



Office of the  
**INDEPENDENT  
POLICE AUDITOR**

BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

# MONTHLY REPORT

April 2022

---

Issue date: May 9, 2022

This report is filed pursuant to the BART Citizen Oversight Model, Chapter 1-05 (B), which requires the Office of the Independent Police Auditor (OIPA) to submit reports to the BART Police Citizen Review Board (BPCRB). This report provides information for the period **April 1, 2022 through April 30, 2022.**<sup>1</sup> (The Quantitative Report includes all complaints received and administrative investigations initiated by both OIPA and the BART Police Department (BPD) Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB)).

## QUANTITATIVE REPORT

	Cases Filed <sup>2</sup>	Open Cases <sup>3</sup>	Investigations Resolved	OIPA Investigations Concluded <sup>4</sup>	Cases Appealed to OIPA <sup>5</sup>	Cases Appealed by BPCRB <sup>6</sup>
April 2021	13	65	9	1	0	0
May 2021	9	69	4	1	0	0
June 2021	5	74	1	1	0	0
July 2021	10	81	3	0	0	0
August 2021	4	78	7	1	0	0
September 2021	10	81	8	2	0	0
October 2021	15	88	7	0	0	0
November 2021	8	87	11	1	0	0
December 2021	6	87	6	0	1	0
January 2022	4	84	7	1	0	0
February 2022	6	81	9	1	0	0
March 2022	6	73*	14	1	0	0
April 2022	10	79	6	1	0	0

## TYPES OF CASES FILED

Citizen Complaints (Formal)	10
Informal Complaints <sup>7</sup>	0
Administrative Investigations	0
Inquiries <sup>8</sup>	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>

## CITIZEN COMPLAINTS RECEIVED PER DEPARTMENT<sup>9</sup>

OIPA	5
BART Police Department	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>

\* This total was adjusted to reflect the closure of IA2021-071/OIPA #21-18, which was completed in March 2022 but not listed by BPD as completed until April 2022.

## COMPLAINTS/INVESTIGATIONS INITIATED DURING REPORTING PERIOD

During April 2022, **5 Citizen Complaints** were received by OIPA:

Complaint # (OIPA Case #) (IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Action Taken	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed
1 (OIPA #22-12) (IA2022-016)	Unknown BPD Officers #1-2: • Performance of Duty • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	OIPA notified BPD which initiated an investigation.	32
2 (OIPA #22-15) (IA2022-018)	Officers #1-3: • Arrest/Detention • Force • Policy/Procedure • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	OIPA notified BPD which initiated an investigation.	29
3 (OIPA #22-14) (IA2022-019)	Unknown BPD Officers #1-2: • Bias-Based Policing	OIPA notified BPD which initiated an investigation.	28
4 (OIPA #22-16) (IA2022-020)	Officers #1-2: • Bias-Based Policing • Policy/Procedure	OIPA notified BPD which initiated an investigation.	27
5 (OIPA #22-17) (IA2022-021)	Officer #1: • Bias-Based Policing • Racial Animus • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	OIPA notified BPD which initiated an investigation.	25

During April 2022, **4 Citizen Complaints (Formal)** were received by BPD:

Complaint # IA Case #	Nature of Complaint	Action Taken	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed
1 (IA2022-017)	Officer #1: • Performance of Duty	BPD initiated an investigation.	27
2 (IA2022-022)	Officer #1: • Bias-Based Policing • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer • Policy/Procedure (AXON Camera)	BPD initiated an investigation.	22
3 (IA2022-024)	Unknown Officers #1-2: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated an investigation.	17
4 (IA2022-025)	Officers #1-2: • Bias-Based Policing • Performance of Duty	BPD initiated an investigation.	14

## COMPLAINTS/INVESTIGATIONS RECEIVED DURING PRIOR REPORTING PERIOD

During March 2022, **1 Citizen Complaint (Formal)** was received by BPD but not previously reported:

Complaint # IA Case #	Nature of Complaint	Action Taken	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed
<b>1</b> (IA2022-023)	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Force</li> <li>• Conduct Unbecoming an Officer</li> </ul>	BPD initiated an investigation.	56

## COMPLAINTS/INVESTIGATIONS CONCLUDED DURING REPORTING PERIOD

During April 2022, **1 Citizen Complaint** was concluded by OIPA:

