Force Review Board

CHIEF'S REPORT
(P78F)

APRIL 29, 2021

TIME: 0902 TO 1116 HOURS

APD HEADQUARTERS - CHIEF'S CONFERENCE ROOM (VIA TELECONFERENCE)

FRB CHAIR (P78)	DCOP JJ Griego (Management Services and Support Bureau) – via teleconference
VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	DCOP Michael Smathers (Special Operations Bureau) – via teleconference DCOP Donny Olvera (Field Services Bureau) – via teleconference DCOP Arturo Gonzalez (Investigative Bureau) – via teleconference Commander James Collins (Foothills Area Command) – via teleconference A/Commander [redacted] (Training Academy) – via teleconference
NON-VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	Judge Rod Kennedy (Legal) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (FRB Admin Personnel/IAFD) – via teleconference Julie Jaramillo (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD) – via teleconference
REPRESENTATIVES	Commander Cori Lowe (IAFD)- via teleconference A/Commander [redacted] (SOD) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (CIT) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (SOD/CNT) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (SOD) – via teleconference Patricia Serna (OPA) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (SOD/Presenter) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (IAFD/Presenter) – via teleconference DCOP Eric Garcia (Compliance Bureau) – via teleconference Superintendent Sylvester Stanley (Police Reform) – via teleconference Chief of Staff Cecily Barker (Chief's Office) – via teleconference
OBSERVERS (P78b)	Sergeant [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Andrea Jones (SOD/Tactical Support Specialist) – via teleconference Katharine Jacobs (IAFD/Data Analyst II) – via teleconference Michelle Hepfer (IAFD/Data Analyst I) – via teleconference Elizabeth Martinez (USDOJ) – via teleconference Corey Sanders (USDOJ) – via teleconference Stephen Ryals (USDOJ) – via teleconference Sarah Lopez (USDOJ) – via teleconference Yvonnie Demmerritte (USDOJ) – via teleconference
PREVIOUS MINUTES	April 22, 2021
UNFINISHED BUSINESS	• None

REFERRAL RESPONSE(S)

CASE NUMBER	MEETING DATE	REFERRAL	REFERRAL PARTY	ACTION TAKEN	STATUS
19-0031543	11/19/2020	Send the case back to IAFD for	Commander Cori Lowe	Commander Lowe provided an extension	Update due May 28, 2021

		additional investigation specifically to review the potential vehicle pursuit and conduct additional interviews regarding the use of force, specific to shows of force in this case.		memo requesting another month for completion.	
20-0024693	3/25/2021	Policy and Procedure Manager Patricia Serna will complete a special order and amend policy to ensure medical care of an individual takes precedence over an administrative interview	Policy Manager Patricia Serna	Policy Manager Patricia Serna provided a copy of the Special Order Draft.	Closed
20-0055810	3/25/2021	Policy and Procedure Manager Patricia Serna will complete a policy revision to SOP 2-8 to determine when OBRD recordings are required when an officer is following and/or pursuing a vehicle.	Policy Manager Patricia Serna	Patricia Serna submitted an SOP recommendation for SOP 2-8 to capture the FRB's referral. During the next revision cycle for the SOP, she will work with the Policy Owner for 2-8 to revise the SOP in response to the FRB's referral.	Closed

USE OF FORCE 1ST QUARTER REPORT	
PRESENTERS	KATHARINE JACOBS MICHELLE HEPFER
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. SEEING A CORRELATION BETWEEN USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS AND BUS STOP LOCATIONS IN THE FOOTHILLS AREA COMMAND. 2. REQUEST TO PROVIDE LARGER VARIANCE BETWEEN THE COLORS ON THE DOT MAP 3. WAS THE PTC ACCOUNTED FOR IN USE OF FORCE DATA REPORT? A. YES, THERE WERE SIX USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS THIS QUARTER. 4. WHEN THERE IS AN EFFECTIVE APPLICATION OF FORCE ARE THERE LESS APPLICATIONS OF FORCE USED? A. CANNOT MAKE DETERMINATION BASED SOLELY FROM GRAPH. 5. WHAT CONSTITUTES A "NULL VALUE"? A. VALUES NOT YET ENTERED INTO THE SYSTEM.

	6. DOES THE RISE IN EFFECTIVE APPLICATIONS OF FORCE IN WARMER MONTHS HAVE TO DO WITH LESS AND/OR LIGHTER LAYERS OF CLOTHING BEING WORN? A. THIS IS THE ASSUMPTION; HOWEVER, WHEN IT WAS BROKEN DOWN, THERE WERE NO TRENDS IDENTIFIED AS TO HAVING MORE EFFECTIVENESS IN THE WARMER MONTHS. 7. REQUEST FOR DATA TO SHOW THE BUREAU/DIVISION WHERE USE OF FORCE IS BOTH IN AND OUT OF COMPLIANCE. A. WILL INCLUDE MOVING FORWARD.

