

LOS ANGELES POLICE COMMISSION

# REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT'S GANG UNIT INSPECTIONS



Conducted by the

## OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

NICOLE C. BERSHON  
Inspector General

July 21, 2010

**OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL  
REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT’S GANG UNIT INSPECTIONS**

**PURPOSE**

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG), in accordance with the Transition Agreement and pursuant to its Annual Audit and Review Plan, completed its first gang unit inspections review. This first review covered three gang unit inspections completed in 2009, which included Arrest Report packages, Detention Logs and the Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) - Supervisor’s Daily Reports.<sup>1</sup>

**BACKGROUND**

Consent Decree paragraph 106(h) required the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Bureau Gang Coordinators (BGCs) to monitor and assess the operations of all units that address gang activity. Each BGC was required to inspect at least one Area unit each month, and submit completed inspections to the pertinent Bureau, Area, Special Operations Support Division and Audit Division. On September 2003, the Department’s Civil Rights Integrity Division was assigned responsibility for planning and coordinating BGC inspections.

The Department has been conducting gang unit inspections for approximately eight years to test adherence of gang units to relevant policies and procedures. The gang unit inspections included review of the Department’s Area GED units, Department’s Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) units, the Operations - South Bureau gang unit and the Gang Criminal Homicide Group gang unit. The entities responsible for conducting and providing supervisory oversight of these inspections since 2003 have been as follows:

<b>Period</b>	<b>Entity Conducting Inspections</b>	<b>Entity Overseeing Inspections</b>
2003 to 2008	Bureau Gang Coordinators	Civil Rights and Integrity Division
2009	Bureau Gang Coordinators	Gang and Narcotics Division (GND)
2010	Internal Audits and Inspections Division (IAID) <sup>2</sup>	IAID

In 2009 the Department completed inspections of various gang unit’s Arrest Report packages, Detention Logs, GED - Supervisor’s Daily Reports, vehicle and equipment check-ins, CalGang® database information gathering, intelligence maintenance, and annual performance evaluations.

**REVIEW OBJECTIVES**

The OIG reviewed separate gang inspections of Arrest Report packages, Detention Logs and GED - Supervisor’s Daily Reports, because it considered these to involve the most high-risk areas. The OIG reviewed each of the three inspections for three objectives: completeness, quality and findings, as described below:

---

<sup>1</sup> The test work for the inspection of Arrest Report packages was completed in 2009, although the final report was issued in 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Since 2005, IAID has also been conducting Area Command Accountability Performance Audits, which also test adherence of gang units to various policies and procedures.

Completeness

- Determine if the inspection tested and reported compliance for all the stated objectives.
- Determine if the inspection samples were selected from complete populations.

Quality

- Determine if appropriate sampling methodologies and testing questions were used.
- Determine if there was evidence of supervisory review of the inspection.
- Determine if the inspection completely and accurately reported the inspection's purpose, methodology, objectives, results and detailed findings.

Findings

- Determine if the reported findings correctly represented significant instances in which compliance was not achieved.
- Determine if there were any additional findings that were not reported which represented significant instances in which compliance was not achieved.

The OIG conducted this review in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. These standards require that the review is adequately planned, performed and supervised, and that sufficient, appropriate evidence is examined to provide a reasonable basis for the results and conclusion.

**OVERALL REVIEW RESULTS**

Completeness

The three inspections reviewed by the OIG reported compliance for all stated objectives, and the inspection samples were selected from complete populations. Hence, the three inspections met the OIG's standard for completeness.

Quality

Appropriate testing questions were generally used for the three inspections, and there was evidence of supervisory review of the inspections. Also, the three inspections completely and accurately reported the inspection's purpose, methodology, objectives, results and detailed findings. Hence, the three inspections met the OIG's standard for quality.

Findings

The reported findings correctly represented significant instances in which compliance was not achieved. Also, there were no additional findings that were not reported which represented significant instances in which compliance was not achieved. Hence, the three inspections met the OIG's standard for findings.

## **REVIEW OF INSPECTION OF ARREST REPORT PACKAGES**

### **Inspection Objectives**

This inspection was conducted to determine if:

- Arrest Reports and Booking Approvals were properly approved by the watch commander;
- The Admonition of Rights, if given, was properly documented on the appropriate reports;
- The Arrest Report properly articulated reasonable suspicion to detain, probable cause to arrest, elements of the crime and the appropriate legal basis for any searches conducted;
- Recovery of property was properly articulated and documented;
- Medical treatment was provided, if applicable; and,
- Proper juvenile arrest policies and procedures were documented.

