CA DOJ Racial and Identity Profiling and San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 96A Report

Police Commission Presentation Executive Summary

Background

In 2015 California Assembly Bill (AB) 953 (The Racial and Identity Profiling Act) was passed. In addition to requiring the collection of data regarding citizen complaints that allege racial or identity profiling, AB 953 requires all city and county local law enforcement agencies in California, as well as the California Highway Patrol and peace officers of California state and university educational institutions to collect perceived demographic and other detailed data regarding pedestrian and traffic stops. The eight mandated Wave 1 agencies began reporting requirements in July 2018.

AB 953 also mandated that the state create the Racial Identity and Profiling (RIPA) Board, to provide public reports with the objective of eliminating racial and identity profiling and improving diversity and racial and identity sensitivity in law enforcement. As mandated by law, each year, California’s RIPA Board must produce a report on the past and current status of racial and identity profiling with policy recommendations for eliminating it. The first report was issued in 2020 using 2018 data.

The San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 96A took effect on January 1, 2016 and required that the San Francisco Police Department and Sheriff’s Department send a written report to Mayor, Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, and the Human Rights Commission by July 1, 2016 covering the previous quarter. The first reports included data for arrests and Use of Force only.

Beginning in June 2017 the Chapter 96A report added data for:
- Encounters (including the total number, broken down by race or ethnicity age, and sex; total numbers of each type of search; type of search broken down by race, age, and sex; total number of each type of disposition broken down by race or ethnicity, age, and sex; and reported separately for detentions and traffic stops)
- Uses of Force
- Arrests
- OCC (now DPA) complaints regarding allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, or gender identity, and total number of each type of disposition for such complaints.

Objective: Using RIPA Report and 96A Data as a Means Toward Eliminating Bias in Policing and Reducing Use of Force

Analysis of the required law enforcement data is essential to realize the RIPA Board’s purpose to eliminate racial and identity profiling, improve diversity and racial and identity sensitivity in law enforcement throughout California. Similarly, the collection and analysis of required
Chapter 96A data by the SFPD affords us an opportunity to identify patterns and trends related to uses of force, stops, detentions, searches, and arrests over time. Similar to the RIPA Board, the SFPD is using the data to work toward reducing racial and ethnic disproportionalities and disparities in policing (including reducing use of force and related disproportionalities and disparities) in the City and County and San Francisco by working with the Police Commission and stakeholders toward improvements.

Working from a blueprint framed by our Collaborative Reform Initiative (CRI), the SFPD’s vision is to reduce force and racial and ethnic disproportionalities in policing our City by focusing on (but not limited to) five primary focus areas: Training, Policy, Accountability, Community Policing, Data Collection/Analysis.

The following points highlights our completed accomplishments, ongoing work and future plans to realize a vision of bias free policing in the City and County of San Francisco. Please note that this list is not all inclusive.

Reducing Force and Addressing Disparities and Bias: What We Have Done to Improve - Highlights

Training (12 related CRI recommendations: 26.1, 27.1, 27.2, 27.3, 27.4, 27.5, 28.2, 28.4, 28.5, 28.6, 28.7, 29.4)

- SFPD Managers (sworn and non-sworn professional staff) are trained every two years on managing implicit bias through the Fair and Impartial Policing course.
- All Department personnel have been or will be receiving training presented by the San Francisco Department of Human Resources titled: Creating an Inclusive Environment: Introduction to Managing Implicit Bias.
- All SFPD personnel are mandated to attend Principled Policing training which incorporates procedural justice and implicit bias training.
- SFPD collaborates with external partners on executive leadership training and Blue Courage training which focuses on developing a guardian mindset to build better relationships with community members. This training also strengthens internal relationships and trust in order to manage and engage with problem officers and become a more effective and efficient Department.
- SFPD re-established a “Community Immersion” block in recruit training in which SFPD recruits go out in our diverse communities and engage with community members. This training promotes cultural awareness, cultural competence and works to dispel stereotypes that may exist about communities and groups in our diverse city. Re-establishment of this block of training is a direct result of community input from members of the Chief’s African American advisory forum.
- Implementation of the Field Training Force Options (FTFO) Training Unit. Among the desired outcomes of the FTFO unit is implementing training that improves outcomes on split-second use of force decisions and ensuring that all in service officers receive this
training periodically. We believe creation of this training unit has improved our overall reductions in uses of force including pointing of a firearm.

