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Introduction

The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) is committed to fostering transparency, accountability, and reform within all aspects of the Department, including alleged employee misconduct. This aligns with the LVMPD Mission: to provide exceptional police services in partnership with the community.

The Department Goals further support the LVMPD mission:

- Strategic prevention and reduction of crime
- Appreciate our employees and those we serve
- Foster leadership, accountability, and reform
- Excel in communication, innovation, and technology

In commitment to the community, LVMPD recognizes the importance of documenting, investigating, analyzing, and publicly reporting data on all complaints and findings against Department members, any criminal misconduct by Department members, the Citizen Review Board (CRB) process, and employee discipline. To maintain the public’s continued trust, LVMPD must maintain a high standard of ethical policing, remaining fair, impartial, and consistent in upholding the law and providing a safe community for citizens and visitors.

The Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Accountability Report reflects the Department’s continued efforts to enhance overall police service. It is intended to provide value by identifying emerging trends which may inform training development or revisions to policy and procedure.

It is important to note that this report will be published annually without data from the previous year. This is due to the length and complexity of investigations, combined with the complication of receiving reports near the end of the year. As of April 2021, there remain 114 open cases from 2020: 88 cases are under review by the Citizen’s Review Board (CRB), 11 cases are criminal complaints, and 15 are statements of complaint.

Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB)

IAB reports directly to the Assistant Sheriff of the Law Enforcement Administration and Detention Group. IAB is responsible for ensuring the Department’s integrity is maintained by conducting thorough, objective, and fair internal investigations of all alleged misconduct.

IAB is led by a captain and is comprised of the Internal Affairs Section, the Criminal Investigations Section, the Employment Diversity Section, and the Early Identification and Intervention Program. IAB staffing in 2019 consisted of two lieutenants, eight sergeants, 18 detectives, and 13 civilian employees.
**Common Terminology**

**Allegation**: A statement made by a complainant regarding a possible act of misconduct by a Department member that has not yet been investigated.

**Arbitration**: The last step in the formal process to appeal discipline where the case is heard by a neutral third party.

**Bureau case**: A Statement of Complaint (SOC) that can be handled at a bureau level. A bureau investigation is completed by the subject employee’s chain of command with the assistance of their IAB liaison sergeant.

**Citizen contact (CC)**: An allegation that does not rise to the level of a policy violation. Used internally to document contact with citizens that are customer-service disputes.

**Citizen Review Board (CRB)**: The LVMPD Citizen Review Board is an independent agency created to receive and review complaints of misconduct filed by any aggrieved person, involving LVMPD employees. Misconduct includes any improper act, omission, or decision directly affecting the person or property of an individual due to a violation of LVMPD policies and procedures.

**Closed on SOC/No Policy Violation**: A case disposition indicating the investigation proved that the complaint did not rise to the level of a policy violation.

**Complainant**: Any person who files a complaint with IAB. The complainant does not have to be directly involved in the complaint; they can be a witness or third-party subject to the complaint.

**Complaint**: Any type of case IAB investigates, e.g., SOC, CC, CRB request, CRB investigation, etc.

**CRB investigation**: A complaint forwarded to IAB via the CRB screening panel for investigation. All CRB cases will be handled by IAB.

**CRB request**: A request from the CRB for information regarding a complaint prior to the CRB screening panel reviewing the complaint. Civilian employees handle this research and serve as a liaison between CRB and IAB.

**Discipline**: Discipline can be any form of reprimand for a sustained policy violation finding. This may include, but is not limited to, a written reprimand, suspension, demotion, or termination.

**Disposition letter**: A letter sent to the complainant upon conclusion of the investigation with the outcome of the complaint.

**Exonerated**: A case disposition indicating the action reported within a complaint did occur, but was justified, legal, and proper.

**External complaints**: Any complaint that has been generated because a citizen has a complaint on an employee.

**Expedited investigation**: An alternative method to a full investigation which may be utilized when an employee readily acknowledges misconduct and wants to conclude the matter without going through a formal investigation. Less investigatory time is needed.

**Finding**: The outcome of the case or the disposition.

**Grievance**: A formal process utilized by employees to appeal any discipline or operational changes.

**Internal complaint**: Any complaint that is generated because an employee has a complaint against another employee, e.g., a supervisor generating a complaint because the employee has misused their sick time or a supervisor generating a complaint because an officer failed to complete a Use of Force Report, etc.

**The Office of Labor Relations**: Labor Relations is responsible for the maintenance of personnel files, disciplinary records and history, and grievance records. Labor Relations is also responsible for any hearings or formal matters that arise from the collective bargaining agreements.
Mediation: A cooperative, voluntary effort between LVMPD and the Clark County Neighborhood Justice Center (CCNJC) to provide a method of resolution for some complaints against employees by citizens or other employees. The process is non-judgmental and will not result in discipline, administrative action, or a report. The goal is to resolve issues and restore relationships through communication. This alternative to an internal investigation provides an opportunity for participants to communicate and understand each other’s point of view with the assistance of trained mediators.

Misconduct Not Based on Complaint (MNBC): A case disposition indicating misconduct occurred and was investigated; however, it was not part of the original complaint.

Not Sustained: A case disposition indicating the investigation failed to produce sufficient evidence to clearly prove or disprove the allegation.

Policy Failure: A case disposition indicating the act did occur and was in compliance with Department policy; however, it is also determined that the allegation of misconduct could have been prevented had policy been more clear or complete.

Preliminary investigation: The initial investigation to determine if the complaint should be handled as a CC or SOC. This entails contacting the complainant, linking any pertinent documents or evidence, and deciding how to proceed with the case.

Primary indicator: Incidents which are related to domestic violence, alcohol/drugs, criminal issues, moral turpitude, and indebtedness and/or garnishment.

Statement of Complaint (SOC): A formal investigation against a member of the Department conducted by IAB or the employee’s bureau of assignment.

Supervisory intervention: Counseling from a supervisor for a complaint that is minor in nature.

Sustained: A case disposition indicating the investigation established that misconduct occurred.

To be Assigned (TBA): An initial complaint created by IAB employees from telephone calls, faxes, emails, USPS mail, or the internet. The TBA is routed to a detective who will do a preliminary investigation and change it to either a CC or SOC.