### **Inspection Methodology**

GND identified the total population of Arrest Report packages for 29 gang units for June 2009. GND deselected infractions, traffic citations, misdemeanor warrants, release-from-custody arrests and parole warrant arrests with no open charges from this total population. GND selected a maximum of ten Arrest Report packages for each gang unit. For gang units with more than ten applicable Arrest Report packages, GND randomly selected a sample of ten Arrest Report packages. For gang units with ten or less applicable Arrest Report packages, GND selected all Arrest Report packages. In total, GND selected 224 Arrest Report packages for testing by the Bureau Gang Coordinators and their supporting staff.

THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**Inspection Test Results**

A total of 224 Arrest Report packages prepared in June 2009 by 29 gang units were inspected by the Bureau Gang Coordinators and their supporting staff. There were 29 findings for the 3,922 total attributes tested, which computed to a 99% weighted average compliance rate.<sup>3</sup>

Bureau	Gang Unit	No. of Arrest Report Packages Tested	No. of Applicable Attributes Tested	No. of Tested Attributes with Findings	Weighted Average Compliance Rate
<b>Central</b>	Central GED	8	176	1	99% (175/176)
“ “	Hollenbeck GED	10	240	0	100% (240/240)
“ “	Hollenbeck Estrada CLEAR	9	207	0	100% (207/207)
“ “	Hollenbeck Ramona CLEAR	7	147	1	99% (146/147)
“ “	Rampart GED	10	240	1	99% (239/240)
“ “	Rampart CLEAR	8	176	0	100% (176/176)
“ “	Newton GED	10	230	0	100% (230/230)
“ “	Newton CLEAR	7	147	3	98% (144/147)
“ “	Northeast GED	10	220	1	99% (219/220)
“ “	Northeast CLEAR	5	110	10	91% (100/110)
<b>South</b>	77 <sup>th</sup> GED and CLEAR	10	140	1	99% (139/140)
“ “	Southeast GED	8	112	0	100% (112/112)
“ “	Southeast CLEAR	5	70	2	97% (68/70)
“ “	Southwest GED	8	112	0	100% (112/112)
“ “	Southwest CLEAR	6	84	0	100% (84/84)
“ “	Harbor GED	9	126	5	96% (121/126)
“ “	Criminal Gang Homicide Group	10	140	0	100% (140/140)
<b>Valley</b>	Van Nuys GED	5	70	0	100% (70/70)
“ “	Mission GED	10	140	0	100% (140/140)
“ “	West Valley GED	3	42	1	98% (41/42)
“ “	Devonshire GED	6	84	0	100% (84/84)
“ “	Foothill GED and CLEAR	10	140	2	99% (138/140)
“ “	North Hollywood GED	3	42	0	100% (42/42)
“ “	Topanga GED	10	140	0	100% (140/140)
<b>West</b>	Hollywood GED	10	191	0	100% (191/191)
“ “	West Los Angeles GED	3	43	0	100% (43/43)
“ “	Wilshire GED	10	150	1	99% (149/150)
“ “	Pacific GED	7	105	0	100% (105/105)
“ “	Olympic GED	7	98	0	100% (98/98)
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>3,922</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>99% (3,893/3,922)</b>

<sup>3</sup> The weighted average compliance rate is determined by comparing the total number of applicable attributes tested for each objective to the number of findings.

## **OIG Review Methodology**

The OIG performed a meta-inspection, which involved answering the inspection's testing questions for the aforementioned inspection objectives.<sup>4</sup> The OIG randomly selected a sample of 22 Arrest Report packages from the total sample of 224 Arrest Report packages and utilized a one-tail confidence level of 95%, with an expected error rate of 6% and a plus-precision of 8%.

## **OIG Review Results**

### Completeness

The inspection tested and reported compliance for 20 questions used to evaluate the preparation and completion of Arrest Reports, Booking Approvals, Property Reports, Miranda Statement Forms, Juvenile Arrest Reports and other related documents in the Arrest Report package. The Arrest Reports were selected from complete populations. Hence, the inspection of Arrest Reports met the OIG's standard for completeness.

