewed under Objective 1(a) to determine whether these activities resulted in an arrest or citation. If there was an arrest or citation, the auditors verified whether the assigned sergeant reviewed the related documents and whether the supervisor took any corrective action for errors and deficiencies.

Findings

For Lancaster Station, of the 20 deputies whose applicable activities were reviewed under Objective 1(a), the auditors identified 16 deputies who had an arrest or citation in their DDWS. The auditors attempted to verify whether the related documents were reviewed by the assigned sergeant and if the supervisor took any corrective action for errors and deficiencies. However, the compliance check logs did not specify whether the documents related to an arrest or citation were reviewed by the assigned sergeant. In addition, the auditors contacted the station and requested supporting documents on the review of arrests and citations. The auditors were informed that the arrests and citations were reviewed separately from the assigned Sergeants' DDWS review and did not provide documents that verified the review was completed by the assigned Sergeant. As a result, none (0%) of the 16 deputies who had an arrest or citation in their DDWS met the criteria for this objective.

For Palmdale Station, of the 100 deputies whose applicable activities were reviewed under Objective 1(a) above, the auditors identified 75 deputies who had an arrest or citation in their DDWS. The auditors attempted to verify whether the related documents were reviewed by the assigned sergeant and whether the supervisor took any corrective action for errors and deficiencies.

However, the compliance check logs did not specify whether the documents related to an arrest or citation were reviewed by the assigned sergeant. In addition, the auditors contacted the station and requested supporting documents on the review of arrests and citations. The auditors were informed that the arrests and citations were reviewed separate from the assigned Sergeants' DDWS review and did not provide documents that verified the review was completed by the assigned Sergeant. As a result, none (0%) of the 75 deputies who had an arrest or citation in their DDWS met the criteria for this objective.

For the AV Stations, none (0%) of the arrest reports or citations were reviewed by the assigned sergeant. The AV Stations did not meet the criteria for this objective and are therefore not in compliance with the established compliance metric.

Recommendations

AV Stations' management must continue to improve their DDWS processes and controls to ensure the sergeants conduct thorough reviews of the deputies' activities including review of the arrest reports and citations. Currently, the DDWS Compliance Check form does not have a specific area to confirm the arrest reports and citations were reviewed. It is recommended that AV Stations' captains revise the current DDWS Compliance Check process to require the sergeants verify the review of arrest reports and citations and note this on the associated form.

Objective No. 2 – Deputy's Daily Worksheet Compliance Checks

This objective evaluated whether AV sergeants took appropriate action to address all violations and deficiencies in stops, seizures, and search activities, as well as legal sufficiency, as documented on the DDWS.

Objective No. 2(a) – Stops, Seizures, and Searches Documentation Errors

Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, Supervisory Review, Paragraph 59, states:

Sergeants assigned as raters shall regularly audit their assigned deputies' stop, search, and seizure documentation in addition to arrest reports and citations for completeness, accuracy, and legal sufficiency. Sergeants shall audit at least one CAD log for each deputy under their supervision each week. Sergeants shall conduct further review as indicated by weekly audits, PPI information and other indicia.

The compliance metric for this objective is **95%**, as documented in the MT's "First Stops and Bias-Free Policing Audit," published in 2024.

Procedures

The auditors applied the compliance metric requirements outlined in Paragraphs 41-57 of the Agreement, which require MDC documentation, to determine whether there were errors on the DDWS. Subsequently, the auditors reviewed the DDWS – Log Compliance Checks to evaluate whether the same errors had been identified by the auditing sergeant.

Findings

For Lancaster Station, of the 20 deputies whose applicable DDWS activity was reviewed, auditors determined that sergeants accurately identified all applicable errors, if any, on 19 DDWS. Of the remaining one deputy, auditors determined the sergeant did not identify all stop, seizure, or search related errors on this one deputy's DDWS. Specifically, the sergeant failed to identify missing contact information for arrest and a SACR clearance code. Therefore, for Lancaster Station, 19 of the 20 (95%) met the criteria for this objective because the sergeant conducted a thorough DDWS review of the stop, seizure, or search activity for accuracy. However, the remaining one (5%) did not meet the criteria because the sergeant did not conduct a thorough DDWS review.

