

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



Prepared by San Francisco Police Department Professional Standards and  
Principled Policing Bureau  
October 2018

**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  
3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter: July 1, 2018 to September 30, 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 third quarter of 2018 (July, August, September).

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;** November 6, 2018  
**Reporting Period;** July 1, 2018 to September 30, 2018  
Includes Use of force and DPA/SFPD EEO's

**Report Due Date;** February 5, 2019  
**Reporting Period;** October 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018  
Includes Use of Force and DPA/SFPD EEO's

**Report Due Date;** May 7, 2019  
**Reporting Periods;** January 1, 2019 to March 31, 2019  
July 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018  
This is the first of two 'catch up' reports to include;  
Jan – Mar 2019 Use of Force and DPA/SFPD EEO's data, **and**  
**July '18 – Dec 2018 AB 953 data.**

**Report Due Date;** August 6, 2019  
**Reporting Periods;** April 1, 2019 – June 31, 2019  
January 1, 2019 – June 31, 2019  
Second of two 'catch up' reports to include;  
April – June Use of Force and DPA/SFPD EEO's data, **and**  
**Jan '19 - June 2019 AB 953 data**

**Report Due Date;** November 5, 2019  
**Reporting Period;** July 1, 2019 to September 31, 2019  
Return to routine quarterly reporting - Use of Force, DPA/SFPD EEO's data, 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 September 30, 2018 has trained 938 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/dgo>.

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 1,850 officers and nine civilians have participated in the CIT/Threat Assessment/De-escalation/Field Tactics and 1,742 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 trained the Crisis Intervention Specialists (Clinical Psychologists) who work with the Department.

The Department and the Department of Public Health (DPH) 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 third quarter of 2018, DPH clinicians responded to four incidents involving a person in a behavioral crisis resulting in a critical incident deployment or C/HNT call out. Additionally, CIT Unit officers consulted, assisted, or responded with Mobile Crisis clinicians to 91 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. Sixty eight cases were presented during the first three quarters of 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 THIRD QUARTER DATA SUMMARY AT A GLANCE;**

- Calls for Service: 180,923
- Calls resulting in Use of Force: 355 (0.20%)
- Suspects Observed and Reported to SFPD (CDW): 9,899
- Total Uses of Force: 660
- 400 officers used force on 406 subjects resulting in a total of 660 uses of force
- Total Arrests: 5,859
- Department of Police Accountability bias related complaints received: 0

**TOTAL CALLS FOR SERVICE (July 1 – September 30, 2018):**

<b>Calls for Service</b>			
<b>July 1 - September 30, 2018</b>			
<b>July</b>	<b>Aug</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Total - Q3</b>
58,128	61,858	60,937	<b>180,923</b>

**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).

<b>SUSPECTS by Race/Ethnicity</b>					<b>9,899 Suspects</b>
<b>July 1 - September 30, 2018</b>					
<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>Jul</b>	<b>Aug</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Total - Q3</b>	<b>% of Total Suspects</b>
<b>Asian or Pacific Islander</b>	120	135	118	373	3.8%
<b>Black</b>	1,479	1,311	1,264	4,054	41.0%
<b>Hispanic or Latin</b>	453	431	425	1,309	13.2%
<b>Native American</b>	6	7	6	19	0.2%
<b>White</b>	597	662	547	1,806	18.2%
<b>Others</b>	843	807	688	2,338	23.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,498</b>	<b>3,353</b>	<b>3,048</b>	<b>9,899</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

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

During the third quarter of 2018, the Department responded to 180,923 calls for service. Of those contacts, force was used in 355 incidents representing less than 1 percent (0.20%) of total contacts. Further, there were 660 uses of force reported by 400 officers against a total of 406 subjects. There were 5,859 arrests during the third quarter of 2018.

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

	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Q1	802	811	1%
Q2	873	601	-31%
Q3	622	660	6%
<b>YTD</b>	<b>2,297</b>	<b>2,072</b>	<b>-10%</b>

Note: 2017 Year to date counts reflect data published in previous quarterly reports

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

<b>Officers Assaulted by Month</b>			
	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>% Change</b>
July	14	36	157%
August	27	23	-15%
September	20	17	-15%
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>25%</b>

**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 third 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 third quarter of 2018, 35 percent of the total uses of force were against Black Male subjects, 22 percent of the total uses of force were against White Males, and 20 percent of the total uses of force were against Hispanic Males.