### Quality

The inspection used an appropriate sampling methodology and testing questions, and there was evidence of supervisory review of the inspection. The inspection completely and accurately reported the inspection's purpose, methodology, objectives, results and detailed findings. Hence, the inspection of Arrest Reports met the OIG's standard for quality.

The OIG noted that 16 of the 240 Arrest Report packages included in the sample were deselected and not replaced with alternate Arrest Report packages.<sup>5</sup> The final inspection sample of 224 Arrest Report packages however, was sufficient in size to accurately determine Department-wide gang unit compliance, thereby negating the impact of not replacing the 16 deselected packages.<sup>6</sup>

The OIG also noted per the inspection workpapers that two of the Arrest Report packages selected by GND could not be located for testing. Although failing to test these two Arrest Report packages did not adversely impact the overall results of the inspection, the OIG believes that it is incumbent upon the Department to locate each package. Prior to the conclusion of this review, both Arrest Report packages were located.

### Findings

The reported findings correctly represented significant instances in which compliance was not achieved. Also, there were no additional findings that were not reported which represented

---

<sup>4</sup> The OIG modified the inspection's Arrest Report package testing questions to match the Arrest Report package testing questions used by IAID during their Command Accountability Performance Audits. In doing this, the total number of testing questions decreased from 29 to 20, because some questions were consolidated, and only questions pertaining to high-risk issues were answered.

<sup>5</sup> Deselecting samples were conducted in accordance with GND's stated methodology.

<sup>6</sup> This conclusion was based on a comparison of total Arrest Report packages reviewed by IAID in its Department-wide 2009/2010 Arrest, Booking, and Charging Reports Audit in which 107 packages reviewed was determined to represent a statistically valid sample.

significant instances in which compliance was not achieved. Hence, the inspection of Arrest Reports met the OIG's standard for findings.

## **REVIEW OF INSPECTION OF DETENTION LOGS**

### **Inspection Objectives**

This inspection was conducted to determine if:

- The detainee/arrestee name was entered on the Detention Log;
- The Detention Log header was appropriately completed;
- The fields of the Detention Log were completed correctly and thoroughly;
- The Detention Log indicated the watch commander inspection and interview boxes were checked;
- The watch commander took appropriate action based on the results of the inspection and responses; and,
- The watch commander signed the Detention Log, with a legible signature.

### **Inspection Methodology**

GND identified the total population of arrests for 30 gang units for March 2009.<sup>7</sup> Infractions, traffic citations, misdemeanor warrants, release-from-custody arrests and parole warrant arrests with no open charges were deselected from this total population because they would not normally result in a detention at the police station requiring Detention Log entries. From these applicable arrests, GND selected a maximum of 15 arrestees for each gang unit. For gang units with more than 15 arrestees, GND randomly selected a sample of 15 arrestees. For gang units with 15 or less arrestees, GND selected all arrestees. In total, GND selected 355 arrestees for testing of Detention Log entries by the Bureau Gang Coordinators and their supporting staff.

THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

---

<sup>7</sup> The Inspection of Arrest Report Packages included 29 gang units, while the Inspection of Detention Logs included 30 gang units because of its inclusion of the Operations - South Bureau unit.

**Inspection Test Results**

Detention Log entries completed in March 2009 for 355 arrestees of 30 gang units were inspected by the Bureau Gang Coordinators and their supporting staff. There were 27 findings for the 2,235 total attributes tested, which computed to a 99% weighted average compliance rate.

