



Johnson County Sheriff's Office Professional Standards Unit 2015 Vanguard Data Review

In accordance with Johnson County Sheriff's Office Policy 2005-04, Racial or Biased-Based Policing, the Professional Standards Unit will conduct an annual review of Vanguard data collected from the previous year. This review includes data which is related to all self-initiated motor vehicle stops, pedestrian checks or vehicle searches.

In an effort to fulfil the requirements of the policy, Professional Standards retrieved data from the Sheriff's Office Vanguard Reporting page. This page was built in late 2015 by CAD Administrator Carter Wetherington as a result of an upgrade in the Communications Division Computer Aided Dispatching (CAD) system. Wetherington created the reporting page in an effort to duplicate the queries used for the manual Vanguard report that was run in previous years (2013 and 2014).

The new reporting page pulls data from tables in the Intergraph CAD Archive database, of which the primary table is called Vanguard. The Vanguard tables store the data inputted by the deputies using the Intergraph CAD/Mobile dispatching system when they are on a self-initiated call. This report is based completely dependent on that self-reported data.

The following tables of information were provided by running the Vanguard report from 01-01-2015 through 12-31-2015:

Race Type	Count	Percentage	Gender Type	Count	Percentage
(A)sian	162	1.41%	(F)emale	4258	37.05%
(B)lack	812	7.07%	(M)ale	7211	62.75%
(H)ispanic	394	3.43%	(U)nknown	2	0.02%
(I)ndian	108	0.94%	Not Given	69	0.60%
(U)nknown	81	0.70%			
(W)hite	9908	86.22%			
Not Given	64	0.56%			
Total	11529	100%	Total	11540	100%

Typically, it is the deputy's discretion as to what category data is placed in. Calls for Service (CFS) are generally those that a deputy is dispatched to by Communications. Self-initiated activity would include activities such as building checks or pedestrian checks. The traffic section typically includes self-initiated activity and is broken down into reasons for those traffic stops. The differences in the totals from race and gender tables and the total of the reason table could be explained when other subjects (passengers in vehicles, more than one subject during a suspicious activity investigation) are contacted during those stops are entered into the report.

Reason	Count	Percentage
CALLS FOR SERVICE (CFS)		
OTHER	27	0.23%
SUSP ACTIONS	2	0.02%
SUSP VEH	6	0.05%
NOT GIVEN	13	0.11%
SELF INITIATED ACTIVITY		
OTHER	115	1%
SUSP ACTIONS	15	0.13%
SUSP VEH	36	0.31%
TRAFFIC		
EQUIP VIOLATION	1849	16.09%
FAIL TO OBEY TRAF CONTRL DEVICE	482	4.19%
FAIL TO SIGNAL	179	1.56
FAIL TO YIELD	154	1.34
FOLLOWING TOO CLOSE	88	0.77
IMPROPER PASSING	83	0.72
LICENSE PLATE VIOLATION	834	7.26
OTHER	915	7.96
SPEEDING	6603	57.46
UNSAFE LANE CHANGE	110	0.96
TOTAL	11511	100

According to the United States Census Bureau QuickFacts information pertaining to Johnson County, the estimated population of the county in 2014 was 574,272. Additionally, the Census Bureau estimated that 87.5% of the population in Johnson County was “white alone”. “Hispanic or Latino” was estimated at 7.4% while 5% of the population in the County was estimated to be “Black or African American alone”. “Asian alone” was estimated at 4.7%.

Since the data captured in the Vanguard report does not include information as to where the subject resided (County of Residence), 2014 Census Bureau information was reviewed for those counties that surround Johnson County in an effort to provide insight into the probable demographics that travel through the county.

Wyandotte County	Douglas County	Miami County	KCMO (2010)	Jackson Co. MO
Asian – 3.7%	Asian – 4.6%	Asian – 0.4%	Asian – 2.5%	Asian – 1.8%
Black – 24.8%	Black – 4.6%	Black – 1.3%	Black – 29.9%	Black – 24.0%
Hispanic – 27.3%	Hispanic – 5.8%	Hispanic – 3.1%	Hispanic – 10.0%	Hispanic – 8.8%
White – 66.9%	White – 84.3%	White – 95.7%	White – 59.2%	White – 70.4%

Based upon this information and the review of the collected data from CAD entries, non-biased policing was executed by the Sheriff’s Office in 2015.

Data collected by Professional Standards included two cases being filed in 2015 for allegations of racial profiling or racial discrimination. One case involved a member of the Vehicle Registration Enforcement Unit and one from Patrol. The other case involved two members of the Civil Division. Those cases are briefly described as follows:

- **PSU 15-018** – Complainants alleged they were subjects of harassment and racial profiling due to recently moving to the area and having out of state tags on their vehicle. The complaint originated when a deputy assigned to the Patrol Division stopped the complainant after believing the out of state tag was expired, which was determined at the time of the stop to be valid. Based upon statements made by complainant at the time of the stop, information was forwarded to the VREU to initiate an investigation to obtain compliance with registration requirements. VREU investigation revealed the complainant was compliant with requirements at the time.

Professional Standards investigated the complaint of harassment and racial profiling. During the course of the investigation, it was determined the original deputy failed to follow policy regarding activation of their body camera; therefore statements by the deputy or complainant at the time of the original stop could not be supported or refuted. The deputy was subsequently disciplined for lack of compliance with policy however there was no evidence to show the original stop involved racial profiling. The second involved deputy conducted the VREU investigation in compliance with policy. There was no evidence to support the allegation of racial profiling.

The investigation completed by PSU was reviewed by the Sheriff's Office Community Advisory Review Board. The responsibility of this Board is to review the findings of the Professional Standards investigation involving a claim of racial and/or biased policing. The review allowed the Board to voice an opinion as to whether the investigation supported or did not support the findings of that investigation or if more information was needed. Upon reviewing the matter, the Board felt the actions taken by the deputies did not rise to the level of racial profiling. The Board, comprised of four of the five members including two that represented the African American community; one representing the Muslim community and one representing the Jewish community, was unanimous in their agreement that the PSU findings were appropriate.

The complainants also filed a complaint with the Racial Profiling and Biased-Based Policing Unit with the Kansas Attorney General's Office. The Attorney General's Office was provided the entire PSU investigative file for review and conducted their own investigation, including interviewing the two involved deputies. The Attorney General's Office determined that there was insufficient evidence of racial or other biased-based profiling on the part of the original deputy. Additionally, the Attorney General's Office determined that there was no evidence of racial or other biased-based policing on the part of the other involved deputy.

- **PSU 15-054** – Civil Division deputies were serving a Court Ordered Protection from Abuse Order with removal of a subject. Almost immediately upon contacting the subject, the subject made comments inquiring to the deputies if they were going to shoot him and stated that he was a "black man." After removing the subject from the residence per the court order, deputies learned that the subject had had contact with

Lenexa Police previously and that the subject had posted messages on Twitter that Lenexa Police had been at his residence to shoot another unarmed black man.” Both deputies were equipped with working body cameras and the event was recorded. The deputies self-reported the contact as a claim of racial profiling and the matter was reviewed.

There was no evidence to support that racial profiling occurred. The deputies were executing an order from the Court and did so in accordance to policy and procedure. The subject’s comments were not provoked and the deputies remained professional throughout the encounter. The subject never stated he desired to make a complaint. The deputies were exonerated of any wrongdoing.

Respectfully submitted,

Detective Kerin Shore, 956/265
Professional Standards Unit
Johnson County Sheriff’s Office