- Mandated Crisis Intervention Training for all sworn SFPD members.
- Implemented Critical Mindset and Coordinated Response (CMCR) Training to enable officers to more efficiently employ Crisis Intervention tactics and better coordinate critical incidents.
- Worked with the Department of Police Accountability to help promote education to SFPD officers and command staff for alternative resolutions, including mediation for public complaints including bias related complaints. DPA personnel have made presentations at line-ups and at Department “All Hands” leadership meetings.

**Policy** (8 related CRI recommendations: 3.1, 3.2, 4.4, 4.5, 25.1, 25.3, 25.4, 84.2)

- Revised DGO 5.01 Use of Force Policy.
- Developed and Implemented DGO 5.22, the SFPD's first Transgender, Gender-Variant, and Non-Binary inclusivity policy.
- Revised DGO 5.15 Enforcement of Immigration Laws.
- Streamlined and improved use of force data entry for more robust use of force data and reporting.
- Issued Department Bulletin explaining Use of Force tracking log, its purpose, and how to accurately complete it.
- Suspension of SFPD participation in JTTF and extensive review of JTTF participation, related DGOs and impact on policing and building trust with concerned ethnic and religious groups.

**Accountability** (8 related CRI recommendations: 4.6, 24.1, 24.2, 24.3, 24.4, 24.5, 24.6, 64.1)

- Implemented a policy stipulating that there is no right to privacy in any use of department-owned equipment or facilities.
- All members are required to acknowledge appropriate use standards for electronic communications.
- The SFPD has established policy and practice for audits of all department-owned electronic communications devices to determine whether they are being used to communicate bias.
- The SFPD presents the results of these electronic audits to San Francisco Police Commission on a regular basis.
- SFPD audits use of force data annually and hold supervisors accountable for ongoing deficiencies.
- Implemented a Discipline Review Panel with DPA to evaluated existing complaint and disciplinary processes, policies, and liaison relationships to enhance trust and legitimacy around these issues.

- Formed a Strategic Plan Steering Committee led by consulting firm. Resulted in development of a Strategic Plan Framework (SFPD Strategic Plan 1.0).
- Initiated and completed a Community Policing Strategic Plan.
- Established multiple Chief Advisory Forums over the last 3 years to allow for diverse communities to have meaningful input into bias training, policies, and the SFPD’s other anti-bias programming.
- Established a bias in policing work group to obtain input on bias related policies and practices as they are being developed.
- Implemented a public education campaign on the policies and procedures for reporting misconduct as centered on anti-bias and the initiatives underway. See SFPD website.
- SFPD has worked with the Police Commission to convene community focus groups to obtain input on policies and practices as they are developed including but not limited to policies directly related to working toward bias free policing and use of force.

Data Collection and Analysis

- Identified and working with research partners CPE (Center for Policing Equity) and Stanford University SPARQ (Social Psychological Answers to Real World Questions) to further refine use of force data findings, analysis, and identify appropriate data for measurement to determine causal factors for disparities and examine bias.
- Ongoing collection and analysis of use of force data to identify patterns and trends over time.
- Better coordination with the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department to work toward and ensure accurate arrest data that corresponds with SFPD incident report and arrest data.
- Development, and continual refinement of San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 96A report to measure the efficacy of bias related training through careful data collection and analysis practices and in partnership with academic researchers.
- Contracted with a consultant to conduct a technology gap analysis comparing the current state of the Department’s technology and information gathering, analyzing, and sharing assets and capabilities with the established best practices.
- Formed Information Technology (IT) Committee to better assess, plan for, and budget forecast for information and technology needs in order to more efficiently and effectively collect and analyze data.

Reducing Force and Addressing Bias and Disparities: Plan to Improve Moving Forward - Highlights

Training

- Continue all aforementioned training with focus on Procedural Justice, Principled Policing and Implicit Bias training and make it a part of our “training DNA” by imbedding
this training into other training modules for recruit and in-service officers and command staff.

- Hire an attorney with recent and relevant criminal law including 4th amendment legal expertise to improve training on the 4th Amendment and applicable state laws on search and seizure. (32.2). This should serve to further reduce disproportionalities and disparities.

