

**Executive Summary
Administrative Code 96A.3
2018 Quarter 4 Report**



Safety with Respect

Prepared by San Francisco Police Department Professional Standards and
Principled Policing Unit
February 2019

Data Sources: San Francisco Police Department's Crime Data Warehouse, accessed via Business Intelligence Tools; San Francisco Police Department Early Intervention Systems Administrative Investigative Management Database; San Francisco Police Department Airport Bureau, San Francisco Police Department Human Resources; San Francisco Police Department Internal Affairs/Equal Employment Opportunity Division; San Francisco Department of Emergency Management; San Francisco Department of Police Accountability

**THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTER 96A.3 REPORT
4th Quarter: October 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of the ongoing conversation on police reform, including accountability and transparency in law enforcement, accurate data collection and reporting has taken center stage. In the forefront is whether specific identifying characteristics (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, or age) play a role in the outcome of interactions between law enforcement officers and members of the public, especially as it relates to the level of force used, and the rate of arrest.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the reforms undertaken by the San Francisco Police Department (the Department), and more importantly, to ensure procedural justice is evenly applied throughout all neighborhoods within our city, the Department is dedicating resources to re-evaluate the data collection process in place for collecting data as required by legislation, (California AB 953 and San Francisco Administrative Code 96A). It is important to the Department that the information collected is properly reported; therefore, these reports will continue to evolve as the technology is streamlined in our efforts to provide clear and concise data.

The Department has continued its efforts to rebuild the community's trust in a variety of ways, including training all sworn members in fair and impartial policing strategies, focusing on procedural justice and implicit bias. Coupled with the updated training in use of force principles that emphasize proportionality and the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) philosophy, officers are being equipped with the tools and knowledge needed to assess and de-escalate situations with the goal of preserving life.

Detailed reports are generated and forwarded to the Chief of Police, Assistant Chiefs, and Deputy Chiefs for review. Commanders review the reports with district captains as a means to monitor and identify concerns immediately. As required under Administrative Code 96A.3, Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements, the Department is submitting this report for the fourth quarter of 2018 (October, November, December).

The Department is now in compliance with AB953, the Racial & Identity Profiling Act of 2015. Among other things, it has required the Department to transition from its previously deployed eStops system, which collected demographic information during stops, to the Stop Data Collection System (SDCS), an application provided by the California Department of Justice. The transition occurred in July of 2018.

Prior to the transition, SF Admin Code 96.A was amended to remove collection requirements that had been superseded by AB953. This change created a short gap in reporting of demographic stops data due to the transition to new data collection systems at the state level, the need to draft a new report format, and other technical issues.

The Schedule for future 96.A and AB953 reports is as follows, per legislative mandate in 96.A of the San Francisco Admin Code:

Report Due Date	Reporting Periods	Report Description
May 7, 2019	January 1, 2019 –March 31, 2019	Use of Force, Dept. of Police Accountability, and SFPD Equal Employment Opportunity data
	July 1, 2018 – December 31, 2018	AB 953 data (1 st of 2 ‘catch up’ reports)
August 6, 2019	April 1, 2019 – June 31, 2019	Use of Force, Dept. of Police Accountability, and SFPD Equal Employment Opportunity data
	January 1, 2019 – June 31, 2019	AB 953 data (2 nd of 2 ‘catch up’ reports)
November 5, 2019	July 1, 2019 – September 31, 2019	Use of Force, Dept. of Police Accountability, SFPD Equal Employment Opportunity and, AB 953 data

This report contains information relating to Uses of Force, Arrests and Department of Police Accountability data on alleged bias related complaints, including the following information:

SEC. 96A.3 (b) - USE OF FORCE

- (1) The total number of Uses of Force
- (2) The total number of Uses of Force that resulted in death to the person on whom an officer used force; and
- (3) The total number of Uses of Force broken down by race or ethnicity, age, and sex

The Department continues to focus on training its officers on the importance of the proportionality of the use of force (using only that force which is reasonable to perform one’s duties), as well as effective communication and de-escalation techniques with an emphasis on safeguarding the sanctity of life, dignity, and liberty of all persons.

The Department has expanded its commitment to the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) concept, and as of December 31, 2019 has trained 990 sworn and 19 non-sworn personnel, as well as 7 clinicians from the Department of Public Health in the updated training curriculum. Included in this number are probationary and veteran officers, as well as members of the command staff. As the CIT program moves forward, the goal of the Department is to provide this 40-hour training to all members. The program focuses on a team response concept throughout all districts and instills the importance of the guardian mentality during public contacts.