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☐ YES ☒ NO (DIRECTOR HARNESS WAS NOT PRESENT)	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. N/A

CASE #: 20-0015405 TYPE: LEVEL 3 (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: FEBRUARY 18, 2020	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 0529 HOURS
CASE PRESENTER	DETECTIVE [redacted]		
DID THE LEAD DETECTIVE PRESENT THE CASE? (P78b)	☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE		
WHY DID THE LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT PRESENT THE CASE?	☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NO LONGER IN UNIT ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT AVAILABLE TO PRESENT ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR WAS CASE PRESENTER ☒ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR PRESENT AS SME ☐ NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION		
INJURIES SUSTAINED	☒ YES ☐ NO		
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	☐ YES ☒ NO		
DID EACH VOTING MEMBER OF THE FORCE REVIEW BOARD REVIEW THE MATERIAL PRIOR TO THE MEETING? (IN THE EVENT A VOTING MEMBER DID NOT REVIEW THE MATERIAL, THEY WILL BE INELIGIBLE TO VOTE ON THE CASE. THIS WILL RESULT IN THE BELOW QUESTION "DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE," TO BE ANSWERED 'YES".)	FIELD SERVICES DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT		

DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION? (P78a)	☐ YES ☒ NO					
DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)	☐ YES ☒ NO					
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:					
(P78a)	POLICY	TACTICS	EQUIPMENT	TRAINING	SUPERVISION	SUCCESSES
	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☒ YES ☐ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO
WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?	☐ YES ☒ NO					
PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ENTERING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS REQUEST (IAR)	N/A					
SOP TITLE OF VIOLATION	N/A					
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? (P78a)					
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? (P78d)					
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? (P78a)
MAJORITY VOTE	☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. IS THE INVOLVED INDIVIDUAL ON CIT'S CASELOAD? A. YES SINCE 2018. B. CIT'S ATTEMPTS TO CONTACT THE INDIVIDUAL HAVE BEEN UNSUCCESSFUL THUS FAR. 2. WERE TRAINING ISSUES REGARDING THE MIRANDA RESOLVED? A. YES, THE TRAINING REFERRAL WAS COMPLETED. 3. WAS THE OFFICER ECIT CERTIFIED AT THE TIME OF THE CALL? A. OFFICER ; BECAME ECIT CERTIFIED ON 1.11.2021. 4. DOES THE NORTHWEST SUBSTATION HAVE SURVEILLANCE IN THE HOLDING CELLS? A. YES; HOWEVER, IT WAS NOT OPERATIONAL. 5. DO THE OTHER SUBSTATIONS HAVE SURVEILLANCE IN THE HOLDING CELLS? A. SOUTHEAST – YES. B. FOOTHILLS – YES. ALL FEED TO A MONITOR IN THE HALL AND ONE MONITOR IN THE BRIEFING ROOM. C. UNKNOWN FOR OTHER AREA COMMANDS. I. REFERRAL GENERATED. 6. DID THE INDIVIDUAL HAVE A SEIZURE? A. UNKNOWN IF THEY HAD A SEIZURE. 7. CONCERN THIS INCIDENT COULD HAVE RESULTED IN MUCH MORE SEVERE INJURY. A. OFFICER WAS PROFESSIONAL THROUGHOUT CONTACT. B. OBRD WAS PROPERLY RUNNING DURING INCIDENT. C. OFFICER WAS ATTEMPTING TO GAIN DISTANCE, WHICH WAS AN APPROPRIATE RESPONSE. D. INTENTION WAS NOT TO CAUSE INJURY. E. THE OFFICER HAD THE RIGHT TO DO THIS BASED ON THE INVESTIGATION CONDUCTED. I. AT SOME POINT, WE NEED TO BELIEVE THE OFFICER AND THE INVESTIGATION THAT OCCURS EVEN THOUGH THERE IS NOT DIRECT VIDEO OF THE CONTACT. 8. IS THERE TRAINING FOR GAINING DISTANCE FROM AN INDIVIDUAL? A. YES WITH A PUSH OFF TO GAIN DISTANCE; HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL OF INJURY