**Policy Revisions** (8 related CRI recommendations pending implementation of these revisions: 25.1, 25.2, 25.3, 25.4, 26.1, 26.2, 26.3, 26.4)

- After approximately two years of public stakeholder input, review of national best practice and vigorous discussion and debate DGO 5.17 Policy Prohibiting Bias Policing, DGO 11.07 Discrimination and harassment, DGO 5.03, Investigative Detentions are completed and scheduled for consideration for Police Commission approval.

- After approximately two years of public stakeholder input, review of national best practices and vigorous discussion a new DGO: Interaction with Deaf and Hard of Hearing Individuals will be presented for consideration for Police Commission approval.

**Accountability** (7 related CRI recommendations: 11.1, 24.2, 24.3, 24.4, 24.5, 24.6, 64.1)

- Continue ongoing feedback and improvement loop around policy and practice for audits of all department owned electronic communications devices to determine whether they are being used to communicate bias.

- Continue presenting the results of electronic audit to San Francisco Police Commission on a regular basis.

- Continue audits use of force data annually and hold supervisors accountable for deficiencies.

- Continue to refine Discipline Review Panel with DPA to evaluate existing complaint and disciplinary processes, policies, and liaison relationships to enhance trust and legitimacy around these issues.

- Improve review process of Officer Involved Shooting investigations and formalize review and evaluation of tactical and training considerations.

- Finish development and implementation of Critical Incident Review Board.

**Community Policing** (5 related CRI recommendations: 26.1, 26.2, 26.3, 26.4, 39.2)

- Finalize more comprehensive SFPD Strategic Plan (2.0).

- Continue Chief Advisory Forums to allow for diverse communities to have meaningful input into bias training, policies, and the SFPD’s other anti-bias programming.

- Refine work group protocols and procedures to increase their effectiveness and efficiency.

- Complete Diversity Strategic plan.

- Continue to refine public education campaign on the policies and procedures for reporting misconduct as centered on anti-bias and the initiatives underway
• Continue working with the Police Commission to convene community focus groups to obtain input on policies and practices as they are developed including but not limited to policies directly related to working toward bias free policing and reducing force.
• Improve Limited English Proficiency procedures and protocols by working with LEP work group.

• Continue to work with research partners CPE (Center for Policing Equity), Stanford University SPARQ (Social Psychological Answers to Real World Questions) to further refine use of force data findings and identify appropriate data for measurement in order to determine causal factors for racial disproportionalities and disparities. This work will focus on policy, procedural, and training solutions to identify and eliminate bias.
• Ongoing collection and analysis of use of force data to identify patterns and trends over time.
• Evaluate and reassess anti-bias and cultural competency training. Make adjustments where necessary.
• Improve open, ongoing command engagement around the issue of bias, both internal and external to the department.
• Continue with outside research partner review and analysis of traffic stop data to identify the reasons and potential solutions for the traffic stop data disparities and identify potential solutions.
• Continue work by Information Technology (IT) Committee to better assess, plan for, and budget forecast information and technology needs in order to more efficiently and effectively collect and analyze data.

Conclusion:

We are pleased with overall reductions in use of force including the significant reductions in pointing of a firearm in recent years. We are also pleased with many aspects of our progress as it relates to improvements in training, policies, accountability, community policing, data collection/analysis in recent years. However, much work lies ahead including increasing the pace of implementation of CRI recommendations. Moreover, although we’ve seen modest reductions in the number of stops, detentions, and searches of Black and Hispanic persons and our search yield rates are the highest among the largest agencies in the state, we remain challenged in the areas of understanding the causal factors for disparities and the reduction of disproportionate numbers in those policing categories among Black and Hispanic person compared to White persons. Like the California RIPA Board report, our ongoing work with research partners regarding disproportionalities and disparities focuses in part on determining the role bias plays in these disparities. This work is promising as we believe it will help us better understand the science and causal factors as well as provide solutions for improvement.
Chapter 96A Report - Outcomes, Trends, and Significant Highlights

