Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
City of Long Beach  
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 14th Floor  
Long Beach, CA  90802  

Dear Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council:  

I am pleased to present you with the 2008 Citizen Police Complaint Commission (CPCC)  
Annual Report. This report contains the final statistics for cases initiated, received, reviewed and  
investigated by the Commission within the 2008 calendar year.  

The CPCC holds a unique role as public servants. The community, government and law  
enforcement have trusted us to conduct our work in a professional, fair and impartial manner.  
We have earned our trust through a firm commitment to the public good, the mission of our  
agency and to strict ethical and professional standards.  

Many thanks to the Commission’s executive staff and the Commission support staff from the  
City Clerk’s Office for their hard work and commitment. On behalf of the Commission, I would  
also like to thank Patrick H. West (City Manager), Suzanne Frick (Assistant City Manager), and  
Reginald I. Harrison (Deputy City Manager), for their continued assistance, counsel and  
encouragement. To my fellow Commissioners, you have my sincere gratitude for making this  
experience a fulfilling and rewarding one, where I have gained knowledge, friends and the  
satisfaction of knowing that I have helped my community.  

Lastly, to the citizens of Long Beach, I thank you for providing the  
CPCC the opportunity to uphold its mission of ensuring professional  
police services in our community. With your continued support, we  
will carry on our endeavor to make Long Beach a model city in the  
policing arena.  

Sincerely,  

Carolyn Smith Watts, Chair  
Citizen Police Complaint Commission
Citizen Police Complaint Commissioners

2008

Ricardo Linarez (District 1)
Termed Out 6/08

Robert Hildebrand (District 1)
Appointed 8/08

Trina Schoonmaker (District 2)
Vice-Chair 7/08-6/09

Rick McGilton-McGlamery (District 3)
Appointed 1/08

G. Andrew Jones (District 4)
Chair 7/07-6/08

Richard Aden (District 5)
Term Extended 7/07-4/08

Monica Blumenfield (District 5)
Appointed 5/08

Lillian Parker (District 6)
Reappointed 7/06, extended through 2008

Carolyn Smith Watts (District 7)
Chair 7/08-6/09

Patrick Thompson (District 8)
Appointed 1/08

Daniel Cartagena (District 9)
Appointed 1/08

Andrew J. Tse (At-Large)
Vice-Chair 7/07-6/08

Wilma Powell (At-Large)
Appointed 7/08

Marcos Gonzalez (At-Large)
Appointed 7/08

Staff

Anitra Dempsey, Executive Director
Henry Quan, Special Investigator
Anthony Dannan, Special Investigator
Dina Lopez, City Clerk Specialist, Minutes

Office of the City Manager

Patrick West, City Manager
Suzanne Frick, Assistant City Manager
Reginald I. Harrison, Deputy City Manager
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Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
City of Long Beach
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 14th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Mayor Foster and Members of the City Council:

I am pleased to provide for your review the Citizen Police Complaint Commission's (CPCC) 2008 Annual Report detailing complaints received, investigated and closed during the 2008 calendar year. In 2008, the CPCC continued to focus on customer service outreach, community awareness, complaint oversight, job performance and overall Charter compliance.

Thank you for your continued support of the Citizen Police Complaint Commission. The CPCC Commissioners and staff appreciate the confidence you have shown in the performance of our duties.

Many thanks to the Commissioners who demonstrated tireless dedication to our common goal. To the CPCC staff, your commitment and efforts are recognized and appreciated. To the Long Beach Police Department, notably the Internal Affairs Division, thank you for your courtesy, cooperation and assistance.

The CPCC continues to demonstrate the highest standards of personal integrity, commitment, truthfulness and fortitude inspiring trust from the community and setting examples for other police oversight boards.

I welcome your comments and will be available to answer questions or provide further information as requested.

Sincerely,

Anitra Dempsey
Executive Director
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report covers the 2008 calendar year: a period of growth, development and achievement for the Citizen Police Complaint Commission (CPCC).

MISSION

The mission of the Citizen Police Complaint Commission is to provide independent, impartial, and objective civilian oversight of the Long Beach Police Department under the authority of Sections 1150-1155 of the City Charter. Special emphasis is placed on those complaints from the public involving allegations of excessive force, false arrest, and racial and/or sexual overtones. Civilian oversight is provided by qualified members of the community who are appointed to the Commission by the Mayor and the City Council. The Commission is a fact-finding body, supported by an administrative and investigative staff that relays the Commission's findings and recommendations to the City Manager who, by Charter, makes the final determination in matters of alleged police misconduct.

