PREFACE

The instant report was prepared during the Lyda Krewson Administration but was not authorized for release until after the commencement of the Tishaura O. Jones Administration. The references to former Mayor Krewson and former Public Safety Director Jimmie Edwards reflect their involvement in the preparation of this report.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Civilian Oversight Board is a neutral review and fact finding agency charged with facilitating transparency and accountability of the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department. The Civilian Oversight Board staff elected to provide a Quadrennial (four year) Report in order to provide data that has been gathered since our inception, to allow for the identification of trends, and to provide recommendations that relate to the information gathered. In the pages that follow, you will find a Quadrennial Report that addresses items directly responsive to relevant portions of Ordinance No. 69984, specifically Section 4 ¶ 9 A through F, ¶ 11 and ¶ 12; Section 6 ¶ 14 A through C; and Section 7 ¶ 1 through 3:

1. An overview of Civilian Oversight Board efforts including the complaints received and closed from 2016-2019 alleging excessive use of force, abuse of authority, sexual harassment and assault, discourtesy, racial profiling, use of offensive language (slurs relating to race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, immigrant status and disability);
2. An overview of complaint data provided by the SLMPD annual reports from 2016-2019
3. Recommendations rendered to SLMPD to address any policies, procedures, racial profiling or systematic problems identified;
4. An analysis of statistics by police district;
5. An analysis of outcome related aggregate data;
6. An audit of intake procedures, inspections, timeliness and disposition of complaints;
7. A review of all relevant racial profiling, pedestrian stops, and vehicle stop data and statistics compiled by government and private entities to help determine if the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department or its employees appear to engage in racial profiling;
8. A review of officer involved use of lethal force since 2016; and
9. Civilian Oversight Board and staff outreach activities.
“Ordinance 69984.” City of St. Louis, 2015, www.stlouis-mo.gov/

At the conclusion of most report sections, a synopsis is provided to highlight relevant information in the section. The conclusions and recommendations are found at the end of the report. Immediately below are summarized segments of information and data derived directly from the report with page numbers provided for ease of access. These summarized segments represent salient facts that pertain to the conclusions and recommendations contained herein:

- Discourtesy is the most common allegation of misconduct followed by Excessive Use of Force and Abuse of Authority. See p. 17
- Once a complaint is filed with the Civilian Oversight Board (COB) on the Joint Civilian Complaint Form (JCCF), per the Ordinance, the complaint is then forwarded to Internal Affairs Division (IAD) within forty-eight (48) hours of receiving the complaint. However, when IAD receives a complaint on their complaint form, IAD does not provide the complaint to COB. See p. 18
- Classification of Citizen Contact based solely on written complaint content without interview of the Complainant is detrimental to the investigative process and the
Complainant. CC cases are afforded a preliminary investigation consisting of review of the written complaint and the police report, if any. The involved officer is not interviewed and very few Complainants are interviewed before IAD recommends closing the case (33% in 2019). See p. 19

- The Ordinance dictates that COB staff attend Complainant interviews with IAD. None of the IAD interviews were attended by COB staff in 2019, down from 57% in 2018. See p. 23
- The number of reported cases for IAD from 2016-2019 was 1010 out of an estimated total of 3123 reflecting only 32% of the estimated total of cases in this timeframe leaving 2113 cases with unknown outcomes. The total was estimated based upon comparison of COB case numbers to IAD case numbers over the same time period. See p. 25
- Because the IAD form complaints are not shared with COB, the number of cases that were actually filed in relevant categories is unknown to COB. See p. 25
- The Black poverty rate was 20 percentage points higher than the White rate in St. Louis City where most of our Complainants reside. See p. 28
- The Black unemployment rate in St. Louis City was 6.5 percentage points higher than White residents in 2017. The majority of COB Complainants are likely to be low income or unemployed St. Louis residents that were educated in one of the 50 schools that were so poorly performing in recent years as to be considered unaccredited. See p. 32
- Districts 4 and 6 were the source of the majority of Complainants in 2017 and 2018; District 2 in 2016; Districts 3, 4 and 5 in 2019. Districts 4, 5 and 6 contain the highest population of minority residents in St. Louis City. These areas are the direct result of previous redlining culminating in densely populated areas with low property values, low income and poorly performing schools. See p. 32
- The preliminary investigation used by IAD in CC cases results in review of the written complaints without an opportunity for the Complainants to explain their circumstances to the investigators verbally. In light of the income, employment, poverty and education challenges presented to our Complainants, this policy works to further disadvantage them. See p. 33
- The Board cannot close a case unless and until the investigatory file is returned from IAD for review and consideration. From 2016-2019, COB awaits 40 pending cases under investigation at IAD. See p. 36
- SLMPD is not in compliance with the ordinance as it relates to timeliness requirements, specifically that the investigations be completed in 90 days or that an extension be provided to COB. See p. 37
- The majority of Complainants were Black males 25-49 years of age. See p. 38
- The SLMPD officer most complained against is a White male 25-49 years of age. See p. 42
- Gender data was available in the 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 SLMPD annual reports. It reflected that SLMPD personnel was consistently 84% male and 16% female. See p. 46
- The SLMPD annual reports for 2016-2019 reveal a minor decrease in the percentage of Black officers each year that corresponds with a minor increase in the percentage of White officers each year. See p. 46
“When you have diverse police departments, diverse governments broadly speaking, that sets in motion dynamics that filter down to the community that galvanizes trust. That helps reduce crime.” The value of diversity is not in changing police behavior but in changing how the community interacts with police. See p. 46

While SLMPD is to be commended for the efforts they have made to increase outreach and to diversify their workforce by April 2020, SLMPD had not created or adopted a comprehensive recruiting plan to address their diversity issues and create a baseline for monitoring over time. See p. 47

During this four year period, investigations were overdue from 21-84% of the time. Since the majority of the cases at issue did not involve interviews of the Complainants or the officers involved, no explanation is readily apparent for these delays. See p. 47

Statewide, Blacks were 1.48 times more likely to be searched by police than Whites in 2018. Hispanics were 1.40 times more likely to be searched by police than Whites in 2018. Blacks were 1.42 times more likely to be searched by police than Whites in 2019. Hispanics were 1.33 times more likely to be searched by police than Whites in 2019. See p. 48

Statewide, Blacks were 91% more likely to be stopped by police than Whites in 2018. Blacks were 94% more likely to be stopped by police than Whites in 2019. See p. 49

In St. Louis City, Blacks were 3 times more likely to be searched than whites in 2018. In 2019, Blacks were 4 times more likely to be searched than whites. See p. 50

In St. Louis City, Black females were stopped 3 times the rate of their White counterparts. See p. 50

Blacks were more likely to be stopped, searched and arrested than Whites citywide in 2018 and 2019. See p. 51

SLMPD has failed to convene the Deadly Force Review Board in over 2 ½ years and none of the lethal force cases listed have been released to COB for review. Failure to provide files to COB for review demonstrates a loss of the accountability and transparency that was anticipated by the ordinance. See p. 55

Lethal force case review by the Circuit Attorney’s Office has been a barrier to COB access to Force Investigative Unit files as these files are provided to the Circuit Attorney for review and charging decisions before review by the Deadly Force Review Board, the Inspector and then COB. This process has resulted in file reviews that stretch into years and prevent the COB from having access to the evidentiary files as anticipated by the ordinance. See p. 56
CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT BOARD
PURSUANT TO ORDINANCE NUMBER 69984
CITY OF ST. LOUIS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

MISSION:

To provide transparency and accountability of the St. Louis City Metropolitan Police Department while ensuring community confidence.

GOALS:

To ensure community confidence, build bridges between law enforcement and the community, and to provide an independent review process. The Civilian Oversight Board (Board) will address concerns about St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department (SLMPD) operations, practices, and activities as well as bring an additional perspective to the Department’s decision-making process and to ensure balance between public safety, civil rights and community concerns.

STRATEGY:

The Civilian Oversight Board (COB) staff will conduct independent, impartial, thorough, and timely investigations into allegations of police misconduct made against SLMPD officers with respect to the rights of all parties involved. In addition, the Board will build bridges between the community and the St. Louis City police by keeping lines of communication open to the community and civic leaders before and after any incidents. The COB will convey concerns and needs of the community to the police and report back to the community through outreach.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

The COB staff will receive complaints and monitor the SLMPD and Internal Affairs Division (IAD) investigations regarding those complaints. The COB staff will review, analyze, investigate, and make recommendations to the Board regarding complaints from the community against officers of the SLMPD with respect to the rights of all parties involved. The Board will make independent findings based thereon.

The COB staff can refer willing participants to mediation on matters deemed appropriate.
It is critical that the Board serve as a bridge between the community and the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department. The Board shall dedicate itself to ongoing outreach efforts by conducting Town Hall meetings, in addition to its own regular meetings.

By bringing the Board’s work and meetings directly into the community, the Board will enhance the public’s understanding of the Police Department. It is necessary to emphasize to both the public and law enforcement the duty to respect and obey the laws of the Constitution in order to prevent or mitigate the likelihood of violations of the law.

The Board will review, analyze, and where appropriate solicit public input and make recommendations to the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department regarding policies, operations, and procedures affecting the community.

The Board will function as a bridge between the Police Department and the community by providing the community an additional means of giving input to the police department and a means of obtaining answers from the police department to community concerns. Furthermore, the Board will bring an additional perspective to SLMPD decision-making to ensure ongoing communications regarding community concerns and balance between public safety and constitutional, civil and human rights.
Dear Mayor Lyda Krewson, Board of Alderman, Director of Public Safety Jimmie Edwards, and Police Commissioner John W. Hayden:

It seems nearly impossible to believe, but nearly four years ago, the Civilian Oversight Board was established and began receiving its first complaints. Since that time, the Civilian Oversight Board (COB) staff has been working with the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department (SLMPD) and the Circuit Attorney’s Office to access files and review investigations related specifically to ordinance authorized allegations against SLMPD officers. The initial Civilian Oversight Board Commissioner, Ms. Nicolle Barton, hired the staff and created the processes and procedures for complaint review. Ms. Barton worked with SLMPD to draft and distribute the Joint Civilian Complaint Form and to increase transparency. Her insight, direction, and leadership were greatly appreciated by the Board and benefited the residents of the City of St. Louis as a whole. Ms. Barton resigned her position in late 2019 and she is wished the best of luck in her next endeavor.

In her wake, COB staff effectively maintained the standards of this office and worked with the Board to continue the work mandated by our enabling ordinance. I assumed the role of Commissioner in January 2020, and with the help of COB staff, began the task of moving the Civilian Oversight Board forward. My transition was made much smoother through the efforts of my dedicated and knowledgeable staff, Aldin Lolic, Louisa Lyles, and Dorothy Malone. We began our alliance by addressing open cases and preparing for our monthly Civilian Oversight Board meetings.

The tasks have been challenging and the road has been unfolding before me on nearly a daily basis. However, upon review of our enabling Ordinance No. 69984 and amendments thereto, my plate has been full of cases to be reviewed and auditing the efforts of the SLMPD. COB staff has been engaged in an internal audit collecting data so that we can quantify the complaints received, assess the progress made in response to these complaints, identify trends and provide meaningful recommendations for the future. It is truly an honor and a privilege to serve the residents of St. Louis in this capacity.

As 2020 progressed, the investigators continued to work diligently preparing new complaints and reviewing completed IAD investigations. Both investigators have continued the community outreach efforts of the Civilian Oversight Board through their association with CAPCR, the
NAACP, Urban League, Black Struggle, Harris-Stowe University, Washington University, St. Louis University, and other community partners.