Unfounded: A case disposition indicating the action reported within a complaint did not occur.
Executive Summary

The IAB Accountability Report is prepared by the Early Identification and Intervention Program (EIIP). This review is a two-year examination of all complaints, alleged criminal misconduct, findings, and discipline from 2018 to 2019. The executive summary is intended to highlight the most significant findings, trends, patterns, or issues documented in the report. Where appropriate, explanations are provided regarding measures introduced by the Department to address and/or mitigate identified areas of concern.

- IAB received a total of 2,096 complaints in 2019. This is a 13% decrease compared to the 2,421 complaints received in 2018 (see Complaints p. 9).

- The top SOC allegation was Interaction with the Public policy violation, with 177 total allegations. Even though this allegation had the highest number of occurrences, only 68 (38%) of these allegations were sustained (see Department-Wide Top SOC Allegations, p. 15).

- The most common disposition an employee received was Closed on SOC/No Policy Violation. A total of 66% (665 out of 1,010) resulted in this finding (see Statements of Complaint, p.14).

- Eighty-two percent (607 out of 739) of complaints received for police officers were for those assigned to one of the 10 area commands or the Traffic Bureau. This can be attributed to the higher number of citizen contacts associated with the area commands (see Police Classifications SOCs, p.17).

- Sixty-one percent (450 out of 739) of police officers with complaints had a tenure between zero and five years with LVMPD (see Police Classifications SOCs, p.18).

- Corrections classifications account for 16% (158) of the 1,010 employees that received an SOC (see Corrections Classifications SOCs, p.19).

- The CO II classification had the highest number of complaints for employees assigned to the corrections classifications with 60% (95), and the highest number of allegations with 62% (122) (see Corrections Classifications SOCs, p.19).

- The civilian classifications account for 11% (112) of the 1,010 employees that received an SOC in 2019 (see Civilian Classifications SOCs, p. 22).

- There were 21 employees arrested for 29 offenses. This is an increase in both arrested employees and offenses compared to 2018. In 2018, there were 18 arrested employees for 24 offenses (see Criminal Investigations, p. 28).

- The most common offense that employees were arrested for in both 2019 and 2018 was DUI with six and seven offenses, respectively. This is followed closely by assault/battery or domestic violence (DV) offenses, with five in 2019 and six in 2018 (see Criminal Investigations, p. 28).

- Both CRB requests and investigations decreased. CRB investigations had a more significant decrease of 57% (from 23 to 10), than CRB requests, which decreased by 25% (from 331 to 248) (see Citizen Review Board, p. 29).

- The average body-worn camera (BWC) activation performance rate (APR) was 91%, which is 11% higher than the minimum Department competency rate of 80% (see Body-Worn Cameras, p. 31).

- Sixty-four percent of cases with BWC footage available cleared the officer of alleged misconduct (see Body-Worn Cameras, p. 32).

- Of the 216 cases where BWC footage assisted IAB with their investigation, 98% were sustained (212 out of 216). This is a 10% increase from 2018, when 88% of cases where BWC footage assisted IAB with their investigation were sustained (159 out of 180) (see Body-Worn Cameras, p. 32).
Investigative Process

All complaints of employee misconduct are accepted via telephone, regular mail, in-person, email, or fax. Citizens can also file complaints directly via the website by clicking here or visiting LVMPD.com.

Once a complaint is received by IAB, a civilian employee enters the associated information into the system. The complaint is then sent to a detective as a “To be Assigned” (TBA) case. The detective will conduct a preliminary investigation to determine if the complaint alleges a policy violation. If the complaint does allege a policy violation(s), the case will become an SOC and be assigned to a team of detectives for investigation. If there were no allegations that a policy was violated, the case will become a Citizen Contact (CC). Once a complaint becomes a CC, it is reviewed by a sergeant for quality assurance and closed out. Whether the complaint becomes an SOC or CC, a detective will contact the complainant to gather more information, explain the investigative process, or explain the reasoning for the complaint being closed out.

Once the complaint becomes an SOC, the section lieutenant will determine, along with Labor Relations, what type of investigation will be conducted. If the allegation is minor in nature, the investigation may be assigned to the employee’s chain of command. It is highly probable these types of investigations will result in a supervisory intervention.

If the allegation is not minor in nature and could result in formal or punitive discipline, IAB will conduct a formal investigation. Both formal and informal investigations can result in employee discipline. Formal investigations can be time-consuming and typically involve multiple taped interviews, BWC footage review, documentation review, and other investigative steps as required to prove or disprove an allegation definitively.

Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), Chapter 289 - Peace Officers and Other Law Enforcement Personnel, is the state law that delineates the rights of peace officers as it pertains to administrative investigations and the guidelines an agency must follow when conducting these investigations. Any violation of NRS 289, can be grounds for the case to be dismissed.

At the conclusion of all cases, the section lieutenant sends a disposition letter to the citizen complainant. The letter includes the investigation’s outcome and instructions for contacting the CRB if the citizen disagrees with the finding.

Disciplinary Process

After IAB determines through an investigation that a policy violation occurred, Labor Relations and the employee’s chain of command work in conjunction to determine the appropriate level of discipline. The level of discipline is based on the specific policy that was violated, the negotiated disciplinary decision guide, comparable discipline for similar violations, and specific aggravating and mitigating factors identified during the investigation. Levels of discipline include: a written reprimand, disciplinary transfer, suspension, demotion, or termination. Once the recommendation for discipline is determined, Labor Relations follows the statutory or negotiated process for implementing discipline. Arbitration is a negotiated process for an employee to grieve discipline. A third-party arbitrator could ultimately decide any discipline above a written reprimand or overturn discipline completely. Decisions made by an arbitrator are binding.

Citizen Review Board (CRB)

The CRB is comprised of a director and 25 members, who are volunteer civilians appointed by City and County Fiscal Affairs Committee members. Members of the CRB come from diverse backgrounds composed of retired law enforcement, educators, and businesspeople, who have a stake in community affairs and are concerned with police and community relations. More information about the CRB is available by clicking here, or visiting their website at citizenreviewboard.com.
Complaints

It is the policy of this Department to provide a thorough, accurate, and impartial investigation of all allegations of misconduct for Department employees. One complaint can contain several different allegations of misconduct or several different employees under the same or separate allegations.

A complaint can be classified as:

- A Citizen Contact (CC)
- A Statement of Complaint (SOC)
- Citizen Review Board (CRB) investigations and requests.