<b>Types of Force by Subject Race &amp; Gender</b>	<b>Pointing of Firearms</b>	<b>Physical Control</b>	<b>Strike by Object/Fist</b>	<b>OC (Pepper Spray)</b>	<b>Impact Weapon</b>	<b>ERIW</b>	<b>Firearm</b>	<b>Spike Strips</b>	<b>Other: Handcuffing</b>	<b>Total Uses of Force</b>	<b>%</b>
Asian Female	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1%
Asian Male	22	7	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	34	5%
Black Female	16	16	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	38	6%
Black Male	99	81	36	3	9	0	0	3	1	232	35%
Hispanic Female	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	2%
Hispanic Male	74	33	22	0	1	2	0	0	0	132	20%
White Female	11	9	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	28	4%
White Male	36	65	29	3	10	0	0	0	1	144	22%
Unknown Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0%
Unknown Male	6	15	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	28	4%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>660</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Percent</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

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, Third Quarter 2017 vs. 2018**

Subject Age Group	Number of Subjects		
	Q3 2017	Q3 2018	% change
Under 18	25	18	-28%
18-29	138	150	9%
30-39	91	116	27%
40-49	52	59	13%
50-59	28	46	64%
60+	11	5	-55%
Unknown	6	12	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>16%</b>

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

White males make up 50% of officers using force during Q3 of 2018. Asian male officers make up 18% of the use of force incidents. This parallels the Department’s Demographics.

Officer Race & Gender	Officers Using Force			Total Uses of Force			Department Demographic		
	Q3 2017	Q3 2018	% change	Q3 2017	Q3 2018	% change	Q3 2017	Q3 2018	% change
Asian Female *	8	6	-25%	11	7	-36%	49	48	-2%
Asian Male *	66	73	11%	104	107	3%	462	464	0%
Black Female	5	5	0%	6	8	33%	46	45	-2%
Black Male	22	24	9%	44	39	-11%	175	176	1%
Hispanic Female	9	9	0%	12	12	0%	70	72	3%
Hispanic Male	49	50	2%	87	81	-7%	302	324	7%
White Female	16	27	69%	32	42	31%	171	170	-1%
White Male	181	198	9%	310	348	12%	965	981	2%
Other Female **	0	1	not cal	0	1	not cal	8	9	13%
Other Male **	10	7	-30%	16	15	-6%	37	33	-11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>660</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2285</b>	<b>2322</b>	<b>1.62%</b>

\* 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		
	Q3 2017	Q3 2018	% change	Q3 2017	Q3 2018	% change
Asian Female	0	7	not cal	0	8	not cal
Asian Male	15	20	33%	27	34	26%
Black Female	28	30	7%	48	38	-21%
Black Male	156	142	-9%	272	232	-15%
Hispanic Female	7	7	0%	12	15	25%
Hispanic Male	62	81	31%	101	132	31%
White Female	4	18	350%	4	28	600%
White Male	67	87	30%	140	144	3%
Unknown Female	0	1	not cal	0	1	not cal
Unknown Male	11	13	18%	17	28	65%
Unknown Race & Gender	1	0	-100%	1	0	-100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>660</b>	<b>6%</b>

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, Third 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		
	Q3 2017	Q3 2018	% change
1	256	319	25%
2	33	25	-24%
3	3	7	133%
4	3	4	33%
5	1	0	-100%
6	0	0	not cal
7	0	0	not cal
8	1	0	-100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>20%</b>

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

Number of Officers Involved	Number of Incidents		
	Q3 2017	Q3 2018	% change
1	156	205	31%
2	97	104	7%
3	20	27	35%
4	16	11	-31%
5	5	6	20%
6	2	2	0%
7	0	0	not cal
8	0	0	not cal
9	0	0	not cal
10	1	0	-100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>20%</b>

## Types of Force by Call Type, Third 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	OC	Impact Weapon	ERIW	Firearm	Spike Strips	Other: Handcuffing	Grand Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	70	48	38	0	5	2	0	0	0	163	25%
Part I Property	82	29	13	1	3	0	0	5	0	133	20%
Person with a gun (221)	34	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	7%
Person with a knife (219)	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1%
Weapon, Carrying	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1%
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/646/916/917)	21	45	19	2	5	0	0	0	0	92	14%
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	11	16	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	33	5%
Restraining Order Violation	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1%
Terrorist Threats (650)	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1%
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	6	35	11	2	5	1	0	0	1	61	9%
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	1%
Vandalism (594/595)	4	6	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	2%
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	1%
Traffic-Related	44	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	62	9%
Citizen Holding a Prisoner (405)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0%
Fraud (470)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Aided Case (520)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0%
Bus Inspection (903M)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Narcotics Arrest	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0%
Person yelling for help (918)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Demonstration (400)	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	6	1%
Disturbance Calls (415/417)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0%
Parking Violation (587)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0%
Panic Alarm (100P)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0%
Prostitution (647B)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>660</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Uses of Force by Reason, Third Quarter 2018

Force is used most often to effect a lawful arrest.