Following the creation and implementation in January 2017 of Department General Order 5.21, the Crisis Intervention Team Response to Person in Crisis Calls for Service, the Department continues to work in close partnership with City agencies and community stakeholders in the development of the CIT training program, including the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI), The Mayor’s Office on Disability Counsel, San Francisco Mental Health Association, the Homeless Coalition, District Attorney’s Witness and Victim Program, and the San Francisco

Public Defender's Office among other advocates and associations. The CIT policy can be viewed on our website at <http://sanfranciscopolice.org/cit>.

In addition, in February 2017, officers began training in the CIT/Threat Assessment/De-escalation/Field Tactics and Use of Force classes, two 10-hour courses which trains officers on the elements contained in the updated Department General Order, 5.01, Use of Force. Currently 1,977 officers and nine civilians have participated in the CIT/Threat Assessment/De-escalation/Field Tactics and 1,935 in the Use of Force course with the goal of training all members by the end of the year. In an effort to ensure a strong partnership with the Department of Public Health, we have also trained the Crisis Intervention Specialists (Clinical Psychologists) who work with the Department.

The Department and the Department of Public Health (DPH) has entered into an agreement to provide support to officers in the field who are responding to crises in which behavioral health concerns may be present. The DPH Behavioral Crisis Intervention Specialist Team was established as a result of an initiative from the Mayor's office. This collaboration coordinates the efforts, logistics, and protocols of deployment of the specialists to provide on-scene support during crisis situations.

During the fourth quarter of 2018, DPH clinicians responded to two incidents involving a person in a behavioral crisis resulting in a critical incident deployment or Crisis/Hostage Negotiation Team call out. Additionally, CIT Unit officers consulted, assisted, or responded with Mobile Crisis clinicians to 50 contacts in the field and Assisted Outpatient Treatment program, which is a program that is designed to conduct outreach to individuals with a known mental illness who are not engaged in care.

A program has been initiated with DPH clinicians and CIT Unit officers walking the mid-Market Street area, UN Plaza, and Union Square areas twice a week connecting the homeless population to services and treatment. The Department continues to focus on the high-end users of psychological and medical services to reduce recidivism. The Department has also created a quarterly multi-disciplinary forensic public safety meeting where the CIT Coordinator presents cases to DPH on persons who pose a safety threat to themselves and/or the community. Ninety two cases were presented during 2018.

SEC. 96A.3 (c) - ARRESTS

- (1) The total number; and
- (2) The total number broken down by race or ethnicity, age, and sex;

SEC. 96A.3 (f) - DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY DATA ON ALLEGED BIAS RELATED COMPLAINTS

This quarterly report will be available to the public on the Department's website as part of an ongoing commitment to transparency. Once the process is fully automated, the datasets used to generate the reports will be published alongside the report to provide the information in a searchable format.

Policy:

The use of force by members is regulated through policies established according to local, state, and federal mandates. Department General Order 5.01, Use of Force, was approved by the Police Commission on December 21, 2016. The complete policy is available on our website at <http://sanfranciscopolice.org/dgo>.

Circumstances where use of force may be necessary:

The use of force must be for a lawful purpose. Officers may only use reasonable force options in the performance of their duties in the following circumstances:

- To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search.
- To overcome resistance or to prevent escape.
- To prevent the commission of a public offense.
- In defense of others or in self-defense.
- To gain compliance with a lawful order.
- To prevent a person from injuring himself/herself. However, an officer is prohibited from using lethal force against a person who presents only a danger to himself/herself and does not pose an immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury to another person or officer.

Levels of Force:

Officers shall strive to use the minimum amount of force necessary to accomplish their lawful purpose.

- A. *Low Level Force.*** The level of control necessary to interact with a subject who is or displaying passive or active resistance. This level of force is not intended to and has a low probability of causing injury.
- B. *Intermediate Force.*** This level of force poses a foreseeable risk of significant injury or harm, but is neither likely nor intended to cause death. Intermediate force will typically only be acceptable when officers are confronted with active resistance and a threat to the safety of officers or others. Case law decisions have specifically identified and established that certain force options such as OC spray, impact projectiles, K-9 bites, and baton strikes are classified as intermediate force likely to result in significant injury.
- C. *Deadly Force.*** Any use of force substantially likely to cause serious bodily injury or death, including but not limited to the discharge of a firearm, the use of an impact weapon under some circumstances, other techniques or equipment, and certain interventions to stop a subject's vehicle, such as vehicle deflections.

