

**FINAL REPORT FOR THE AUDIT OF THE STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT
BETWEEN THE MARYLAND STATE CONFERENCE OF NAACP BRANCHES,
ET.AL. AND THE BALTIMORE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT, ET.AL.**

**CHARLES F. WELLFORD
AUDITOR
JUSTICE ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION SERVICES
December 31, 2014**

INTRODUCTION

This is the final report of the Auditor for the settlement between the Maryland State Conference of the NAACP Branches, et.al. and the Baltimore Police Department (the Department), et.al. (hereinafter the Voluntary Agreement). It covers the period of January 1, 2014 to September 30, 2014. The Auditor was selected by the parties to the agreement and notified of his selection in October of 2010. The Auditor submitted a required work plan and detailed auditors manual that were approved by March of 2011. The contract for the services of the auditor was issued at the end of July 2011. The Auditor submitted to the parties, for their approval, staff who would work on the audit. The Auditor was notified of staff approval in March of 2011. The first audit report was submitted April 30, 2012; the second report was submitted October 31, 2012; the third audit report was submitted April 30, 2013; the fourth audit report was submitted on October 31, 2013; the fifth audit report was submitted on April 30, 2014¹.

As in the first five reports, this report uses the methods approved in the Audit Manual to assess the extent of compliance with each of the auditable tasks contained in the voluntary agreement. The audit has determined that the Baltimore Police Department is in compliance with 17 of the tasks (48%), in material compliance with 16 of the tasks (46%), and in noncompliance with 2 (6%) of the

¹ Copies of previous reports are available from the Baltimore Police Department.

tasks. These levels of compliance are unchanged from the first five audit reports. While the Department continues to make progress in complying with tasks that address policies and procedures, to date the Baltimore Police Department has not achieved compliance with the task that measures behavioral changes in arrest reports for Quality of Life Offenses².

TASK AUDIT

Task 1. Within thirty days of the effective date of this Agreement, the Department shall issue a policy stating that the Department does not support a policy of Zero Tolerance Policing. Quality of Life Offenses³ committed in an officer's presence may be enforced by several means, including but not limited to: Counseling, verbal warning, written citation or arrest.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

The Department issued a Police Commissioners Memorandum on July 29, 2010 (PC Memorandum 11-10) that contains all of the elements required by this task.

Task 2. Within 30 days of the Effective Date of this Agreement, the Department shall issue a written directive or directives enumerating the elements of each Quality of Life Offense and providing guidance on appropriately identifying and

² The Voluntary agreement requires that this report append the comments of the Department. They are contained in Appendix A.

³ In the Voluntary Agreement, Quality of Life Offenses are defined as including the following offenses: "loitering, trespassing, public defecation/urination, open container, disorderly conduct (particularly "failure to obey" and disturbing the peace), hindering, and littering.

reacting to conduct that does and does not amount to a Quality of Life Offense, including guidance on conduct that is protected by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

The Department issued a Police Commissioners Memorandum on July 29, 2010 (PC Memorandum 13-10) that contains all of the elements required by this task.

Task 3. The written directive or directives concerning Quality of Life Offenses required by Section IV.B.1.a.2 of the Voluntary Agreement shall include a requirement that any time an officer effects a custodial arrest for a Quality of Life Offense, the officer shall record in the incident report and the statement of probable cause the factual basis for his or her decision to effect a custodial arrest, rather than providing counseling, a verbal warning or issuing a citation.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

The Department issued a Police Commissioners Memorandum on July 29, 2010 (PC Memorandum 14-10) that exceeds the requirements of this task.

a. The Auditor shall review a statistically meaningful sample of statements of probable cause required by section IV.B.1.a.2.a to determine whether the factual narrative of the arrest could on its face support a finding of probable cause and that the arrest was in accord with the Policies.

STATUS: NONCOMPLIANCE

To assess compliance with this task the Auditor reviewed all arrests for the period and identified all arrests involving a Quality of Life Offense. The auditor then selected a 25% sample of all Quality of Life Offense arrests for the months of January 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014. The Department provided copies of the statements of probable cause for these sampled arrests. The attorney assisting the auditor read each of the sampled arrests to determine if they contained acceptable statements of probable cause and if the arrest was in accord with the department's policies noted in Tasks 1-3 above. These reviews were corroborated by the Auditor.

During the current period the Department provided files on 67,932 arrests of which 3993 (5.9% of all arrests) were for Quality of Life Offenses as defined by the Voluntary Agreement⁴. The random sample of these quality of life offenses totaled 999. Compliance with this task was determined by the analysis of these sampled cases. The Audit Manual stated that to be in full compliance the analysis of the sampled cases would have to result in a level of estimated compliance that included the possibility that 100% of the cases were compliant.

⁴ In our first report we noted that we had also requested and were provided arrest data for April of 2010 and September of 2010. We compared these months to the comparable months in 2011. This analysis showed a decline in arrests and Quality of Life arrests of between 16 and 25%. For the second report we compared April through June of 2011 with the same months in 2012 and found a 3% decrease in total arrests and about a 1.6% increase in quality of life arrests. In 2013 we find a decrease in quality of life arrests for the same period of .5%.

