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MISSION STATEMENT

of the

LIVINGSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

It is the mission of the Livingston Police Department to enforce the laws of the United States, the State of Montana and the City of Livingston, to assist the citizens of Livingston in protecting their lives and property, and to provide service to the public to the extent which we are empowered and enabled to do so by law, by department regulation, and by financial consideration.
INTRODUCTION

The Livingston Police Department, Park County Sheriff’s Department and Park County / City of Livingston 911 communications center acquired a new records management and computer aided dispatch (CAD) software system in 2013. 2014 was the first full year utilizing the new software system. Due to the technique used to gather data in the new software system, it may not be completely comparable with previous year’s data collection. From 2014 forward the method of data collection will remain consistent.

PERSONNEL RELATED

DEPARTMENT STAFFING

The police department's budgeted staffing consists of 14 full-time sworn officers. The structure consists of the chief, assistant chief, 3 sergeants, 6 patrol officers, two full time detectives, and one school resource officer (SRO). Budgeted staffing levels remain consistent from the previous year.

Chief Darren Raney retired in September after 25 years of service. This vacancy is currently in the process of being filled. Assistant Chief Dale Johnson is acting as the Interim Chief.

The termination of an officer in late 2012 was resolved following a Supreme Court decision in late November. Prior the Supreme Court’s decision, the vacant position had not been filled and staffing consisted of only 13 officers during most of 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Budgeted Positions</th>
<th>Staffing Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Chief</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Officer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Resource Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department Chain of Command

Chief

Asst. Chief

Sergeants (3)
(One day shift, one afternoon shift, one night shift)

Detectives (1)
One day shift
One afternoon shift

Patrol Officers (6)

School Resource Officer (1)
(One position)
2014 Overtime Usage Distribution
(Actual number of hours logged)

- Court: 269 hours (25%)
- Mandatory Training / Meetings: 362.5 hours (34%)
- Cover Vacant Shifts (Vacation, sick leave, other absences): 286 hours (26%)
- Other (Hold over to finish work, special assignments, call-out, etc.): 167 hours (15%)

Bar chart showing monthly overtime hours from Jan to Dec.

Monthly OT Hours:
- Jan: 67
- Feb: 64
- March: 86.5
- April: 86.5
- May: 66.5
- June: 80.5
- July: 185.5
- Aug: 104.5
- Sept: 119
- Oct: 77
- Nov: 77.5
- Dec: 70
PERSONNEL COMPLAINTS / COMPLIMENTS

The Livingston Police Department is committed to receiving and accepting complaints and compliments about the actions and performance of all our personnel. We believe the public is entitled to efficient, fair and impartial service. We investigate the allegations of employee misconduct, respond to inquiries about employee actions or department policy, and document all commendations received from the public.

We formally investigate all allegations and inquiries for the following reasons:

1. To protect citizens from misconduct by an employee.
2. To identify and take appropriate action against employees who violate the law, department policy, or rules and regulations.
3. To protect the department and those employees who conduct themselves appropriately.
4. To identify policies and procedures that may need review or change, and to find ways to improve the quality of service to the community.

Complaints against employees may be initiated by citizens or internally. Citizen complaints generally pertain to improper conduct or unsatisfactory service. Internal complaints generally deal with violations of policy, SOP or rules and regulations. Complaints are resolved in one of the following manners:

1. **Unfounded** – The investigation conclusively proved that the allegations or act complained of did not occur.
2. **Exonerated** – The acts that formed the basis for the complaint or allegation did occur, but were justified, lawful, and proper according to department policy or standard operating procedures.
3. **Not Sustained** – The investigation failed to discover sufficient evidence to clearly prove or disprove the allegations made.
4. **Sustained** – The investigation disclosed a preponderance of the evidence to prove the allegation(s) made.
5. **Sustained with Qualifications** - The investigation discloses the action complained of did in fact occur, but not in the manner or to the degree stated.
6. **Unresolved** – The investigation cannot proceed because the complainant failed to disclosed promised information to further the investigation; or the complainant wished to withdraw the complaint; or the complainant is no longer available to provide necessary information. This finding may also be used when information provided is not sufficient to determine the identity of the officer(s) involved.

If a complaint is sustained against an employee, appropriate action will be taken. The action may involve counseling, written reprimand, suspension from duty, termination, criminal prosecution, or other action.