Reason for Use of Force	Q3 2017	Q3 2018	% Change
To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search, or to prevent escape	557	622	12%
To gain compliance with a lawful order	23	10	-57%
In defense of others or in self-defense	26	21	-19%
To prevent a person from injuring himself/herself, when the person also poses an imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury to another life or	16	6	-63%
To prevent the commission of a public offense	0	1	not cal
<b>Total</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>660</b>	<b>6%</b>

## SEC. 96A.3(c) (1) TOTAL ARRESTS – Third 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 15 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	Q3 2017	Q3 2018	% change
Co. A - Central	697	886	27%
Co. B - Southern	689	721	5%
Co. C - Bayview	527	429	-19%
Co. D - Mission	955	1164	22%
Co. E - Northern	478	466	-3%
Co. F - Park	202	271	34%
Co. G - Richmond	257	211	-18%
Co. H - Ingleside	410	459	12%
Co. I - Taraval	305	275	-10%
Co. J - Tenderloin	928	964	4%
Outside SF	78	13	-83%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5526</b>	<b>5859</b>	<b>6%</b>

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

Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander

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

<b>Race and Gender</b>	<b>Q3 2017</b>	<b>Q3 2018</b>	<b>% change</b>
Asian Female	58	95	64%
Asian Male	231	344	49%
Asian Unknown	0	0	not cal
Black Female	482	550	14%
Black Male	1617	1669	3%
Black Unknown	5	1	-80%
Hispanic Female	146	206	41%
Hispanic Male	1005	1010	0%
Hispanic Unknown	1	1	0%
White Female	313	407	30%
White Male	1288	1379	7%
White Unknown	4	0	-100%
Unknown Female	60	35	-42%
Unknown Male	298	142	-52%
Unknown Race & Gender	18	20	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5526</b>	<b>5859</b>	<b>6%</b>

**SEC. 96A.3(c) (2) – ARRESTS BY AGE**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Q3 2017</b>	<b>Q3 2018</b>	<b>% change</b>
Under 18	242	228	-6%
18-29	2,069	2,087	1%
30-39	1,524	1627	7%
40-49	864	1041	20%
50-59	586	661	13%
60+	239	215	-10%
Unknown	2	0	not calc
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,526</b>	<b>5,859</b>	<b>6%</b>

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, Third Quarter 2018

<b>Race and Gender</b>	<b>Q3 Total</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Asian Female	1	1.3%
Asian Male	7	8.9%
Asian Unknown	0	0.0%
Black Female	3	3.8%
Black Male	18	22.8%
Black Unknown	0	0.0%
Hispanic Female	2	2.5%
Hispanic Male	5	6.3%
Hispanic Unknown	0	0.0%
White Female	2	2.5%
White Male	25	31.6%
White Unknown	0	0.0%
Unknown Female	3	3.8%
Unknown Male	13	16.5%
Unknown Race & Gender	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

### Airport Arrests by Age, Third Quarter 2018

<b>Age</b>	<b>Q3 Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Under 18	0	0%
18-29	16	20%
30-39	27	34%
40-49	27	34%
50-59	6	8%
60+	3	4%
Unknown	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100%</b>

**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	Q3 2018
Racial Bias	0
Gender Bias	0
Both Racial and Gender Bias	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>

No officers were named for allegations of racial or gender bias.

DPA received 176 cases for the quarter, including above.

**Total Cases Received in 2018 involving Racial or Gender Bias: 10 Cases**

Closures of cases involving claims of racial and/or gender bias	Q3 2018
Racial Bias	6
Gender Bias	1
Both Racial and Gender Bias	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>

11 Officers were named in those 7 cases.

Dispositions of the cases	Q3 2018
Sustained	17
Sustained bias-related allegation	0
Closed	162
Mediated	8

Closure reasons: Unfounded, Proper Conduct, Not sustained,

No Finding, and No Finding Withdrawn.

DPA closed a total of 187 cases for the quarter, including above.

DPA closed a total of 442 cases for the year, including above.

Source: Department of Police Accountability.

The total number of dispositions for each of the allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender or gender identity.



**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**

<b>EEO Cases Received</b>	<b>Q3 2018</b>
Gender Identity	1
Hostile Work Environment	1
Race	2
Retaliation	1
Sexual Harrassment	1
Sexual Orientation	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>

7 employees were named in the above 7 cases

<b>EEO Cases Closed</b>	<b>Q3 2018</b>
Hostile Work Environment	2
Military Discrimination	1
Sexual Harrassment	1
Sexual Orientation	1
Race	6
Race/Gender	1
Retailation	1
Slur	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>

<b>Dispositions of the cases</b>	<b>Q3 2018</b>
Sustained	0
Closed	14

Closure reasons:

- (10) Admin Closure, Insufficient Evidence
- (4) SFDHR EEO Investigation Completed

Source: SFPD Risk Management EEO Quarterly Report