The goals of the Commission include, but are not limited to, improving the demeanor of the officers toward the public and maintaining community trust in the local law enforcement agency. The Commission endeavors to accomplish these goals by maintaining an atmosphere of mutual trust and understanding between itself, the community and the Police Department.

VALUES

Accountability, Integrity, Transparency, Respect for the law and those who serve, Respect for all people.

FUNCTIONS

The CPCC has three primary functions:

1. Fact-finding and making recommendations relative to reported police misconduct to the City Manager. The Commission is neither an advocate for the complainants nor police officers. The CPCC is empowered to conduct hearings and, through the City Attorney's Office, may subpoena witnesses and records when necessary to facilitate the fact-finding process.

2. Representing the people of Long Beach. Individuals who prefer not to complain directly to the Police Department have the option of filing their complaint with the CPCC, which is a completely civilian organization. However, citizen complaints received directly by the Police Department are copied and sent to the Commission for review. At its discretion, the CPCC may exercise its authority to request further investigation on behalf of the complainant.

3. Oversee the investigation process, which is aimed at capturing all facts. Although CPCC investigators review allegations independent of the Police Department, the
Commission or the Executive Director will request further investigation only when the Police Department has not conducted a comprehensive case study or when new information becomes available. The Commission Staff accepts the Police Department’s investigation as a basis for their independent review and evaluation. As part of this process, additional interviews of witnesses and complainants, as well as site visits, are routinely conducted by Commission staff. Whenever staff discovers new facts or data, the pertinent information is shared with the Police Department.

CASES

The total number of cases evaluated by the CPCC has been divided into two categories. The first category enumerates those cases investigated by staff and presented to the Commission for their review. The second category consists of those complaints classified by the CPCC and the Long Beach Police Department as Non-Misconduct, or No Further Action (NFA) by the CPCC. Non-Misconduct cases are forwarded to the CPCC staff for evaluation and concurrence. The criterion for a No Further Action (NFA) classification is fully defined in the Annual Report.

COMPLAINTS

During this reporting period, 287 complaints were filed and thoroughly reviewed by staff. This represents a .7% increase from 2007, which had 285 complaints. Thirty-two cases were presented to the Commission during Executive Sessions, where 8.6% of the allegations reviewed were sustained.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

The CPCC staff and Commissioners conduct extensive outreach to educate the community about the mission and functions of the CPCC, assess the needs and concerns of diverse communities, and make services visible and accessible to the public. In 2008, the CPCC was represented in numerous local community forums including the Youth and Gang Violence Prevention Task Force. The CPCC was contacted by the Riverside Police Review Commission for information regarding Officer Involved Shootings and, also, hosted a community forum. The CPCC continues to be a reliable community resource.

CONCLUSION

In 2008, the CPCC saw a slight increase in the number of complaints filed against Long Beach police personnel. Additionally, CPCC continues to provide strong customer service outreach in support of positive community relations.
THE CITIZEN POLICE COMPLAINT COMMISSION

On April 10, 1990, the voters of the City of Long Beach approved the creation of the Citizen Police Complaint Commission by adding Sections 1150 – 1155 to the City Charter. This Amendment authorized the Commission to receive and investigate complaints of police misconduct with emphasis on allegations of *Excessive Force*, *False Arrest*, and *Racial and/or Sexual Overtones*.

The Commission's primary role is that of fact-finding and making recommendations relative to reported police misconduct to the City Manager. The Commission is neither an advocate for the complainant nor police officer. The Citizen Police Complaint Commission is empowered to conduct hearings and, through the City Attorney's Office, may subpoena witnesses and records when necessary to facilitate the fact-finding process.

The Citizen Police Complaint Commission plays a vital role in representing the people of Long Beach. Individuals who prefer not to complain directly to the Police Department have the option of filing their complaint with the Commission, which is a completely civilian organization. However, citizen complaints received directly by the Police Department are copied and sent to the Commission for review. At its discretion, the Commission may exercise its authority to request further investigation on behalf of the complainant.

The investigative process is aimed at capturing all allegation-related facts. Although Commission investigators review allegations independent of the Police Department, the Commissioners or the Executive Director will request further investigation only when the Police Department has not conducted a comprehensive case study or when new information becomes available.