**Three (3) complaints were received and investigated.**
2014 Personnel Complaints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaint Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Force</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Exonerated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Force</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Exonerated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourteous</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITIZEN CALLS FOR SERVICE

The department received 7,684 calls for service in 2014, 1,465 more than 2013. The largest reason for this dramatic increase is due to the implementation of the new software and how it collects the statistical data. Calls for service represent all calls received by the communications center that fall within our jurisdiction, including fire/EMS and animal related calls. Although officers may not respond to or handle all such calls, they do respond to most. Therefore all calls for service are included.

Annual Calls for Service

![Annual Calls for Service Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td>5,212</td>
<td>6,749</td>
<td>6,592</td>
<td>6,335</td>
<td>6,458</td>
<td>6,220</td>
<td>7,684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6
TYPES OF CALLS RECEIVED

Officers respond to a wide variety of calls that may be time consuming but unrelated to crime or enforcement activities. Consistent with prior years, a large percentage of calls for service are non-criminal related.
POLICE ACTIVITY

PATROL OFFICER WORKLOAD

Although patrol officers handle the vast majority of calls, for statistical purposes the annual average number of calls shown is based on the total number of sworn officers budgeted during the designated time periods, including the police chief, assistant chief, school resource officer and detective positions. Despite 14 budgeted positions, only 13 officers were actually employed due to the vacancy created by an on-going employment action following the termination of an officer in 2012. There are also times of staffing shortage that can be expected due to vacation, sick leave, injury, training, and other vacancies created by resignation or retirement. Although available when needed, the detectives, chief, assistant chief and the school resource officer (during school months) do not respond to calls for service on a routine basis. In reality, the number of calls per patrol officer is actually much greater than shown.

In the 1980’s, based on full staffing of 10 sworn officers as of 1989, officers averaged 317 calls per year. Despite adding 2 sworn positions in the 1990’s, this average rose when the number of calls escalated rapidly during this time period. A new position was added in the fall of 2001 when the City entered into an agreement with the school district and a private citizen to fund a School Resource Officer position. Although the SRO was assigned to the schools during the school year, the position was available for patrol during the summer months to assist with the added workload. Despite this added position, the workload continued to grow.

The average number of calls per officer from 2000-2009 reflect a 70% increase from the 1980’s and a 20% increase from the 1990’s. A 14th sworn position was added in 2009, which attributed to a decline in the average numbers of calls per officer in subsequent years. The 2014 calls for service per officer is considerably higher than the 1980’s and prior, higher with the 1990’s, and approaching the same number of calls per officer as in the 2000’s.
As the number of calls per officer increases, less time is available for routine patrol duties and traffic enforcement. Each call for service can be time consuming, some more so than others, considering response time and any follow-up work that needs to be done. Calls that require an investigation or that lead to an arrest require written reports to be generated and data entered into the computerized records management system, in addition to time dedicated to the investigation or activity related to the call. Increased workload also requires officers to prioritize calls and assess how much time to dedicate to minor issues or routine patrol activities.

Regardless of the number of calls for service officers must respond to, it is important to recognize that much of the time there are only 2 patrol officers on duty and there are times when only 1 is on duty. Most calls are non-threatening in nature. However, on duty officers are expected to immediately respond to whatever situation occurs, frequently dealing with hostile situations and dangerous persons alone or with inadequate assistance. Typical of smaller jurisdictions, our officers do not always benefit from relying on multiple officers to assist with a dangerous situation.
INVESTIGATIONS

Officers generated 858 written offense reports, an increase from 89 the previous year. Offense Reports are calls for service that result in an arrest, criminal investigation or other police action requiring written investigative reports and follow-up activity.

The department has experienced an increase in felony investigations, including financial crimes that are time consuming to investigate along with more intensive drug related investigations.

USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS

Many force and equipment options are available to officers. They must choose an appropriate option based on the threat, either actual or perceived, including but not limited to: officer presence, verbal direction, physical control, chemical or inflammatory agents, impact weapons, Tasers (Electronic control devices), firearms, vehicles, and/or weapons of necessity or opportunity.

It is the policy of the Livingston Police Department that officers use the amount of force which is objectively reasonable to make an arrest, gain control of a situation, or to protect the officer or another from harm, given the facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time force is applied.
A separate written Use of Force Report is completed and documented, in addition to an incident report, in any of the following use of force incidents:

- Discharge of a firearm, accidentally or intentional, at or toward any person
- Striking of a subject with an impact weapon, or other weapon of necessity or opportunity.
- Discharge of a Taser.
- Use of force that results in injury to the subject, or complaints of injury.
- Use of physical or weaponless force against an individual to the extent it is likely to cause or lead to unforeseen injury, claim of injury or allegations of excessive force.
- Use of empty hand stunning or striking techniques.
- Discharge of a chemical weapons.
- Use of a vehicle as an offensive weapon.
- The use of a canine to apprehend a subject, resulting in a bite.
- The pointing of a weapon at any person, or drawing a weapon accompanied by verbal threats to use the weapon. This does not apply to the drawing of weapons in appropriate situations where officers do not point the weapon at any person or threaten to use the weapon.
- The use of leg restraints.

