



OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT  
**POLICE AUDITOR**

**BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT**

# **MONTHLY REPORT**

March 2024

---

Issue date: June 10, 2024

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 **March 1, 2024 through March 31, 2024.**<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 (IA)).*

## 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>
March 2023	10	98	4	1	0	0
April 2023	12	99	10	1	0	0
May 2023	10	101	6	1	1	0
June 2023	7	103	6	1	2	0
July 2023	18	106	7	1	0	0
August 2023	18	114	8	1	0	0
September 2023	11	115	11	1	0	0
October 2023	4	106	14	2	0	0
November 2023	6	109	3	0	0	0
December 2023	9	114	4	0	0	0
January 2024	5	107	10	1	0	0
February 2024	12	118	7	1	0	0
March 2024	12	116	9	2	0	0

### TYPES OF CASES FILED

Citizen Complaints (Formal)	12
Informal Complaints <sup>7</sup>	0
Administrative Investigations	0
Inquiries <sup>8</sup>	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>

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

OIPA	3
BART Police Department	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>

## COMPLAINTS/INVESTIGATIONS INITIATED DURING REPORTING PERIOD

During March 2024, **3 Citizen Complaints** were received by OIPA:

Complaint # (OIPA Case #) (IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Action Taken	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed
<b>1</b> (OIPA #24-13) (N/A)	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy/Procedure</li> <li>• Workplace Discrimination</li> <li>• Performance of Duty</li> <li>• Conduct Unbecoming an Officer</li> <li>• Workplace Harassment</li> </ul>	OIPA initiated an investigation.	76
<b>2</b> (OIPA #24-15) (IA2024-030)	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct Unbecoming an Officer</li> </ul>	OIPA initiated an investigation.	74
<b>3</b> (OIPA #24-12) (IA2024-021)	Officers #1-2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy/Procedure (Body Worn Camera)</li> <li>• Arrest/Detention</li> <li>• Force</li> <li>• Policy/Procedure (Report Writing)</li> <li>• Policy/Procedure (Improper Citation)</li> </ul>	OIPA notified BPD which initiated an investigation.	76

During March 2024, **9 Citizen Complaints (Formal)** were received by BPD:

Complaint # IA Case #	Nature of Complaint	Action Taken	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed
<b>1</b> (IA2024-016)	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct Unbecoming an Officer</li> </ul>	BPD initiated an investigation.	101
<b>2</b> (IA2024-017)	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct Unbecoming an Officer</li> <li>• Bias-Based Policing</li> <li>• Arrest/Detention</li> </ul>	BPD initiated an investigation.	101
<b>3</b> (IA2024-019)	Officers #1-2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Force</li> </ul>	BPD initiated an investigation.	94

<b>4</b> <b>(IA2024-020)</b>	Officers #1-2: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated an investigation.	87
<b>5</b> <b>(IA2024-022)</b>	Officer #1: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated an investigation.	83
<b>6</b> <b>(IA2024-023)</b>	Officer #1: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated an investigation.	84
<b>7</b> <b>(IA2024-024)</b>	Officers #1-2: • Force	BPD initiated an investigation.	84
<b>8</b> <b>(IA2024-025)</b>	Officer #1: • Policy/Procedure • Performance of Duty • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated an investigation.	80
<b>9</b> <b>(IA2024-030)</b>	Officer #1: • Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	BPD initiated an investigation.	76

**COMPLAINTS/INVESTIGATIONS CONCLUDED DURING REPORTING PERIOD**

During March 2024, **2 Citizen Complaints** were concluded by OIPA:

Complaint # (OIPA Case #) (IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed	Days Taken to Complete Investigation
<p><b>1</b> (OIPA #23-14) (IA2023-036 &amp; IA2023-037)*</p>	<p>Officers improperly detained complainant, improperly enforced fare evasion laws, discriminated against complainant, used unnecessary force, and failed to provide a business card upon request.</p>	<p>Officers #1-3:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrest/Detention – Exonerated</li> <li>• Force – Unfounded</li> <li>• Courtesy – Unfounded</li> </ul> <p>Officers #2-3:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bias-Based Policing – Exonerated</li> </ul> <p>Officer #1:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy/Procedure (Failure to Provide Business Card) – Exonerated</li> <li>• Policy/Procedure (Failure to Provide Name) – Unfounded</li> </ul> </p> </p></p>	<p>424</p>	<p>328</p>

---

\* These two IA complaint investigations were consolidated, and IA deferred both investigations to OIPA at the request of the complainant.