Use of Force

- Overall Use of Force down 53% from year end totals 2016 to year end totals 2019.
- Pointing of Firearm down 66% from year end totals 2016 to year end totals 2019.
- Percentage of pointing of a firearm versus total uses of force down 26% from 2016 to 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2016 to 2019 % Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Force (UOF)</td>
<td>3738</td>
<td>2930</td>
<td>2706</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pointing of a Firearm UOF</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total UOF Involving Pointing of a Firearm</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Although pointing of firearms are down significantly since 2016, disproportionate rates on Black and Hispanic persons still exist. 605 (406 Black and 199 male) of 868 reported pointing of firearms uses of force were on Black or Hispanic persons in 2019. This represents 70% of the total.
- Of the 181,596 calls for service Quarter 4 2019, 216 (0.12%) resulted in use of force.
- Quarter 4 yielded double-digit reductions in total use of force in every district station led by Park Station’s 79% decrease (from 33 to 7) and Ingleside’s 66% decrease (from 62 to 21). All district stations had at least a 20% decrease in uses of force compared to the 4th quarter 2018.
- One officer involved shooting reported in 4th quarter 2019. This was the only on-duty officer involved shooting in 18 months (June 2018 to December 31, 2019).
- Officer Involved shootings decreased from 13 (27-month Chapter 96A reporting period April 2016 through June 2018) to 1 (during 20 month Chapter 96A reporting period June 30, 2018 through February 2020).

Stops, Detentions, and Searches

- Overall stops trending down 18% from Quarter 4,2018 to Quarter 4,2019.
• Stops on Black persons decreased 29% from 6,794 Quarter 4, 2018 to 4,828 Quarter 4, 2019.
• Stops on Hispanic persons decreased 20% from 4,942 Quarter 4, 2018 to 3,948 Quarter 4, 2019.
• Of the 21,068 stops, 3,613 involved searches.
• Of 3,613 searches, 1,388 (38%) involved Black persons, 1006 (28%) involved White persons, 814 (23%) involved Hispanic persons.
• Higher Discretion (officer asks and receives consent to search) Search yield rates (contraband found) were 31% for Black persons, 35% for Hispanic persons, 32% for White persons.
• Lower Discretion (officer required to search due to search warrant, arrest or vehicle inventory) Search yield rates (contraband found) were 42% for Black persons, 35% for Hispanic persons, 32% for White persons.

RIPA Report - Outcomes, Trends, and Significant Highlights

• SFPD has the lowest rate (3%) of bias related complaints, of the eight agencies in the 2020 RIPA report.
• SFPD meets 9 of 10 RIPA recommendations for bias free policing policy. If the SF Police Commission adopts DGO 5.17 on March 4, 2020, the SFPD will meet 10 of 10 CA RIPA recommendations.
• SFPD commended as the first state law enforcement agency to develop a bias-by-proxy policy (Note: Policy is pending Police Commission approval).
• SFPD searches find contraband more often than any other agency included in the RIPA report. (RIPA report page 194).
  o During officer-initiated stops, SFPD searches result in contraband more often for every race. (RIPA report page 195).
    ▪ During officer initiated stops, SFPD’s lower discretion searches (officer required to search due to search warrant, arrest or vehicle inventory) find contraband more often than any other agency. (RIPA report page 194).
    ▪ During officer initiated stops, SFPD’s consent-based searches find contraband the third most often. (RIPA report page 194)
Overview

- Overview of reports, timeframe of data
- Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board Report
  - Background
  - Best Practices comparisons
  - Data Collected
  - Findings: California compared to SF
- San Francisco 96A - SFPD Quarterly Report
  - Training summary; new policies
  - Q4 summary
  - Stops and Search data
  - Use of Force
  - Arrests
  - Next Steps for 96A Report
Racial & Identity Profiling Advisory (RIPA) Board Report
July 1, 2018 – December 31, 2018
RIPA Board Report Finds Best Practices at SFPD

Includes analysis from the CA Department of Justice on the stop data collected under the Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (AB953)

Provides recommendations related to bias and racial/identify profiling that law enforcement agencies can incorporate to enhance their policies and procedures

Provides next steps for all stakeholders including advocacy groups, community members, and policymaker

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: PHASE 1
RIPA Data Collection and Submission

- Officer enters data
- CA DOJ collects
- SFPD corrects for "personally identifiable information."
- Resubmission