In the first five reports and in this one, in reviewing the sampled cases to determine compliance, we encountered two issues. First, each month a number of the sampled cases of Quality of Life arrests involved arrests for offenses that emerged after the stop for the Quality of Life Offense. For example, an officer approaches a person who is on private property and as the officer approaches, the person of interest drops something that later turns out to be a controlled substance. The officer arrests the person for trespassing and for possession of the controlled substance without indicating in the report that an alternative to arrest was considered. In these instances we determined, after consultation with the parties to the Voluntary Agreement, that as long as the arrest report accurately stated probable cause these arrests would be considered consistent with departmental policy and were compliant for purposes of this audit. In other words, those arrests were counted as compliant even if the probable cause statement did not indicate that an alternative was considered. This issue continued in this reporting period and was handled the same way as before.

The second issue we encountered during the first five reporting periods and in the current period was a number of expunged cases for which arrest reports were unavailable. It was explained that pursuant to statute the Department was required to expunge the records of those who were arrested but were released without charges (referred to as RWOC cases). We sought these records because

these cases are similar to the kind of cases that prompted the lawsuit that resulted in the Voluntary Agreement we are auditing. When the draft report of our first report was reviewed by the representatives of the plaintiffs, they pointed out that while the statute (Md.Code, Crim. Proc. §10-101) requires expungement in these cases, it further requires that the Department retain the record for three years. The Department, in response to our inquiry concerning this, stated that after expungement the records were not available through the Department's management information system. We indicated in our first four reports that during the subsequent reporting periods we would continue to seek access to these cases. During the last two reporting periods there was a drop in number of these expunged cases. While during the third reporting period there were a total of 119 sampled cases that were expunged, during the current period the number of sampled cases that are reported as expunged totals 18. While in the past we were concerned that the large number of expunged cases would hamper our ability to accurately determine compliance, this concern is minimized since the number of expunged cases remains low. Then and now the Department is not compliant with this task no matter how we handle the expunged cases⁵.

The Department continues to contend that even if they had access to the incident reports for the expunged cases that they could not give them to us for two

⁵ During the current reporting period the Department used our review of cases that were not compliant to develop and offer new educational programs and materials for supervisors and officers in all police Districts.

reasons: 1) the statement of probable cause in the incident report may be different from the final statement of probable cause; and 2) since the record has been expunged they cannot provide the auditor with a copy of the report that would identify the person arrested because that would violate the purpose of expungement. Specifically, the Department has contended:

Probable cause statements pertaining to the arrest of an individual that has been expunged are not part of the records considered to be in the custody of the Baltimore Police Department. Maryland Code of Criminal Procedure Section 10-103.1 requires that all police records regarding the arrest of a person who is arrested or confined and is released without being charged with the commission of a crime are entitled to an automatic expungement.

The State's Attorney's Office has the discretion to determine which cases to prosecute. An individual may be released without charges for numerous reasons, all of which are within the prosecutorial discretion of the State's Attorney. Consequently, the Auditor is not required by the terms of the Settlement Agreement to speculate on whether there is a direct correlation between someone being released without charges and the absence of probable cause to arrest. Furthermore, any estimation of the rate of compliance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement would be speculative, and is not contemplated within the task language of the Settlement Agreement for this litigation. Accordingly, any reference to said materials is outside of the purview of the Auditor's stated tasks⁶.

We have offered a number of ways to address these concerns but to date the Department contended that they cannot provide to us the information needed to determine whether those arrests are in compliance or not. The Auditor continues to believe that to conduct a complete assessment of compliance with this task that,

⁶ Email from the Office of Legal Affairs, Baltimore Police Department dated 9/11/12.

even though the numbers are now small, access to the expunged cases is necessary.


The review of the sampled cases, (not including the expunged cases) for the current reporting period, determined that the Department complied with this task in 83.2% of the arrests with a margin of error of +/-3%⁷. The primary reason for non-compliance was the absence of an explanation of why a non-custodial disposition was not appropriate in the case. Therefore, it was determined that the Department was not in compliance (the Auditor's Manual makes clear that for this task material compliance and compliance are treated without distinction).

This finding of noncompliance has been consistent since our first monthly review in April of 2011. Sampled cases reviewed in each month since then have consistently found that the arrest reports do not meet the requirements in departmental policies adopted in response to the Voluntary Agreement. Table 1 shows the monthly levels of compliance beginning in April 2011 (411 in the Table) through September of 2014 (914 in the Table). These data demonstrate there has been no systematic improvement in arrests reports for quality of life offenses during this period⁸.

⁷ As noted above, each month a substantial portion of the quality of life arrests included arrests for other offenses. After consultation with the parties to the agreement, the Auditor decided that as long as probable cause was established these arrests were judged to be compliant. If these arrests were eliminated from the analysis, the compliance rate would be 78% (+/-4%). If the expunged cases were counted as non-compliant and included in the denominator, the compliance rate would be estimated at 76% (+/-4%).