	COMPLETING THIS ON A HANDCUFFED INDIVIDUAL IS A CONCERN. B. OFFICER'S INTENT WAS TO SEPARATE FROM THE INDIVIDUAL TO PREVENT INJURY TO THE OFFICER. I. NEW MORE EFFECTIVE GENERAL ESCORT POSITION SHOULD REMEDIATE THIS CONCERN. 9. WAS THERE INDICATION THE INDIVIDUAL WAS GOING TO BECOME COMBATIVE AND IF SO, WOULD HAVING TWO OFFICERS PRESENT BE APPROPRIATE? A. INDIVIDUAL WAS COMPLIANT WHEN ARRESTED. B. THE INDIVIDUAL BECAME AGITATED DURING THE TRANSPORT. 10. MEDICAL ATTENTION WAS NOT IMMEDIATELY REQUESTED DUE TO THE OFFICER NOT KNOWING THE INDIVIDUAL WAS INJURED. IS THERE ANYTHING THE OFFICER COULD HAVE DONE TO GET CLOSER TO EVALUATE FOR INJURIES? A. THE OFFICER DID NOT WANT TO INDUCE ANOTHER USE OF FORCE. B. WHILE HE DID NOT IMMEDIATELY REQUEST RESCUE, ANOTHER OFFICER PRESENT OBSERVED THE INDIVIDUAL BLEEDING AND IMMEDIATELY REQUESTED RESCUE. 11. IMPROPER CLASSIFICATION OF THE LEVEL OF FORCE WAS PROPERLY ADDRESSED IN A PREVIOUS REFERRAL. A. CORRECT.

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☐ YES ☒ NO (DIRECTOR HARNESS WAS NOT PRESENT)	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1 N/A

DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE FOR THE REFERRAL? ☐ YES ☒ NO	REFERRAL INFORMATION
TYPE OF REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	☐ POLICY ☐ POLICY VIOLATION (IAR) ☐ TRAINING ☐ SUPERVISION ☒ EQUIPMENT ☐ TACTICS ☐ SUCCESS (IAR)
REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A DEFICIENCY/CONCERN RELATED TO EQUIPMENT. DEPUTY CHIEF JJ GRIEGO WILL ENSURE ALL

	SUBSTATIONS AND THE PTC ARE CHECKED FOR THE ADEQUACY OF THE VIDEO RECORDING EQUIPMENT IN THE PRISONER HOLDING AREAS
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	DEPUTY CHIEF JJ GRIEGO
DEADLINE: (P78e)	MAY 31, 2021

CASE #: 21-0010315	DATE OF INCIDENT: FEBRUARY 7, 2021	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1801 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 1830 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 2007 HOURS
TYPE: SOD (P73)			

CASE PRESENTER	LIEUTENANT
DID THE LEAD DETECTIVE PRESENT THE CASE? (P78b)	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT APPLICABLE
WHY DID THE LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT PRESENT THE CASE?	☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NO LONGER IN UNIT ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT AVAILABLE TO PRESENT ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR WAS CASE PRESENTER ☐ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR PRESENT AS SME ☒ NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION
INJURIES SUSTAINED	☐ YES ☒ NO
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	☐ YES ☒ NO
DID EACH VOTING MEMBER OF THE FORCE REVIEW BOARD REVIEW THE MATERIAL PRIOR TO THE MEETING? (IN THE EVENT A VOTING MEMBER DID NOT REVIEW THE MATERIAL THEY WILL BE INELIGIBLE TO VOTE ON THE CASE. THIS WILL RESULT IN THE BELOW QUESTION "DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE." TO BE ANSWERED "YES".)	FIELD SERVICES DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT
DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE	☐ YES ☒ NO

INVESTIGATION? (P78a)						
DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)			☐ YES ☒ NO			
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:			
(P78e):	POLICY	TACTICS	EQUIPMENT	TRAINING	SUPERVISION	SUCCESSES
	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☒ YES ☐ NO
WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?			☐ YES ☒ NO			
PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ENTERING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS REQUEST (IAR)			N/A			
SOP TITLE OF VIOLATION			N/A			
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? (P78a)			
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? (P78d)			
MAJORITY VOTE			☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?			FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATOR'S			

☐ YES ☒ NO	FINDINGS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE? (P78a)
MAJORITY VOTE	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. WERE THE INDIVIDUALS ON SCENE WHO WERE HANDCUFFED THE OFFENDERS IN THE INCIDENT? A. UNKNOWN. ONCE SOD HANDS TURNS THE INDIVIDUALS OVER THE INVESTIGATORS, THE OUTCOME OF THE INVESTIGATION IS NOT PROVIDED TO SOD PERSONNEL. 2. WHY ARE INDIVIDUALS HANDCUFFED BY SOD? A. PROTOCOL TO LIMIT OFFICER SAFETY CONCERN WHILE SOD CONTINUES THEIR FOCUS ON THE LOCATION THEY ARE CONTACTING. 3. DID SOD KNOW WHO THE TARGET INDIVIDUALS THEY WERE LOOKING FOR DURING THEIR ACTIVATION? A. THERE WERE SEVERAL ACTIVE SCENES, TO INCLUDE MOBILE SURVEILLANCE. B. IT WAS UNKNOWN WHO THE DIRECT TARGETS WERE; HOWEVER, IT WAS KNOWN THE TARGET LOCATION CONTAINED INSTRUMENTS FROM THE CRIME. 4. CONCERNS REGARDING TIME DELAY IN OBTAINING WARRANTS? A. A FEW ISSUES WORKED THROUGH DURING THIS ACTIVATION. I. DETERMINATION BETWEEN ROBBERY UNIT AND ISU ON WHO WAS COMPLETING THE WARRANTS. II. TIME DELAY WITH DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. III. NEW TECHNICAL ISSUES THEY WERE HAVING TO WORK THROUGH WITH THE DIGITAL SIGNATURES. 5. ANOTHER GREAT EXAMPLE OF GOOD COMMANDS CREATING POSITIVE OUTCOMES. A. JOB WELL DONE BLUETEAM ENTRY TO BE COMPLETED.