Our seven unpaid Board members have demonstrated their commitment to fairness, equity, and diversity through their efforts at each Board meeting and through attendance at community meetings. Our office could not be a success without the efforts of our Board members and the City of St. Louis appreciates their dedicated service.

The Board and its staff endeavor to move forward with authorized initiatives that enhance and enrich community confidence by creating an environment that fosters transparency and accountability of the SLMPD.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kimberley Taylor-Riley Commissioner
Civilian Oversight Board
SECTION I: OVERVIEW OF CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT BOARD EFFORTS INCLUDING INTAKE PROCEDURES

A. Complaint Activity and COB Complaint Flowchart

Complaint filed on JCCF

- COB Staff reviews
  - If jurisdiction, review, assign case # and forward to IAD
  - If no jurisdiction, reject and refer

IAD receives complaint, case number and investigator assigned

- Preliminary investigation (Can involve interview of complainant)

Classify Complaint as Citizen Contact (CC) or Employee Misconduct Report (EMR)

- If EMR, gather evidence and continue investigation

IAD Internal Process

- If CC, IAD completes report and forwards to COB
  - COB Staff receives and reviews the report, prepares investigative summary and report for Board review, and case presented to Board
  - If Board disagrees, file can be returned to IAD for further action or closed with recommendations on future actions or authorizes independent inquiry
  - If returned to IAD for additional information, COB Staff awaits provision of information and presents the case to Board for findings a second time
  - If independent Inquiry, COB staff will conduct investigation and provide report to the Board, DPS, and Chief. After Board Decision, file will be closed

- If investigation is complete, forward to COB, if not, forward a 90 day extension notice from Chief of Police to COB staff

- If over 120 days, additional extension from Chief with reason for delay to COB staff required. This process continues until investigation is complete

- Once completed, forward to COB staff for review and Board presentation

- Once the file is closed, a memo is forwarded to Director of Public Safety and Chief of Police with Board decision and a letter is sent to the Complainant

- If the Board agrees, file is closed
An overview of Civilian Oversight Board efforts including the complaints received and closed from 2016-2019 alleging excessive use of force, abuse of authority, sexual harassment and assault, discourtesy, racial profiling, use of offensive language (slurs relating to race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, immigrant status and disability) follows.

B: COB Classifications Defined

The Civilian Oversight Board classifies complaints based on seven (7) main categories. However, the Internal Affairs Division uses many more categories for complaints as outlined in their departmental policies. This varies depending on whether an officer or supervisor has violated any departmental policy, special order, the police manual or city regulations. Community Complaints alleging officer misconduct will be classified by COB in one of the following seven (7) statutorily defined categories:

1. **Bias-Based Policing**: Circumstances where the police actions of a department member were substantially based on the race, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, religious beliefs, disability, or national origin of a person, rather than upon lawful and appropriate police training and procedures.

2. **Discourtesy**: Circumstances where the actions or statements of a department member were in violation of SLMPD Law Enforcement “Code of Ethics”.

3. **Excessive Use of Force**: Circumstances where a department member used more force than reasonably necessary to arrest a suspect, take a suspect into custody, stop a suspect for investigation, control a situation, restore order, or maintain discipline.

4. **Harassment**: Circumstances where a department member has had repeated or continued contact with a person without lawful police justification.

5. **Abuse of Authority**: Circumstances where the department member acting “under color of law” (The police officer must have been acting as an officer at the time that the incident occurred) violated Complainant’s Constitutional rights. This includes, but is not limited to, improper search and seizure, omission of the Miranda Warning where required, unlawful arrest, etc.

6. **Sexual Harassment and Assault**: (Harassment) Circumstances where a department member has made unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical harassment of a sexual nature. (Assault) Circumstances where a department employee has coerced or physically forced a person to engage, against their will, in an involuntary sexual act, or any non-consensual sexual touching of a person.

7. **Use of Offensive Language**: Slurs relating to race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, immigrant status, and disability per RSMo § 590.653 authorizing local governments to establish police oversight agencies.

Department Member is defined as a current sworn Officer of the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department.

All complaints processed by the COB are submitted on a Joint Civilian Complaint Form. The Internal Affairs Division (IAD) uses a separate complaint form.
Joint Civilian Complaint Form  
SLMPD Internal Affairs Division & Civilian Oversight Board

Aggrieved parties may file a complaint against a St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department law enforcement officer regarding alleged misconduct, excessive use of force, abuse of authority, sexual harassment, discourtesy, racial profiling, or use of offensive language, including, but not limited to, slurs relating to race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, immigrant status, and disability. An aggrieved party is an individual whose legal rights have been violated and becomes a complainant once they have submitted a complete and signed form regarding a specific incident. Personal information will not be disclosed to the public unless required by law. All completed forms and any additional information provided will be shared in duplicate with the SLMPD Internal Affairs Division.

May be submitted in person  May be submitted in person only to:
Or by mail to:
Civilian Oversight Board  South Patrol  Central Patrol  North Patrol
1520 Market St. Room 4029  3157 Sublette  919 N. Jefferson  4014 Union
St. Louis, MO 63103  St. Louis, Mo  St. Louis, Mo  St. Louis, Mo
314-657-1600  63139  63106  63115

Your complaint may be eligible for mediation. Please indicate if you would be interested in allowing a mediator to hear your case. This will not disqualify your complaint from COB review

☐

Required Information

Contact Information (Print):

Name: _____________________________ Month & Year of Birth:____/____ Sex: M / F
Race: ________________________ Primary Phone #:(          )________-__________
Address:____________________________________________________ Apt #:_______
City: __________ State:______ Zip Code:_________ Email:__________________

Incident Report (Print):

Location / Address of Incident:____________________________________________________

Date of Incident:____/_____/______  Time:____:____ AM / PM

Names of SLMPD Law Enforcement Officers Involved/Badge # if known: ____________

Witness Name:______________________________ Phone #:(          )________-__________

Witness Name:______________________________ Phone #:(          )________-__________
*Please include any additional witnesses and their contact information in your description of the incident and provide a full and complete description of the incident citing specific transgressions as they occurred. (Back – add additional pages as necessary) Complainants should anticipate requests from the COB and IAD to be interviewed regarding the incident. Failure to cooperate or falsification of information may lead to unfavorable action.

________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Signature:____________________________________Date:_____/_____/_____
ST. LOUIS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT COMPLAINT/COMMENDATION FORM

Internal Affairs Division
1915 Olive Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63103
Office (314) 444-5405  Fax (314) 444-5711

Instructions:
1. If you wish to file a complaint against a St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department (SLMPD) employee or praise a SLMPD employee, please write legibly and fill out this form. Personal information will not be disclosed to the public, unless required by law.  

2. You can submit this form by mailing it or by dropping it off at the Internal Affairs Division at the address, at the top of this page.

I wish to file (please check one):
☐ Complaint ☐ Commendation

Information About You:
Name:
Work Phone: (   ) Ext: Home Phone: (   )
Street Address:
City:
Date of Birth:
Sex: _____ Race: (optional)
Other Message Phone:
Apt. Number:
State:
Zip Code:

Are you filing this information on behalf of someone else? Yes ☐ No ☐
What is his/her name?
Address:
Location or Address of Incident?
Witness Name:
Witness Address:
Name of officer(s) or employees involved:
Narrative: Briefly describe what happened (attach additional sheets if necessary):

Was anyone arrested? ☐ Yes ☐ No Name of person(s) arrested:

MPD Form GEN-366 (R-2) 07/14
While the ordinance anticipates the use of one form, IAD continues to utilize their form instead of the JCCF. The use of two forms, the JCCF and the IAD complaint form, is inconsistent with the content and intent of the Ordinance.

**Total Number of Complaints Accepted and Denied**

In 2019, there were a total of thirty-eight (38) complaints filed. Twenty-five (25) were accepted, for processing, and investigation. There were thirteen (13) denied. Over the years, the complaints denied were primarily due to being outside of the time frame, not alleged against a current SLMPD Officer, or COB not having jurisdiction to investigate the complaint.
In 2016, COB had their ‘start-up’ year and began taking cases in May. In 2017, the decision was made not to pursue Officer Stockley criminally for the death of Anthony Lamar Smith and protest ensued across the City. As a result, several complaints were filed with COB. In 2018, the Plain View Project (bias based social media posts by law enforcement officers) was referred to the FBI for investigation. The number of yearly filings directly reflects the social climate of the City in these years.

C: Comparison of Complaints by Allegation

![Comparison of Complaints by Allegation](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Allegation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Abuse of Authority</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biased Based Policing</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourtesy</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excessive Use of Force</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Abuse of Authority</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biased Based Policing</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourtesy</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excessive Use of Force</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE:

Pie charts represent raw numbers followed by the overall percentage of cases that year. For example: (7 raw number, 23% of total that year). There were no Sexual Harassment allegations filed. Some complaints have more than one allegation.
Allegations by Quantity and Percentage 2016-2019

The number of allegations exceeds complaints filed as some Complainants have more than one misconduct allegation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abuse of Authority</th>
<th>Biased Based Policing</th>
<th>Discourtesy</th>
<th>Excessive Use of Force</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Sexual Harassment</th>
<th>Total # of Allegations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Allegations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Allegations</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Allegations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Allegations</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Allegations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Allegations</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Allegations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Allegations</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Allegations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Allegations</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discourtesy is the most common allegation, followed by Excessive Use of Force and Abuse of Authority.
D: 2016-2019 Citizen Contacts Compared to Employee Misconduct Reports

Once a complaint is filed with the Civilian Oversight Board (COB) on the Joint Civilian Complaint Form (JCCF), per the Ordinance, the complaint is then forwarded to Internal Affairs Division (IAD) within forty-eight (48) hours of receiving the complaint. However, when IAD receives a complaint on their complaint form, IAD does not provide the complaint to COB.

Complaints are classified by IAD as either a Citizen Contact (CC) or an Employee Misconduct Report (EMR). If it is determined that an officer may be in violation of any departmental policy and thereby potentially subject to discipline, the complaint is elevated to an EMR. Should a complaint rise to the level of an EMR, any involved officer(s) will be interviewed regarding the alleged misconduct. If classified as a CC, the investigation will not involve an interview of the officer(s).

77% of all cases that COB closed from 2016-2019 were classified as CC by IAD. 23% of all cases closed by COB were elevated to EMR.

Four of the EMR cases in 2019 were investigated by the FBI. These cases were part of the Plain View Project (PVP). The PVP was a national research initiative conducted by attorneys in Philadelphia. It involved the inappropriate use of social media (posts endorsing violence, racism and bigotry) by law enforcement officers and resulted in the Federal Bureau of Investigation conducting investigations of the SLMPD officers involved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of CC</th>
<th>Number of Complainants Interviewed by IAD</th>
<th>Percentage of Complainants Interviewed by IAD</th>
<th>Number of Interviews Attended by COB Staff</th>
<th>Percentage of Interviews attended by COB Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification of Citizen Contact based solely on written complaint content without interview of the Complainant is detrimental to the investigative process and the Complainant. CC cases are afforded a preliminary investigation consisting of review of the written complaint and the police report, if any. The involved officer is not interviewed and very few complainants are interviewed before IAD recommends closing the case.