⁸ After reviewing a draft of this report, Counsel for the plaintiffs stated: "I think that the non-compliance at least with Task 3.a. means that pursuant to the Settlement Agreement § IV.B.1.b.5, the audit should continue for an

Table 1: Monthly Compliance Rates – April 2011 through September 2014



Task 4. Within 30 days of the effective date of this Agreement, the

Department shall issue a written directive requiring officers to provide their names and badge numbers to any individual who requests this information.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

additional year. The Settlement Agreement contemplated 3 years of audits, with an additional year if the Department was not fully in compliance with the Agreement at the end of the 3 year period. The Auditor’s Manual on p. 4 specifies that “Compliance will include compliance and material compliance as defined above provided all tasks have been completed when the final report of the Auditor is submitted.” The continued finding of non-compliance at the end of the 3 year period should, I believe, preclude a finding of overall compliance with the agreement, and should trigger the additional year of monitoring, during which, I hope, the BPD will finally come into full compliance. I also note, as I did with respect to the previous Report, that the continued refusal to provide information on expunged cases is inexplicable given Commissioner Batts’ promise to us in October, 2013 that the data would be provided. (Email to Auditor dated 12/9/14).

The Department issued Police Commissioners Memorandum (14-10) on July 29, 2010 that met all of the requirements of this task.

Task 5. The Zero Tolerance Policing policy required by section IV.B.1.a.1 shall not be rescinded or diminished by the Department during the term of this Agreement.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

The Auditor has verified that this policy has not been rescinded.

Task 6. The written directive or directives required by section IV.B.1.a.2 of the Voluntary Agreement shall not be rescinded or diminished by the Department during the term of this Agreement unless (a) the Department determines, in good faith and upon advice of counsel, that the policies conflict or will conflict with any applicable law, regulation, or court order; or (b) the Department determines in good faith that such rescission or diminishment is necessary for the safety of the public or Department personnel. In the event the Department concludes a modification of the written directive or directives required by section IV.B.1.a.2 is necessary, it will notify Plaintiffs' Counsel of the planned modification and offer a reasonable opportunity for Plaintiffs' Counsel to comment upon it. The Department shall in good faith consider such comments.

THERE IS NO AUDIT FUNCTION ASSOCIATED WITH THIS TASK AND IT WILL NOT BE INCLUDED IN AUDIT REPORTS. HOWEVER, IF CHANGES

ARE MADE USING THE PROCESS SPECIFIED THE AUDITOR WILL INCLUDE THOSE CHANGES IN THE AUDIT MANUAL AFTER BEING INFORMED OF THE CHANGES BY THE DEPARTMENT.

STATUS: NO CHANGES NOTED

Task 7. The Municipal Defendants shall provide the Auditor with access to all officers, employees, documents, and data of the Municipal Defendants that are reasonably necessary to complete the Tasks enumerated in this Agreement.

THERE IS NO AUDIT FUNCTION ASSOCIATED WITH THIS TASK AND IT WILL NOT BE INCLUDED IN AUDIT REPORTS. ALL INSTANCES OF FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCESS WILL BE NOTED IN RELEVANT SECTIONS OF THE REQUIRED BI-ANNUAL AUDIT REPORTS ALONG WITH AN ASSESSMENT OF HOW SUCH DENIAL MAY HAVE IMPACTED THE AUDIT.

Task 8. Within 120 days of the Effective Date of this Agreement, the Department shall develop a document and database retention protocol to maintain and retain all records, including documents and the database described in Section IV.B.1.c of the Voluntary Agreement, documenting compliance with the terms of this Agreement and all documents required by or developed pursuant to this Agreement. The protocol shall be evaluated and reported on by the Auditor.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

As of March 2013, the Department fully implemented a data collection and reporting system that provides an automated way to track police officer performance with regards to compliance with Departmental policies. This system is a version of IAPro that incorporates specific elements to address the requirements of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. A retention protocol that meets the requirements of this Task and includes the information in IAPro was promulgated on January 31, 2011 (Police Commissioner's Memorandum 05-11).

Task 9. Within 180 days of the effective date of this Agreement, the Municipal Defendants shall create and automate a database to track police officer performance.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

As of March 2013, the Department fully implemented a data collection and reporting system that provides for tracking police officer performance with regards to compliance with Departmental policies. This system is a version of IAPro that incorporates specific elements to address all the requirements of the Collective Agreement.

