Force Review Board- Chief's Report

CHIEF'S REPORT

JULY 9, 2020 | **TIME: 1010 TO 1210 HOURS** | **APD HEADQUARTERS - CHIEF'S CONFERENCE ROOM (VIA TELECONFERENCE)**

FRB CHAIR	Deputy Chief of Staff [redacted]
VOTING MEMBERS	DCOP [redacted] via teleconference DCOP [redacted] (present for 1st presentation voting only) – via teleconference DCOP [redacted] – via teleconference Commander [redacted] – via teleconference Commander [redacted] – via teleconference
NON-VOTING MEMBERS	Robyn Rose (City Legal/observer only) – via teleconference Lindsay Van Meter (City Legal) – via teleconference Edward Harness (CPOA) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (FRB Admin Personnel/IAFD) Julie Jaramillo (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD)
REPRESENTATIVES	Commander [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Deputy Commander [redacted] (IAPS) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (CIT) – via teleconference Patricia Serna (OPA) – via teleconference
OBSERVERS	Detective [redacted] Presenter/IAFD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (Presenter/IAFD) – via teleconference DCOP [redacted] (Compliance) Commander [redacted] (AOD) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] IAFD) – via teleconference Corey Sanders (USDOJ) – via teleconference Stephen Ryals (USDOJ) – via teleconference
PREVIOUS MINUTES	July 2, 2020 - approved
UNFINISHED BUSINESS	• None

CASE #: 20-0009417 TYPE: SUOF - LEVEL 3	DATE OF INCIDENT: JANUARY 30, 2020	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIME: 0933 HOURS
CASE PRESENTER	**DETECTIVE** [redacted]		
INJURIES SUSTAINED	**YES**		
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	**NO**		
DID THE BOARD REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF	**YES**		

RECEIVING THE CASE INFORMATION?					
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER FOR:			
POLICY	TACTICS	EQUIPMENT	TRAINING	SUPERVISION	SUCCESSES
☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: WAS THE TACTICAL ACTIVATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S SPECIALIZED RESPONSE PROTOCOLS?			
MAJORITY VOTE		☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: ARE THERE ANY OTHER CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES RELATED TO THE UNITS THAT REQUESTED TACTICAL SUPPORT NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER?			
MAJORITY VOTE		☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, VOTE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATION WAS THOROUGH AND COMPLETE?			
MAJORITY VOTE		☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE UOF IS CONSISTENT WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY?			
MAJORITY VOTE		☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATOR'S FINDINGS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE?			
MAJORITY VOTE		☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION			
DISCUSSION		☒ YES ☐ NO			

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☒ YES ☐ NO

CASE #: 20-0005183 TYPE: 10% - LEVEL 2	DATE OF INCIDENT: JANUARY 17, 2020	LOCATION: 4950 MONTGOMERY BLVD NE	TIME: 0905 HOURS

CASE PRESENTER		**DETECTIVE** [redacted]			
INJURIES SUSTAINED		**NO**			
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY		**NO**			
DID THE BOARD REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF RECEIVING THE CASE INFORMATION?		**YES**			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		**DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER FOR:**			
POLICY	**TACTICS**	**EQUIPMENT**	**TRAINING**	**SUPERVISION**	**SUCCESSES**
☒ YES ☐ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		**FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: WAS THE TACTICAL ACTIVATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S SPECIALIZED RESPONSE PROTOCOLS?**			
MAJORITY VOTE		☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		**FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: ARE THERE ANY OTHER CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES RELATED TO THE UNITS THAT REQUESTED TACTICAL SUPPORT NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER?**			
MAJORITY VOTE		☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		**FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, VOTE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATION WAS THOROUGH AND COMPLETE?**			
MAJORITY VOTE		☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		**FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE UOF IS CONSISTENT WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY?**			
MAJORITY VOTE		☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO		**FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATOR'S FINDINGS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE?**			
MAJORITY VOTE					

	☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☒ YES ☐ NO

DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE FOR THE REFERRAL? ☐ YES ☒ NO	REFERRAL INFORMATION
TYPE OF REFERRAL(S):	☒ POLICY DEFICIENCY ☐ POLICY VIOLATION (IAR) ☐ TRAINING ☐ SUPERVISION ☐ EQUIPMENT ☐ TACTICS ☐ SUCCESS (IAR)
REFERRAL(S)	THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A DEFICIENCY RELATED TO THE POLICY SPECIFIC TO HOW THE DEPARTMENT CONDUCTS TACTICAL OPERATIONS, TO INCLUDE DEPLOYMENT OF RESOURCES AND HOW EACH RESOURCE AND/OR PERSONNEL (E.G. UNDERCOVER OFFICERS VS. PLAIN CLOTHES OFFICERS) ARE UTILIZED. INVESTIGATIONS BUREAU WILL REVIEW THE POLICIES SPECIFIC TO HOW THE DEPARTMENT CONDUCTS TACTICAL OPERATIONS, TO INCLUDE DEPLOYMENT OF RESOURCES AND HOW EACH RESOURCE AND/OR PERSONNEL (E.G. UNDERCOVER OFFICERS VS. PLAIN CLOTHES OFFICERS) ARE UTILIZED.
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S)	*COMMANDER* [redacted]
DEADLINE	AUGUST 20, 2020

CASE #: 20-0004664 TYPE: 10% - LEVEL 2	DATE OF INCIDENT: JANUARY 15, 2020 LOCATION: [redacted] TIME: 1510 HOURS
CASE PRESENTER	DETECTIVE [redacted]
INJURIES SUSTAINED	YES
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	NO
DID THE BOARD REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF RECEIVING THE CASE INFORMATION?	YES
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?	DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER FOR:

☐ YES ☒ NO					
POLICY	TACTICS	EQUIPMENT	TRAINING	SUPERVISION	SUCCESSES
☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒NO	☒ YES ☐ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO

DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO	FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: WAS THE TACTICAL ACTIVATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S SPECIALIZED RESPONSE PROTOCOLS?
MAJORITY VOTE	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO	FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: ARE THERE ANY OTHER CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES RELATED TO THE UNITS THAT REQUESTED TACTICAL SUPPORT NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER?
MAJORITY VOTE	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO	FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, VOTE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATION WAS THOROUGH AND COMPLETE?
MAJORITY VOTE	☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO	FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE UOF IS CONSISTENT WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY?
MAJORITY VOTE	☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO	FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATOR'S FINDINGS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE?
MAJORITY VOTE	☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☒ YES ☐ NO

DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE FOR THE REFERRAL? ☐ YES ☒ NO	REFERRAL INFORMATION

TYPE OF REFERRAL(S):	☐ **POLICY DEFICIENCY** ☐ **POLICY VIOLATION (IAR)** ☒ **TRAINING** ☐ **SUPERVISION** ☐ **EQUIPMENT** ☐ **TACTICS** ☐ **SUCCESS (IAR)**
REFERRAL(S)	THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A DEFICIENCY RELATED TO TRAINING, SPECIFIC TO THE RETRAINING OF OFFICER [redacted] (MAN [redacted] REGARDING SAFETY AND SECURING OF HIS EQUIPMENT. THE TRAINING ACADEMY WILL PROVIDE RETRAINING TO OFFICER [redacted] (MAN # [redacted] REGARDING SAFETY AND SECURING OF HIS EQUIPMENT.
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S)	*COMMANDER* [redacted]
DEADLINE	AUGUST 20, 2020

DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE FOR THE REFERRAL? ☐ **YES** ☒ **NO**	**REFERRAL INFORMATION**
TYPE OF REFERRAL(S):	☐ **POLICY DEFICIENCY** ☐ **POLICY VIOLATION (IAR)** ☒ **TRAINING** ☐ **SUPERVISION** ☐ **EQUIPMENT** ☐ **TACTICS** ☐ **SUCCESS (IAR)**
REFERRAL(S)	THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A CONCERN RELATED TO TRAINING, SPECIFIC TO USE OF FORCE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND WARNINGS. THE TRAINING ACADEMY WILL TO RESEARCH USE OF FORCE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND WARNINGS AND ENSURE THEY ARE ENFORCED DURING TIER 4 USE OF FORCE TRAINING AND REINFORCED DURING TASER 7 RECERTIFICATION.
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S)	*COMMANDER* [redacted]
DEADLINE	AUGUST 20, 2020

Next FRB Meeting: July 16, 2020

Approved: [redacted]
Michael J. Geier, Chief of Police