Only 33% of complainants were interviewed by IAD in 2019, down from 73% in 2016. The ordinance states that monitoring shall mean COB’s active observation of an ongoing IAD investigation, including meetings and witness interviews. COB staff cannot effectively oversee SLMPD investigations without inclusion in Complainant interviews. See Ordnance 69984, Section 6 Inspection Procedures, ¶3. COB Criteria for Inspection and 5. Monitoring.
## E: COB Classifications and IAD Classifications Compared 2016-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019 COB #’S</th>
<th>COB ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>2019 IAD #’S</th>
<th>IAD ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abuse of Authority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open/Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Biased Based Policing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open/Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Discourtesy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Closed/ No Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Open/Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excessive Use of Force</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Open/ Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Open/ Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 COB #’S</th>
<th>COB ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>2018 IAD #’S</th>
<th>IAD ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Abuse of Authority</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Failing to make a report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Money/ Property Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unjust Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Open/Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Racial Profiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Closed/None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncivil Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Violation of Towing Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Biased Based Policing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Racial Profiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncivil Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Discourtesy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>COB ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>IAD ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Failed Proper Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Failure to Make Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of Police Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Open/Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uncivil Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Excessive Use of Force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Open/Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unlawful Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>COB #S</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>IAD #’S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COB ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</td>
<td>IAD ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Abuse of Authority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Closed / Client Non-Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Open/Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Illegal Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uncivil Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unjust Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Violation of Dept. Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Biased Based Policing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Closed/Client Non-Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Open/Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncivil Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uncivil Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open/Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Discourtesy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Closed/ Client Non-Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 COB #S</td>
<td>COB ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</td>
<td>2017 IAD #'S</td>
<td>IAD ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Open/Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Failed to conduct Proper Inv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 COB #S</th>
<th>COB ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>2017 IAD #'S</th>
<th>IAD ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Failure to make Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Money/Missing Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uncivil Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15</th>
<th>Excessive Use of Force</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Closed/No Jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Code of Conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncivil Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Violation/Use of Force Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Withdrawal/Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 58          | Sub total                      | 58           |                               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 COB#’S</th>
<th>COB ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>2016 IAD#S</th>
<th>IAD ALLEGATION CLASSIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Abuse of Authority</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conduct Unbecoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Failed to make proper report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncivil Treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7           | Biased Based Policing          | 3          | Uncivil Treatment             |
|             |                                 | 1          | Improperly handled radio assignment |
|             |                                 | 1          | Failed to make proper report  |
|             |                                 | 2          | Failed to conduct Proper Investigation |

| 8           | Discourtesy                    | 4          | Uncivil Treatment             |
|             |                                 | 1          | Conduct Unbecoming            |
|             |                                 | 1          | Failed to make proper report  |
|             |                                 | 2          | Unknown                       |

| 8           | Excessive Use of Force         | 3          | Uncivil Treatment             |
|             |                                 | 1          | Conduct Unbecoming            |
SECTION I SYNOPSIS:

- Discourtesy is the most common allegation, followed by Excessive Use of Force and Abuse of Authority.
- The number of yearly filings with COB directly reflects the social climate of the City.
- CC cases are afforded only preliminary investigations that tend not to involve an interview of the Complainant and do not involve interview of the officer involved. Only 33% of complainants were interviewed by IAD in 2019.
- Failure to interview Complainants is detrimental to the preliminary investigation, the classification of the complaint and the overall investigative process.
- The Ordinance dictates that COB staff attend Complainant interviews with IAD. None of the IAD interviews were attended by COB staff in 2019, down from 57% in 2018.
- COB staff utilizes the allegation categories/classifications provided by the enabling Ordinance; however IAD uses additional classifications that do not always coincide with COB categories creating inconsistency across agencies.
- The use of competing forms for the same complaint allegations, categorization of cases as CC through preliminary investigation, failure to include COB staff in Complainant interviews and use of inconsistent allegation classifications all serve as significant barriers to the Board’s review of relevant complaints and hinders transparency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage/Reimbursement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>193</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:

Some complaints may have been classified under more than one category.

The Internal Affairs Division receives significantly more complaints than the COB annually. The chart reflects only COB complaints received in the relevant timeframe.
SECTION II: OVERVIEW OF SLMPD COMPLAINT DATA

An overview of complaint data provided by SLMPD annual reports from 2016-2019.

Each year, SLMPD publishes an annual report reflecting its activities for the year covered as does COB. The list below shows the SLMPD categories that most closely match COB categories:

- Racial Profiling
- Uncivil Conduct
- Violation Of Use Of Force Policy
- Conduct Unbecoming
- Physical Abuse
- Verbal Abuse

Because these categories differ from COB categories, COB staff is unable to track the complaints from filing through SLMPD published outcomes. The following table reflects the total number of cases processed by COB compared to the cases reported by SLMPD over the same timeframe in the categories set out above. The COB closed 95 cases from 2016-2019. IAD closed 1010 cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total COB Cases Filed</th>
<th>SLMPD Cases Reported</th>
<th>COB Active Cases</th>
<th>Closed COB Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The 2018 report did not reflect any violations of Use of Force, Racial Profiling, or Verbal Abuse policies. There were only 10 SLMPD cases reported in the remaining categories in that year, however COB closed 27 cases in 2018 all of which were investigated by IAD. This discrepancy cannot be explained with current data.
COB Case Numbers Compared to IAD Case Numbers

At the beginning of each year, both the COB and IAD start numbering cases chronologically beginning with number one. The following chart reflects the difference in case numbers between COB and IAD. The unreported cases column reflects the number of cases wherein the outcome is publicly unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>COB Case #</th>
<th>IAD Case #</th>
<th>Reported IAD Cases</th>
<th>Unreported Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>16-0017</td>
<td>16-407</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>17-0040</td>
<td>17-657</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>18-0039</td>
<td>18-990</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>19-0023</td>
<td>19-1092</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>2113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


NOTE:

In some instances, the COB case was filed at the end of the year but did not get assigned an IAD number until the following year.
The unreported cases lack information regarding the officer involved, the allegations contained in these complaints and the ultimate outcomes of these matters.
The number of reported cases for IAD from 2016-2019 was 1010 out of a total of 3123 possible cases reflecting only 32% of their total number of cases in this timeframe.

SECTION II SYNOPSIS:

- Because the IAD form complaints are not shared with COB, the number of cases that were actually filed in relevant categories is unknown to COB.
- Direct comparison of SLMPD data and COB data is frustrated by the use of the differing categories for the same cases. In 2018, COB closed 27 cases, but SLMPD reported only 10 cases in the relevant categories.
- IAD has more than 2100 cases (68%) that have both unknown allegations and unknown outcomes from 2016-2019.
- The number of reported cases for IAD from 2016-2019 was 1010 as compared to 95 reported cases from COB.
Civilian Oversight does not occur in a vacuum. Many issues are relevant in the lives and circumstances of the individuals that file complaints against SLMPD officers. Socioeconomic factors are characteristics such as geographic area, social class, education and income status that have influence over the individual's role in society. In this section, the COB presents some of the relevant factors that directly affect the Complainants that request our help.

A: Income (City, County)

**Income for whites higher in city, county**

Median income

| St. Louis County black | St. Louis city black | St. Louis County white |

| St. Louis city white |

**SOURCE:** U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 1-year estimates


In 2017, Blacks living in St. Louis City made approximately $25,000 annually while Whites made approximately $60,000. Blacks living in the County made approximately $42,000 annually while their White counterparts made approximately $75,000. The majority of COB Complainants are Black males residing in St. Louis City.
B: The Link between Poverty and Education

The correlation between high poverty schools and low academic achievement sounds obvious, and it is well-documented over decades. But as Missouri has had perhaps its deepest conversation to date about the state of its failing schools, the connection between poverty and performance has never been so plain. Crouch, Elisa, and Walker Moskop. “Poverty and Academic Struggle Go Hand in Hand.” STLtoday.com, www.stltoday.com/ 17 May 2014. Specifically, in schools with some of the highest concentrations of poverty and minority children, students are a third as likely to pass state exams as students at schools of higher affluence. And at several of such high schools, they’re half as likely to graduate. Crouch, et al., 2014. Roughly 50 schools in the St. Louis area did so poorly in 2013, they would be considered unaccredited. In St. Louis Public Schools, the three highest-performing schools have the lowest poverty levels in the city. In fact, the poverty rate at Kennard Classical Junior Academy, one of the best elementary schools in the state, is lower than either of the two elementary schools in Brentwood, an affluent district in St. Louis County. Crouch, et al., 2014. “These communities are poor because the families are poor...Why are these families poor? Because the vast majority of parents didn’t get a great education.” Crouch, et al., 2014.

C: Poverty Rates

C: Poverty Rates

Poverty rate lower for whites in city, county
Percent below poverty level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Louis County black</th>
<th>St. Louis city black</th>
<th>St. Louis County white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 1-year estimates
Barker, Jacob. “Racial Disparities in Income and Poverty Remain Stark, and in Some Cases, Are Getting Worse.” STLtoday.com, 7 Aug. 2019,
In 2017, the poverty rate for Blacks in St. Louis City was approximately 30%; for Whites it was approximately 10%. In 2017, the poverty rate for Blacks in St. Louis County was approximately 19%; for Whites it was approximately 7%. Barker, et al., 2019. The Black poverty rate was 20 percentage points higher than the White rate in St. Louis City where most of our Complainants reside.

According to the 2018 Missouri Poverty Report, the statewide poverty rate was 14%, higher than the United States poverty rate of 12.7%. In Missouri, the poverty rate was 19.2% for children. Factors pushing people into poverty include affordable housing shortages, food insecurity, low-wage jobs, and increasing health care costs, among other things. Bennett, Dr. John H, et al. “Missouri Poverty Report.” Missouri Poverty Report, 19 June 2020, missouripovertyreport.org/.

In 2018, the poverty rate in St. Louis City was 24.3%; in St. Louis County its 9.2%. The high school graduation rate in St. Louis City is 52.16%, but the statewide graduation rate is 87.8%. Bennett, et al., 2020. Additionally, Missouri ranked 19th in food insecurity among the 50 states at 14.2%. Lack of appropriate nourishment is another factor directly affecting a student’s ability to concentrate, study and achieve educational goals. Bennett, et al., 2020

**D: Unemployment (City, County)**

**Fewer whites unemployed in city, county**

Percent unemployed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Louis County black</th>
<th>St. Louis city black</th>
<th>St. Louis County white</th>
<th>St. Louis city white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 1-year estimates

Barker, Jacob. “Racial Disparities in Income and Poverty Remain Stark, and in Some Cases, Are Getting Worse.” STLtoday.com, 7 Aug. 2019,
In 2017, the Black unemployment rate in St. Louis City was 12%; the White rate was 3.5%. In the County, the Black unemployment rate was 10%; the White rate was 3.5%. Barker, et al., 2019

The Black unemployment rate in St. Louis City was 6.5 percentage points higher than White residents. Based upon the foregoing, the majority of COB Complainants are likely to be low income or unemployed St. Louis residents that were educated in one of the 50 schools that were so poorly performing in recent years as to be considered unaccredited. Reliance solely on written complaints by residents in these areas of the City is detrimental to these Complainants and the complaint investigation process.

E: Segregation and Ethnicity

In 1876, home rule was established in St. Louis City. This created a hard boundary for the City, but also created an environment that allowed for the growth of suburbs in the surrounding area. Strauss, Valerie. “Analysis | The Sad Story of Public Education in St. Louis.” The Washington Post, WP Company, 7 Sept. 2017, www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2017/09/07/the-sad-story-of-public-education-in-st-louis/. White flight (white community members moving out of the City and into the suburbs) was well underway in the early 20th century. Over the same time period, segregation was actively encouraged within the boundaries of the City resulting in whites and blacks congregating in different parts of the City. Strauss, 2017

Maps of both the City and County of St. Louis created by Vox, reflect the pattern of segregation by race and income levels. The noteworthy portions of the maps demonstrate that the northern-most portion of the City has the highest concentration of Blacks. Yglesias, Matthew. “Map: The Racial and Economic Divide in the St. Louis Area.” Vox, Vox, 19 Aug. 2014, www.vox.com/xpress/2014/8/19/6044335/st-louis-segregation. The highest concentration of poverty in the City is also in the northern-most portion of the City nearest the river. Yglesias, 2014 The roots of neighborhood-level segregation go back to Jim Crow and old practices of redlining (redlining is the practice of excluding minorities from designated areas of a community). In more recent times, the cause is more likely to be exclusionary zoning in suburbs that ban multi-family homes and small lots effectively preventing low income buyers from securing housing. Yglesias, 2014
Districts by Neighborhood

**District 1** includes Bevo Mill, Boulevard Heights, Carondelet, Carondelet Park, Holly Hills, Mount Pleasant, Patch, Princeton Heights, and portions of Dutchtown and South Hampton.