Task 10. Within 180 days of the effective date of this Agreement, the Department shall:

- a. establish and enforce a policy and procedure requiring shift supervisors to review statements of probable cause for custodial arrests for Quality of Life

Offenses to ensure that probable cause in fact existed and that the arrest was in accord with the Policies. If, after this agreement has been in effect for 365 days, the result of the review is a determination that the arrest was in contravention of the Policies, the supervisor shall refer the matter to his or her command for action consistent with the policy established. If the result of the review is a determination that the arrest is consistent with the Policies, the supervisor shall determine the necessity, if any, for non-punitive counseling.

b. establish and enforce a policy and procedure requiring a line supervisor's review of probable cause statements for custodial arrests for Quality of Life Offenses is reviewed by second-level supervisors on a periodic basis, not to exceed every six months, to ensure that probable cause in fact existed and that the arrest was in accord with the Policies;

c. establish a policy identifying corrective actions, up to and including disciplinary action, as warranted and consistent with established Departmental disciplinary policies, procedures, contracts, memoranda of understanding, and all applicable laws governing the discipline of law enforcement officers, including, but not limited to the Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights. ("LEOBR"), Md. Ann. Code, Public Safety Act, 3-101, et seq., to be taken by the Department when an officer's conduct is deemed to be in contravention of the Policies;

STATUS: NON-COMPLIANCE

The Department has established a policy to require supervisors to review probable cause statements in all quality of life arrests. Furthermore, the Department also requires periodic review by second-level supervisors. In addition, the policy requires that each arrest report must be signed by the reporting officer and the first level supervisor, usually a sergeant before the report is ready for submission. Hence there is compliance with sections a and b of this task. The Early Intervention Unit is still in place and is identifying officers and imposing non-punitive interventions. Even though the policy establishing it has not been promulgated, the unit is functioning consistent with this task. The Deputy Commissioner reported to the Auditor that the policy would be promulgated very soon. It is reported that the purpose of the order is to establish early intervention within the Department, to identify members displaying problematic behavior, and provide them with non-disciplinary corrective guidance. This will be done via the IAPro system and the employee's first line supervisor. The IAPro system will provide an alert when a member reaches a predetermined threshold within a set time frame for the category. The triggering alert will list the date, IAD case number, and BPD central complaint ("CC") number. Additionally, a letter will be sent from the Chief of Internal Affairs to the District Commander indicating that the member has been identified for participation in the early intervention program based upon the number of incidents occurring in the last twelve months. It directs

the District Commander to ensure that a supervisor conducts an intervention with the member and thereafter monitor the member's work closely for a thirty day period. At the conclusion of the monitoring the supervisor must complete an administrative report outlining the course of action taken to correct the member's issues. This will also become part of the member's periodic evaluation. Because the Department has not provided the Auditor with the policy it is impossible to determine if the procedures described to the Auditor are will be followed in the future. Even though this policy has not been adopted the Department has provided copies of investigations triggered by the early intervention policy. These records demonstrate that the Department would be in complete compliance if it had adopted the policy but even though it has not been adopted the Department is meeting the intent of this task.

Beginning in October 2013 the Department agreed to review the cases that each month the Audit has determined to be non-compliant. Since then the Auditor has sent these cases to the Department, The Auditor requested that the Department have the appropriate supervisors review these cases and prepare a response explaining why they did not determine them to be non-compliant with Departmental policy. The Auditor requested access to the responses or a summary of the responses. To date this has not occurred. The Auditor has not been informed how the Department is using the cases submitted for supervisory review

except that they are being used to improve training for line officers and supervisors⁹.

Task 11. Within 365 days of the effective date of this Agreement, the Department shall develop protocols for use of the database in evaluating compliance with the Policies. Such protocols shall establish reasonable triggering thresholds for review of officer conduct to monitor effective compliance with the Policies. The protocols referred to here are the “triggering points” for the EWS. The Auditor will confirm that each of the protocols required by the Agreement is developed and implemented. The Auditor will also report on the efficacy of the triggering points established by the Department.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

The Voluntary Agreement requires two types of “triggers”, one for complaints involving quality of life offenses and a second for quality of life arrests. The Department has established a policy for Quality of Life complaints that sets the “trigger” at seven complaints in any twelve month period. As noted in the last report, these triggers could allow a substantial number of complaints in an officer’s career before there was a mandated non-punitive intervention. The Early Intervention Unit in the Internal Affairs Section of the Department is using these triggers to identify officers who need intervention and is providing that

⁹ The failure to provide supervisory reports could be interpreted as non-compliance with Task 7 of the agreement.

intervention. It is clear that the Department, since the introduction of IAPro system, has fully achieved the requirements of this task. The efficacy of these “triggers” has not been determined by the Department or by this audit. To do so would take more time and a design not included in the Audit Manual.

Task 12. Within 90 days of the effective date of this Agreement, the Municipal Defendants shall enter all citizen complaints into a database. The database shall include the file number of the complaint (also provided to the complainant); the names of all accused officers, if provided or known; contact information for all complainants, non-accused but related officers, and witnesses, if provided or known; the race and gender of all involved officers and complainants if known or ascertainable by reasonable investigation; a narrative description of the allegations; significant dates; the street address and district of the incident; and the disposition of the complaint (sustained, not sustained, unfounded or exonerated).