For Palmdale Station, of the 100 deputies whose applicable DDWS activity was reviewed, auditors determined that sergeants accurately identified all applicable errors, if any, on 90 DDWS. However, for the remaining 10 deputies, auditors noted the sergeants failed to identify the following errors:

Specifically,

- 3 errors for missing contact information fields for arrest or detention
- 2 errors for missing or incorrect clearance code
- 5 errors for incorrect or lack of documentation of contact information fields for type/reason for contact

For Palmdale Station, 90 of the 100 (90%) met the criteria for this objective because the sergeant conducted a thorough DDWS review of the stops, seizures, or search activities for accuracy. However, the remaining 10 (10%) did not meet the criteria because the sergeant did not conduct a thorough DDWS review.

For the AV Stations in total, 109 of the 120 (91%) sergeants conducted a weekly, thorough DDWS review of the stops, seizures, or search activities for accuracy. The AV Stations did not meet the criteria for this objective and are therefore not in compliance with the established compliance metrics.

Recommendations

It is recommended the AV Stations' captains must ensure sergeants continue to conduct thorough reviews of the deputies' activities and identify repeated violators. A corrective action plan should be implemented that includes specific action is taken when sergeants fail to adequately review the deputies' DDWS. The corrective actions must be defined with a focus on monitoring repeated violators for improvement in the DDWS review requirements.

Objective No. 2(b) – Review for Sufficient Legal and Department Policy Justification

Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, Supervisory Review, Paragraph 60, states:

If a deputy's stop, search, or seizure documentation does not provide sufficient detail or articulate sufficient legal and policy justification for the action, the supervisor shall review the action with the deputy to determine whether there was sufficient legal and LASD policy justification.

The compliance metric for this objective is **95%**, as documented in the MT's "First Stops and Bias-Free Policing Audit," published in 2024.

Procedures

The auditors reviewed the DDWS' and identified instances when the sergeant noted any stops, seizures, or search activities that lacked sufficient detail or did not articulate adequate legal and policy justification. The auditors then reviewed the DDWS – Log Compliance Check to determine whether the supervisor reviewed the action with the deputy and documented the discussion or other actions taken on the form.

Findings

For Lancaster Station, when conducting their reviews, sergeants identified stops, seizures, or search related errors, if any, for 19 of the 20 deputies. Of the remaining one deputy, auditors determined the sergeant did not identify the stop, seizure, or search related errors based on the findings above. Therefore, for Lancaster Station, 19 of the 20 (95%) DDWS reviews of legal sufficiency with the deputy were documented on the Compliance Check form.

For Palmdale Station, when conducting their reviews, sergeants identified stops, seizures, or search related errors, if any, for 93 deputies. In all 93 instances, the sergeant documented on the Compliance Check form the activity had been reviewed with the deputy. Therefore, for Palmdale Station, all 93 (100%) DDWS reviews of legal sufficiency with the deputy were documented on the Compliance Check form.

For the AV Stations in total, 112 of the 113 (99%) DDWS reviews of legal sufficiency with the deputy were documented on the Compliance Check form. Based on these results, the AV Stations met the criteria for this objective and are therefore in compliance with the established compliance metric.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the AV Stations met the established compliance metrics.

Objective No. 2(c) – Documentation of Corrective Action

Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, Supervisory Review, Paragraph 61:

Antelope Valley supervisors and commanders shall take appropriate action to address all violations or deficiencies in stops, searches, or seizures including non-disciplinary corrective action for the involved deputy, and/or refer the incident for disciplinary action.

The compliance metric for this objective is **95%**, as documented in the MT's "First Stops and Bias-Free Policing Audit," published in 2024.