Separate Use of Force Reports are not required for weaponless hand to hand control techniques that have little or no chance of producing injuries when gaining control over or subduing non-compliant or resisting persons. These techniques include, but are not limited to, physical touching, escort holds, gripping or holding, frisking, or handcuffing.

**Use of Force Reports**

- Use of force reports in 2014 24
- Use of force reports in 2013 18
- Use of force reports in 2012 15
- Use of force reports in 2011 26

**Taser Deployments:**

- Taser deployments in 2014 2
- Taser deployments in 2013 5
- Taser deployments in 2012 4
- Taser deployments in 2011 1
- Taser deployments in 2010 3

- Officers injured from Taser deployments in 2014 0
- Officers injured from Taser deployments in 2013 0
- Officers injured from Taser deployments in 2012 1
- Officers injured from Taser deployments in 2011 0
- Officers injured from Taser deployments in 2010 0
- Suspects / Citizens injured from Taser deployments in 2014: 0
- Suspects / Citizens injured from Taser deployments in 2013: 0
- Suspects / Citizens injured from Taser deployments in 2012: 1
- Suspects / Citizens injured from Taser deployments in 2011: 0
- Suspects / Citizens injured from Taser deployments in 2010: 1

**Reason for Use of Force – 2014 (More than one may apply during each incident)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Arrest</th>
<th>Prevent Escape</th>
<th>Defend An Officer</th>
<th>Defend Other Person</th>
<th>Restrain Person For Their Own Safety</th>
<th>Prevent Escalation Of The Situation</th>
<th>Felony Vehicle Stop</th>
<th>Size Disparity Of Officer VS. Suspect</th>
<th>Alarm Call</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resulting Outcome**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misdemeanor Arrest</th>
<th>Felony Arrest</th>
<th>Protective Hold (Mental)</th>
<th>Suspect Escaped</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**At Time of Contact, the Individual was: (As perceived by officers)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under Influence Of Alcohol Or Drugs</th>
<th>Suspected Under The Influence</th>
<th>Mentally Impaired</th>
<th>Emotionally Upset</th>
<th>Normal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Resistance (More than one may apply during each incident)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Psychological Intimidation</th>
<th>Verbal Non-Compliance</th>
<th>Passive Resistance</th>
<th>Escape Resistance</th>
<th>Active Aggression</th>
<th>Aggravated Active Aggression - Weapon Visible</th>
<th>Aggravated Active Aggression – Weapon Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Control Techniques Used (More than one may apply during each incident)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Presence</th>
<th>Verbal Direction Only</th>
<th>Verbal Commands While Displaying Chemical Weapon (i.e. OC spray)</th>
<th>Verbal Commands While Displaying Impact Weapon</th>
<th>Verbal Commands While Displaying Firearm</th>
<th>Verbal Commands With Firearm Pointed At Individual</th>
<th>Soft Empty Hand Control Techniques</th>
<th>Chemical Weapon / Taser Used</th>
<th>Hard Empty Hand Control Techniques</th>
<th>Impact Weapon Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BICYCLE PATROL

Several specially trained officers continued to conduct bicycle patrols throughout the City at various times of the day and night, depending on workload and the availability of enough officers to provide vehicle patrol. Bicycle patrols are very effective in proactive patrol, being stealthy and versatile. Officers can cover much more area than foot patrols, and are less visible to potential offenders than marked patrol vehicles. Bicycle patrols are also more approachable to citizens, affording enhanced interaction with the public.

MISSOURI RIVER DRUG TASK FORCE

The Livingston Police Department continued to be a member of the Missouri River Drug Task Force, a multi-jurisdictional effort funded by a federal grant with partial contributions from participating agencies. Pursuant to the agreement, the City of Livingston and Park County equally fund a portion of the costs necessary to provide one full time Park County deputy who works with the task force as a full time investigator. Our officers, especially the afternoon shift detective, work closely with this investigator, sharing drug related intelligence and forwarding cases for follow up investigation by the task force. These joint efforts continue to be successful in prosecuting drug offenders in Livingston and Park County.