<b>Bureau</b>	<b>Gang Unit</b>	<b>No. of Arrestees Requiring Detention Log Entries</b>	<b>A No. of Applicable Detention Log Entry Attributes Tested<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>B No. of Tested Attributes with Findings</b>	<b>(A-B)/A The OIG's Calculated Compliance Rate<sup>9</sup></b>
<b>Central</b>	Central GED	15	96	3	97% (93/96)
" "	Hollenbeck GED	15	97	11	89% (86/97)
" "	Hollenbeck Estrada CLEAR	7	43	3	93% (40/43)
" "	Hollenbeck Ramona CLEAR	15	90	0	100% (90/90)
" "	Rampart GED	15	90	0	100% (90/90)
" "	Rampart CLEAR	14	98	0	100% (98/98)
" "	Newton GED	11	77	2	97% (75/77)
" "	Newton CLEAR	8	56	1	98% (55/56)
" "	Northeast GED	7	43	1	98% (42/43)
" "	Northeast CLEAR	13	80	1	99% (79/80)
<b>South</b>	77 <sup>th</sup> St. GED and CLEAR	15	95	3	97% (92/95)
" "	Southeast GED	13	79	0	100% (79/79)
" "	Southeast CLEAR	12	72	0	100% (72/72)
" "	Southwest GED	15	92	0	100% (92/92)
" "	Southwest CLEAR	15	97	0	100% (97/97)
" "	Harbor GED	15	93	0	100% (93/93)
" "	Criminal Gang Homicide Group	15	97	0	100% (97/97)
" "	Operations - South Bureau	15	97	0	100% (97/97)
<b>Valley</b>	Van Nuys GED	9	57	0	100% (57/57)
" "	Mission GED	15	93	0	100% (93/93)
" "	West Valley GED	6	37	0	100% (37/37)
" "	Devonshire GED	3	18	0	100% (18/18)
" "	Foothill GED and CLEAR	15	95	0	100% (95/95)
" "	North Hollywood GED	6	38	0	100% (38/38)
" "	Topanga GED	15	91	0	100% (91/91)
<b>West</b>	Hollywood GED	15	93	0	100% (93/93)
" "	West Los Angeles GED	11	67	1	98% (66/67)
" "	Wilshire GED	4	24	0	100% (24/24)
" "	Pacific GED	6	38	0	100% (38/38)
" "	Olympic GED	15	92	1	99% (91/92)
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b><u>355</u></b>	<b><u>2,235</u></b>	<b><u>27</u></b>	<b>99%</b> (2,208/2,235)

<sup>8</sup> Some Detention Log entries have as many as seven applicable attributes.

<sup>9</sup> The Department calculated each unit's compliance rate somewhat differently than the OIG, which sometimes resulted in a one-percentage point difference from the OIG's rate. Whereas the OIG calculated compliance rates based on the weighted average, the Department first calculated an average compliance rate for each of the seven test questions, and then averaged the results of the seven questions.

## **OIG Review Methodology**

The OIG performed a meta-inspection, which involved answering the inspection's testing questions for the aforementioned inspection objectives. The OIG randomly selected a sample of 23 arrestees from the total sample of 355 arrestees requiring Detention Log entries. The sample size of 23 was calculated based on a one-tail confidence level of 95%, with an expected error rate of 6% and a plus-precision of 8%.

## **OIG Review Results**

### **Completeness**

The inspection tested and reported compliance for the seven objectives used to evaluate the preparation and completion of Detention Logs, and the inspection samples were selected from complete populations. Hence, the inspection of Detention Logs met the OIG's standard for completeness.

### **Quality**

The inspection used an appropriate sampling methodology and testing questions, and there was evidence of supervisory review of the inspection. Also, the inspection completely and accurately reported the inspection's purpose, methodology, objectives, results and detailed findings. Hence, the inspection of Detention Logs met the OIG's standard for quality.

The OIG noted that for seven of the 30 gang units, the working papers showing the methodology used by GND to randomly select the arrestees requiring Detention Log entries could not be provided. Nevertheless, the working papers are just one source of information relied upon by the OIG to determine GND's methodology. Based on a review of GND's audit work plan, working papers of the remaining 23 gang units and staff interviews, the OIG concluded with reasonable assurance that all arrestees were randomly selected.

### **Findings**

The reported findings correctly represented significant instances in which compliance was not achieved. Also, there were no additional findings that were not reported which represented significant instances in which compliance was not achieved. Hence, the inspection of Detention Logs met the OIG's standard for findings.

## **REVIEW OF INSPECTION OF GED - SUPERVISOR'S DAILY REPORTS**

### **Inspection Objectives**

This inspection was conducted to determine if GED supervisors were properly, thoroughly and accurately completing the GED - Supervisor's Daily Report (SDR) for each day worked; and to measure the supervisory field presence. Specifically, the inspection was conducted to determine:

- If the SDR properly documented whether GED officers were in appropriate uniform/vehicles;
- If GED officers attended a scheduled daily patrol roll call;
- If the watch commander properly documented GED oversight and receipt of GED documents;
- If required signatures were contained on all documents reviewed; and,

- The average amount of time per DP that the GED supervisors spent in the field.<sup>10</sup>