**District 2** includes Botanical Gardens, Cheltenham, Clayton/Tamm, Clifton Heights, Ellendale, Forest Park, Forest Park Southeast, Franz Park, Hi-Point, Kings Oak, Lindenwood Park, McRee Town, North Hampton, Shaw, Southwest Garden, St. Louis Hills, The Hill, Tiffany, Tower Grove Park, Tower Grove South, Wilmore Park, Wydown/Skinker and portions of South Hampton.

**District 3** includes the neighborhoods of Benton Park, Benton Park West, Compton Heights, Fox Park, Gravois Park, Kosciusko, Lafayette Square, Lasalle, Marine Villa, McKinley Heights, Peabody/Darst/Webbe, Soulard, The Gate District, Tower Grove East, and portions of Dutchtown.

**District 4** includes the neighborhoods of Carr Square, Columbus Square, Covenant Blu-Grand Center, Downtown, Downtown West, Fairgrounds Park, Hyde Park, Jeff Vander Lou, Midtown, Old North St. Louis, St. Louis Place and portions of College Hill Fairgrounds and Near North Riverfront.

**District 5** includes the neighborhoods of Academy, Central West End, DeBaliviere Place, Fountain Park, Hamilton Heights, Kingshighway West, Lewis Place, Skinker/DeBaliviere, The Ville, Vandeventer, Visitation Park, Wells/Goodfellow, West End and portions of the Greater Ville and Kingsway East.

**District 6** includes the neighborhoods of Baden, Mark Twain, Mark Twain/I-70 Industrial, North Point, North Riverfront, O’Fallon, O’Fallon Park, Penrose, Penrose Park, Riverview, Walnut Park East, Walnut Park West and portions of College Hill, Fairgrounds, Greater Ville, Kingsway East and Near North Riverfront.

[https://www.slmpd.org/](https://www.slmpd.org/)
The majority of complaints were filed in the Discourtesy category. Districts 4 and 6 were the source of the majority of Complainants in 2017 and 2018; District 2 in 2016; Districts 3, 4 and 5 in 2019. Districts 4, 5 and 6 contain the highest population of minority residents in St. Louis City. These areas are the direct result of previous red lining culminating in densely populated areas with low property values, low income and poorly performing schools.
SECTION III SYNOPSIS:

In 2017, Blacks living in the City earned approximately $25,000 annually while Whites earned approximately $60,000. The majority of COB Complainants are Black males residing in St. Louis City.

In 2017, the Black unemployment rate was 6.5 percentage points higher than Whites in St. Louis City and the poverty rate for Blacks residing in St. Louis City was 20 percentage points higher than Whites.

Roughly 50 schools in the St. Louis area did so poorly in 2013, they would be considered unaccredited. By 2018, the high school graduation rate in St. Louis City was 52.16%, statewide the rate was 87.8%.

The majority of complaints were filed in the Discourtesy category. Districts 4 and 6 were the source of the majority of Complainants in 2017 and 2018; District 2 in 2016; Districts 3, 4 and 5
in 2019. Districts 4, 5 and 6 contain the highest population of minority residents in St. Louis City. These areas are the direct result of previous red lining culminating in densely populated areas with low property values, low income and poorly performing schools.

The preliminary investigation used by IAD in CC cases results in review of the written complaints without an opportunity for the Complainants to explain their circumstances to the investigators verbally. In light of the income, employment, poverty and education challenges presented to our Complainants, this policy works to further disadvantage them.

SECTION IV:
OUTCOME RELATED AGGREGATE DATA
INCLUDING DISPOSITIONS OF COMPLAINTS

The findings IAD provides to the Civilian Oversight Board are placed into one of the following defined categories:

A: Disposition of Complaints 2016-2019

1. **Exonerated**- The alleged act did occur, but the department member engaged in no misconduct because the actions of the department member were lawful, justified and/or proper.
2. **Not Sustained**- The evidence fails to prove that an act of misconduct occurred.
3. **Sustained**- The alleged act occurred and was without lawful police justification.
4. **Unfounded**- The act alleged by the Complainant did not occur or the subject department was not involved in the act.

5. **Other Disposition:**
   A. **Closed**- The complaint was closed due to the following circumstances: Lack of jurisdiction, pending litigation, Complainant anonymity, or third-party complaint.
   B. **Non cooperative**- The Complainant failed to cooperate.
   C. **Resolved through Mediation**- Any complaint which is mediated and resolved through mediation.
   D. **Withdrawn**- The Complainant did not wish to pursue the complaint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISPOSITION SUMMARY 2016-2019</th>
<th>SUSTAINED</th>
<th>NOT SUSTAINED</th>
<th>CLOSED NO RATIONALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Closed-No Rationale includes cases that do not fall into 5. A-D. See Ordinance No. 69984, Section 6. Inspection, Procedures ¶ 8. Completing the IAD Investigation and Forwarding Information.
Disposition of Complaints 2017

Disposition of Complaints 2016
B: Timeliness

The foregoing disposition charts depict the status of each case from filing through years’ end. However, they do not depict the total number of cases closed by the Board in that calendar year, January 1 to December 31.

In 2016, COB staff accepted 19 complaints, the Board closed 9;
In 2017, COB staff accepted 42 complaints, the Board closed 26 (10 from 2016);
In 2018, COB staff accepted 39 complaints, the Board closed 38 (15 from 2017); and
In 2019, COB staff accepted 25 complaints, the Board closed 12 (2 from 2017, 7 from 2018).

The Board cannot close a case unless and until the investigatory file is returned from IAD for review and consideration. From 2016-2019, COB awaits 40 pending cases under investigation at IAD.

Per Ordinance 69984, Section Six, Subsection 7, “Within ninety (90) days of receiving a complaint, IAD shall complete its investigation unless the Commissioner, for good cause, authorizes additional time, the Commissioner shall notify the COB that additional time has been authorized.

The Commissioner may not extend the time for investigation by more than one hundred twenty (120) days unless either:
(a) there are extraordinary circumstances that require an extension,
(b) a criminal charge arising from the subject matter of the complaint is pending against the officer, or (c) the United States Attorney, the Circuit Attorney, or other federal or state law enforcement requests that the investigation be extended or not be completed at this time. “Ordinance 69984.” City of St. Louis, 2015, www.stlouis-mo.gov/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>OVER 90 DAYS</th>
<th>EXTENSION RECEIVED</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>EMR</th>
<th>TOTAL COMPLAINTS</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL COMPLAINTS OVERDUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:

2019 data is unknown as the majority of the investigations are not yet completed.
In 2017, COB received extensions in one quarter of the overdue cases. In 2018, COB received extensions in 1/6 of these cases, but by 2019, no extensions were received even though 21 out of the total 25 complaints were overdue. Additionally, less than 50% of the CC cases involved an interview of the Complainant in 2019 and none should involve an interview of the officer. However, half of the overdue cases in 2017 were CC cases and 83% of the overdue cases in 2018 were CC cases. When cases are classified as CC, they are subjected to preliminary investigation only. In 2019, 84% of the complaints were overdue. No explanation has been provided for the delay in completing these investigations. See Complaint Flowchart p.11

Once cases are returned to COB staff from IAD, they are reviewed, assessed and summarized in reports for the Board’s review. Upon presentation to the Board, if no other action is authorized, the matter is closed and a memorandum reflecting the outcome is provided to the Director of Public Safety and the Commissioner of Police.

From 2016-2019, COB staff had an average processing time of 24 days or less (meaning the time that elapsed between IAD returning the completed investigative file to COB staff and the Board’s final determination of the case).

Based upon the foregoing, SLMPD is not in compliance with the ordinance as it relates to timeliness requirements, specifically that the investigations be completed in 90 days or that an extension be provided to COB. “Ordinance 69984.” City of St. Louis, 2015, www.stlouis-mo.gov/ (See Section Six, Subsection 7)
C: Complainant Demographics by Gender, Ethnicity and Age

Below are the self-reported demographics of all COB Complainants from 2016-2019. In 2019, there were seven White male Complainants and no females. The total number of Black Complainants was seventeen (13 males and 4 females). In 2018, there were twelve White Complainants (4 males and 8 female) The total number of Black Complainants was twenty-two (15 males and 7 females). In 2017, during the Stockley protests, there was an increase in White Complainants. The total number of Black Complainants was twenty-three (19 males and 4 females) and there were sixteen White Complainants (11 male and 7 female). In 2016, there were three White Complainants (2 male and 1 female). The total number of Black Complainants was fourteen (8 males and 6 females) The demographics show that from 2016-2019 the age range from 25-49 yielded the highest number of Complainants. In 2019, the highest number of Complainants were in the 35-64 age range. Overall, the majority of Complainants were Black males 25-49.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender 2016</th>
<th>Gender 2017</th>
<th>Gender 2018</th>
<th>Gender 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male 11</td>
<td>Male 28</td>
<td>Male 19</td>
<td>Male 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 6</td>
<td>Female 13</td>
<td>Female 19</td>
<td>Female 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown-2</td>
<td>Unknown-1</td>
<td>Unknown 1</td>
<td>Unknown 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complainant Demographics

Ethnicity 2016

Ethnicity 2017

Ethnicity 2018

Ethnicity 2019
D: SLMPD Demographics by Gender, Ethnicity and Age

The demographics reflected herein are based upon data provided to COB by SLMPD. Based on the demographics of 2019 in comparison to the demographics of the 3 previous years, the following information was yielded regarding the gender of the officers complained against: In 2016, there were 12 male officers, 2 female and 6 unknown. In 2017, the number of male officers increased. In 2017, there were 29 male, 2 female, and 9 unknown. In 2018, there were 28 male, 5 female and 7 unknown. In 2019, there were 26 male, 0 female, and 18 unknown.