The Commission staff accepts the Police Department’s investigation as a basis for their independent review and evaluation. As part of this process, additional interviews of witnesses and complainants, as well as site visits, are routinely conducted by Commission staff. Whenever staff discovers new facts or data, the pertinent information is shared with the Police Department.

The Citizen Police Complaint Commission serves the community by providing an impartial viewpoint of alleged incidents and applying the "reasonable person’s" standard in addressing complaints of police misconduct. The Commission makes findings-of-fact on cases brought before it and submits those findings to the City Manager. Cases heard by the Commission also receive formal review by the Police Chief’s senior staff. The Police Chief’s disposition of allegations, along with the Commission’s findings, are presented to the City Manager for final case determination.

The Commission's findings and recommendations often provide valuable insight into the community’s perception of the Police Department. This insight can assist with police personnel training and public relations. It should be noted that the Commission cannot recommend discipline or penalty.
The Long Beach Model

Since 1990, a greater nationwide emphasis has been placed on the value of providing civilian oversight to the various law enforcement agencies. As a result, professional, non-profit organizations have been instituted to provide support to newly formed, evolving and established civilian oversight/review boards. The National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) is one of these organizations.

NACOLE identifies three distinct models used most frequently by the various boards.

- The first system is described as an Independent, Investigative model. This style investigates complaints and, based on the findings, makes recommendations regarding discipline and policy.
- The second system is identified as being a Monitoring model. This process reviews the investigations completed by the Police Department’s Internal Affairs Division and simply makes findings based on agreement or disagreement with the Internal Affairs investigation. This model may ask for further investigation.
- The third system is described as an Auditor/Ombudsman model, having the power to compel evidence. This process reviews Internal Affairs investigations, conducts its own investigations, and conducts investigations not generated by complaints.

The model used by the City of Long Beach varies from the three basic models and has been specifically identified as being a Hybrid model. The Long Beach Hybrid process reviews investigations completed by the Long Beach Police Department’s Internal Affairs Division and, when the need arises, initiates audits and may conduct additional investigations. The Long Beach CPCC determines findings based on the results of the investigation, but does not recommend discipline.

As the Citizen Police Complaint Commission’s system evolves, many community-policing agencies recognize Long Beach as one of the best combinations of all working models. Two California communities, Riverside and Claremont, have adopted the Long Beach model for their review board.

During this reporting period, the following cities/organizations contacted CPCC staff requesting information on the structure and function of the Commission: Riverside Police Review Commission, The Long Beach Unified School District and The Youth and Gang Violence Prevention Task Force.
To assist these organizations, the CPCC provided background information, copies of annual reports and in some cases, copies of the Long Beach City Charter that established the CPCC.

**Goals and Objectives**

From its inception, the long-range goal of the Citizen Police Complaint Commission has been the restoration and maintenance of public trust in its community law enforcement agency. Additionally, the demeanor of police officers, and their interactions with the public is also important to the CPCC. The Commission believes that if it can assure that police officers take appropriate action while interacting with the public, the community will more readily support the police. When the public supports the police, they become personally involved in the law enforcement effort and contribute to crime reduction within the City. A proven benefit of both goals is that cities with low crime rates improve the quality of community life, retain long-term residents, attract new businesses and encourage tourism.

The Commissioners and staff believe the “reasonable person’s standard,” by which the Commission operates, is helping police employees and complainants have a more favorable understanding of Police Department actions. Additionally, this standard is used to ensure that police conduct is appropriate and acceptable, thus diminishing the public’s need to file complaints of misconduct. The desired result is to encourage understanding and harmony between the community and law enforcement. The CPCC has and will continue to strive for preservation of community trust in its law enforcement agency by assuring fairness and accountability.

**Reports**

Commission meetings are conducted monthly during the calendar year. This schedule enables the Citizen Police Complaint Commission to receive, investigate, deliberate, and make findings regarding a public complaint of police misconduct in a timely manner.

By monitoring complaints and allegations, the Executive Director reports obvious and developing trends related to police misconduct and public perception to the City Manager. As they emerge, these patterns may indicate an increase in specific allegations based on public perception, media attention and/or incidents occurring locally or nationally. This reporting procedure is necessary to assist with police officer review and to assess individual and department training needs.

**Case Tracking**

The Citizen Police Complaint Commission maintains an ever-evolving database that stores case information on complainants. The tracking system includes details of alleged incidents and the nature of the allegations. Initial incident information is updated as cases progress through the complaint process to their conclusion.