Complaint # (IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed	Days Taken to Complete Investigation
<b>1</b> (OIPA #21-10) (IA2021-043)	Officers improperly detained subjects and used excessive force and did so because of the subjects' race.	Officers #1-5: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrest/Detention – Exonerated</li> <li>• Force – Exonerated</li> <li>• Bias-Based Policing – Unfounded</li> </ul>	347	313

During April 2022, **2 Citizen Complaints** were concluded by BPD:

Complaint # (IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed	Days Taken to Complete Investigation
<b>1</b> (IA2021-008)	Officers did not take enforcement action against fare evaders and attempted intimidate complainant.	Officers #1-5: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance of Duty – Administratively Closed</li> <li>• Conduct Unbecoming an Officer – Administratively Closed</li> </ul>	483	469 <sup>†</sup>
<b>2</b> (IA2021-042)	Officer harassed complainant during a law enforcement contact.	Officers #1-2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct Unbecoming an Officer – Unfounded</li> </ul>	351	338

<sup>†</sup> BPD reported that this case was tolled due to a subject officer's unavailability from May 28, 2021 to April 1, 2022 (308 days).

During April 2022, **2 Administrative Investigations** were concluded by BPD:

Nature of Allegations	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Investigation Initiated	Days Taken to Address Allegation(s)	
1 (IA2021-032)	Officer was impaired while on duty.	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance of Duty – Sustained</li> <li>• Policy/Procedure – Not Sustained</li> </ul>	385	357
2 (IA2021-037)	Complainant stated that officer should be held accountable for misconduct during an arrest/detention and use of force. Supervisor did not forward potential misconduct complaint to Internal Affairs.	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Force – Administratively Closed</li> </ul> Officer #2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervision – Training Recommendation</li> </ul>	363	349

## DISCIPLINE ISSUED DURING REPORTING PERIOD

During April 2022, BPD took the following actions in cases where one or more allegations of misconduct were sustained:

Case #	Nature of Sustained Allegation(s) ‡	Classification of Sustained Allegation(s)	Action Taken
1	Officer used racist language in an email to BART staff.	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Racial Animus</li> <li>• Conduct Unbecoming an Officer</li> </ul>	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Action<sup>§</sup></li> </ul>
2	Officer was impaired while on duty.	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance of Duty – Sustained</li> </ul>	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written Reprimand<sup>10</sup></li> </ul>
3	Officer failed to properly document a law enforcement contact and did not properly review the use of force.	Officer #2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy/Procedure (AXON Camera) – Sustained</li> <li>• Policy/Procedure (Use of Force Review) – Sustained</li> </ul>	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter of Discussion<sup>11</sup></li> </ul>
4	Officer did not properly document a law enforcement contact.	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy/Procedure (AXON Camera)</li> </ul>	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter of Discussion</li> </ul>

‡Some details regarding the nature of sustained allegations may be withheld to avoid unintentionally breaching mandatory confidentiality requirements. In some instances, the relative infrequency of the alleged misconduct may tend to allow for identification of the subject officer in violation of the applicable CA Penal Code section (832.7).

§ Subject officer separated from the Department prior to the imposition of any discipline for the sustained allegations.

5	Officer did not properly document a law enforcement contact.	Officer #1: • Policy/Procedure (AXON Camera)	Officer #1: • Letter of Discussion
6	Officer did not properly document a law enforcement contact.	Officer #1: • Policy/Procedure (AXON Camera)	Officer #1: • Letter of Discussion

## ADDITIONAL NOTES

In accordance with the BART Citizen Oversight Model (Model), OIPA investigates certain complaints, conducts complainant-initiated appeals, and monitors and/or reviews complaint investigations conducted by BPD. Though potentially work-intensive, some complaint investigation reviews are completed informally, with any concerns being addressed through a conference with BPD's Internal Affairs investigators. Noting the various kinds of work that OIPA undertakes with regard to complaints and investigations, the following chart includes some of the pending cases in which OIPA is involved as of the end of this reporting period.

Investigations Being Conducted	8
Complainant-Initiated Appeals	1
BPD-Initiated Appeals	0
Investigations Being Monitored	71
Investigations Reviewed During Current Month	10†

†This number does not include all OIPA reviews, as OIPA commonly looks at a variety of cases in the Internal Affairs database to obtain updates on both pending and completed investigations.