The category of “Unknown” reflects the number of officers not yet known due to pending investigations. It should be noted, Special Teams within SLMPD are not individually identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Known</td>
<td>38 Known</td>
<td>33 Known</td>
<td>26 Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Unknown</td>
<td>6 Unknown</td>
<td>7 Unknown</td>
<td>11 Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
Demographic Information is not provided to COB until the IAD report is reviewed. There may be multiple officers that are the subject of one complaint. In the first 3 years, the majority of the subject officers were in the 25-49 age range. In 2019, the majority of the subject officers were in the 35-64 age range. The SLMPD officer most complained against is a White male between the ages of 25-49. SLMPD workforce gender revealed that time SLMPD was 84% Male and 16% Female.
SLMPD Demographics

**Ethnicity 2016**

Total SLMPD officers = 1187 (64.3% White) (32.4% Black)

**Ethnicity 2017**

Total SLMPD officers = 1192 (65.69% White) (30.87% Black)
Total SLMPD officers= 1179 (65.99% White) (30.36% Black)

Total SLMPD Information (Unknown)

The percentage of Hispanic officers was not specified in the 2016, 2017, 2018 or 2019 SLMPD annual reports
AGE RANGE 2016

AGE RANGE 2017

AGE RANGE 2018

AGE RANGE 2019
E: Recruitment Efforts by SLMPD


Recent events highlighting tensions in predominately minority communities, most notably in Baltimore and Ferguson, Mo., have caused many to call for improving police diversity. Along with orders from local leaders, the White House Task Force on 21st Century Policing weighed in, making several recommendations earlier this year. While increasing ranks of minority officers alone won’t solve many of the underlying problems, numerous factors are slowing progress to addressing an imbalance that dates back generations. Maciag, Mike. “Where Police Don’t Mirror Communities and Why It Matters.” Governing, 28 Aug. 2015 https://www.governing.com/topics/public-justice-safety/gov-police-department-diversity.html

“When you have diverse police departments, diverse governments broadly speaking, that sets in motion dynamics that filter down to the community that galvanizes trust. That helps reduce crime.” The value of diversity is not in changing police behavior but in changing how the community interacts with police said Janice Iwama an assistant criminology professor at American University. Keating, Dan and Uhrmacher, Kevin. “In Urban Areas, Police Are Consistently Much Whiter Than The People They Serve.” The Washington Post, WP Company, 04 June 2020,
In order to address these challenges, Michelle Martin Bonner, Fellow at FUSE Corps, was retained by SLMPD to assist with developing a recruitment plan to increase the number of qualified diverse candidates for employment. Ms. Bonner reviewed use of social media to reach youth, women and nontraditional applicants, increasing the referral bonus, use of Ethical Society of Police recruitment through the Urban League and the pre-academy, outreach to the schools to get youth interested in being police officers at a young age, waiving residency and increased wages for new recruits. Ms. Bonner was retained through a grant and left this position in late April, 2020 after having rendered recommendations to SLMPD to address identified deficits. Action is being taken on some recommendations, for example support of the Cadet Program, legislative action to remove the residency requirement and active youth outreach programming. However, adoption of a comprehensive plan would provide a roadmap to success. While SLMPD is to be commended for the efforts they have made to increase outreach and to diversify their workforce, as of April, 2020, SLMPD had not created or adopted a comprehensive recruiting plan to address these issues and create a baseline for monitoring over time.

SECTION IV SYNOPSIS:

The majority of Complainants were Black males 25-49.

The SLMPD officer most complained against is a White male between the ages of 25-49.

By far, the majority of the cases COB closed from 2016-2019, were categorized as CC by IAD and closed with no rationale.

During this four year period, investigations were overdue from 21-84% of the time. Since the majority of the cases at issue did not involve interviews of the Complainants or the officers involved, no explanation is readily apparent for these delays. The consistent failure of SLMPD to investigate these complaints in a timely fashion prevents COB from:

1. reviewing evidence gathered;
2. determining what, if any, additional evidence might be available;
3. obtaining relevant evidence; and
4. closing cases while ensuring a full and complete investigation of the issues.

A University of Maryland criminologist found that crime rates in minority neighborhoods are lower when local police and government diversity matches the community. Keating, et al., 2020

Gender and ethnicity imbalances within SLMPD were significant enough for them to retain a consultant to assist them in addressing the issue. Having officers at SLMPD reflect the community they serve is vital to fostering public confidence. The lack of a specific recruiting plan to address these issues ensures that the deficits will continue into the foreseeable future.
SECTION V:
MISSOURI ATTORNEY GENERAL VEHICLE STOP DATA

A: Statewide

| Key Indicators | Total | White | Black | | | |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| **Years** | **2018** | **2019** | **2018** | **2019** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Vehicle Stops | 1,539,477 | 1,524,640 | 1,177,844 | 1,161,680 | 296,065 | 297,608 |
| Searches | 101,671 | 102,755 | 71,168 | 72,387 | 26,448 | 26,371 |
| Arrest Rate | 4.68 | 4.89 | 4.25 | 4.55 | 6.37 | 6.21 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Rates 2018</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hispanic</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Rates 2019</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hispanic</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Blacks were 1.48 times more likely to be searched by police than Whites in 2018; 1.42 times more likely to be searched than Whites in 2019.

Additionally, Blacks were 1.50 times more likely to be arrested than Whites in 2018; 1.36 times more likely to be arrested than Whites in 2019.

Hispanics were 1.40 times more likely to be searched by police than Whites in 2018; 1.33 times more likely to be searched by police than Whites in 2019.

**NOTE:**

Population figures are from the 2010 Census for persons 16 years of age and older who designated a single race. Disparity Index: (proportion of stops/proportion of population). A value of 1 represents no disparity; values greater than 1 indicate over-representation, value less than 1 indicate under-representation. Search rate= (searches/stops X 100) Contraband hit rate = searches with contraband found. Likelihood= Minority search rate/White search rate

The Black arrest rate was higher than the statewide average arrest rate; the White arrest rate was lower than the statewide average.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disparity Index 2018</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparity Index 2019</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Blacks were 91% more likely to be stopped by police than Whites in **2018**; 94% more likely to be stopped by police than Whites in **2019**.

Whites were 19% more likely to be stopped by police than Hispanics in **2018**; 16% more likely to be stopped by police than Hispanics in **2019**.

Blacks were stopped at a higher rate than expected based upon their percentage of the population statewide.

Whites and Hispanics were stopped at a rate lower than expected based upon their percentage of the population statewide.

Blacks were more likely to be stopped, searched and arrested than Whites statewide in 2018 and 2019.
### B: St. Louis City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
<th>Total 2018</th>
<th>Total 2019</th>
<th>White 2018</th>
<th>White 2019</th>
<th>Black 2018</th>
<th>Black 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Vehicle Stops</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Stops</td>
<td>54943</td>
<td>57948</td>
<td>16632</td>
<td>17591</td>
<td>36500</td>
<td>38544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Stop Percentages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searches</td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>3576</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>2823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages of Searches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Rate</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraband Hit Rate</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>24.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest Rate</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stop Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>22540</td>
<td>25393</td>
<td>5263</td>
<td>7197</td>
<td>16776</td>
<td>17461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>17464</td>
<td>18414</td>
<td>4922</td>
<td>4887</td>
<td>11944</td>
<td>12985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>10899</td>
<td>10464</td>
<td>4035</td>
<td>3482</td>
<td>6368</td>
<td>6627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Stop</th>
<th>Total 2018</th>
<th>Total 2019</th>
<th>White 2018</th>
<th>White 2019</th>
<th>Black 2018</th>
<th>Black 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Street</td>
<td>48769</td>
<td>50556</td>
<td>14004</td>
<td>14619</td>
<td>33224</td>
<td>344407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38166</td>
<td>39454</td>
<td>12765</td>
<td>12748</td>
<td>23907</td>
<td>25341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16777</td>
<td>18494</td>
<td>3867</td>
<td>4843</td>
<td>12593</td>
<td>13203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver Age</th>
<th>Total 2018</th>
<th>Total 2019</th>
<th>White 2018</th>
<th>White 2019</th>
<th>Black 2018</th>
<th>Black 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17&amp; Under</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>20406</td>
<td>21485</td>
<td>4105</td>
<td>4633</td>
<td>15648</td>
<td>16154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>14727</td>
<td>16433</td>
<td>4178</td>
<td>4795</td>
<td>10098</td>
<td>11096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and over</td>
<td>19348</td>
<td>19594</td>
<td>8263</td>
<td>8041</td>
<td>10418</td>
<td>11019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In St. Louis City, Blacks were 1.46% more likely to be searched than Whites in 2018; 1.78% more likely to be searched than Whites in 2019.

Further, the Black search rate was nearly one percentage point above the City average in 2018; it was 1.15 percentage points above the average in 2019.

In St. Louis City, Black females were stopped 3 times the rate of their White counterparts.
The White search rate was one and a half percentage points below the City average in 2018; it was 2.07 percentage points below the average in 2019.

The Black arrest rate was above the City average by .47 percentage points in 2018 and .55 percentage points in 2019.

The White arrest rate was below the City average by .81 percentage points in 2018 and .99 percentage points in 2019.

Blacks were more likely to be stopped, searched and arrested than Whites Citywide in 2018 and 2019.

SECTION V SYNOPSIS:

Blacks were stopped at a higher rate than expected based upon their percentage of the population statewide.

Whites and Hispanics were stopped at a rate lower than expected based upon their percentage of the population statewide.

Blacks were more likely to be stopped, searched and arrested than Whites statewide and in St. Louis City in 2018 and 2019.

Although Blacks represent about 45% of the population in the City, they were stopped 67% of the time in 2019 clearly evidencing disproportionate minority contact between Blacks and SLMPD officers. The majority of these stops occur on city streets and Black males are usually the drivers. While 20% of Whites were searched in 2019, 79% of Blacks were subjected to searches. Interestingly, their contraband hit rates have less than a 3 percentage point difference. Demonstrating that the additional searches do not equate to finding more contraband.

In St. Louis City, Black females were stopped 3 times the rate of their White counterparts.
SECTION VI:
OFFICER INVOLVED LETHAL FORCE CASES

A: Officer Involved Lethal Force Cases 2016-2019

The Civilian Oversight Board is a neutral review and fact finding agency charged with facilitating transparency and accountability of the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department. Toward that end, Ordinance 69984, Section Six, Subsection 14, states as follows:

In the event of any officer-involved shooting that results in the fatality of a civilian:

A. The Director of Public Safety (DPS) shall inform, as soon as practical, the COB members and the COB Executive Director that the officer-involved shooting occurred. The COB members and staff shall not interfere with any investigation into the officer-involved shooting.

B. The Commissioner shall provide the COB with copies of IAD’s findings, recommendations, and investigative file only after the Force Investigative Unit and Deadly Force Review Board have completed their analyses and provided their final reports to the Commissioner.

C. The Director of Public Safety shall request that the Attorney General of the State of Missouri oversee or conduct the IAD investigation concerning the incident. If the Attorney General agrees to do so under reasonable terms, the Attorney General’s investigation shall be treated as the IAD investigation for purposes of this Ordinance and the COB’s role as described in this Ordinance shall continue as if the IAD investigation was overseen or conducted by IAD rather than by the Attorney General.

The SLMPD numbers reflected herein are accurate, the ability to compare this data to other jurisdictions is hindered by the data analysis shortfalls across jurisdictions. Nationally, there have been 1013 Officer Involved Shootings over the past year (2019-2020). Tate, Julie, et al. “Fatal Force: Police Shootings Database.” The Washington Post, WP Company, 22 Jan. 2020. Statistics show that officer involved shootings have been undercounted. The relative data is gathered from social media, news and media stations, and police reports. Tate, et al.,2020. The data analysis over the past 5 years reveals the demographics of victims and fatalities have remained consistent. Black Americans are killed at more than twice the rate of White Americans. Tate, et al.,2020.