Analysis and Reporting
### RIPA: SFPD has Lowest Rate of Profiling Complaints

**Bias Related Complaints**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total Complaints Reported</th>
<th>Profiling Complaints Reported</th>
<th>Sworn Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Police Department</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>274 (14%)</td>
<td>9,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>67 (6.7%)</td>
<td>9,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>35 (12%)</td>
<td>7,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Police Department</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15 (20%)</td>
<td>1,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>2,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Police Department</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>21 (3%)</td>
<td>2,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>33 (33%)</td>
<td>2,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>1,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SFPD has the lowest rate of bias related complaints**
## RIPPA: San Francisco Complaint Process a Best Practice

### Complaint Form Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Forms Accessible Online?</th>
<th>Can Submit Online?</th>
<th>Multiple Methods of Submission?</th>
<th>Available in Multiple Languages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Police Department</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Police Department</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Police Department</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County Sheriff's Department</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SFPD is one of the 3 LE agencies that meet all of the Complaint Form requirements.
SFPD meets 9 of 10 recommendations pertaining to bias free policing and policy.

The RIPA Report recommends other agencies follow the policy development model SFPD has implemented around the update to DGO 5.17.

The RIPA Report specifically calls out the SFPD as the first agency, if included and approved, that would have a bias by proxy policy in the state.
### RIPA Data Elements
#### Officer Reporting Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Regarding Stop</th>
<th>Information Regarding Officer’s Perception of Person Stopped</th>
<th>Information Regarding Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Date, Time, and Duration</td>
<td>1. Perceived Race or Ethnicity</td>
<td>1. Officer’s Identification Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Location</td>
<td>2. Perceived Age</td>
<td>2. Years of Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reason for Stop</td>
<td>3. Perceived Gender</td>
<td>3. Type of Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was Stop in Response to Call for Service?</td>
<td>4. Perceived to be LGBT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Actions Taken During Stop</td>
<td>5. Limited or No English Fluency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contraband or Evidence Discovered</td>
<td>6. Perceived or Known Disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Property Seized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Result of Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The demographic information in this report is based on officers’ perceptions and may not reflect actual demographic statistics.*
RIPA: CHP and LAPD Skew Trends With Volume
Number of Stops by Agency

Number of Stops by Agency
(n = 1,800,054)

- California Highway Patrol
- Los Angeles Police Dept
- Los Angeles County Sheriff's Dept
- San Diego Police Dept
- San Diego County Sheriff's Dept
- San Bernardino County Sheriff's Dept
- San Francisco Police Dept
- Riverside County Sheriff's Dept

- 336,681, 19%
- 136,635, 8%
- 89,455, 5%
- 40,515, 2%
- 62,433, 3%
- 56,409, 3%
- 44,505, 3%
RIPA: Percent of All Stops Represented by Demographic Total California and SFPD Only

**Sources:** RIPA Annual Report 2020
RIPA: Vehicle Stops Consistent with Drivers' Demographics
Vehicle Stop Analysis – SFPD vs SWITRS Data

SFPD Vehicle Stops vs 2018 SWITRS Not at Fault Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SFPD Vehicle Stops</th>
<th>2018 SWITRS Not at Fault Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The SWITRs methodology uses not at fault collision demographics to create a sample of who drives in San Francisco. This analysis reduces disparities in all noted demographic groups as compared to the ACS methodology, however, a 7.3% disparity still exists for African American drivers in San Francisco compared to their expected representation in the driving population data.
RIPA: SFPD Searches, Finds Contraband More Often
SFPD Uses Consent Searches Less Often, Still Finds Contraband More

Search and Yield Results
July 1, 2018 - December 31, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Search Rate</th>
<th>Total Yield Rate</th>
<th>% of Higher Discretion Searches</th>
<th>Higher Discretion Yield Rate</th>
<th>% of Lower Discretion Search</th>
<th>Lower Discretion Yield Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPD</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- "Higher Discretion" = consent for search
- "Lower Discretion" = incidents involving search warrants, incidents to arrest, and/or vehicle inventory.
Administrative Code
Chapter 96A.3- Stop
Data Summary
Quarter 4 2019
SFPD Moves Forward with Training and Policies

- **Training**
  - Principal Policing and Procedural Justice
  - Managing Implicit Bias
  - Racial and Cultural Diversity and Racial Profiling
  - Creating an Inclusive Environment
  - Equal Employment Opportunity/Harassment
  - To be developed:
    - Bias by proxy