Force Options:

The force options authorized by the Department are physical controls, personal body weapons, chemical agents, impact weapons, extended range impact weapons, vehicle interventions, K-9 bites and firearms. These are the force options available to officers, but officers are not required to use these force options based on a continuum. While deploying a particular force option and when feasible, officers shall continually evaluate whether the force option may be discontinued while still achieving the arrest or lawful objective.

The following tools and techniques are not in a particular order nor are they all inclusive.

- Verbal Commands/Instructions/Command Presence
- Control Holds/Takedowns
- Impact Weapons
- Chemical Agents (Pepper Spray, OC, etc.)
- K-9 (Dog) Bite
- Vehicle Intervention (Deflection)
- Personal Body Weapons.
- Firearms
- Impact Projectile

Documenting the Use of Force:

Members are required by policy to immediately notify supervisors following a use of force incident, which is then documented and immediately evaluated by the supervisor. Use of force reporting and evaluation forms have been redesigned to include all the elements and data fields required by state and local legislation. These forms must be submitted by the end of watch following a use of force incident.

Staff assigned to the Risk Management Office (RMO) are responsible for tracking and maintaining all data relating to use of force incidents. They continue to review data by district stations and specialized units. RMO, which includes the Internal Affairs Division and the Early Intervention System Unit (EIS), collects and analyzes the use of force data, i.e., under what circumstance it was used, type/level of force, and subject/ officer demographics which is available on our website at: <http://sanfranciscopolice.org/early-intervention-system>

At the Chief's direction, the Staff Inspections Unit has been developed which will expand on existing processes to audit performance, and other metrics.

The Department is currently working with a research/academic institution to perform in-depth analysis of our stop and use of force data.

2018 FOURTH QUARTER DATA SUMMARY AT A GLANCE;

- Calls for Service: 178,530
- Calls resulting in Use of Force: 301 (0.16%)
- Suspects Observed and Reported to SFPD (CDW): 9,236
- Total Uses of Force: 630
- 367 officers used force on 354 subjects resulting in a total of 630 uses of force
- Total Arrests: 5,308
- Department of Police Accountability bias related complaints received: 1

TOTAL CALLS FOR SERVICE (October 1 – December 31, 2018):

Calls for Service October 1 - December 31, 2018			
Oct	Nov	Dec	Total - Q4
64,442	57,932	56,156	178,530

DESCRIPTION OF SUSPECTS OBSERVED AND REPORTED TO POLICE;

The following table represents suspect descriptions provided by members of the public when requesting police assistance via the Department of Emergency (DEM) dispatch. It also includes information/descriptions provided by victims and/or witnesses directly to officers during a call for service, as well as suspect information directly observed by officers who witness a crime in progress. This information is gathered during the call directly from the reporting party, entered by the dispatcher, and relayed to responding officers who document this information in an incident report (CDW).

SUSPECTS by Race/Ethnicity October 1 - December 31, 2018					9,236 Suspects
DESCRIPTION	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total - Q4	% of Total Suspects
Asian or Pacific Islander	129	121	129	379	4.1%
Black	1,449	1,186	1,245	3,880	42.0%
Hispanic or Latin	434	355	359	1,148	12.4%
Native American	4	6	4	14	0.2%
White	576	534	568	1,678	18.2%
Others	735	739	663	2,137	23.1%
Total	3,327	2,941	2,968	9,236	100.0%

SEC. 96A.3 (b) (1) – TOTAL USES OF FORCE

During the fourth quarter of 2018, the Department responded to 178,530 calls for service. Of those contacts, force was used in 301 incidents representing less than 1 percent (0.16%) of total contacts. Further, there were 630 uses of force reported by 367 officers against a total of 354 subjects. There were 5,308 arrests during the fourth quarter of 2018.