The following list contains the lethal force cases in St. Louis City from 2016, the beginning of Board review, through 2019. The Board offers their condolences to these families and renews its commitment to transparency and accountability in reviewing the circumstances surrounding their deaths.
Civilian Oversight Board Pending Lethal Force Cases

1. Jorevis Scruggs: B/M age 15 (04/19/2016) District 4 (Central Patrol)
2. Michael Thompson B/M age 38 (9/2/2016) District 6 (North Patrol)
3. George Bush III B/M age 19 (11/21/2016) District 2 (South Patrol)
4. Davion Henderson B/M age 21 (01/09/2017) District 5 (North Patrol)
5. Don Clark B/M age 63 (02/21/2017) District 3 (Central Patrol)
6. Robin White B/F age 50 (05/10/2017) District 1 (South Patrol)
7. Jamie Robinson W/M age 34 (05/26/2017) District 1 (South Patrol)
8. Isaiah Hammet W/M age 21 (6/7/2017) District 1 (South Patrol)
10. Isaih Perkins B/M age 27 (07/20/2017) District 6 (Central Patrol)
11. Kenneth Herring Transgender B/F age 30 (08/22/2017) District 5 (North Patrol)
12. Rehyen McMurray B/M age 17 (11/23/2017) District 6 (North Patrol)
13. Demario Bass B/M age 29 (12/12/2018) District 6 (North Patrol)
14. Quency Chavez Floyd B/M age 22 (1/15/2019) District 5 (North Patrol)
15. Katlyn Alix W/F age 24 (01/24/2019) District 1 (South Patrol)
16. Kaylon Robinson B/M age 18 (04/01/2019) District 1 (South Patrol)
17. Demetrious Brooks B/M age 34 (04/11/2019) District 3 (Central Patrol)
18. Rodnell Cotton B/M age 26 (06/06/2019) District 4 (Central Patrol)
19. Cortez Shepherd B/M age 28 (09/05/2019) District 4 (Central Patrol)
20. Steven Day B/M age 30 (10/20/2019) District 4 (Central Patrol)
21. Cortez Bufford B/M age 24 (12/12/2019) District 1 (South Patrol)

*The deceased range in age from 15-63 and 18 of the 21 on this list (86%) are Black. Specifics concerning the involved officers’ names are precluded from release by ordinance.
SLMPD has adopted a process for addressing lethal force incidents. The following flowchart depicts that process in the Force Investigation Unit.

**LETHAL FORCE INVESTIGATION FLOWCHART**

COB (Civilian Oversight Board)
CAO (Circuit Attorney’s Office)
SLMPD (St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department)
IAD (Internal Affairs Department of SLMPD)
FIU (Force Investigative Unit of SLMPD)
A joint statement from Mayor Krewson, Director Edwards, and Chief Hayden stated that “the primary responsibility of the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department and each of its members is to protect the lives of the citizens they are sworn to serve. The reverence of human life is paramount, and therefore the mention of our primary responsibility prefaces our rules and regulations...Officers of the Saint Louis Metropolitan Police Department must use the highest degree of care in the application of any use of force. We also recognize that in unique situations, exceptions to some restrictions may be necessary. Thus, every use of deadly force will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine the reasonableness of an Officer’s actions...The St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department regularly reviews policies and procedures to ensure that the Department is serving the community to the best of its abilities. We routinely update special orders to improve transparency and accountability, including complaint taking, internal investigations, and disciplinary processes.” Krewson, Lyda, et al. “Joint Statement Regarding Use of Force Policies and Training for the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department.” Stlouis, 2020.

Since COB’s inception, the Force Investigation Unit (FIU) has investigated the circumstances surrounding the above-listed deaths, but has not provided the investigatory file and/or evidence for any of these matters to the COB for review and consideration. SLMPD has provided some investigations related to the foregoing cases to the Circuit Attorney’s office for review and charging decisions. To date, the only case that is completely resolved through prosecution, conviction and sentencing is the matter involving Officer Alix. However, her investigative file and the evidence attendant thereto have not been provided to COB. As of this writing, COB awaits the receipt of any and all of these cases.

Case review by the Circuit Attorney’s Office has been a barrier to COB access to FIU files as these files are provided to the Circuit Attorney for review and charging decisions before review by the Deadly Force Review Board, the Inspector and then COB. This process has resulted in file reviews that stretch into years and prevent the COB from having access to the evidentiary files as anticipated by the ordinance. If the process adopted by SLMPD for the review of these very important matters has resulted in a bottleneck that cannot be resolved, an alternative method of moving these cases to closure should be adopted.

The Director of Public Safety has complied with the ordinance. The SLMPD Commissioners have failed to convene the Deadly Force Review Board in over 2 ½ years and none of the cases listed above have been released to COB for review. The process adopted by SLMPD to address lethal force cases has resulted in a frustration of the oversight authorized by the ordinance. In the event the investigative files cannot be completed and reviewed within a reasonable timeframe, a new system should be adopted. Presently, ongoing monitoring of lethal force cases by COB is lacking. The failure of the Commissioners to provide these investigatory files to COB for review
demonstrates a breakdown of the accountability and transparency that was anticipated by the ordinance.

As previously stated, the ordinance requires that the Director of Public Safety request that the Attorney General of the State of Missouri oversee or conduct the IAD investigation concerning a lethal force incident. The Attorney General has not assumed any of the Lethal Force investigations involving the cases listed above. The Attorney General’s office asserts that they lack the statutory authority to perform an Internal Affairs investigation. However, they stand ready to assume lethal force investigations, without performing the internal affairs function, upon a proper request from the local Circuit Attorney’s office. To date, no such request has been made by the Circuit Attorney’s Office. The Circuit Attorney’s Office previously requested funds to create a unit to independently investigate lethal force cases. The Board of Alderman did not authorize the expenditure and the initiative failed. However, according to Ms. Gardner, the Circuit Attorney’s Office has an attorney and an investigator dedicated to working on these matters internally. The Circuit Attorney could not provide an estimated date when case review might be completed by her office as they were still reviewing evidence for cases that predated her tenure in the office.

SECTION VI SYNOPSIS:

When a community member is lost at the hands of law enforcement everyone suffers. The loved ones of that community member feel it much more strongly than the rest and are entitled to timely resolution of the case so that the circumstances can be known and the family can move toward closure. COB was created in response to many advocates moving lawmakers to enact this ordinance and they were buoyed in this effort by the unfortunate death of Michael Brown. The process currently in place at SLMPD for review of lethal force cases has not been effective or efficient. When the COB was empowered, it was anticipated that, in addition to review of the enumerated complaints, the Board would have access to investigations of lethal force. However, this function has been frustrated and effectively voided by the failure to provide these files to the Board from 2016-present.
SECTION VII:
CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT BOARD AND STAFF OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

In 2019, the Civilian Oversight Board (COB) continued to increase awareness of the Board’s mission and conveyed a better understanding about the agency’s authority and process. The agency extended Community Outreach efforts through its board members and achieved a higher number of professional and community contacts.

Through the dedication of the staff and Board members of COB, we have attended numerous outreach events in the community including; schools and universities and other public forums as well as providing education on the COB’s process to the SLMPD police academy recruits and at the International Institute for new minority groups.

Our outreach presentations provide an overview of the COB process, an explanation of basic guidelines when encountering the police, and an understanding of their rights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Outreach 2019</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Collaborations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/Universities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Events</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACOLE Events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2019
In 2019, the Civilian Oversight Board staff and/or members attended 115 community outreach events. In 2018, the Civilian Oversight Board staff and/or members attended 48 community outreach events. Due to a decrease in received complaints from the previous year, the COB Staff/Members increased their community outreach by attending professional and community meetings through schools, universities, and other public forums. The staff continued presentations at the SLMPD academy with the new recruits about the agency’s authority, process, and mission. The COB will continue to expand its community outreach strategic plan. The goal is to continue to increase awareness through both professional and community events and engage all stakeholders in these efforts.
SECTION VIII:
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations rendered to SLMPD to address any policies, procedures, racial profiling and systematic problems identified.

A: Recommendations Rendered from 2016-2019

2017

The following are recommendations that have been made to date regarding complaints:

1. Regarding complaint COB-16-0006, the Complainant alleged police officer(s) used excessive force causing injury to the Complainant and the Complainant alleged they were not resisting arrest when the incident occurred. Internal Affairs Division turned over its investigative file and determined the complaint was Unfounded. However, the COB found that the officer used more than the least amount of force reasonably necessary to accomplish their lawful objectives violating Special Orders Section I of SO 1-01 (B)(2). The COB recommended that the officer review the video of this event, along with his/her supervisor, and the officer undergo reinstruction on the Use of Force Continuum. Response from Lt. Colonel Rochelle D. Jones on October 2, 2017 was to disagree with COB findings.

2. Regarding complaint COB-16-0016, the Complainant alleged being assaulted by individuals in an apartment complex the Complainant resided in. The assault resulted in the Complainant needing medical treatment including staples in the top of the head. Complainant alleged when police arrived the individuals told police the Complainant had a mental health illness and was not currently taking medication. Complainant stated the police did not do a thorough investigation at that point and only took the Complainant to the hospital. The suspects were not arrested, and no police report was generated. The COB recommended that the SLMPD adopt the following policy: “In the event of an assault allegation, where an injury has occurred, a police incident report will be written.” Response from Lt. Colonel Rochelle D. Jones on October 2, 2017, was to disagree with COB findings.

3. Regarding complaint COB-16-0017, the Complainant alleged that while officers were executing a warrant they beat and Tased him several times. The Complainant also alleged being hit in the face with the barrel of a rifle and that officers shot and killed his dog. The COB recommended that SLMPD adopt the following policy regarding standard TASER activation, “all subjects experiencing the TASER, who are in police custody, that have been Tased three (3) times or more be taken to the hospital for evaluation before being taken to the Justice Center”. This would differ from the current requirements in
Special Order 1-01, Section VI, Subsection I that the subject be taken to the hospital if exposure were greater than the standard three (3) five-second exposures. **Response:**

The Department’s existing policy adheres to both the current International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Model Policy and to the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS)/ Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) recommendations.

Additionally, all subjects exposed to three (3) or fewer Electronic Control Weapon (ECW) activations are to be evaluated by medical personnel at the City Justice Center, along with general policy to request EMS for on-scene injuries. Moreover, the Department does acknowledge the existing order needs reconstruction to explicitly address hospital evaluations on ECW exposures. The Department is working to make such modifications.

**This recommendation was accepted by SLMPD.**

4. Regarding complaint COB-16-0018, the Complainant alleged that a neighbor was harassing the Complainant and the Complainant’s family, based primarily on their religious beliefs. The Complainant alleged that they contacted SLMPD on several occasions by calling 911 to report the incidents. Complainant alleged that on each occasion SLMPD responded to the calls but never wrote a police report to document the issues the Complainant called to report. The Civilian Oversight Board recommends the following policy and procedure to be submitted to the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department. Allegations D & E: COB does not agree with findings of the Internal Affairs Division. **Response:** The Department maintains the position that sufficient evidence does not support the findings and conclusions of the COB.

5. It is recommended that all Garrity statements must be audio and video recorded. **Response:** While recording Garrity statements may be the preferred method, recording all statements may be unfeasible and impractical in various situations. At this time, the Department supports a policy that favors audio/video recording of statements (particularly in serious incidents) however, continues to recognize the relevance of written statements which provides the Department with the necessary flexibility in the conduct of its investigations. The policy will be regularly reviewed and updated in accordance with existing laws and best practices.

**This recommendation was accepted by SLMPD.**

In 2017, the only accepted recommendations were in case nos. 16-0017 & 16-0018.

In case no. 16-0017, the COB recommended that “all subjects experiencing the TASER, who are in police custody, that have been Tased three (3) times or more be taken to the hospital for evaluation before being taken to the Justice Center”. This would differ from the requirements in Special Order 1-01, Section VI, Subsection I that the subject be
taken to the hospital if exposure were greater than the standard three (3) five-second exposures.

In case no 16-0018, the COB recommended that all Garrity interviews are audio and video recorded. SLMPD agreed to apply this principal whenever feasible.