Procedures

Auditors reviewed the DDWS - Log Compliance Checks to evaluate whether the sergeant documented corrective actions for stops, seizures, or search activities errors they identified on the DDWS.

Findings

For Lancaster Station, when conducting their reviews, sergeants identified stops, seizures, or searches related errors, if any, for 19 of the 20 deputies. Of the remaining one deputy, auditors determined the sergeant did not identify the stop, seizure, or search related errors based on the findings above in Objective 2(a). Therefore, for Lancaster Station, 19 of the 20 (95%) DDWS reviews documented the corrective action taken.

For Palmdale Station, when conducting their reviews, sergeants identified stops, seizures, or searches related errors, if any, for 93 deputies. In all 93 instances, the sergeant documented on the Compliance Check form, the activity had been reviewed with the deputy, and the corrective action taken regarding the errors. Therefore, for Palmdale Station, 93 of the 93 (100%) DDWS reviews documented the corrective action taken.

For the AV Stations in total, 112 of the 113 (99%) DDWS reviews documented the corrective action taken on the Compliance Check form. Based on these results, the AV Stations met the criteria for this objective and are therefore in compliance with the established compliance metric.

Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the AV Stations met the established compliance metrics.

Objective No. 3 – Watch Commander Review of Compliance Checks

This objective evaluated if AV Watch Commanders took appropriate action to address all violations and deficiencies in stops, seizures, or search activities documented on the DDWS.

Objective No. 3 (a) - Review of Compliance Checks

Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, Supervisory Review, Paragraph 61, states:

Antelope Valley supervisors and commanders shall take appropriate action to address all violations or deficiencies in stops, searches and seizures including non-disciplinary corrective action for the involved deputy, and/or referring the incident for disciplinary action.

Lancaster Unit Order #69 and Palmdale Station Unit Order #14-06:

Watch Commander/Lieutenant shall thoroughly review the log audits to ensure the sergeants are accurately auditing the deputy DDWS logs and note any issues in the Watch Commander signature line area of the form.

Sergeants assigned as raters shall audit their assigned deputies' stop, search, and seizure documentation for completeness, accuracy, and legal sufficiency. This includes log entries that were not coded as arrests, stops, searches, or seizures but should have been. If a deputy's stop, search, or seizure documentation does not provide sufficient detail or articulate sufficient legal and policy justification for the action, or contains abbreviations that are indiscernible, the supervisor shall review the action with the deputy to determine whether there was sufficient legal and LASD policy justification and to take corrective action.

The compliance metric for this objective is **95%**, as documented in the MT's "First Stops and Bias-Free Policing Audit," published in 2024.

Procedures

Auditors reviewed the DDWS - Log Compliance Checks to determine whether the Watch Commander identified deficiencies in the sergeant's audit. Any deficiencies found by the auditors but not documented by the Watch Commander were determined to be an audit finding.

Findings

For Lancaster Station, eight of the 15 (53%) Compliance Checks met the criteria for this objective because they did not contain any unidentified stop, seizure, or search related errors or lacked a review of a DDWS with applicable activity. The remaining 7 (47%) Compliance Checks did not meet the criteria for this objective because they contained unidentified stop, seizure, or search related errors or lacked a review of a DDWS with applicable activity.

For Palmdale Station, 23 of the 47 (49%) Compliance Checks met the criteria for this objective because they did not contain any unidentified stops, seizures, or searches related errors or lacked a review of a DDWS with applicable activity. The remaining 14 (51%) Compliance Checks did not meet the criteria for this objective because they contained unidentified stop, seizure, or search related errors or lacked a review of a DDWS with applicable activity.

For the AV Stations in total, 31 (50%) of the 62 Compliance Checks demonstrated evidence of a thorough DDWS review by the Watch Commander or Lieutenant. The AV Stations did not meet the criteria for this objective and are therefore not in compliance with the established metric.