Complaint Types

LVMPD responded to 1,588,167 calls for service*, of which .132% resulted in a complaint being generated. IAB received a total of 2,096† complaints. This is a 13% decrease compared to the 2,421 complaints received in 2018. Even though calls for service increased, along with the increase in LVMPD’s jurisdiction population, tourist volume, and convention attendance, the total number of complaints decreased from 2018 to 2019, as well as each complaint category.

Of the complaints received in 2019, 53.82% (1,128) were CCs. This number decreased 15% from the previous year (1,327). SOCs decreased 4% (740 to 710).

The most significant decreases are in the CRB category. CRB requests decreased 25% from 2018, while CRB investigations decreased 57% from 2018. Of the 248 CRB requests received in 2019, only 4% (10 complaints) were recommended for a full investigation from the CRB. In 2018, 7% (23 complaints) were recommended for a full investigation by IAB.

---

*Includes both citizen-initiated calls and the following officer-initiated calls: Vehicle stops, pedestrian stops, and bar/perimeter checks.
† Criminal complaints are not included in this total. See section Criminal Investigations for criminal complaint numbers.
Complainant Type

LVMPD makes every effort to provide accessibility for citizens and employees to file a complaint. All complaint types are generated from either an internal complainant or an external complainant.

Complaints will be accepted from any person regardless of race, sex, religion, sexual orientation or identification, age, or involvement in criminal proceedings.

In 2019, 84% (1,757) of complaints were generated from an external complainant, with 16% (339) generated from an internal complainant. This is the same for 2018 (84% or 2,027 and 16% or 394).

Complaint Sources

LVMPD believes in giving everyone an equal opportunity to report potential employee misconduct. In line with this, there are currently nine avenues LVMPD utilizes to receive complaints from citizens and employees. Complaints can be received the following ways: reporting database, callouts, in person, internal/electronic (email), letter, LVMPD.com, phone call, the CRB, and fax.

The most common reporting method for 2019 was the reporting database, with 25% (517) of complaints generated this way. When a complaint is reported through the reporting database, it means the complaint was received by an LVMPD employee and sent to IAB for investigation. This number has decreased 15% compared to 2018 (608 complaints generated). The least common reporting method for both 2018 (two) and 2019 (three) is fax.

There was a significant decrease in phone complaints (37%) and CRB (27%). However, this decrease is accounted for with a substantial increase in complaints made in person (57%). In 2018, in-person complaints accounted for 6% of all complaints made, rising to 12% in 2019. Complaints received from LVMPD.com also increased slightly, with a 10% increase from 2018, accounting for 23% of all complaints received (476 out of 2,096).
Complaint Source by Internal Versus External

SOCs had a relatively even distribution of origination from an external complainant versus an internal complainant, with 53% from an external complainant and 47% from an internal complainant. CCs almost exclusively had an external complainant (99.6%) versus .4% from an internal complainant.

The most common source type for CCs was via LVMPD.com, with 335 instances, while the most common source type for SOCs was the reporting database with 262 occurrences (237 internal complainants, 25 external complainants). The most common external complainant reporting method for both CCs and SOCs was via LVMPD.com, with 335 and 139 complaints, respectively. The most common internal complainant reporting method for SOCs was the reporting database with 237 occurrences.
**Complainant Demographics**

In the spirit of being transparent, demographics have been included in this report. Complainants do not have to provide their demographics to IAB to make a complaint. This information, if provided, is voluntary. It should be noted that the U.S. Census Bureau reports Hispanic as an ethnicity and not a race. Fifty percent of complainants for 2019 had an unspecified race or did not report their race to LVMPD.

---

### LVMPD Complainant Data – 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th># of Complainants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statements of Complaint (SOCs)

Of the 2,096 complaints received in 2019, 34% (710) were SOCs. This is a 4% decrease compared to the 740 SOCs received in 2018.

It is important to note that even though there were 710 SOCs, there was a total of 1,010 employees involved, with 1,274 allegations contained in the 710 SOCs. An SOC can include multiple officers and multiple allegations. In addition, each employee can have a different outcome or finding at the end of the investigations.

The three main categories that employees are divided into are police officers, corrections officers, and civilian employees. All categories can have employees of different ranks or classifications.

Police officers had the highest number of employees with SOCs for both 2018 and 2019. The police officer classifications account for more than half of the LVMPD workforce, making it reasonable for this classification to receive more complaints. SOCs for corrections officers increased slightly by 6% in 2019 (from 149 to 158).
SOC Dispositions

Each case has an overall finding or disposition; however, each allegation within a complaint can have a different finding. Also, employees under the same complaint with the same allegation can have different findings depending on their actions and what the investigation and evidence reveal.

The most common disposition for 2019 investigations was closed on SOC/No Policy Violation, with 66% of the investigations resulting in this finding (665 out of 1,010). Nineteen percent of findings were sustained (188), while 11% were partially sustained (111). A case can be partially sustained when there are multiple allegations, and not all of them had a sustained finding.

The police classifications had the majority of the closed on SOC/No Policy Violation findings with 80% (531 out of 665) compared to the corrections classifications and civilian classifications. Closed on SOC/No Policy Violation accounted for 72% (531 out of 739) of the police classification findings.

Even though the police classifications had the highest number of sustained complaints, they had the lowest percentage of sustained complaints with 14% (104 out of 739). The civilian classifications had the highest percentage of sustained complaints with 38% (42 out of 112). Twenty-seven percent of corrections classifications' complaints were sustained (42 out of 158).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th># of Findings</th>
<th>Percentage of Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed on SOC/No Policy Violation</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Sustained</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sustained</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other- Not Sustained</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages might not equal 100% due to rounding.

*One case with an unknown employee and classification is not included in this chart.
*The 2 pending cases are being handled criminally before the administrative investigation can begin.
The top SOC allegation for 2019 was *Interaction with the Public* policy violation, with 177 total allegations. Even though this allegation had the highest number of complaints, only 38% (68) of these allegations were sustained. The allegation with the highest number of sustained complaints was the *Body-Worn Cameras* policy violation, with 82% of allegations sustained (78 instances). *Use of Force* policy violation allegations were sustained 28% of the time (22 instances). The sustained rate for all allegations ranges from a low of 26% to a high of 82%. The median sustained rate is 37%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th># of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with the Public Policy</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of Conduct Policy</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body-Worn Cameras Policy</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Rules &amp; Regulations Policy</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Force Policy</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect of Duty Policy</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests without Warrants Policy</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search and Seizure Policy</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony and Cooperation within the Department Policy</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness Required at all Times Policy</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This allegation has two pending investigations.*

*Sustained findings include supervisory interventions.*
The police classifications include all commissioned police ranks: police recruit, police officer I (PO I), police officer II (PO II), sergeant, lieutenant, captain, deputy chief, assistant sheriff, undersheriff, and sheriff. These classifications account for the highest number of LVMPD employees, with 3,300 officers. The police officer classifications received 516 SOCs (73%) involving 739 employees and 950 allegations. Sixty-two percent of these complaints involved white employees. Twenty-two percent of these complaints involved Hispanic employees. The demographics profile for police employees with complaints versus the LVMPD police personnel demographics, are comparable.