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

Effective March of 2013 the Department deployed their version of IAPro which captures all of the elements required by this task for all citizen complaints. The auditor has reviewed the system and can confirm it is capable of achieving the requirements of this task. The Audit does not provide for a test of the extent to which all elements are actually entered for all cases.

Task 13. Complainants shall be allowed to initiate complaints against an officer in person, by telephone, by mail, by fax, or via the internet. A complainant shall not be required to fill out or sign a form to initiate a complaint. Municipal Defendants may seek from the complainant sufficient information to enable the identification of the involved officers and incident.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

General Order C-07 issued on April 8, 2004 details the process for receiving and processing civilian complaints. In part it states that a citizen cannot be turned away or instructed to go to another office or person to lodge a complaint against a police officer. However, the citizen is given the address and location of other offices where a complaint can be filed. As specified in that document, in a brochure that has been developed by the Department to explain the complaint process, and on the Department's website (in the FAQ section) which was last modified in August of 2011)) complaints can be made in person, by phone, by mail or by e-mail. While they do not provide for fax submission, these procedures are fully compliant with the intent of the task which was to provide multiple ways for the public to file a complaint.

Task 14. Complainants shall be permitted to initiate complaints anonymously, in writing or verbally. Third-part complaints shall be allowed.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

In General Order C-07 and the above referenced brochure and website, citizens are informed that they can file complaints in writing or verbally. If a complaint involves allegations of excessive force, discourtesy, or harassment, the Department requires that the complainants put the complaint in writing and swear to its accuracy, but members of the Internal Affairs Division can notarize these complaints. While the Department policy and procedures as described on the website do not specifically include or exclude third party complaints, the Department indicates they are accepted.

- For Tasks 13, 14, 18 – 21, the Settling Parties anticipate that the Auditor will evaluate the Department's compliance with this task by reviewing a statistically meaningful sample of complaint investigation files and other documentation, if any, identified by the Auditor. Such sample shall include a meaningful percentage of investigation files regarding complaints for false arrest or lack of probable cause for Quality of Life Offenses to satisfy section IV.B.1.b.18 of this Agreement.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

The Auditor requested copies of all citizen complaints involving Quality of Life Offenses for the year 2011. The Department indicated that until their citizen complaint database was operational they could not identify all such complaints. However, they were able to provide those complaints involving false arrests. The

Auditor reviewed the case files for the fifty-one cases supplied by the Department and found them to be in compliance with the requirements of Tasks 13, 14, and 18-21. There were no apparent limits on how complaints could be initiated or filed; investigators sought interviews at times convenient to the complainants; updates were provided; investigators understood and sought to use a preponderance of evidence standard; complainants were notified in writing of final determinations. None of the complaints in these cases were substantiated¹⁰.

During the last reporting period, the Auditor requested copies of all complaints involving quality of life offenses. Using IAPro, the Department identified two complaints during the period April 2013 through October 2013. Although the Auditor cannot independently verify that these are all of the complaints, the Department has assured the Auditor that all complaints are being entered into IAPro and that these two are the only ones involving quality of life offenses. The Department asserts that this reflects an overall substantial decline in complaints received during the past year. A review of these two complaints indicated there were no apparent limits on how complaints could be initiated or filed; investigators sought interviews at times convenient to the complainants; updates were provided; investigators understood and sought to use a preponderance of evidence standard; complainants were notified in writing of final determinations. None of the

¹⁰ In October of 2013 the Department has agreed to provide copies of all Quality of Life complaints that are included in IAPro for review by the Auditor.

complaints in these cases were substantiated. Therefore, none of the fifty-three complaints reviewed by the Auditor for the last report had been substantiated. All had been administratively closed primarily because the complainant had not responded to multiple requests to be interviewed about their complaint. During the current reporting period the Department has provided access to the files of officers who have been identified as needing additional training and counseling on how to better respond to the enforcement of Quality of Life Offenses but has not provided any cases documenting the resolution of citizen complaints.

Task 15. Within 180 days of the Effective Date of this Agreement, a telephone number shall be created to allow for toll free calls to initiate complaints.

The auditor will verify that such a number is created and will on a monthly basis verify that it is operational by calling it with a test report.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

A number is provided on the BPD website and is operational. Testing each month demonstrated that the line is operational and being answered.

Task 16. Within 180 days of the Effective Date of this Agreement, the telephone number shall be advertised with the goal that Baltimore residents and visitors should be generally aware of how to initiate a complaint.

The Auditor will verify that the number is advertised by reviewing the advertisement strategies that the Department uses and verifying that the strategies

are in fact implemented. There will be no effort to determine the extent to which the advertising effort reaches the intended audiences.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

The number has been included on the website and is contained in a brochure that is available in each district station, at police headquarters, and at other City offices. Printed posters are displayed in each District and in the Office of the Civilian Review Board, the Legal Affairs Bureau, and the Internal Affairs Office. The website and the brochure give clear instructions on how to make a complaint. The Audit does not include an assessment of the success of these strategies.