2018

1. Regarding complaint COB-18-0004, the Complainant alleged Officer(s) with St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department (SLMPD) displayed discourtesy when they used profanity and were unprofessional when they responded to an incident that occurred at the intersection of Boyle Avenue and Chouteau Avenue. The Complainant also stated that the officers engaged in racially profiling him by how they responded to his explanations of the events that occurred prior to their arrival. The Complainant further alleged the officer(s) did not conduct a proper investigation. The COB Agreed with IAD’s findings regarding the allegations. However, COB recommended the following: To ensure that protocol is followed with respect to the COB staff being notified by IAD regarding interviews of Complainants and witnesses. Please refer to Ordinance 69984 Section Six, subsection (5) (Monitoring) for specific reference. The recommendation was made to SLMPD on September 18, 2018.

**This recommendation was accepted.** Please see the SLMPD response included in the letter from Commissioner Hayden immediately following these COB recommendations.

2. Regarding complaint COB-18-0019, the Complainant alleged that the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department officers displayed Abuse of Authority during the execution of a search warrant when they caused unnecessary damage to the property located at Barrett, St. Louis, Missouri 63107. After consideration, the Civilian Oversight Board made a determination to Agree with Internal Affairs Division to close this case as Unfounded.

However, the following recommendation was made regarding COB-18-0019: It is recommended that all IAD reports which investigate COB-referred complaints refer to all such regulations, policies, and procedures which govern the incident that occurred. This complaint was based on the entry and execution of a warrant. IAD determined no policies or procedures were violated and cited only Police Manual Rule 7, “Conduct Unbecoming”. However, there was no reference made to any other policies or procedures that may have been violated pertaining to this specific incident, such as Section II of SO 8-02, “Searches with and without Warrants” and/or Section IV of SO 2-12 (C)(4)(b), “Executing high-risk search warrants.” The recommendation was made to the Department on September 18, 2018.
3. Regarding COB-18-0020, the Complainant alleged that an SLMPD officer failed to conduct a proper investigation after recovering the Complainant’s stolen vehicle.

The following recommendation was made regarding COB-18-0020:
It is recommended that SLMPD create a policy, where when appropriate, under the circumstances police upon recovery of a stolen vehicle be permitted to release the vehicle to its owner ONLY AFTER informing the owner of options. This would require giving the option for an owner to pick up their vehicle at a scene, if no other crime has occurred, or to have the vehicle towed to be processed for fingerprints. This may include a waiver form to be signed by the owner prior to being released if the vehicle is not going to be towed for further processing. The recommendation was made to SLMPD on November 1, 2018.

** Please see the SLMPD response included in the letter from Commissioner Hayden immediately following these COB recommendations.

4. Regarding COB-18-0021, the Complainant alleged that the SLMPD officer failed to investigate a reported incident and failed to complete a police report on time. Internal Affairs Division turned over its investigative file on September 24, 2018. Internal Affairs Division found no further action was needed in this matter as it was determined that the officers used discretion along with handling this case in good faith.

The following recommendation was made by the Civilian Oversight Board regarding complaint COB-18-0021:
It is recommended that officer(s) should refrain from giving legal advice with respect to obtaining a civil restraining order in matters OTHER THAN domestic situations. The recommendation was made to the SLMPD on November 1, 2018.

** There has been no written response to date regarding this recommendation although it has been requested as recently as March 24, 2020.

2019

5. Regarding COB-19-0001, the Complainant alleged that the SLMPD officer displayed discourtesy when the officer failed to update her, after several phone calls, on status of a Robbery First Degree incident wherein she was the victim of a robbery at gunpoint. Internal Affairs Division turned over its investigative file on July 2, 2019. Internal Affairs Division determined to close this complaint as the Detectives did finally contact the
Complainant back with an update on the status of her case. IAD determines this case is Not-Sustained.

After consideration, the Civilian Oversight Board made a determination to Agree with Internal Affairs Division and close this complaint as the Complainant was satisfied with the Detectives contacting her back with an update on the status of her complaint. This case will be closed as Not-Sustained.

However, after consideration the Civilian Oversight Board made the determination, after several complaints including this complaint, there is a lack of communication on behalf of SLMPD on returning phone calls to victims and/or victims’ families regarding updating on cases or follow up on investigations. Therefore, the following recommendation was approved by the Civilian Oversight Board regarding complaint 19-0001. It is recommended to the Commissioner of SLMPD to consider implementing a policy, when there is an investigation of a violent crime, to set a reasonable time frame for returning phone calls to victims, families of victims, or witnesses who are attempting to contact an investigating officer regarding the violent crime that occurred.
April 9, 2020

Kimberley Taylor-Riley
Commissioner, Civilian Oversight Board
1520 Market Street, Suite 4029
Saint Louis, MO 63103

Re: Responses to Recommendations

Commissioner Taylor-Riley,

Detective Sergeant Latroy Taylor, Deputy Commander, Internal Affairs Division, reviewed your request and provided the attached written responses. These responses were also reviewed and approved by Lieutenant Colonel Michael Sack and Lieutenant William Brown. I appreciate your interest and we want to ensure you that we are working hard to guarantee that you are well informed on Civilian Oversight Board cases and on our investigative process.

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Colonel John W. Hayden Jr.
Commissioner of Police

Cc: Judge Jimmie M. Edwards, Director of Public Safety
Lieutenant Colonel Michael Sack
Lieutenant William Brown
Sir,

The following are the responses to several of the questions posed by the COB:

1. Regarding complaint COB-18-0004, the complainant alleged Officer(s) with St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department (SLMPD) displayed discourtesy when they used profanity and were unprofessional when they responded to an incident that occurred at the intersection of Boyle Avenue and Chouteau Avenue. The Complainant also stated that the officers engaged in racially profiling him by how they responded to his explanations of the events that occurred prior to their arrival. The complainant further alleged the officer(s) did not conduct a proper investigation. Internal Affairs Division turned over its investigative file on August 30, 2018 and determined the allegation in the complaint was Not Sustained.

The COB Agreed with IAD's findings regarding the allegations. However, COB recommended the following: To ensure that protocol is followed with respect to the COB staff being notified by IAD regarding interviews of complainants and witnesses. Please refer to Ordinance 69984 Section Six, subsection (5) (Monitoring) for specific reference. The recommendation was made to the Department on September 18, 2018.

Please be advised that IAD investigators were reminded to notify the COB of all interviews of complainants and witnesses in COB investigations. We are not aware of this occurring since this reported occurrence but will address it immediately should it happen again.

3. Regarding complaint COB-18-0019, the complainant alleged that the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department officers displayed Abuse of Authority during the execution of a search warrant when they caused unnecessary damage to the property located on Barrett, St. Louis, Missouri 63107. Internal Affairs Division turned over its
investigative file on August 30, 2018 and determined this case would be closed as there were no policies or procedures violated by the Departments SWAT team.

After consideration, the Civilian Oversight Board decided to Agree with Internal Affairs Division to close this case as Unfounded.

However, the following recommendation was made regarding COB-18-0019: It is recommended that all IAD reports which investigate COB-referred complaints refer to all such regulations, policies, and procedures which govern the incident that occurred. This particular complaint was based on the entry and execution of a warrant. IAD determined no policies or procedures were violated and cited only Police Manual Rule 7, “Conduct Unbecoming”. However, there was no reference made to any other policies or procedures that may have been violated pertaining to this specific incident, such as Section II of SO 8-02, “Searches with and without Warrants” and/or Section IV of SO 2-12 (C)(4)(b), “Executing high-risk search warrants.” The recommendation was made to the Department on September 18, 2018.

In complaints of this nature, where outside agencies conduct independent investigations and only use the SLMPD as a resource/assist, the additional allegations spoken of in the COB’s recommendation are not investigated or referenced. This is because the search warrant was obtained by the Webster Groves Police Department (an outside agency); therefore, those allegations did not apply in this investigation. Had this search warrant originated from officers within the SLMPD, those additional allegations would have been investigated and/or referenced.

The SLMPD SWAT team was contacted by the Webster Groves Police Department for the sole purpose of conducting the entry. This was the only role they played; therefore, the entry is what was investigated. The SLMPD was not involved with any other portion of the search warrant or events leading up to it.

4. Regarding COB-18-0020, the complainant alleged that an Officer with SLMPD failed to conduct a proper investigation after recovering the complainant’s stolen vehicle.

Internal Affairs Division turned over its investigative file September 24, 2018. Internal Affairs Division contacted the complainant who advised he wished to withdraw the complaint because he did not want anyone to get into trouble, however stated he would like some policy changes regarding stolen vehicles in the future. Internal Affairs Division found no further action would be taken in this matter as the complainant wished to withdraw the complaint.

The COB Investigator contacted the complainant who stated he did wish to withdraw his complaint, however, would like policy changes regarding how stolen vehicles are processed in the future.

After consideration, the Civilian Oversight Board decided to Agree with Internal Affairs Division to close this case at this time as the complainant wished to withdraw the complaint.
ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

COB investigators have obtained law enforcement oversight certifications through the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement.

COB investigators received Internal Affairs training and certifications through the Public Agency Training Council.

Creation of the Joint Civilian Complaint Form by COB and SLMPD.

The Board has been granted subpoena power.

COB Staff have observed that over time IAD officers have adopted an interview style that is less confrontational when interacting with Complainants.

COB Staff maintain an ongoing dialogue with SLMPD through our liaison officer.

Some of the recommendations offered to SLMPD by COB have been accepted.

Increased outreach efforts by the Board and staff.

B: Recommendations Based Upon the Data Contained in this Report

- Internal Affairs provide status reports including allegations and outcomes on all unreported matters from 2016-2019.
- Internal Affairs provide status reports for the 40 pending COB cases from 2016-2019.
- Internal Affairs commence exclusive use of the Joint Civilian Complaint Form.
- Preliminary investigation of complaints includes a minimum of an interview of the Complainant.
- Civilian Oversight Board Staff be included in all Complainant interviews.
- Internal Affairs utilize the classifications set out in the ordinance.
- Internal Affairs provide a rationale supported by the evidence for every case at closure.
- Internal Affairs provide complaints that they receive to COB within 48 hours of receipt.
- Establish an updated investigative timeline for the Internal Affairs Division as 84% were not completed within the initial 90 days in 2019.
- Establish an investigative timeline for the Force Investigation Unit for lethal force cases.
- Review the Force Investigation Unit process for lethal force cases to provide investigative files on all lethal force cases to COB contemporaneously with the Circuit Attorney’s Office to expedite the review process.
- SLMPD create and adopt a comprehensive recruiting plan to address diversity deficits in their workforce.
• SLMPD include a representative of COB into the screening/hiring process.
• SLMPD adopt implicit and explicit bias training to address disproportionate minority contact.
• Upon termination and/or voluntary resignation while under investigation, SLMPD pursue decertification of the involved officer.

Additionally, the Board concurs with the following recommendations from the National Agency for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE), the nonprofit national organization that works to build accountability, transparency, and community trust in law enforcement, that:

• The Legislature repeal laws that conceal police disciplinary records from public view;
• The mandatory use of the national de-certification index to prevent officers terminated from one police force from getting a job at another; and
• Oversight entities have unfettered access to department data and records, personnel files, and police, jail, and prison facilities, so that they can carry out their existing mandates. Perez, Liana. National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement, NACOLE, 2 June 2020, www.nacole.org/.

And the Board joins Mayor Lyda Krewson, Judge Jimmie Edwards, (Director of Public Safety) and Police Commissioner John Hayden in supporting the following local efforts to improve service, integrity and leadership in law enforcement:

• A national registry of bad and corrupt police officers;
• National standards for police training; and
• The hiring of mental and behavioral health specialists to assist police.