The rank of PO II accounted for 66% of complaints (490) and 66% of allegations (631) received for all police classifications. The second highest was the PO I classification with 25% of complaints (184) and 25% of allegations (240). The ranks of PO I and PO II are frontline officers, who comprise the majority of the police classifications and have the most contact with the public. PO recruits accounted for 1% of complaints and 1% of allegations (eight complaints, nine allegations). PO recruits are in training to become police officers; this classification is a much smaller portion of the workforce. The supervisory rank with the highest number of complaints and allegations was PO sergeant, accounting for 6% of complaints (45) and 6% of allegations (53).

The police classifications include all commissioned police ranks: police recruit, police officer I (PO I), police officer II (PO II), sergeant, lieutenant, captain, deputy chief, assistant sheriff, undersheriff, and sheriff. These classifications account for the highest number of LVMPD employees, with 3,300 officers. The police officer classifications received 516 SOCs (73%) involving 739 employees and 950 allegations. Sixty-two percent of these complaints involved white employees. Twenty-two percent of these complaints involved Hispanic employees. The demographics profile for police employees with complaints versus the LVMPD police personnel demographics, are comparable.

The rank of PO II accounted for 66% of complaints (490) and 66% of allegations (631) received for all police classifications. The second highest was the PO I classification with 25% of complaints (184) and 25% of allegations (240). The ranks of PO I and PO II are frontline officers, who comprise the majority of the police classifications and have the most contact with the public. PO recruits accounted for 1% of complaints and 1% of allegations (eight complaints, nine allegations). PO recruits are in training to become police officers; this classification is a much smaller portion of the workforce. The supervisory rank with the highest number of complaints and allegations was PO sergeant, accounting for 6% of complaints (45) and 6% of allegations (53).

Top Policy Violation Allegations

Of the 950 allegations received for police classifications, Interaction with the Public policy violation was the most common allegation, with 153 occurrences. These allegations decreased by 11% from 2018. Forty-one percent (62 out of 153) of the Interaction with the Public policy violation complaints were sustained for 2019.

The allegation with the highest number of sustained complaints and the highest sustained percentage was the Body-Worn Cameras policy violation, with 82% (78 out of 95) of the allegations being sustained. Search and Seizure policy violation allegations had the lowest number of sustained complaints, with 28% (15 out of 53).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with the Public Policy</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body-Worn Cameras Policy</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of Conduct Policy**</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests without Warrants Policy</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search and Seizure Policy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sustained includes Supervisor Intervention findings. Not Sustained includes No Policy Violation, Unfounded, Exonerated, and Unable to Complete Investigation findings.

**This allegation has two pending investigations.
**Area of Assignment**

LVMPD’s jurisdiction is divided into 10 area commands, including the four surrounding, unincorporated, rural resident areas, along with the Traffic Bureau, which serves all of LVMPD’s jurisdiction. Eighty-two percent of complaints received against police officers were for officers assigned to one of the 10 area commands or the Traffic Bureau (607 out of 739). This can be attributed to the higher number of citizen contacts associated with the area commands. The remaining 18% of complaints were for officers assigned to bureaus outside of the Patrol Division.

2019 saw a slight decrease in complaints (2%) for the area commands. The Southeast Area Command (SEAC) had the highest number of complaints for 2019, with 83, and the most significant increase of complaints, up 53% from 2018 (29). The Traffic Bureau saw the second highest increase in complaints of 36% (15).

Bolden Area Command (BAC) experienced the largest decrease in complaints, with a 27% reduction (20 complaints). This was followed closely by Northeast Area Command (NEAC), which had the second highest decrease of 23% (17 complaints). Northwest Area Command (NWAC) had a comparable decrease in complaints to NEAC of 23% (13 complaints).

**Shift Assignment**

Police officers are assigned to one of three shifts: day shift, swing shift, and grave shift. Most officers work 10-hour shifts, while some work 12-hour shifts. Swing shift had the highest occurrence of complaints for 2019 (290) and 2018 (386). However, swing shift experienced a decrease of 96 incidents from 2018. Swing shift is generally a busier shift, with more assigned officers and calls for service. Grave shift had the lowest number of complaints for 2019 (201) and 2018 (290). This can be attributed to grave shift answering fewer calls for service and having fewer citizen contacts than other shifts. Day shift and grave shift experienced a similar reduction in complaints from 2018. Day shift decreased by 90 complaints and grave shift decreased by 89 complaints.
Officer Tenure

Police officer tenure ranges from a low of zero to a high of 27 years employed with the Department. Tenure does not include any years previously employed by a different law enforcement agency. Officers with zero years are those employees in the PO recruit and PO I classifications who were not employed for a full year before receiving a complaint. For supervisory ranks, tenure includes time on the Department, not necessarily time in rank.

Sixty-one percent of police officers with complaints in 2019 had a tenure between zero and five years (450 out of 739). The zero-to-five-year tenure category for officers with complaints is comprised of PO recruit, PO I, and PO II classifications. There are no supervisory classifications in this category because it is a requirement to have been a police officer for a minimum of six years to promote.

PO II was the predominant classification for officers with complaints overall for 2019 and across all tenure categories. This can be attributed to this classification’s diverse nature in terms of tenure, size, and the likelihood of public and suspect contact. The PO II classification saw a high number of complaints for officers in the zero-to-five-year tenure category with 259 complaints, and then again in the 11-to-15-year tenure category with 102 complaints. Complaints for PO II classifications seem to decrease significantly in the six-to-ten-year (49 complaints) and 16-to-20-year (55 complaints) tenure categories, and then continue to decrease further within the 21+ year tenure category (25 complaints).