Task 17. Within 365 days of the Effective Date of this Agreement, the Municipal Defendants shall publicize information concerning the purpose and goals of the citizen complaint and resolution process, and the process for initiating a complaint, including publishing and distributing pamphlets describing the complaint and resolution process and holding at least one community meeting in each police district.

The Auditor will verify that the required information is publicized as specified by reviewing the required pamphlet, how the pamphlet is distributed, and the minutes of all community meetings where the information is discussed and/or presented. Compliance will require development of the pamphlet, its distribution,

and documentation of at least one community meeting in each police district where the citizen complaint and resolution process is described.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

The Auditor has reviewed the above mentioned brochure and determined that it contains the elements required by this task. The Department has provided minutes of District Council meetings that document the presentation of the complaint and resolution process in all districts..

Task 18. Investigators shall attempt to interview complainants and witnesses at their own convenience, but, if necessary, shall offer to conduct interviews during non-business hours or at locations other than Departmental offices.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

General Order C-07 requires and the Early Intervention brochure states that the investigator of civilian complaints is to make every effort to “reasonably accommodate you during the complaint process”. In addition, the procedures used by the Early Intervention Unit specifies the processes to be followed in closing a case, including specific requirements for administrative closure The Auditor requested copies of all citizen complaints involving Quality of Life Offenses for the year 2011. The Department indicated that until their citizen complaint database was operational they could not identify all such complaints. However, they were able to provide those complaints involving false arrests. The Auditor reviewed the

case files for the fifty-one cases supplied by the Department and found them to be in compliance with the requirements of Tasks 13, 14, and 18-21. There were no apparent limits on how complaints could be initiated or filed; investigators sought interviews at times convenient to the complainants; updates were provided; investigators understood and sought to use a preponderance of evidence standard; complainants were notified in writing of final determinations. None of the complaints in these cases were substantiated.

During the last reporting period, the Auditor requested copies of all complaints involving quality of life offenses. Using IAPro, the Department identified two complaints during the period April 2013 through October 2013. Although the Auditor cannot independently verify that these are all of the complaints, the Department has assured the Auditor that all complaints are being entered into IAPro and that these two are the only ones involving quality of life offenses. The Department asserts that this reflects an overall substantial decline in complaints received during the past year. A review of these two complaints indicated there were no apparent limits on how complaints could be initiated or filed; investigators sought interviews at times convenient to the complainants; updates were provided; investigators understood and sought to use a preponderance of evidence standard; complainants were notified in writing of final determinations. None of the complaints in these cases were substantiated. The

Department has not provided any complaint files for the current reporting period. During the current reporting period, despite numerous requests from the Auditor, the Department has not provided access to any complaints for review nor has it indicated whether there are any complaints that could be reviewed.

Task 19. If conduct in contravention of Departmental policy, other than the conduct alleged by the complainant, is discovered in the course of an investigation, the Department shall investigate such other conduct.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

General Order C-08 issued August 26, 2011 specifies the Internal Investigation Division (IID) has responsibility for all investigations of all allegations of misconduct by employees of the Department. This policy does not limit the IID's ability to initiate investigations of instances of conduct in contravention of Departmental policy that is discovered during the course of an investigation. The Department reports it is the practice of the IID to investigate all violations of departmental policy regardless of the manner in which they become aware of the violation. A review of 53 cases of citizen complaints noted above found no instance where an investigation uncovered another policy violation, however, none of these cases came from the current reporting period. During the current reporting period, despite numerous requests from the Auditor, the

Department has not provided access to any complaints for review nor has it indicated whether there are any complaints that could be reviewed.

Task 20. Upon request, the Department shall provide a complainant reasonable updates on the status of the investigation. Even absent any such request for information, complainants shall be apprised of the status of open complaints every 60 days and promptly upon resolution of the investigation.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

The policy on investigations and the above referenced brochure provided to the public make clear that the complainants may contact their assigned investigator to get answers to questions about their complaint or to express concerns. The Auditor requested copies of all citizen complaints involving Quality of Life Offenses for the year 2011. The Department indicated that until their citizen complaint database was operational they could not identify all such complaints. However, they were able to provide those complaints involving false arrests. For the last report, the Auditor reviewed the case files for the fifty-one cases supplied by the Department and found them to be in compliance with the requirements of Tasks 13, 14, and 18-21. There were no apparent limits on how complaints could be initiated or filed; investigators sought interviews at times convenient to the complainants; updates were provided; investigators understood and sought to use a

preponderance of evidence standard; complainants were notified in writing of final determinations. None of the complaints in these cases were substantiated.

During the last reporting period, the Auditor requested copies of all complaints involving quality of life offenses. Using IAPro, the Department identified two complaints during the period April 2013 through October 2013. Although the Auditor cannot independently verify that these are all of the complaints, the Department has assured the Auditor that all complaints are being entered into IAPro and that these two are the only ones involving quality of life offenses. The Department asserts that this reflects an overall substantial decline in complaints received during the past year. A review of these two complaints indicated there were no apparent limits on how complaints could be initiated or filed; investigators sought interviews at times convenient to the complainants; updates were provided; investigators understood and sought to use a preponderance of evidence standard; complainants were notified in writing of final determinations. None of the complaints in these cases were substantiated. During the current reporting period, despite numerous requests from the Auditor, the Department has not provided access to any complaints for review nor has it indicated whether there are any complaints that could be reviewed.