Use of Force Year to Date Comparison – 2017 vs. 2018

	2017	2018	% Change
Q1	804	814	1%
Q2	912	601	-34%
Q3	705	660	-6%
Q4	732	630	-14%
Total	3,153	2705	-14%

Note: 2017 Total reflects data queried on Jan. 28, 2019

San Francisco Police Officers Assaulted Fourth Quarter Comparison, 2017 vs. 2018

Officers Assaulted by Month			
	2017	2018	% Change
October	31	18	-42%
November	24	17	-29%
December	18	25	39%
Total	73	60	-18%

SEC. 96A.3 (b) (2) USE OF FORCE RESULTING IN DEATH TO THE PERSON ON WHOM AN OFFICER USED FORCE;

There were no Uses of Force resulting in death during the fourth quarter of 2018, nor any officer involved shootings.

SEC. 96A.3 (b) (3) USES OF FORCE BY RACE/ETHNICITY and GENDER OF SUBJECT

In the fourth quarter of 2018, 35 percent of the total uses of force were against Black Male subjects, 21 percent of the total uses of force were against White Males, and 19 percent of the total uses of force were against Hispanic Males.

Types of Force by Subject Race & Gender	Pointing of Firearms	Physical Control	Strike by Object/Fist	Impact Weapon	OC (Pepper Spray)	ERIW	Flash Bang	Spike Strips	Total Uses of Force	%
Asian Female	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	1%
Asian Male	14	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	29	5%
Black Female	35	5	2	0	0	0	2	1	45	7%
Black Male	127	51	28	4	4	6	2	1	223	35%
Hispanic Female	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	3%
Hispanic Male	72	30	14	4	0	0	0	0	120	19%
White Female	17	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	25	4%
White Male	50	59	19	3	3	0	0	0	134	21%
Unknown Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Unknown Male	9	7	7	1	2	0	0	0	26	4%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0%
Total	344	176	73	13	11	6	4	3	630	100%
Percent	55%	28%	12%	2%	2%	1%	1%	0%	100%	

Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander.

Note: Unknown indicates data not provided in incident report. Includes ethnicity outside DOJ definitions and Native American.

SEC. 96A.3 (b) (3) Use of Force by Age of Subject, Fourth Quarter 2017 vs. 2018

Subject Age Group	Number of Subjects		
	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% change
Under 18	22	14	-36%
18-29	173	147	-15%
30-39	101	100	-1%
40-49	54	53	-2%
50-59	30	26	-13%
60+	9	6	-33%
Unknown	6	8	33%
Total	395	354	-10%

Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Officer, Fourth Quarter 2017 vs. 2018

White males make up 49% of officers using force during Q4 of 2018. Asian male officers make up 19% of the use of force incidents. This parallels the Department’s Demographics.

Officer Race & Gender	Officers Using Force			Total Uses of Force			Department Demographic		
	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% change	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% change	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% change
Asian Female *	7	3	-57%	12	4	-67%	48	46	-4%
Asian Male *	68	71	4%	108	115	6%	468	467	0%
Black Female	2	6	200%	6	11	83%	47	46	-2%
Black Male	25	22	-12%	32	34	6%	174	176	1%
Hispanic Female	8	13	63%	16	16	0%	73	72	-1%
Hispanic Male	63	43	-32%	104	74	-29%	308	330	7%
White Female	21	17	-19%	42	34	-19%	171	167	-2%
White Male	196	179	-9%	381	318	-17%	976	974	0%
Other Female **	1	0	-100%	2	0	-100%	8	11	38%
Other Male **	10	13	30%	29	24	-17%	39	35	-10%
Total	401	367	-8%	732	630	-14%	2312	2324	1%

* Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander

** Includes race/ethnicity outside DOJ definitions and Native American

Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Subject upon Whom Force was used.

The number of subjects upon whom force was used is less than the total number of force reported, as officers may use more than one type of force on a subject. Example; An officer may first point a firearm at a subject believed to be armed. Once the subject drops the weapon, the officer may then have to resort to physical force to effect the arrest of the subject.

Subject Race & Gender	Number of Subjects			Total Uses of Force		
	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% change	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% change
Asian Female	3	5	67%	10	7	-30%
Asian Male	23	19	-17%	56	29	-48%
Black Female	28	24	-14%	43	45	5%
Black Male	153	131	-14%	265	223	-16%
Hispanic Female	8	8	0%	21	19	-10%
Hispanic Male	75	56	-25%	144	120	-17%
White Female	15	14	-7%	27	25	-7%
White Male	75	79	5%	141	134	-5%
Unknown Female	3	0	-100%	6	0	-100%
Unknown Male	12	16	33%	19	26	37%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	2	not cal	0	2	not cal
Total	395	354	-10%	732	630	-14%

Note: Unknown indicates data not provided in incident report. Includes ethnicity outside DOJ definitions and Native American.

Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Subjects Involved, Fourth Quarter 2017 vs. 2018

In this quarter, most uses of force involved only one subject. However, in incidents where officers anticipate a resistive subject, they will request assistance or wait for additional officers to arrive on scene before attempting to take the subject into custody.

Number of Subjects Involved	Number of Incidents		
	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% change
1	261	260	0%
2	37	30	-19%
3	10	10	0%
4	5	1	-80%
5	2	0	-100%
Total	315	301	-4%

Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Officers Involved, Fourth Quarter 2017 vs. 2018

Number of Officers Involved	Number of Incidents		
	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% change
1	145	173	19%
2	108	87	-19%
3	32	25	-22%
4	16	9	-44%
5	8	4	-50%
6	4	2	-50%
7	1	0	-100%
9	1	0	-100%
11	0	1	not cal
Total	315	301	-4%

Types of Force by Call Type, Fourth Quarter 2018

To further evaluate why officers use force, the Department collected data on the type of call for service to which an officer was responding wherein force was used.

Types of Call	Pointing of Firearms	Physical Control	Strike by Object/Fist	Impact Weapon	OC (Pepper Spray)	ERIW	Flash Bang	Spike Strips	Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	95	32	14	2	2	4	0	0	149	24%
Part I Property	153	30	10	1	4	0	0	3	201	32%
Person with a gun (221)	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5%
Person with a knife (219)	4	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	11	2%
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	13	51	19	4	4	0	0	0	91	14%
Narcotics Arrest	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	2%
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	17	10	3	1	0	0	4	0	35	6%
Aided Case (520)	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	1%
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1%
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1%
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	7	14	11	2	0	0	0	0	34	5%
Passing Call (903)	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0%
Purse Snatch (213)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0%
Restraining Order Violation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0%
Terrorist Threats (650)	3	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	8	1%
Traffic-Related	13	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	19	3%
Vandalism (594/595)	0	10	6	1	0	0	0	0	17	3%
Total	344	176	73	13	11	6	4	3	630	100%

Uses of Force by Reason, Fourth Quarter 2018

Force is used most often to effect a lawful arrest.

Reason for Use of Force	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% Change
In defense of others or in self-defense	17	10	-41%
To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search, or to prevent escape	669	586	-12%
To gain compliance with a lawful order	40	26	-35%
To overcome resistance or to prevent escape	0	1	not cal
To prevent a person from injuring himself/herself, when the person also poses an imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury to another person or officer	5	4	-20%
To prevent the commission of a public offense	1	3	200%
Total	732	630	-14%

SEC. 96A.3(c) (1) TOTAL ARRESTS – Fourth Quarter Comparison 2017 vs. 2018

It is important to note that arrests made by SFPD members at San Francisco International Airport are investigated by, and reported as part of San Mateo County data, and are therefore not included in the City totals. Airport Arrest data is provided on page 14 of this summary and pages 123 through 124 of the attached report.

Arrests made outside San Francisco are a result of comprehensive investigations of crimes originating in San Francisco. For a detailed listing of locations see page 129 of the attached report.

District	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% change
Co. A - Central	596	840	41%
Co. B - Southern	545	560	3%
Co. C - Bayview	488	441	-10%
Co. D - Mission	842	998	19%
Co. E - Northern	493	409	-17%
Co. F - Park	191	308	61%
Co. G - Richmond	231	201	-13%
Co. H - Ingleside	407	343	-16%
Co. I - Taraval	349	250	-28%
Co. J - Tenderloin	862	938	9%
Outside SF	13	20	54%
Total	5017	5308	6%

SEC. 96A.3(c) (2) – TOTAL ARRESTS BY RACE/ETHNICITY and GENDER.

Race and Gender	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% change
Asian Female	78	77	-1%
Asian Male	239	243	2%
Asian Unknown	0	1	not cal
Black Female	459	426	-7%
Black Male	1547	1628	5%
Black Unknown	5	4	-20%
Hispanic Female	163	157	-4%
Hispanic Male	930	988	6%
Hispanic Unknown	1	4	300%
White Female	274	337	23%
White Male	1153	1262	9%
White Unknown	0	2	not cal
Unknown Female	37	26	-30%
Unknown Male	124	139	12%
Unknown Race & Gender	7	14	100%
Total	5017	5308	6%

Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander

Note: Unknown indicates data not provided in incident report. Includes ethnicity outside DOJ definitions and Native American.