The predominant supervisory classification with complaints is PO sergeant overall for 2019 and in each tenure category. Of the supervisory classifications, PO sergeant is a larger classification with more public and suspect contact. PO sergeant saw a low of complaints in the six-to-ten-year tenure category (four complaints) and a high in the 11-to-15-year tenure category (21 complaints). PO Sergeants with six to seven years on are more likely to be in a probationary status as a sergeant. There were no SOCs for personnel at the executive staff level. Executive staff includes the ranks of deputy chief, assistant sheriff, undersheriff, and sheriff. Complaints against executive staff members are not common. Still, it is important to note that when a complaint comes in for executive staff, they are investigated fully and with the same level of professionalism and thoroughness that any other Department member would receive.

Multiple SOCs

Thirteen percent (96 out of 739 employees) of employees within the police officer classifications who received an SOC received more than one SOC. The lowest was two complaints while the highest was six complaints. The most common number of SOCs for those with multiple was two, comprising 76% of officers with multiple complaints (73 out of 96). Three SOCs was the second most common number of multiple complaints, with 15 officers having three. Two officers of the 96 received six complaints, and one officer received five complaints. Officers with five or more SOCs accounted for 3% of officers with multiple complaints.
The corrections classification is comprised of all commissioned corrections ranks: corrections recruit, corrections officer I (CO I), corrections officer II (CO II), corrections sergeant, corrections lieutenant, and corrections captain, corrections deputy sheriffs, and constables. The number of corrections classifications is much smaller than the police officer classifications, and they account for 929 positions within LVMPD. The corrections classifications received 102 SOCs containing 158 involved employees and 197 allegations, accounting for 16% (158) of the 1,010 employees that received an SOC in 2019. Thirty-eight percent of these complaints involved white employees. Twenty-six percent of these complaints involved black employees. The demographics profile for corrections employees with complaints versus the LVMPD corrections personnel demographics, are comparable.

The CO II classification had the highest number of complaints in 2019 with 60% (95), and the highest number of allegations with 62% (122). The second highest classification of CO I accounted for 21% of complaints (33) and 22% of allegations (44). The CO II classification accounts for the highest number of corrections employees.

CO sergeant is the supervisory classification with the highest number of complaints and allegations, with 15 each. CO lieutenant is the second highest for complaints and allegations, with five each.

Top Policy Violation Allegations
Of the 197 allegations for corrections officers in 2019, the most common allegation was Conformity to Rules and Regulations policy violation for both 2018 (49 allegations) and 2019 (52 allegations). This allegation is used to document violations of standard operating procedures that are only applicable to the Detention Services Division. These allegations accounted for 26% of the total allegations received for corrections officers in 2019. The Conformity to Rules and Regulations policy violation allegation had the highest sustained rate by a significant margin at 75% (39) sustained allegations.
Area of Assignment

The Clark County Detention Center (CCDC) is divided into six bureaus. The bureau with the highest number of complaints for 2019 was the Central Booking Bureau (D/CBB). D/CBB had 56 complaints in 2019, which is a 100% increase from 2018 (28 complaints). Two other bureaus experienced increased complaints in 2019, the Civil/Constable Bureau (D/CCB) by 63%, and the North Tower Bureau (D/NTB) by 5%. The remaining three bureaus, North Valley Complex (D/NVC), Staff/Admin Operations Bureau (D/SAOB), and South Tower Bureau (D/STB) experienced an 86% decrease, 52% decrease, and 14% decrease, respectively. D/NVC had the lowest number of complaints for both 2018 and 2019 and saw an 86% decrease. D/SAOB saw the second highest decrease, with a change of 52%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Booking Bureau (D/CBB)*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil/Constable Bureau (D/CCB)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tower Bureau (D/NTB)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Valley Complex (D/NVC)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Admin Operations Bureau (D/SAOB)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tower Bureau (D/STB)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The CBB had multiple cases with several involved officers.

Shift Assignment

Unlike police officers, corrections officers primarily work 12-hour shifts consisting of a day shift and night shift. In 2019, there were more complaints on night shift than day shift. This is the opposite of 2018 when more complaints were filed on day shift than night shift.

*There was one incident in 2018 that occurred on swing shift that is not reflected in the above chart.
Officer Tenure

Tenure for corrections officers with complaints ranges from a low of zero to a high of 24 years. Tenure does not include any years previously employed by a different law enforcement agency. Corrections officers with zero years are those employees in the CO recruit and CO I classifications who were not employed for a full year before receiving a complaint. For supervisory ranks, tenure includes time on the Department, not necessarily time in rank.

The zero-to-five-year tenure category for corrections officers accounted for the most complaints with 48% (76 out of 158 complaints). The predominant classification within the zero-to-five-year tenure range is CO II with 36 complaints, followed closely by CO I with 33 complaints. The disparity between these two classifications is much smaller than the disparity between the comparative PO II and PO I classifications for police officers within the zero-to-five-year tenure range. Complaints for the CO II classification are highest in every category and overall account for 60% of all corrections complaints. Complaints for the CO II classification saw a high during the zero-to-five-year tenure (36) and a decline in complaints during the six-to-ten-year tenure (5) category.

The corrections officer supervisory classifications received the majority of their complaints in the 11-to-15-year tenure category and the 16-to-20-year tenure category. CO sergeants had the highest number of complaints in both aforementioned tenure categories (seven and six). CO lieutenant was the only supervisory rank to receive more complaints in a tenure category than the CO sergeant rank. CO lieutenants had two complaints for employees in the 21+ years tenure category, versus one complaint for CO sergeants in the 21+ years tenure category.

Multiple SOCs

Of the 158 corrections officers that received complaints in 2019, 24 of those had more than one complaint. Those with multiple complaints account for 15% of corrections officers with complaints (24 out of 158). There was a low of two complaints and a high of three complaints. The most common number of multiple complaints was two, with 18 occurrences. There were six instances where a single corrections officer had three complaints.
The civilian classification is comprised of all non-commissioned LVMPD employees. There are numerous different jobs and ranks within the civilian classification, which can include administrative assistants, report takers in the field, and forensic scientists. These can best be understood and broken down by performing distinct functions within the Department: administrative positions, investigative positions, supervisory positions, and part-time positions. The civilian classification received 91 SOCs involving 112 employees and 126 allegations. The civilian classification accounts for 11% (112) of the 1,010 employees that received an SOC. Fifty-four percent of these complaints involved white employees. Thirteen percent of these complaints involved Hispanic employees. The demographics profile for civilian employees with complaints versus the LVMPD civilian personnel demographics are comparable.