Task 21. All findings shall be based on the “preponderance of the evidence” standard, and all investigators shall be trained on that standard. Investigators shall

be required to state the factual basis for each finding in the final report of each investigation.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

All investigations are conducted to meet the preponderance of evidence test. This is the burden of proof required by Maryland statute (Md. State Code Ann. § 10-217). Investigators are instructed to use this standard. The Auditor requested copies of all citizen complaints involving Quality of Life Offenses for the year 2011. The Department indicated that until their citizen complaint database was operational they could not identify all such complaints. However, they were able to provide those complaints involving false arrests. The Auditor reviewed the case files for the fifty-one cases supplied by the Department and found them to be in compliance with the requirements of Tasks 13, 14, and 18-21. There were no apparent limits on how complaints could be initiated or filed; investigators sought interviews at times convenient to the complainants; updates were provided; investigators understood and sought to use a preponderance of evidence standard; complainants were notified in writing of final determinations. None of the complaints in these cases were substantiated.

During the last reporting period, the Auditor requested copies of all complaints involving quality of life offenses. Using IAPro, the Department identified two complaints during the period April 2013 through October 2013.

Although the Auditor cannot independently verify that these are all of the complaints, the Department has assured the Auditor that all complaints are being entered into IAPro and that these two are the only ones involving quality of life offenses. The Department asserts that this reflects an overall substantial decline in complaints received during the past year. A review of these two complaints indicated there were no apparent limits on how complaints could be initiated or filed; investigators sought interviews at times convenient to the complainants; updates were provided; investigators understood and sought to use a preponderance of evidence standard; complainants were notified in writing of final determinations. None of the complaints in these cases were substantiated. During the current reporting period, despite numerous requests from the Auditor, the Department has not provided access to any complaints for review nor has it indicated whether there are any complaints that could be reviewed.

Task 22. The Municipal Defendants shall make final determinations of all citizen complaints, and shall inform each complainant in writing of the final determination on his or her complaint.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

In the 53 complaints reviewed in previous reports by the Auditor the complainant was informed in writing of the final determination of their complaint. During the current reporting period, despite numerous requests from the Auditor,

the Department has not provided access to any complaints for review nor has it indicated whether there are any complaints that could be reviewed.

Task 23. When a review of an officer's performance is triggered by a data analysis under Section IV.B.1.c.3 of the Voluntary Agreement, the Department shall notify the appropriate supervisor of the officer or officers in question. This notice shall include the information available from the database (Task 9 above) that triggered the review.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

The Department has developed but not promulgated a general order on performance evaluation. Even though the General Order has not been approved, the Auditor has reviewed thirty-two instances where an officer has been flagged by the Early Intervention unit. In these cases the Early Intervention Unit is already implementing a system in which supervisors are informed when officers they supervise have met the threshold indicators and are in need of intervention. The notification includes the indicators that have triggered the need for intervention and the actions taken.

Task 24. Once notified, a supervisor shall conduct a reasonable investigation of the performance of the officer in question by reviewing records relative to the conduct that triggered the review (e.g., complaint records, statements of probable

cause, incident reports, etc.). The review shall specifically include a determination of the sufficiency of the probable cause underlying each Quality of Life arrest that is associated with the conduct under review. Based upon the review of related records, the supervisor shall determine, based upon a preponderance of the documentary evidence, whether the officer's actions are in contravention of the Policies. If the result of the review is a determination that the officer's actions are in contravention of the Policies, the supervisor shall refer the matter to his or her command for action consistent with the policy established under section IV.B.c.2.c of the Voluntary Agreement. If the result of the review is a determination that the officer's actions are consistent with the Policies, the supervisor shall determine the necessity, if any for non-punitive counseling.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

The Department reports and General Order C-08 requires that these procedures are followed. Under the newly created Early Intervention Unit (EIU), the responsibility for determining when a non-punitive intervention is required has been shifted from the supervisor to the EIU. It is the EIU that is responsible for setting the threshold and conducting the review to determine the need for non-punitive intervention. These procedures are considerably more stringent than those required by this Task. The Auditor has verified that these procedures have

been followed even though the policy for early intervention has not been promulgated.

Task 25. Upon completion of the review, the investigating supervisor shall provide written documentation of the process and the results of the investigation in the form of a review memorandum. The review memorandum shall specifically document the conduct of the investigation, the outcome of the review and whether the supervisor provided the officer with non-punitive counseling.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

The Department reports and General Order C-08 requires that these procedures are followed. Under the newly created Early Intervention Unit (EIU), the responsibility for conducting the review, determining the need for non-punitive intervention, and monitoring the interventions impact us given to the EIU. It is the EIU that is responsible for setting the threshold and conducting the review to determine the need for non-punitive intervention. These procedures are considerably more stringent than those required by this Task. The Auditor has verified that these procedures have been followed even though the early intervention policy has not been promulgated.