Additionally in mid-2007, the CPCC began to document contacts from community members that do not rise to the level of a complaint.
Relationship with Staff and Others

The Commissioners enjoy an excellent relationship with Commission staff, the Deputy City Manager and the City Manager. The CPCC staff is committed to supporting the Commissioners in every aspect of their responsibilities. Staff provides insight and background to assist the Commissioners in reaching fair and impartial case findings. The staff does not make recommendations of findings or exercise influence over the Commissioners.

Selection and Training

Each year, several CPCC seats become vacant, creating an opportunity for new community members to participate as Commissioners. Effective and meaningful CPCC service begins by ensuring that the Commissioners are prepared to perform their duties and providing ongoing training.

Appointed Commissioners submit their fingerprints and a background investigation is completed. Upon being cleared, the Commissioners receive an orientation from the Executive Director who meets with them individually for approximately three hours on their role and to equip them with the information they will need to perform their duties. Topics include: CPCC By-Laws, Policies and Procedures, Allegation Codes, Use of Force, Police Officer Bill of Rights, Long Beach Police Department Training Bulletins and Officer Involved Shootings.

Ongoing training is an important part of the CPCC function. Because many Commissioners arrive with little background in police operations, the Executive Director and the Internal Affairs Commander arrange an all-day training at the Long Beach Police Academy. In condensed format, the Commissioners have an opportunity to learn about critical decision-making, the legalities and mechanics of making arrests, escalation and de-escalation of force, and proper search techniques. These training days include practical scenarios where Commissioners assume the role of an officer handling a police call for service. Equipped with simulated weapons that operate like real weapons, Commissioners make critical “shoot,” or “don’t shoot” decisions. Also, Commissioners are required to go on a police “ride-a-long” every two years to experience the perspectives of the patrol officers’ activities.
Additionally, subject matter experts are routinely invited to the open and/or executive sessions to provide information. During this reporting period, topics included: Constitutional Law, Force Options and Arrest Control Techniques, Use of Force and the Hollywood Factor, Firearms Scenario Training, Internal Affairs Intake Overview, Race Based Policing and Laws of Arrest.

**Investigative Process**

Although the Commission officially implemented its operational system in 1991, it was not until 1992 that a consistent method of collecting and analyzing data was put into practice. In 1994, the Commission refined its policy to exclude complaints that were invalid and/or were complaints of police service (non-disciplinary), which were not violations of Police Department policy. These complaints, collectively, are classified as No Further Action (NFA).

As a part of the policy change, the Commission delegated authority to the Executive Director to initially screen new complaints. This expedited the preliminary review process and reduced time spent on frivolous and intentionally misleading complaints of misconduct. The need to redefine the policy was based on a number of complaints that had no merit. Additionally, complaints deemed to have “judicial review,” such as traffic and parking citations, are not taken unless there are extenuating circumstances.

In 1996, the Commission staff computerized the complaint tracking process to accurately reflect data available for analysis. The CPCC database provides the statistics and information used for annual analysis and year-to-year comparisons. The stored data is consistent with Commission findings. The most current five-year period of statistics are reflected in this annual report.
Outreach

The CPCC has made an effort to reach the Long Beach community through newspaper, cable television, non-profit, government, faith-based and various professional and cultural organizations. It is not possible to quantify the number of people reached via these venues. However, each contact results in phone calls or requests for clarification of procedures or additional information.

CPCC staff has participated in several community informational forums including: Letter of the Law, hosted by City Prosecutor Tom Reeves, Youth and Gang Violence Prevention Task Force, speaking engagements at LBUSD schools, as well as sharing information with Riverside Police Review Commission on CPCC involvement in Officer Involved Shootings.

In these forums, CPCC staff provided an overview of the Long Beach citizen police complaint process and discussed the procedure of filling out the complaint form with emphasis on being specific and factual with regard to an allegation of misconduct. The CPCC staff provided scenarios concerning the various types of stops police officers might make. The CPCC staff also discussed the “do’s and don’ts” when detained by law enforcement and supplemented the information with hand-out materials. The CPCC believes that sharing information will foster better police community relations and reduce conflict.