The civilian classification with the highest number of complaints and allegations is administrative with 81 complaints and 87 allegations. Administrative employees account for 72% of the civilian complaints received in 2019. Several administrative positions provide essential services to the public, such as fingerprinting, report taking, and background checks. These employees have a larger propensity for citizen contact than those in investigative or supervisory positions. Supervisory positions accounted for 18 complaints received in 2019, which is 16% of the total complaints.

**Top Policy Violation Allegations**

The most common allegation for civilian employees in 2019 by a small margin was Neglect of Duty policy violation with 17 allegations. Neglect of duty complaints decreased by one from 2018. The allegations with the highest number of sustained complaints were the Neglect of Duty policy violation and the Conformity to Rules and Regulations policy violation, both with 14 sustained. However, Conformity to Rules and Regulations policy violation cases had a higher sustained percentage of 88% (14 of 16). Harmony and Cooperation Within the Department policy violation had 14 total allegations; however, 86% were not sustained (12 out of 14).
**Area of Assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Areas of Assignment for Complaints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD Records Bureau (D/REC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records and Fingerprint Bureau (RFB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Booking Bureau (D/CBB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalistics Bureau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civilians are assigned to all bureaus within LVMPD. The civilian classifications provide vital support in many different forms. Some bureaus have a higher number of civilians or are complete civilian bureaus, which causes those bureaus to have a higher number of civilian complaints. The Communications Bureau and the Detention Services Division Records Bureau (D/REC) had the highest number of complaints for civilians in 2019, accounting for 20% each (23 out of 112). For the Communications Bureau, this is a decrease of 41% (16 complaints). In contrast, the D/REC Bureau saw an increase of 21% from 2018 to 2019 (four complaints).

**Shift Assignment**

Civilian employees can be assigned to any shift, with any days off, similar to the police and corrections classifications. However, most of the civilian workforce is on day shift. Day shift is consistently the shift with the highest number of complaints by a large margin.
Civilian Tenure

Tenure for civilian employees with complaints ranges from a low of zero to a high of 38 years. Civilians have a higher range of tenure than the police and corrections classifications as civilians are required to work more years. Zero to five years is the most common tenure category for civilians with complaints, accounting for 39% (44 out of 112). This is followed by a sharp decrease in the six-to-ten-year tenure category comprised of 5% of complaints (six out of 112). The second highest complaint tenure category is 11 to 15 years, with 26% (29 out of 112).

The administrative civilian employee classification was the only one to record complaints in every tenure category. The most common tenure category for administrative civilian employees with complaints was zero to five years, with 39 complaints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>0-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11-15 Years</th>
<th>16-20 Years</th>
<th>21+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple SOCs

Civilian employees had the lowest number of employees with multiple complaints, with 12 out of the 112. No civilian employees had more than two SOCs in 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Complaints</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 SOCs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department-Wide Citizen Contacts (CCs)

A CC can involve more than one employee under the same complaint number, but unlike SOCs, they do not contain any specific allegations. Furthermore, a CC will never be generated to track criminal misconduct of officers. In 2019, 53.82% of all complaints received were CCs (1,128 out of 2,096). This is a 15% decrease from the 1,327 CCs that were received in 2018. There were 1,707 employees involved in the 1,128 CCs received in 2019. This is a 13% decrease from the 1,971 employees with a CC in 2018. Although a CC does not rise to the level of an SOC, they still receive an investigation from IAB to ensure no misconduct occurred. If it is found that misconduct occurred during the investigation, a CC is converted into an SOC for a formal investigation.

Classifications

Like SOCs, police officers received the majority of CCs for 2019. Police officers accounted for 81% of the employees involved in a CC (1,388 of 1,707). The next highest classification was the unknown employee classification accounting for 12% of CCs received in 2019 (208 out of 1,707). When a detective is unable to link an employee to a CC through the course of the investigation, they leave it in the system under the “unknown” employee category. Often, the lack of information received from a complainant limits IAB’s ability to identify and link a Department member to the complaint. Overall, each classification saw a reduction in the number of CCs received from 2018 to 2019. The corrections classification saw the most significant reduction in CCs of 52% (60).

Members of executive staff received only one CC during 2019. This is a reduction of two CCs from the three received in 2018. CCs against executive staff members are not common. Still, it is important to note that when a CC comes in for executive staff, they are investigated fully and with the same level of professionalism and thoroughness that any other Department member would receive.
Area of Assignment

The bureau with the highest number of employees with CCs for 2019 was NWAC, with 170 employees being the subject of a CC. The 10 area commands in the valley and the Traffic Bureau accounted for 73% of all employees with CCs in 2019 (1,247 out of 1,707). Twelve percent, or 208 CCs, had an unknown employee, and the remaining 15% of employees with a CC work in various investigative bureaus throughout the Department.

The number of employees involved in CCs in 2019 is comparable to the numbers from 2018. Overall, there was a reduction, and almost every area command saw a reduction in the number of involved employees. Only two area commands saw an increase in involved employees: SEAC had an increase of 9% (136 to 148), and SVAC had an increase of 39% (88 to 122).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Command</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolden Area Command (BAC)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Center Area Command (CCAC)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Area Command (DTAC)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Area Command (EAC)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Area Command (NEAC)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Area Command (NWAC)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Area Command (SCAC)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Area Command (SEAC)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Valley Area Command (SVAC)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerlin Area Command (SAC)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Bureau (TRAFF)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Bureaus</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>-34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criminal Investigations

Criminal complaints against Department members undergo two separate IAB investigations. First, the complaints are investigated criminally by the IAB Criminal Investigations section (CIS) to determine if a crime occurred and if any criminal charges are warranted. After the completion of the criminal investigation, IAB performs an internal administrative investigation to determine if there were any LVMPD policy violations relating to the allegations of criminal misconduct. The criminal and administrative investigations are conducted separately; however, the administrative investigation is privy to the information uncovered during the criminal investigation. The criminal detectives are not involved in the administrative investigation. It is imperative to ensure the bifurcation of the two investigations to avoid compromising a criminal case or violating an employee’s constitutional rights.

In 2019, CIS within IAB made 21* arrests involving criminal misconduct of employees. This was a 17% increase from 2018, where there were 18 arrests made for criminal misconduct by employees. Police officer classifications accounted for more arrests in both 2018 and 2019 than the other classification and accounted for 74% of all arrests made for both 2018 and 2019.