During March 2024, **5 Citizen Complaints** were concluded by BPD:

(IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed	Days Taken to Complete Investigation
<b>1</b> <b>(IA2023-019)</b>	Officer unlawfully arrested complainant and conducted an illegal search.	Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrest/Detention – Exonerated</li> <li>• Search/Seizure – Exonerated</li> </ul>	460	372
<b>2</b> <b>(IA2023-023)</b>	Employee refused to provide service to complainant based on complainant's race.	Employee #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bias-Based Policing – Unfounded</li> <li>• Performance of Duty – Unfounded</li> </ul>	455	353
<b>3</b> <b>(IA2023-026)</b>	Officers failed to provide assistance to complainant due to complainant's race and subject's race.	Officers #1-2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance of Duty – Exonerated</li> </ul> Officer #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bias-Based Policing – Unfounded</li> </ul> Officer #2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bias-Based Policing – Not Sustained</li> </ul>	441	358
<b>4</b> <b>(IA2023-031)</b>	Officers failed to properly address a fare evasion and failed to properly document enforcement activities.	Officers #1-2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance of Duty – Sustained</li> <li>• Policy/Procedure (Body Worn Camera) – Sustained</li> </ul>	441	364
<b>5</b> <b>(IA2023-038)</b>	Employee cited complainant for illegal parking and harassed complainant because of complainant's race.	Employee #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct Unbecoming an Officer – Unfounded</li> <li>• Bias-Based Policing – Unfounded</li> </ul>	413	337

During March 2024, **2 Administrative Investigations** were concluded by BPD:

(IA Case #)	Nature of Complaint	Disposition	Days Elapsed Since Complaint Filed	Days Taken to Complete Investigation
<b>1</b> (IA2020-017)	Officer-Involved Shooting investigation.	Officers #1-2: • Force – Exonerated	1577	1490†
<b>2</b> (IA2023-035)	Officers used excessive force.	Officers 1-2: • Force – Exonerated	441	347

### DISCIPLINE ISSUED DURING REPORTING PERIOD

During March 2024, 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
<b>1</b>	Officer did not properly document a law enforcement contact.	Officer #1: • Policy/Procedure (Body Worn Camera)	Officer #1: • Letter of Discussion <sup>10</sup> •
<b>2</b>	Officer did not properly document a law enforcement contact.	Officer #1: • Policy/Procedure (Body Worn Camera)	Officer #1: • Letter of Discussion
<b>3</b>	Officer did not properly document a law enforcement contact.	Officer #1: • Policy/Procedure (Body Worn Camera)	Officer #1: • Written Reprimand <sup>11</sup>

†Per the IA report, this investigation was tolled from January 7, 2021 to May 8, 2023 due to civil litigation (851 days).

‡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).

<b>4</b>	Officer did not properly document a law enforcement contact.	Officer #1: • Policy/Procedure (Body Worn Camera)	Officer #1: • Letter of Discussion <sup>12</sup>
<b>5</b>	Officers did not properly respond to a fare evader and did not properly document a law enforcement contact.	Officers #1-2: • Performance of Duty • Policy/Procedure (Body Worn Camera)	Officer #1: • Oral Counseling <sup>13</sup>

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	3
BPD-Initiated Appeals	0
Investigations Being Monitored	28
Investigations Reviewed During Current Month	17†

†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.

## ISSUES DETECTED

The Model provides that OIPA shall have authority to require follow-up investigation into any citizen complaint or allegation that is handled by BPD.<sup>14</sup> The OIPA Monthly Report will reflect information regarding monitored cases, investigations, and contacts with detail not to exceed that which is allowable under state law. The investigations reviewed by OIPA during this period did generate some recommendations for revisions or additional investigation and these items will be compiled and included in a subsequent monthly report and will include responses from BPD.

<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> 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>11</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>12</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>13</sup> Oral Counseling (third level of pre-discipline): An oral counseling may be the next step of the informal process. It is documented in a memorandum to the employee entitled "Oral Counseling." Prior to issuance, the supervisor should discuss the performance or infraction in detail with the employee. The purpose of the discussion is for the employee to be made aware of the unacceptable behavior. An employee who is covered by a collective bargaining agreement and who may be

---

issued an Oral Counseling is entitled to appropriate association representation. An Oral Counseling is pre-disciplinary, however, if the employee fails to correct the behavior, there will be cause to move to progressive discipline.

<sup>14</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.