The Commission staff and Commissioners represented the CPCC at community events such as the Cambodian New Year’s Parade and the Freedom School Event. Commission staff maintains a keen awareness of the many ethnicities that exist in the community and the subtle cultural perceptions that could influence police community relations.
Customer Service and Community Relations

CPCC staff recognizes that, while many contacts do not warrant a formal complaint, it is important to employ comprehensive problem solving as a priority customer service strategy, including referral to another City department or social service agency if the concern is not police-related. In addition to reviewing and evaluating each complaint and all allegations received, CPCC staff implemented a new procedure to track customer contacts that do not rise to the level of a formal complaint.

Staff observed that while the official number of complaints declined, the request for assistance and the time spent to resolve a problem, make a recommendation or refer the caller to another department or agency was constant. However, this information was not consistently captured. Therefore in mid-2007, staff designed an “internal public assistance form” and implemented a new procedure to document the contacts for assistance and the time spent with each person. The contacts include phone calls, walk-ins and requests written by letter or email. In 2008, there were 210 documented contacts that did not rise to the level of a complaint. The average number of minutes spent on each contact was 40 minutes.

CPCC staff also enhanced its communication with the community by changing the NFA letter to more clearly explain the specific reason a complaint was categorized as NFA.

Meetings

The Commission met ten times in public session during 2008. By Commission policy, these meetings were convened in the City Council Chambers at 6:30 p.m. on the second Thursday of each month unless a special training had been arranged. The public was welcome to participate in these sessions. As a matter of routine, the complaining person or persons are notified approximately one week in advance by mail or telephone of the date, time and location their case is to be heard by the Commission. This gives the complaining party an opportunity to address the Commission and to answer whatever questions the Commissioners might have.

On November 14, 2008, the Commission convened for a training session at the Police Academy. Training was provided by Academy staff and supplemented with an address by Long Beach Police Chief Anthony Batts, who shared his goals and expectations while discussing the various aspects of training each officer is responsible for knowing. Chief Batts’ address and candor was very well-received by all who attended. The Commissioners were very impressed with the training provided and professionalism of the Academy staff and later wrote them letters of commendation.
Each month after general business was completed, the Commission entered into Executive or Closed Session to discuss specific details of allegations appearing on that meeting’s agenda. Following discussion, the Commissioners voted to determine appropriate findings for each case. Executive Session is confidential and the public cannot attend or participate.

Budget

The CPCC budget for fiscal year 2008 was $366,107. This reflects the costs of personal, non-personal and inter-department items.

Hearings and Investigations

To date, the Commission has not found it necessary to hold a formal hearing where the subpoena or testimony of witnesses was required. The current review process makes formal hearings unnecessary at this time. However, future hearings may be held if an incident having significant public impact occurs. The effectiveness of the hearing process in obtaining facts will remain unknown until such an incident occurs. The police action review process has been cost-effective in obtaining the facts regarding allegations brought before the Commission.
RELATIONSHIP WITH THE LONG BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT

Cooperation Starts at the Top

Under Chief Batts’ leadership, the Long Beach Police Department continued to work closely with the CPCC. Chief Batts continued to foster a better understanding between the CPCC and the Long Beach Police Department by permitting ride-alongs for the Commissioners and Commission staff, encouraging open communication with the Police Department’s Internal Affairs Division and developing training relative to police procedures and policy. Chief Batts continued to meet with Commission members on an informal basis to discuss issues of mutual concern. These meetings were limited in number of participants so as not to establish a quorum. This spirit of cooperation has continued to help improve police community relations.

Interaction with the Police Department

The Commissioners commend Chief Batts for allowing them the opportunity to suggest recommendations that may be in conflict with current policy, and for accepting that information in good faith. The Commissioners are fully aware that they do not have the authority to formulate or dictate Police Department policy, as that is the responsibility of the Chief of Police. However, the Commissioners would be remiss if they did not inform the Chief of observations they have made which could assist the Chief in improving the performance of the Department while enhancing the philosophy and concept of community policing.

Relationship with the Long beach Police Officer’s Association

The Commission and staff have developed and continue to maintain a cooperative relationship with the Long Beach Police Officers’ Association. The Police Officers’ Association presidents have addressed the Commission and provided insight regarding their role during the Internal Affairs investigative process. Their dialogue has been very informative and productive.
The following represents a five-year complaint trend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Number of Completed Investigations</th>
<th>+/- to Prior Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-33.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>+35.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>-06.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>-16.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>+00.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A statistical review of the complaints filed by race* in 2008 is listed below. The percentage shown reflects the proportion of the total complaints for the listed year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>(46.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(19.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideasterner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (non Asian)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(24.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commissioners have noted that a disproportionate number of complaints were from African-Americans. While African-Americans represent only 14.5% of the Long Beach population, the total percentage of complaints by this group amounts to 46.6% percent of all the complaints received. There were no unusual situations or incidents to explain why there is a trend with regard to there being more complaints by African-Americans.