Tenure

The tenure of employees arrested from 2018 to 2019 ranged from zero to 23 years with LVMPD. Fifty-six percent of employees arrested for both years had a tenure between two and five years at the time of the arrest. This is comparable to the most common tenure range of employees that received IAB complaints. Additionally, the tenure range of zero to five years was the highest for 2019 and 2018 by double or more than any other tenure category.

---

* Criminal investigations are not counted in the overall complaint total to avoid duplication of complaints.
Criminal Offenses

Similar to how a complaint against an employee can contain multiple allegations of misconduct, an arrest can involve multiple offenses or charges. In 2019, there were 21 employees arrested for 29 offenses. This is an increase in both arrested employees and offenses compared to 2018. In 2018, there were 18 arrested employees for 24 offenses. The most common offense that employees were arrested for in both years was DUI, with seven (2018) and six (2019) offenses. This is followed closely by assault/battery or domestic violence (DV) offenses, with five in 2019 and six in 2018. There was a total of 16 different offense categories between 2018 and 2019 that employees were arrested for.

Arrest Jurisdiction

LVMPD employees do not have to be arrested by LVMPD. Employees can be subject to misconduct, investigations, and arrests in other jurisdictions. When an LVMPD employee is arrested in another jurisdiction, IAB and CIS are often notified during the arrest or immediately after so that LVMPD can respond to the scene (if in-state). Furthermore, it is the policy of the Department that employees will immediately, or as soon as practical, notify their supervisor when charged with, or accused of, a criminal violation or misconduct regardless of the jurisdiction. For employee arrests, LVMPD was the arresting agency 54% of the time. The second highest arresting agency was Nevada Highway Patrol, with 18% of employee arrests, which correlates with the high DUI and traffic offenses. Only 3% of employee arrests were conducted by out-of-state agencies.

Criminal Offense Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUI Offense</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault/Battery/DV Offense</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Offense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resisting/Obstructing Arrest Offenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewdness/Obscenity Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbance Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offense</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny/Theft/Stolen Property Offense</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child/Minor Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Person Offense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud/Forgery Offense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms/Weapons Offense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes Against Person Offense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The “other” offense category consists of criminal violations such as perjury and misconduct of a public officer.*
Citizen Review Board (CRB)

The LVMPD CRB is an independent agency created in 1997 to receive and review complaints of misconduct involving LVMPD employees, filed by any aggrieved person. The CRB has subpoena power and the authority to recommend sanctions for officer misconduct. In addition, the CRB also can review internal investigations completed by IAB.

The CRB is comprised of a director and 25 members who are volunteer civilians appointed by the City and County Fiscal Affairs Committee. Membership is composed of retired law enforcement, educators, and businesspeople, who are invested in their community and concerned with police and community relations. Even though board members may have prior law enforcement experience, they cannot be a current or former LVMPD employee. This requirement is put in place to uphold the integrity of the investigations.

CRB Requests and Investigations

With the CRB being a separate entity, it has its own process for classifying and investigating complaints that differ from the way the IAB classifies complaints. This report only reflects the IAB side of CRB investigations. When the CRB receives a complaint, it will often request information from IAB to conduct its investigation. These requests are tracked and classified as CRB requests. When the CRB reviews a complaint that warrants a full IAB investigation, these complaints come to IAB as CRB investigations. CRB investigations will receive a full and thorough investigation as if it were an SOC. In 2019, both CRB requests and investigations decreased. CRB investigations decreased by 57% (from 23 to 10), and CRB requests decreased by 25% (From 331 to 248).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Dismissed</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismiss- Agree with IA</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismiss- No Jurisdiction</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain- Agree with IA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRB Request Findings

The CRB request findings, or case dispositions, come directly from the CRB to IAB. These are used so that the IAB knows if a full investigation is needed or if the request can be closed out, indicating that the CRB has completed their investigation. The most common disposition for both 2019 and 2018 is Case Dismissed with 161 and 210 findings, respectively. While almost all findings saw a decrease from 2018, the Sustain-Agree with IA finding saw an increase of 109% (12 complaints).

CRB Investigation Findings

CRB investigation findings are more similarly aligned with the SOC or complaint dispositions. This is because the CRB investigation findings come from IAB after conducting a full investigation at the request of the CRB. The Closed on SOC and Partially Sustained findings are the most common in 2019, with three findings each. The Closed on SOC finding had a dramatic decrease from 2018 to 2019 of 82% (14 complaints). However, this decrease corresponds with the decrease in overall CRB investigations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed on SOC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Sustained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sustained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfounded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed- No Policy Violation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CRB Requests by Classification**

Like complaints, CRB requests can involve multiple employees being investigated by the CRB. Of the 248 CRB requests received in 2019, there were 325 employees involved. The predominant classification of involved employees was the CO II classification with 128 in 2019. This is a decrease from the number of CO II employees involved in 2018. The corrections classification receives the majority of CRB requests, which may be attributed to the reporting system made available to inmates within the Clark County Detention Center (CCDC).

**CRB Investigations by Classification**

Of the 10 CRB Investigations conducted in 2019, there were 20 involved employees. The most common involved employee classification was CO II with seven, followed closely by the PO II classification with five. Both the CO II and PO II classifications experienced a significant decrease in CRB investigations of five and six investigations, respectively. This significant decrease can be attributed to the decrease in overall CRB investigations in 2019. The corresponding ranks in both the corrections and police classifications experienced a comparable number of complaints in 2018 and 2019.
Body-Worn Cameras

LVMPD strives to maximize trust, transparency, and communication, as well as develop and enhance community relationships. The deployment of body-worn cameras (BWC) affords the Department the ability to be transparent and investigate complaints by reviewing a firsthand account of the event.

LVMPD began outfitting officers with BWC in 2014. Currently, 2,384 (73%) police officers wear BWC, to include all patrol officers. Some specialized units have not been issued BWC due to the nature of their position. When compared to 2018, the number of issued cameras increased by 21, which is a 1% increase. It is the policy of this Department that officers assigned a BWC will activate their camera under the following circumstances:

- All calls for service involving citizen or suspect contact
- Officer-initiated activity
- Any citizen contact that becomes adversarial
- Witness, victim, and suspect interviews including Miranda Warning and post-Miranda contact
- Detentions or investigations pursuant to an arrest
- Searches of persons, structures, or vehicles
- While transporting prisoners
- After the occurrence of an officer-involved traffic accident
- When viewing third-party video that may be deleted or lost as evidence
- When driving code 3 (lights and siren)
- Any involvement in a vehicle pursuit
- When field testing narcotics, counting seized money, or documenting high value property
- K9, traffic, and resident officers responding to calls will activate within two miles of arrival

**Department-Wide Activation Performance Rates**

LVMPD monitors compliance with the Body-Worn Cameras policy by evaluating the activation performance rate (APR) each month. The minimum acceptable APR is 80%. Any officer with an APR below 80% is evaluated by the sergeant to verify if the activation rate is accurate and if all BWC footage from that officer was properly linked with a corresponding event. They also consider instances where a BWC activation was not required by policy. These instances are factored in manually to get an accurate APR for those officers. All policy violations are documented, and any performance issues are addressed.