**Inspection Methodology**

The inspection selected the four-week period of November 9 to December 6, 2008 (Deployment Period (DP) 12, 2008). GND randomly selected one Area from each bureau for testing by the Bureau Gang Coordinators and their supporting staff. The randomly selected Areas were Central, Southwest, Van Nuys, and Hollywood. There were six supervisors selected, including one for Central, one for Van Nuys, one for Hollywood and three for Southwest. The SDRs of all six sergeants were inspected for all working days.<sup>11</sup>

**Inspection Test Results**

A total of 80 SDRs prepared in DP 12, 2008 by six GED sergeants at four Areas were inspected by the Bureau Gang Coordinators and their supporting staff. There were seven findings for the 756 total attributes tested, which computed to a 99% weighted average compliance rate.

Bureau	Area	No. of SDRs Tested	Total No. of Attributes Tested	No. of Findings	Weighted Average Compliance Rate
Central	Central	15	149	0	100% (149/149)
Valley	Van Nuys	12	113	0	100% (113/113)
West	Hollywood	13	119	0	100% (119/119)
South	Southwest - Sergeant A	12	107	4	96% (103/107)
“ “	Southwest - Sergeant B	13	120	0	100% (120/120)
“ “	Southwest - Sergeant C	15	148	3	98% (145/148)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>756</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>99% (749/756)</b>

**OIG Review Methodology**

The OIG performed a meta-inspection, which involved answering the inspection’s testing questions for the aforementioned inspection objectives. The OIG randomly selected 29 SDRs from a total sample of 80 completed by the aforementioned six supervisors and utilized a one-tail confidence level of 95%, with an expected error rate of 6% and a plus-precision of 6%.

**OIG Review Results**

Completeness

This inspection had five objectives. The OIG verified that the first four objectives were performed for each of the six GED supervisors in the four Areas. However, documentation as evidence of completion of the fifth objective, to calculate the average amount of time per DP that the GED

<sup>10</sup> Consent Decree Paragraph 106(e) required the proper completion of SDRs, and CD Paragraph 106(f) required that the GED supervisor provide daily field presence. The Consent Decree was still in effect during this inspection.

<sup>11</sup> GND indicated that there was a change in the sampling methodology from prior years which encompassed the review of all GED supervisors. Due to the magnitude of data collection and review, the current inspection changed the methodology to select one sergeant from each bureau, except that three sergeants for South Bureau were selected.

supervisors spent in the field, was available for only the Hollywood GED sergeant.<sup>12</sup> The documented result for the Hollywood supervisor for DP12, 2008 was that 76% of his time was spent in the field and 24% in the office. The OIG noted that calculating the average amount of time per DP that each GED supervisor spent in the field is cumbersome since the SDR form does not readily capture all the information necessary to perform this calculation. Furthermore, this fifth objective is low risk, as there is no standard to determine the appropriate percentage of the time each GED supervisor should spend in the field. Hence, although completeness was lacking for this fifth objective, the totality of the inspection of SDRs met the OIG's standard for completeness.

#### Quality

An adequate sampling methodology was used to select the six supervisors at the four Areas to test, and appropriate testing questions were used for the first four objectives. However, regarding the fifth objective, the testing questions pertaining to calculation of the average amount of time per DP that the GED supervisors spent in the field were cumbersome and difficult to answer. As previously stated, the SDR form does not readily capture all of the information necessary to perform this calculation. Hence, although quality was somewhat lacking for this fifth objective, the totality of the inspection of SDRs met the OIG's standard for quality.

#### Findings

The reported findings correctly represented significant instances in which compliance was not achieved for the four objectives tested. Also, there were no additional findings that were not reported which represented significant instances in which compliance was not achieved. Hence, the inspection of SDRs met the OIG's standard for findings.

### **GND MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE**

GND management expressed general agreement with the OIG's review.

### **CONCLUSION**

The OIG concluded that the three inspections reviewed met the OIG's standard for completeness, quality and findings. This conclusion was based on the OIG's meta-inspection review whereby the OIG selected sub-samples of the inspection samples and re-performed the same tests. Since January 2010, responsibility for conducting the Department's gang unit inspections has been transferred to IAID.

---

<sup>12</sup> The current management of GND was not in place when the inspection was started and, therefore, was unable to provide detailed reasoning why documentation was lacking to support that this objective was completed for the Central, Van Nuys and Southwest GED supervisors.