Task 26. When an officer's performance is being reviewed as part of the Department's periodic performance evaluation process, copies of any review

memoranda created during the period under review shall be provided to and considered by the reviewing officer in evaluation the subject officer's performance.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE The BPD reports and General Order C-08 requires that these procedures are followed. Under the newly created Early Intervention Unit (EIU), it is the responsibility of the EIU to inform the supervisor and to make sure a report is placed in the officers file. These procedures are considerably more stringent than those required by this Task. The Auditor has verified that these procedures have been followed even though the early intervention policy has not been promulgated.

Task 27. When an officer, who is the supervisor of other officers, is the subject of a review as part of the Department's periodic performance evaluation process, copies of any review memoranda relating to the officer under the subject officer's supervision created during the period under review will be provided to and considered by the reviewing officer in evaluation the subject officer's performance.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

The Department reports and General Order C-08 requires that these procedures are followed. With the implementation of the IAPro system, the EIU, and the proposed General Order on Professional Performance Enhancement Program the Department will be in compliance with this Task. The Auditor has

verified that these procedures have been followed even though the early intervention policy has not been promulgated.

Task 28. The Municipal Defendants shall monitor citizen complaints related to Quality of Life Offenses to gauge the effectiveness of training and to detect the need for new or further training.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

It is reported that the BPD Director of Training has revised training curricula in response to information on problems in the probable cause statements in some Quality of Life arrests. In addition, the Director has instituted on-going training to improve report writing generally. The Auditor has not been provided with any documentation of any training changes that occurred during this reporting period.

Task 29. Except with respect to complaints subject to the statutory requirements of Article 4, section 16-44 of the Public Local Laws of Maryland, the Municipal Defendants shall monitor and be responsible for completing all investigations and shall not have discretion to reject a citizen complaint without investigation if sufficient information is provided to or obtained by the Municipal Defendants through reasonable investigation.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

Departmental policy (General Order C-07), the essence of which is included on the Department website describing the complaint process, requires that all

complaints be investigated. Our review of the fifty-three complaints noted above indicates compliance with this task.

Task 30. Within 120 days of the effective date of this Agreement, the Municipal Defendants shall create and maintain individual training records for all police officers, documenting the date and topic of all pre-service and in-service training completed. These records shall also reflect whether the training was completed satisfactorily, as well as the reasons for any mandatory re-training.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

The Auditor inspected the training records maintained by the training academy and verified that individual records were being maintained and that they contained all elements specified in the task.

Task 31. Within 180 days of the effective date of the Agreement, the Department shall develop training curricula for pre-service and annual in-service training regarding Quality of Life Offenses, assessing probable cause, rights protected by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, especially the lawful exercise of those rights on City sidewalks and other public areas, and the appropriate officer response when an individual requests an officer's name and badge number.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

Within 180 days of the signing of the Agreement, the BPD developed training guides for pre-service and in-service training on the policies of the

Department concerning zero tolerance policing, the use of arrest in Quality of Life Offenses, the requirement to provide names and badge numbers, and the rights of free speech and assembly. The training curricula were reviewed by the parties to the agreement and the Auditor and were found to contain all elements specified in this task. These training guides have been modified based on the review by the training staff of the cases determined by the Auditor to be non-compliant.

Task 32. Within 120 days of the effective date of this Agreement, the Department shall provide the training curricula required by section IV.B.1.f of the Voluntary Agreement to the Auditor and Plaintiff's Counsel for comment, to be received no later than 30 days from receipt of the curricula. The Department shall consider in good faith any comments so received, but is not required to make any changes to the curricula based upon the comments.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

As noted above, the training curricula were provided to the Plaintiff's counsel and the Auditor for review and comment. All comments made were addressed by the BPD.

Task 33. Pre-service training based upon the training curricula required by this section shall be provided to all incoming classes as of the first incoming academy class after the finalization of the training curricula.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

All pre-service requirements since February 2011 have included the training specified in the task.

Task 34. In-service training based upon the training curricula required by this section shall be provided to officers beginning with in-service training that occurs within 90 days of the finalization of the required training curricula, and shall continue for all in-service training sessions provided during the term of the Agreement.

STATUS: COMPLIANCE

The in-service training curriculum has been included in all in-service training plans since it was approved.

Task 35. Notice of this in-service training shall be disseminated to all officers employed by the Department as of the effective date of this Agreement within 120 days of the effective date of this Agreement.

STATUS: MATERIAL COMPLIANCE

Notice of the in-service requirement was sent to all officers in the BPD on February 2, 2011. This exceeded the requirement of completing this task within 120 days. In-service training continues to include these elements.

Appendix A

RESPONSE FROM THE BALTIMORE POLICE DEPARTMENT

DRAFT

DRAFT