The Model provides that OIPA shall have authority to require follow-up investigation into any citizen complaint or allegation that is handled by BPD. The OIPA Monthly Report will reflect information regarding monitored cases with detail not to exceed that which is allowable under state law. The investigations reviewed by OIPA during the period did not generate any notable recommendations for revisions or additional investigation.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In addition to reporting on complaints received by the BART Police Department, the Citizen Oversight Model requires reporting on all complaints received by the "Citizen Board, Office of the District Secretary, and other District departments." As complaints received by the BART Police Citizen Review Board are customarily directed to OIPA for further action, such complaints are included in the Quantitative Report above; OIPA is also made aware of additional complaints about the BART Police Department by the Office of the District Secretary or other District departments.

<sup>2</sup> This number includes all Citizen Complaints filed against members of the BART Police Department, as well as Administrative Investigations generated internally by BART Police Department members (as opposed to being filed by a citizen). This number also includes previously completed cases that have been re-opened during the current reporting period.

<sup>3</sup> This number indicates all investigations that are open as of the end of the reporting period. It includes Citizen Complaints (regardless of whether the investigation is being conducted by OIPA, the BART Police Department, or both) and Administrative Investigations.

<sup>4</sup> This number includes all cases completed by OIPA during the reporting period for which OIPA's findings are required by the BART Citizen Oversight Model to be submitted to the BART Police Citizen Review Board. It therefore includes independent investigations, as well as reviews of completed BART Police Department investigations initiated via appeal from a complainant. Unless otherwise noted, it does not include reviews of BART Police Department investigations initiated at the discretion of OIPA, which happen commonly and do not always generate a formal report; it also does not include reviews conducted by OIPA of complaint investigations where the complaint was filed with OIPA but did not fall under OIPA's investigative jurisdiction.

<sup>5</sup> This number refers to appeals filed with OIPA by complainants who have been issued the findings of the BART Police Department's internal investigation into their complaint regarding on-duty incidents. OIPA has a responsibility to review such appeals pursuant to the BART Citizen Oversight Model, Chapter 1-04 (E).

---

<sup>6</sup> This number refers to all appeals initiated by the BART Police Citizen Review Board after receiving and reviewing the findings issued by OIPA in a given case. The routes of all such appeals are described in detail in the BART Citizen Oversight Model, Chapter 1-04 (B) (iv-v).

<sup>7</sup> The BART Police Department defines an Informal Complaint as, “A comment on the actions of a Department employee, where the reporting party expressly states that he or she does not feel that the matter should be formally investigated with the understanding that an Informal Complaint does not hold the potential to result in disciplinary action against the employee.” (BART Police Department Policy Manual, Policy 1020.1.1(d)).

<sup>8</sup> BPD policy provides that if a person alleges or raises an issue that does not constitute a violation of Department policy, procedure, rules, regulations, or the law, the Department will classify the issue as an inquiry.

<sup>9</sup> It is important to note that OIPA does not separate citizen complaints it receives into “Formal” and “Informal” classifications. This chart reflects all citizen complaints received by OIPA and all Formal Complaints received by the BART Police Department.

<sup>10</sup> Written Reprimand (first level of formal discipline): If there have been no re-occurrences at the end of the time frames as determined by the collective bargaining agreement (up to 3 years), the immediate supervisor shall meet with the employee and advise him/her that the progressive discipline has become inactive and has been removed from the employee's personnel files.

<sup>11</sup> Letter of Discussion (second level of pre-discipline): A letter of discussion may be the next step of the process of the informal process. It is a written memorandum to the employee making the employee aware of the unacceptable behavior. A letter of discussion is pre-disciplinary, however, if the employee fails to correct the behavior, there will be cause to move to the next level of the process or to move to formal progressive discipline. An employee who may be issued a letter of discussion is entitled to appropriate representation. (BPD Policy Manual)

<sup>12</sup> OIPA may submit recommendations to IA regarding minor clerical or record-keeping adjustments which are intended to maintain the integrity of the data collection and record-keeping processes at BPD. These are not considered by OIPA to be substantive recommendations requiring reporting herein.