*In some cases, there are more than one complainant.

Observations and Recommendations

The major objective for the future continues to be to establish, preserve and encourage an atmosphere of positive police community relations that will strive for fair treatment in all aspects of law enforcement within Long Beach. Maintaining this standard will provide the ideal environment for improved quality of life and increased tourism.

During this reporting period, the Commission observed that the number of complaints increased only slightly throughout the past year. However, the impact of perceived police misconduct on the complainants and the overall community remains an area of concern. The Commission has considered ways of strengthening the complaint process to meet the public’s expectation while maintaining adherence to the laws that protect police officers.
Conclusion

The CPCC is proud to perform civilian oversight in Long Beach. It is through a cooperative relationship with the Long Beach Police Department and collaborative members of the community that the benefits of civilian oversight are fully achieved. We are thankful to have total participation of all involved parties as we work toward our common goal of ensuring professional police services in our community.
STATISTICAL COMPARISONS

COMPLAINTS (CASES) FILED
2004 – 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPLAINT SOURCES
2004 – 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CPCC</th>
<th>CPCC</th>
<th>CPCC</th>
<th>CPCC</th>
<th>CPCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LBPD</th>
<th>LBPD</th>
<th>LBPD</th>
<th>LBPD</th>
<th>LBPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL INFORMATION FOR 2008 ONLY

ARREST / INJURED REPORT

- Arrested and Injured: 18.77%
- Arrested but NOT Injured: 12.97%
- NOT Arrested but Injured: 8.53%
- NOT Arrested and NOT Injured: 59.73%

TOTAL: 100.00%
Complainants by Gender 2008

- Male: 64%
- Female: 35%
- N/A: 1%

Complaints by Ethnicity 2008

- African American: 24%
- American Indian: 19%
- Asians: 3%
- Hispanic: 0%
- White: 6%
- Other/Unknown: 6%
Arrested/Injured Report 2008

- Arrested and Injured: 59%
- Arrested but NOT Injured: 19%
- NOT Arrested but Injured: 13%
- NOT Arrested and NOT Injured: 9%
### Citizen Police Complaint Commission
### ATTENDANCE RECORD
#### 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner (District)</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linarez, Ricardo (1)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>DARK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointed 7/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildebrand, Robert (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed 7/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoonmaker, Trina (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair 07/08 – 06/09</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>DARK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGilton-McGlamery, Rick (3)</td>
<td>No Live Scan clearance</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>DARK</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>DARK</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed 1/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, G. Andrew (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointed 8/07</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>DARK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>DARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair 07/07 – 06/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aden, Richard (5)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>DARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(term extended on 7/07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenfield, Monica (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed 4/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Lillian (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>DARK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointed 7/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Watts, Carolyn (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed 7/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair 07/08 – 06/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Patrick (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed 01/08</td>
<td>No Live Scan clearance</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartagena, Daniel (9)</td>
<td>No Live Scan Clearance</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>DARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>DARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed 1/08</td>
<td>Open Session Only*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (At Large)</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, Wilma (At Large)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed 07 08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tse, Andrew (At Large)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointed 7/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair 7/07 – 06/08</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>DARK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales, Marcos (At-Large)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed 7/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHAIR:** Andrew Jones (Term: 07/07-06/08)
**VICE CHAIR:** Andrew Tse (Term: 07/07-07/08)

**CHAIR:** Carolyn Smith Watts (Term: 07/08-06/09)
**VICE CHAIR:** Trina Schoonmaker (Term: 07/08-06/09)

**KEY:**
- **P** = Present
- **A** = Absent
- **Ex** = Excused Absence
- **DARK** = No Meeting
- **R** = Resigned
- **+** = Term Extended
- **=** = Early Departure
- **** = Resigned
- **NQ** = No Meeting/No Quorum
- **=** = Non Commission
- **=** = Vacant

*Attended Open Session Only – Live Scan not yet returned

**UPDATED:** 09 08 09