- **Revised Policies**
  - 5.17: Policy Prohibiting Biased Policing - Bias by proxy
  - 5.03: Investigative Detentions – Documentation
  - 11.07: Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation
SFPD: Large Calls for Service Volume, Low Use of Force and Even Lower Complaints

Calls for Service
- Dispatched: 117,143
- Officer Initiated Activity: 64,453

Use of Force
- Reduced by 33% since last year

96A 4th Quarter of 2019 Data Summary
- Additional 117 arrests at the SFO are investigated and reported by San Mateo County
- Department of Police Accountability has received only one bias related complaint

Total Arrests
- 4,713

Bias Complaints
-
SFPD: In Last Year, 29% Reduction of Stops of African-Americans More than any other group.

- Overall, stops are down 18% from Q4-2018
- Each demographic group is downward trending
SFPD: 24% reduction in Searches of African Americans
More than any other group

- 21,068 stops were made during Q4-2019; an 18% decrease from Q4-2018
- White subjects accounted for 34% of all stops in Q4
- African Americans were stopped 4,828 times—a 29% decrease from 2018
  - 29% of these stops resulted in searches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Race</th>
<th>Stops Q4-2018</th>
<th>Stops Q4-2019</th>
<th>%Δ from Q4-2018</th>
<th>Searches Q4-2018</th>
<th>Searches Q4-2019</th>
<th>%Δ from Q4-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8,975</td>
<td>7,251</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>6,794</td>
<td>4,828</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4,942</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3,081</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>2,266</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,581</td>
<td>21,068</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>4,328</td>
<td>3,613</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SFPD: Searches Down for All Groups
Lower Discretion Searches

- Lower Discretion Searches
  July 1, 2018 - December 31, 2019

- “Lower Discretion” = incidents involving search warrants, incidents to arrest, and/or vehicle inventory.
- SFPD searches w/ lower discretion account for 46% of all searches
SFPD: Consent Searches Down 45% since 2018
47% for African Americans

Higher Discretion Searches
July 1, 2018 - December 31, 2019

- "Higher Discretion" = consent searches
- Accounts for 8% of all searches
RIPA Methodology: How Often Does SFPD Find Contraband Yield Rates by Discretionary Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consent Searches Yield Rate</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrests, Warrants, Vehicle Inventory Yield Rate</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total yield rate for all searches is 34%
- Total average yield rate of higher discretion searches is 30%
- Total average yield rate of lower discretionary searches is 41%
SFPD Improvements on Use of Force

Significant changes to policy and training has reduced use of force in the last three years:

Policy:
- 5.01 Use of Force – revised in 2016, prior to California legislation

Training
- Critical Incident Team (Use of Force)
- Critical Mindset, Coordinated Response (Use of Force)

Ongoing improvements
- Field Tactics Force Options unit will review OISs to determine how to make improvements to training
SFPD Reduces Uses of Force by 33% in One Year, 56% Overall Use of Force

- SFPD responded to 181,596 calls for service
- Force was used in 216 incidents accounting for less than 1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Race</th>
<th>Uses of Force Q4-2018</th>
<th>Uses of Force Q4-2019</th>
<th>%Δ from Q4-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SFPD: Pointing a Firearm Reduced by 67% Overall Uses of Force and Pointing of Firearms

Use of Force
Jan 1, 2016 - Dec 31, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointing of Firearm</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>%Δ from 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pointing of Firearm</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses of Force</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Force</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Pointing of Firearm</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SFPD: De-escalation = Less Force
Officer Involved Shootings

Officer Involved Shooting
January 1, 2016 - December 31, 2019

For 17 consecutive months (July 2018 - Nov 2019), SFPD did not have any Officer Involved Shootings.
**SFPD: In One Year, Arrests Down 13%, 16% for African Americans Arrests**

- Q4 arrests decreased by 13% since Q4-2018
- Compared to 2016, total arrests for 2019 have only decreased by 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Race</th>
<th>Arrests Q4-2018</th>
<th>Arrests Q4-2019</th>
<th>%Δ from Q4-2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,410</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,713</strong></td>
<td><strong>-13%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps for 96A Reporting

- More trend analysis and interpretation of data/trends

- Working to determine what set of measures, trend analyses, RIPA metrics, or new analyses will provide the best information and indicators for the Department

- Using the data to inform fuller view on crime activity