Recommendations

It is recommended the AV Stations management continue to improve their DDWS review processes and controls to ensure the watch commanders or lieutenants are thoroughly reviewing DDWS logs involving stops, seizures, or search activities.

The stations must require the watch commanders or lieutenants to verify whether the sergeants are reviewing DDWS logs involving stops, seizures, and search activities. A checklist would be a helpful tool to document the key elements watch commanders or lieutenants must verify during the reviews (e.g., clearance codes, clearance narrative, contact information, etc.). The watch commander or lieutenant should be required to document their name, signature, date of review, and acknowledgement of the review. The checklist should be included with every DDWS – Log Compliance Check form and subject to audit by the MT and AAB.

Objective No. 4 – Tracking of Repeated Violations

This objective evaluated whether AV Station management tracked repeated violations or deficiencies in stops, seizures, and search activities, and documented the corrective action taken.

Objective No. 4 (a) – Documentation of Repeated Violations

Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, Supervisory Review, Paragraph 62, states:

Antelope Valley supervisors and unit commanders shall track repeated violations of the provisions of this agreement, or deficiencies and the corrective action taken, if any, in PPI.

In the MT's "First Stops and Bias-Free Policing Audit," published in 2024, the compliance metric for this objective was documented as "Qualitative." However, auditors will conduct audit testing and provide a compliance percentage to help guide the auditee in understanding their level of adherence to the requirements outlined in Paragraph 62 of the Agreement.

Procedures

The auditors contacted the AV Stations' management to request the 2024 4th Quarterly Review Reports, which had previously been used to track repeated violations of stops, seizures, or search activities documented in the DDWS. These reports were intended to help determine whether repeat violations of the applicable activity were being tracked.

Findings

The auditors were informed the Quarterly Review Reports are no longer prepared for the AV Stations and the information is now available through the new dashboard system, the Performance Oversight and Intervention Tracker (POINT)¹². However, auditors reviewed this system and determined POINT does not capture or track repeated violations.

According to the AV Stations management, the repeated violations of stops, seizures, or search activities are not being tracked at the AV Stations. As a result, the compliance rate for this objective is 0%. Therefore, the AV Stations did not meet the criteria for this objective and are not in compliance with the established compliance metrics.

¹² POINT is a collection of datasets from some of the Department's enterprise systems which have been imported into the Microsoft Power BI service and used to create dashboards and visuals.

Recommendations

It is recommended that LASD develop a system for tracking deputy activities in the AV. This system should identify and document repeated violations, along with the corrective actions taken. LASD should also review which types of documentation need to be captured to ensure unit commanders have the necessary information to track and hold staff accountable for repeated violations, and the corresponding corrective action.

Additionally, the system should track instances when sergeants and lieutenants fail to provide adequate review of stops, seizures, or search activities, and when they do not provide corrective actions to staff when warranted.

Additionally, it is recommended that the AV Stations resume utilizing the Quarterly Review Report to track repeated violations until the POINT system is updated with this functionality. The POINT system should be made fully operational for AV Stations' use as soon as practical.

CONCLUSION

The AAB acknowledges the ongoing efforts of the AV Stations' management to address the identified issues, such as discussing errors with the deputies and taking action to correct the errors identified. However, the arrest reports and citations issued in the deputies' DDWS were not reviewed as required by the AV Agreement. In addition, there continues to be a lack of thoroughness in the review of the DDWS logs involving stops, seizures, or search activities.

The auditors believe the results of this Stops and Detentions audit are valuable in identifying opportunities to further improve the AV Stations' operations. The AAB will continue to work with the stations to find reasonable solutions to achieve compliance with the AV Agreement and LASD policies.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this section is to provide a concise reference for all recommendations aimed at improving compliance with the AV Settlement Agreement and Department policies and procedures. The recommendations listed below are the same as those detailed in the above report.