SEC. 96A.3(c) (2) – ARRESTS BY AGE

Age	Q4 2017	Q4 2018	% change
Under 18	189	200	6%
18-29	1,773	1,937	9%
30-39	1,446	1465	1%
40-49	845	906	7%
50-59	563	613	9%
60+	192	187	-3%
Unknown	9	0	-100%
Total	5,017	5,308	6%

Note: Unknown indicates data not provided in incident report

SEC. 96A.3(c) (1) ARRESTS AT SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Airport Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, Fourth Quarter 2018

Race and Gender	Q4 Total	% of Total
Asian Female	3	2.2%
Asian Male	6	13.2%
Asian Unknown	0	0.0%
Black Female	3	11.0%
Black Male	27	17.6%
Black Unknown	0	0.0%
Hispanic Female	1	1.1%
Hispanic Male	5	3.3%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0.0%
White Female	3	6.6%
White Male	16	25.3%
White Unknown	0	0.0%
Unknown Female	0	3.3%
Unknown Male	11	16.5%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0.0%
Total	75	100%

Note: Unknown indicates data not provided in incident report. Includes ethnicity outside DOJ definitions and Native American.

Airport Arrests by Age, Fourth Quarter 2018

Age	Q4 Total	% of Total
Under 18	0	0%
18-29	23	31%
30-39	19	25%
40-49	17	23%
50-59	11	15%
60+	5	7%
Unknown	0	0%
Total	75	100%

SEC. 96A.3 (f) – DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY (DPA)

The Department is required to obtain information from the Department of Police Accountability (DPA), formerly the Office of Citizens Complaints, relating to the total number of complaints received during the reporting period that it characterizes as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity. The Department also is required to include in its report the total number of complaints DPA closed during the reporting period that were characterized as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity, as well as the total number of each type of disposition for such complaints. These closed cases may include complaints made in previous quarters.

Allegations of Bias based on Race or Ethnicity, Gender, or Gender Identity Received and Closed by the Department of Police Accountability (formerly the Office of Citizen Complaints)

Cases received involving claims of racial and/or gender bias	Q4 Total
Racial Bias	1
Gender Bias	0
Both Racial and Gender Bias	0
Total	1

No officers were named for allegations of racial or gender bias.
 DPA received 161 cases for the quarter.
 Total Cases Received in 2018 involving Racial or Gender Bias: 16 Cases

Closures of cases involving claims of racial and/or gender bias	Q4 Total
Racial Bias	5
Gender Bias	0
Homophobic Bias	1
Both Racial and Gender Bias	0
Total	6

11 Officers were named in those 6 cases.

Case dispositions	Q4 Total
Sustained	14
Sustained Bias-Related Allegation	0
Closed*	141
Mediated	7

*Closure reasons: Unfounded, Proper Conduct, Not Sustained, No Finding, and No Finding/Withdrawn

DPA closed a total of 162 cases for the quarter, including above.
 DPA closed a total of 613 cases for the year, including above.

Source: Department of Police Accountability

SFPD ADDED SECTION: BIAS-RELATED COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY SFPD, AND INVESTIGATED BY DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

As part of the Department’s commitment to transparency, the Department also will report on all bias-related complaints received by the Department and forwarded to the Department of Human Resources (DHR) for investigation. Closed cases may include complaints received in previous quarters.

**Bias Complaints Received and Closed by
The San Francisco Police Department and Investigated by DHR**

EEO Cases Received	Q4 2018
Gender Identity	1
Gender Discrimination	1
Race Discrimination	1
Race/Sexual Orientation Discrimination	1
Retaliation/Age Discrimination	1
Total	5

5 employees were named in the above 5 cases

EEO Cases Closed	Q4 2018
Gender Discrimination	1
Hostile Work Environment	2
Race	2
Race/Gender	1
Sexual Harassment	1
Total	7

Dispositions of the cases	Q4 2018
Sustained	0
Closed	7

Closure reasons:

- (5) Admin Closure, Insufficient Evidence
- (1) Admin Closure, Rejected
- (1) Admin Closure, Information Only

Source: SFPD Risk Management EEO Quarterly Report