The Department maintains an APR range of 90% to 92%. The average APR for all of 2019 was 91%, which is 11% higher than the minimum competency of 80%.
Of the 2,096 complaints that came in for 2019, there was BWC footage available for 1,178 complaints. During an investigation, IAB detectives will watch and analyze all BWC footage related to the complaint. However, even though there are stringent BWC activation guidelines, there is not always BWC footage available to investigators when a complaint comes in. Sometimes, IAB is unable to determine the subject employee of a complaint through an investigation, and therefore cannot review BWC footage. There may also be instances when an officer is not required to wear a BWC or when an officer does not activate their BWC. When an officer fails to activate their BWC as required per policy, the appropriate course of action is taken to address the policy violation.

During an investigation, the IAB detectives spend a considerable amount of time reviewing all available footage that pertains to the allegation. In doing this, detectives are able to obtain a firsthand account of the encounter in question. Sometimes this BWC review can result in a case being cleared without further investigation. In 2019, 64% of cases with BWC footage available cleared the officer of alleged misconduct (754 out of 1,178). This is comparable to 2018, where 65% of cases were cleared by BWC footage (786 out of 1,206). In addition to clearing cases, BWC is a useful tool for proving or sustaining allegations of misconduct. In 2019, of the 216 cases where BWC footage assisted IAB with their investigation, 98% were sustained (212 out of 216). This is a 10% increase from 2018, when 88% of cases where BWC footage assisted IAB with their investigation were sustained (159 out of 180).
Employee Discipline

Once IAB concludes their investigation, the subject employee is notified of the outcome by their chain of command. A recommendation for discipline, if any, is determined by reviewing the case, the appropriate Disciplinary Decision Guide, comparable discipline, and any aggravating and mitigating factors. Labor Relations then oversees the discipline process with the employee and their chain by ensuring compliance with the procedures as outlined by negotiations and statutes. Discipline is outlined in an Adjudication of Complaint (AOC). Once given the AOC, the employee has a specified amount of time to file a grievance to appeal the determination of discipline. The grievance process contains multiple steps, and in some cases, the final step is a neutral, third-party arbitrator who will hear the case and ultimately determine the appropriate level of discipline, if any.

**Discipline Given**

The most common form of discipline received in 2019 was a written reprimand with 104 occurrences. This is a decrease of 31 from 2018. The written reprimand is the lowest level of discipline an employee can receive for a sustained complaint and is reserved for minor policy violations. An employee can receive higher levels of discipline if they continue to receive sustained complaints for similar misconduct, have prior discipline in their file, or if the misconduct itself warrants a more severe level of discipline.

Suspension was the second most common level of discipline given in 2019, with 60 occurrences. A suspension is a set number of hours, ranging from eight to 40, during which the employee will be prohibited from working and will not receive pay. There was a decrease by four suspensions from 2018 to 2019.

The highest level of discipline that the LVMPD utilizes is termination. There were 11 terminations in 2019. Employee termination was the only category of discipline to experience an increase from 2018.
Arbitration Decisions

In 2019, seven disciplinary grievances proceeded to arbitration. Arbitration is the final step in the grievance process for terminations, other high levels of discipline, and non-disciplinary grievances. The arbitrator’s decision is binding and can only be challenged in very rare circumstances. Of the seven arbitrations in 2019, three grievances were granted by the arbitrator, and four were denied. Therefore, in three cases the arbitrator agreed with the employee’s challenge and awarded what the employee had requested as a remedy. Overall, there were four more arbitrations in 2019 compared to 2018. In 2018, there were no grievances that were granted by an arbitrator; however, there was one instance where a grievance was modified.
Accountability

LVMPD endeavors to foster leadership, accountability, and reform as stated in the Department Goals. The patterns revealed by the data collected in this report will be used in conjunction with LVMPD’s Early Identification and Intervention Program (EIIP). This program aims to improve supervision, clarify patterns in employee behavior, and strengthen the culture of integrity and accountability within the Department by attempting to understand employee behavior related to misconduct allegations.

EIIP is designed to track various indicators and assist supervisors with early identification of employees whose performance indicates emerging problems. Ultimately, this allows supervisors to intervene in a productive way and address these patterns before they turn into employee misconduct. EIIP works in collaboration with the Police Employee Assistance Program (PEAP), the Health and Safety Detail, and Advanced Training to offer relevant assistance in many forms to include counseling, training, and modified job duties for identified performance issues.

This is the first edition of The Internal Affairs Bureau Accountability Report, and therefore provides data for 2018-2019; however, in the years to come, this report will grow into a three-year statistical analysis. Based on the data from this initial report, the Department has identified areas for further analysis in hopes of identifying policy and training improvements by illumining both weaknesses and best practices.

Actionable Items

LVMPD is committed to analyzing the following data points:

- Bolden Area Command experienced the largest decrease in complaints from 2018 to 2019 with 27% (74 to 54).
- The Traffic Bureau experienced the second highest increase in complaints from 2018 to 2019 with 36% (42 to 57).
- Central Booking Bureau in the Clark County Detention Center saw a 100% increase in complaints from 2018 to 2019 (28 to 56).
- Corrections officers on night shift experienced more complaints in 2019 than corrections officers on day shift. This was contrary to 2018, when day shift experienced more complaints.
- The Civil Constables Bureau experienced a 63% increase in complaints from 2018 to 2019 (8 to 13).
- The top SOC allegation for 2019 was Interaction with the Public policy violation with 177 allegations.
- Employees within the 11-to-15-year tenure category received the second highest number of complaints across all classifications for 2019.
- Allegations for violations of the Use of Force policy accounted for 6% of all SOC allegations against Department employees in 2019 (78 allegations out of 1,274 allegations).
- DUI related offenses were consistently the top offense that LVMPD employees were arrested for in 2018 and 2019.