Finally, the COB Staff commits to development of a training plan for Board members. The training plan will include relevant constitutional and state laws; SLMPD policies and procedures; implicit bias; and the gathering and objective analysis of evidence.
SECTION IX: WORKS CITED

SECTION X:
CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF

Board Members

Stephen Rovak, Chairman, District Seven (Wards 10, 23, 24, 28):

Steve is a partner at Dentons US LLP. He is a former JAG officer, with 30 years commissioned service in the Air Force and Army, retiring from active reserves in 2000 with the rank of colonel. He completed a Fellowship in Forensic Medicine at the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, Walter Reed Medical Center, earned as M.S. in Forensic Sciences from George Washington University, and his law degree from Harvard. Steve is currently a member of the institutional review board for Washington University School of Medicine, as well as Co-chair of the Mediation Committee of the International Institute for Conflict Prevention & Resolution. Alderwoman Krewson endorsed this candidate.

Heather Highland, Vice Chair, District Six (Wards 14, 15, 20, 25):

Heather has practiced family law and criminal defense at Fredman & Fredman P.C. since 2000. In addition, she serves as a municipal court Judge in St. Louis County. She earned her B.A. in Spanish and Criminology from the University of Missouri-St. Louis, and a law degree from Saint Louis University. Heather is a member of the Bar Association of Metropolitan St. Louis, the Hispanic Bar Association, the Mound City Bar Association, and the Women Lawyer's Association. She volunteers for CLOUT and the American Cancer Society. Aldermen Green, Spencer, and Cohn endorsed this candidate. Heather resigned from District Six and was appointed to District Four during 2018.
Jane Abbott-Morris, District Two (Wards 5, 6, 18, 19)

Jane a self-employed business owner of “Human Resources Select Services”, serving as the president and CEO since 1999. She is also a certified Equal Employment Opportunity Investigator, examining cases of alleged discrimination based upon race, sex, disability, national origin, and religion, as well as cases of alleged harassment. She earned a B.A. in Elementary Education from Harris Teacher's College, an M.S. in Counseling Education from Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, as well as an M.S. in Public Administration from Webster University. Jane is a part of a multitude of organizations, past and present, including founding Teen Leaders & Communicators and the Grand Center Toastmaster Chapter, as well as membership in the Coalition of 100 Black Women, Association for Training and Development, NAACP, NOBLE, Top Ladies of Distinction, Human Resources Management Association, and the St. Louis Minority Business Corporation.

Bradley T. Arteaga, District Five (Wards 11, 12, 13, 16)

Bradley Arteaga is the owner of “Arteaga Photos Ltd, “which he has operated in the City since 1984. He is the past presidents of both the Southtown Business Association and the St. Louis Hill Neighborhood Association. He currently serves as a board member of the St. Louis Second District Police Business Association. Brad grew up in the Baden neighborhood before moving to the St. Louis Hills. Alderman Baringer endorsed this candidate.
David Bell, District Three (Wards 1, 4, 22, 26)

David Bell resides in the 26th Ward. David has been employed at SSM Health St. Louis University Hospital (SLUH) since 2008, where he has been caring for the city's most vulnerable residents. SSM Health SLUH is a Level 1 Trauma Center and hospital in St. Louis South City. David was an Emergency Room and Trauma Registered Nurse in the hospital's Emergency Department for several years before transitioning to his current position as the Nurse Practitioner for the Employee Health Department at SSM Health SLUH. David occasionally returns to the Emergency Department as a provider. David graduated from the University of Missouri-St. Louis with a Bachelor’s of Nursing (BSN) degree. David also received a Masters of Nursing (MSN) degree from St. Louis University with a specialty in Family Practice. He is currently certified and licensed as a Family Nurse Practitioner. David has over 20 years of St. Louis City community involvement and outreach experience, as an Outreach Coordinator. He works with a variety of Christian and Community organizations in St. Louis City to bring positive programs and events to inner city residents. David was nominated by Mayor Francis Slay and endorsed by Alderman Frank Williamson for the 26th Ward.

Ciera Simril, District One (Wards 2, 3, 21, 27)

Ciera L. Simril is the youngest member serving on the Civilian Oversight Board representing District One. She has been a longtime activist for change within the communities that she serves daily. Ciera is a graduate of Soldan International Studies High School, a University of Missouri-St. Louis graduate with a Bachelor of Arts in Communications and currently working on a Masters in Organizational Development from Webster University. She interned with The St. Louis American and has written several columns on community issues. Ciera currently works for US Bank in government operations, after working in various capacities at the Urban League of Metropolitan St. Louis and North Newstead Association as a facilitator for the Neighborhood Ownership Model started in 2011 in North Pointe, Walnut Park East/West neighborhoods. She also was a program coordinator for St. Louis Connecting and Assisting Neighborhoods in North City. She received the Earl E. Howe Community Service Award, Neighborhood Hero Award from Nextdoor and the Neighborhood Star, an award from the Circuit Attorney's Office, for acting as an intermediary between police and neighborhood residents. Ciera believes that “every great dream begins with a dreamer. Always remember, you have within you the strength, the patience, and the passion to reach for the stars to change the world.” – Harriett Tubman.
Kimberley Taylor-Riley graduated from the University of Nebraska at Omaha with a degree in social work and a minor in criminal justice. Ms. Taylor-Riley is certified as a law enforcement officer in the State of Nebraska and holds certifications in basic and family mediation. Since graduation from Creighton Law School, Ms. Taylor-Riley has engaged in a myriad of civil and criminal practice areas with a concentration in family and juvenile law. In 2005, she closed her private practice and took a position with the Nebraska Attorney General's Office. Ms. Taylor-Riley worked in the Civil Division handling Inmate litigation matters before moving to the Violence against Women Act Prosecutor position wherein she prosecuted domestic and sexual violence cases. She served as the Resource Prosecutor for Nebraska during that time while coordinating a training team to address best practices/protocols for successful intervention in domestic and sexual violence cases. In 2012, she became the Director of Equity and Diversity for the City of Lincoln involving supervision of the of the Lincoln Commission on Human Rights, performing internal discrimination/harassment investigations, serving as the ADA co-coordinator, assisting with federal civil rights contract compliance issues and working with a team designated by the Mayor to create a more inclusive workforce. In 2018, she relocated to Missouri to serve as the Diversity and Inclusion Manager for the Office of State Courts Administrator involving supervision of unit staff, drafting of the Diversity Statement and chairing the Civility Team. In addition to those tasks, she served as the Executive Director of the Commission on Racial and Ethnic Fairness. In January 2020, Ms. Taylor-Riley became the Commissioner of the Civilian Oversight Board for the City of St. Louis.
Aldin Lolic, CPO, CIAI, Special Investigator, Civilian Oversight Board

Aldin is the Civilian Oversight Board (COB) Special Investigator with an additional assignment to serve as a liaison to the minorities and immigrant communities. He comes from an extensive background in investigations, specializing in criminal investigations, insurance fraud, corporate investigations and private investigations. Aldin became a Certified Oversight Practitioner (CPO) through National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE); and a Certified Internal Affairs Investigator (CIAI) through Public Agency Training Council. He has an Associate’s Degree from Maryville University and holds a BS from University of Belgrade. His future plans involve the candidacy of Washington University Law School. Aldin is proficient in English and Bosnian language, as well fluent in German and Russian. He received numerous awards and certifications as a Criminal and Defense Investigator and training in Criminal Investigation and Internal Affairs.

Louisa Lyles, M.A., CPO, Legal Investigator, Civilian Oversight Board

Louisa is an investigator with twenty-six years of experience. Her career includes fourteen years with the St. Louis City Division of Corrections where she implemented and developed corrections’ Internal Affairs Unit and taught Report Writing, Legal Issues Effecting Correctional Officers, Handling of Evidence, and How to Conduct an Internal Investigation for Corrections. She also was a criminal investigator for the St. Louis City Circuit Attorney’s Office, in the Sex Crime/Family Violence and the Child Support Units. Louisa graduated from St. Louis University with a B.A. in Criminal Justice Administration in 1999 and graduated from Webster University with a Masters in Legal Studies in 2002. She is a Certified Practitioner of Oversight (CPO) with the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) and a member of NACOLE’s Communication Workshop Group. Louisa is an adjunct instructor teaching Foundations of Law and Research Writing for Harris Stowe State University in the Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences. She is currently a member of Dred Scott Heritage Foundation, League of Women Voters, and Women’s Voices Raised for Social Justice. Her goal is to obtain a Ph.D. in Criminal Justice, be an advocate for social change, and continue her ministry as the Sunday school teacher at her church.

Dorothy Malone, Executive Secretary, Civilian Oversight Board

Dorothy has been with the Civilian Oversight Board since April 2016. She has over 20 years of experience in her field. Prior to working for the COB, she worked for several departments within the State of Missouri over an 8 year time span. Those departments include Department of Corrections and the Department of Social Services. She worked at Missouri Eastern Correctional Center, Probation and Parole, and later transferred to the Department of Social Services. She is currently pursuing her Bachelor’s Degree in Social Work.
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Nicolle Barton, M.A., CFE, CPO, former Executive Director, COB

Nicolle Barton resigned as the Executive Director for the St. Louis City Civilian Oversight Board in September of 2019. She had been the Director since its inception in February of 2016. She has earned her Master’s Degree in Legal Studies from Webster University in St. Louis. She also has a Bachelor’s Degree in Administration of Justice. She has a background in both law enforcement and community outreach. She has previously worked for the Missouri Department of Corrections, Division of Probation and Parole. She worked in various capacities in this role which included supervising staff in the largest district in St. Louis.

Nicolle has helped develop and write policy and procedures, implement training, and have served on various committees throughout her tenure. She has implemented Strategic Planning and Community Outreach efforts in the St. Louis City and surrounding areas. She has conducted numerous trainings including Domestic Violence, Pathways to Change, Career Development, Victim Impact, Life Skills Training, and Cognitive Behavior Programs for chronically unemployed offenders.

Nicolle is a Member of the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement and was a panel speaker at the 23rd Annual Conference on Civilian Oversight in a Changing Landscape in 2017. She has been recognized as a leader in “Eliminating Racism, Empowering Women”.

Daniel Blocher, former Board Member, COB District Four (Wards 7, 8, 9, 17)

Daniel Blocher has resided in the City’s 14th Ward since 2014 with his wife and son. Daniel is a Vice President at U.S. Bancorp Community Development Corporation, working to provide capital for investments in low-income communities for over a decade. He is also a board member of Bridge Investment CDC, a national non-profit, supporting job creation and economic growth in low to moderate income communities and underserved areas. Daniel resigned from the COB in October of 2019, due to job relocation. The COB would like to thank Mr. Blocher for his time served as one of the Board Members on the Civilian Oversight Board.
A special 'Thank You' to Civilian Oversight Board Staff Aldin Lolic, Louisa Lyles, and Dorothy Malone who worked diligently during this transition period to ensure that COB reported updated and accurate data. Additionally, they were instrumental in compiling the information that is reflected in the charts and graphs contained herein.

The St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department deserves recognition for their continued efforts and cooperation with the Civilian Oversight Board over the years.

Our heartfelt appreciation goes to the Board members for their tireless commitment and dedication to our mission of ensuring transparency and accountability of SLMPD.

A debt of gratitude is owed to Mayor Krewson and Director Edwards for their ongoing support of our efforts.

The Civilian Oversight Board could not succeed without you!

Kimberley Taylor-Riley, Commissioner
Civilian Oversight Board

"With each day the opportunity for meaningful change is presented. "We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history, there "is" such a thing as being too late. This is no time for apathy or complacency. This is a time for vigorous and positive action." Martin Luther King Jr."