CANINE UNIT

The department maintains one canine unit, consisting of a specially trained and certified dog/handler team. The canine is certified in narcotics detection, article search, tracking, building search, area search, officer protection and aggression control. Over 100 training hours were completed in 2014 and annual certifications were received from the North American Police Work Dog Association, National Police Canine Association and the Southern Police Canine Inc. The canine unit assists other agencies in the local area upon request. One (1) public demonstration was conducted.

The number of drug related incidents utilizing the K9 dramatically decreased in 2014. This is a direct result of the Montana Highway Patrol acquiring several K9 units for their agency, two (2) of which are stationed here in Livingston/ Park County. Due to this, there is currently four (4) drug detection K9s in the Livingston/ Park County area. Although the number of drug sniffs has decreased, the number of patrol related deployments and K9 apprehensions from individuals attempting to flee or elude officers has increased.

CANINE DEPLOYMENTS BY TYPE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Searches</th>
<th>Apprehensions (1 Forceful)</th>
<th>Vehicle Sniffs</th>
<th>Tracking</th>
<th>Article Searches</th>
<th>School Sniffs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canine Deployments by Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livingston P.D.</th>
<th>Park County S.O. / MRDTF</th>
<th>Montana Highway Patrol</th>
<th>Department of Criminal Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximate Drug Seizures Resulting From Canine Sniffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methamphetamine</th>
<th>Marijuana</th>
<th>Numerous Drug Paraphernalia items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3 grams</td>
<td>25 grams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of theft and burglary reports decreased in 2014, but vandalism reports were up. Overall, reported incidents of theft, vandalism and burglary remain lower than the long term average and continue a positive trend in this direction.

There were 15 vehicles reported stolen from our jurisdiction in 2014 (not including unauthorized use), compared to 11 in 2013, 10 in 2012, 6 in 2011, 7 in 2010, 5 in 2009, 11 in 2008, 19 in 2007, 12 in 2006 and 15 in 2005.
VEHICLE ACCIDENTS

Officers completed 160 vehicle accident reports in 2014, slightly less than the previous year but continuing a trend of low accident rates compared to the long term average. Even though the City has assumed jurisdiction of more roads through annexation in recent years, the accident rate has remained relatively static until 2009 when we have since experienced a significant reduction. No fatal accidents occurred in 2014.

Of the accidents that occur on public roads (not including private property, such as parking lots), most (67%) were not intersection related. This is consistent with previous years.

93% of intersection related accidents occur at controlled intersections. Controlled intersections are those where at least one roadway is regulated by a stop sign or traffic light.
Total Accidents; Private Property vs. Public Road

Intersection Accidents that Occurred on Public Roads
(Private Property Accidents Not Included)
Intersection Related Accidents; Controlled vs Uncontrolled

Uncontrolled Intersection vs. Total Public Road Crashes
Although traffic enforcement is an important public safety tool and a means to address specific problems, based on historical accident data aggressive traffic enforcement or the number of citations issued does not seem to correlate to lower accident rates.

![Vehicle Accident / Traffic Citation Ratio, 1980 – 2014 Trends](chart.png)

**RACIAL PROFILING AND TRAFFIC STOP DATA**

Pursuant to the requirements of 44-2-117 MCA, department policy requires the collection of data for each traffic stop that determines whether any officer has a pattern of stopping members of minority groups for violations of vehicle laws in a number disproportionate to the population of minority groups residing or traveling within our jurisdiction.

Officers are required to document the race or ethnicity of the driver and record the information into our records management system to be used to compile racial profiling data. The determination is based on their perception of the person’s race. The diagrams below shows the number of drivers, by race, ethnicity and sex that were stopped in 2014.

Consistent with the requirements of law, department policy provides for an annual review of this data. If the review reveals a pattern of any officer(s) of the Livingston Police Department stopping members of minority groups for violations of vehicle laws in a number disproportionate to the population of minority groups residing or traveling within our jurisdiction, an investigation must be conducted to determine whether the officer(s) routinely stop members of said minority groups for violations of vehicle laws as a pretext for investigating other violations of criminal
law. The required review is incorporated into the Livingston Police Department Annual Report of Statistics, and this shall be considered the required review.

Upon review of departmental statistics, and having received no complaints alleging racial profiling from any person in 2014, there is no reason to conclude that officer(s) routinely stop members of minority groups for violations of vehicle laws as a pretext for investigating other violations of criminal law.

Traffic Stops by Race, 2014