Objective No.1(a) – Sergeant's Weekly Audit of Deputy's DDWS

The AV Stations should consider streamlining the review of DDWS logs by utilizing SACR to identify stops, seizures and search activities, as it is less labor-intensive than the current process. In addition, AV Stations management must improve their DDWS log review procedures to ensure sergeants are thoroughly reviewing DDWS logs involving applicable activity. The watch commanders or lieutenants should be required to verify the DDWS logs were properly reviewed by the sergeants. The use of a checklist would be a helpful tool to guide the watch commander to ensure the critical elements such as stop clearance codes, narrative details and contact information were reviewed by the sergeant.

Objective No. 1(b) – Citations and Arrest Reports

AV Stations' management must continue to improve their DDWS processes and controls to ensure the sergeants conduct thorough reviews of the deputies' activities including review of the arrest reports and citations. Currently, the DDWS Compliance Check form does not have a specific area to confirm the arrest reports and citations were reviewed. It is recommended that AV Stations' captains revise the current DDWS Compliance Check process to require the sergeants verify the review of arrest reports and citations and note this on the associated form.

Objective No. 2(a) – Stop, Search and Seizure Documentation Errors

It is recommended the AV Stations' captains must ensure sergeants continue to conduct thorough reviews of the deputies' activities and identify repeated violators. A corrective action plan should be implemented that includes specific action is taken when sergeants fail to adequately review the deputies' DDWS. The corrective actions must be defined with a focus on monitoring repeated violators for improvement in the DDWS review requirements.

Objective No. 3(a) – Review of Compliance Checks

It is recommended the AV Stations management continue to improve their DDWS review processes and controls to ensure the watch commanders or lieutenants are thoroughly reviewing DDWS logs involving stops, seizures, or search activities.

The stations must require the watch commanders or lieutenants to verify whether the sergeants are reviewing DDWS logs involving stops, seizures, and search activities. A checklist would be a helpful tool to document the key elements watch commanders or lieutenants must verify during the reviews (e.g., clearance codes, clearance narrative, contact information, etc.). The watch commander or lieutenant should be required to document their name, signature, date of review, and acknowledgement of the review. The checklist should be included with every DDWS – Log Compliance Check form and subject to audit by the MT and AAB.

Objective No. 4(a) – Documentation of Repeated Violations

It is recommended that LASD develop a system for tracking deputy activities in the AV. This system should identify and document repeated violations, along with the corrective actions taken. LASD should also review which types of documentation need to be captured to ensure unit commanders have the necessary information to track and hold staff accountable for repeated violations, and the corresponding corrective action.

Additionally, the system should track instances where sergeants and lieutenants fail to provide adequate review of stops, seizures, or search activities, and when they do not provide corrective actions to staff when warranted.

Additionally, it is recommended that the AV Stations resume utilizing the Quarterly Review Report to track repeated violations until the POINT system is updated with this functionality. The POINT system should be made fully operational for AV Stations' use as soon as practical.

FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES

The AAB will conduct a follow-up of the recommendations and verify if the auditee has made necessary improvements. Verification of corrective action will be assessed by examining new directives, amended unit orders, and/or relevant documentation. The AAB will work with the auditee in understanding the implementation of audit recommendations, as it may be a lengthy process and require a collaborative effort with other Department resources.

DEPARTMENT APPLICATIONS

- Employee Performance Evaluation Tracking System (EPETS)
- Regional Allocation of Police Services (RAPSNET)
- Mobile Digital Computer (MDC)

REFERENCES

- United States Department of Justice – Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, Case Number CV 15-03174 (April 2015)
- Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement Compliance Metrics (October 2019)
- Antelope Valley Monitoring Team First Stops and Bias-Free Policing Audit (September 2023)
- Lancaster Station Unit Order #69, Supplemental Supervisor Responsibilities (August 2019)
- Palmdale Station Unit Order #14-06, Supplemental Supervisor Responsibilities (July 2021)

Views of Responsible Officials

On July 1, 2025, the AAB presented the findings to the AV Station command staff. The AAB presented the final audit report to the Division Director, Office of Constitutional Policing.



12/15/2025

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