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☐ YES ☒ NO (DIRECTOR HARNESS WAS NOT PRESENT)	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. N/A

DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE FOR THE REFERRAL? ☐ YES ☒ NO	REFERRAL INFORMATION
TYPE OF REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	☐ POLICY ☐ POLICY VIOLATION (IAR) ☐ TRAINING ☐ SUPERVISION ☐ EQUIPMENT ☐ TACTICS ☒ SUCCESS (IAR)
REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A DEFICIENCY/CONCERN RELATED TO A SUCCESS. COMMANDER JAMES COLLINS WILL COMPLETE A JOB WELL DONE BLUETEAM ENTRY REGARDING POSITIVE OUTCOMES BY SOD PERSONNEL
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	COMMANDER JAMES COLLINS
DEADLINE: (P78e)	MAY 31 2021

CASE #: 20-0078615	DATE OF INCIDENT: AUGUST 29, 2020	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 0750 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 1006 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 1130 HOURS
TYPE: SOD (P78)			

CASE PRESENTER	LIEUTENANT [redacted]
DID THE LEAD DETECTIVE PRESENT THE CASE? (P78b)	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT APPLICABLE
WHY DID THE LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT PRESENT THE CASE?	☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NO LONGER IN UNIT ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT AVAILABLE TO PRESENT ☐ LEAD INVESTIGATOR WAS CASE PRESENTER ☐ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR PRESENT AS SME ☒ NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION
INJURIES SUSTAINED	☒ YES ☐ NO
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	☒ YES ☐ NO
DID EACH VOTING MEMBER OF THE FORCE REVIEW BOARD REVIEW THE MATERIAL PRIOR TO THE MEETING?	FIELD SERVICES DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT

(IN THE EVENT A VOTING MEMBER DID NOT REVIEW THE MATERIAL THEY WILL BE INELIGIBLE TO VOTE ON THE CASE THIS WILL RESULT IN THE BELOW QUESTION "DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE," TO BE ANSWERED "YES".)	ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT
DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION? (P78a)	☐ YES ☒ NO
DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)	☐ YES ☒ NO
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:

(P78e)	POLICY	TACTICS	EQUIPMENT	TRAINING	SUPERVISION	SUCCESSES
	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO

WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?	☐ YES ☒ NO
PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ENTERING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS REQUEST (IAR)	N/A
SOP TITLE OF VIOLATION	N/A
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ NO	<u>FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY</u>: 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	<u>FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY</u>: 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? (P78a)
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? (P78d)
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? (P78a)
MAJORITY VOTE	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. CONCERNS REGARDING USE OF 40MM ON AN ELEVATED PLATFORM. A. CONSIDERATIONS WERE MADE BEFORE THE DEPLOYMENT OCCURRED. 2. EXAMPLES OF HOW QUESTIONS HAVE EVOLVED ON DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT TO ACTIVATE SOD. A. NEED FOR EXIGENCY. I. THUS FAR IN 2021, THERE HAVE BEEN 23 TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS AND 15 DENIED ACTIVATIONS. 1. EXAMPLE OF DENIED ACTIVATION – SERGEANT CALLED REFERENCE A FELONY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDER WHO BATTERED VICTIM WITH A METAL POLE. UPON FURTHER QUESTIONING, IT WAS DIVULGED THE "METAL POLE" WAS A CURTAIN ROD; THEREFORE, SOD DETERMINED IT WAS NOT NECESSARY TO ACTIVATE. 3. WHAT WERE THE FIELD'S ACTIONS ON THE AFOREMENTIONED DENIED ACTIVATION? A. VICTIM AND CHILDREN WERE REMOVED TO A SAFE LOCATION. 4. WERE THE TWO LEVEL 1 USES OF FORCE (SHOWS OF FORCE) IDENTIFIED ON THE AAR INVESTIGATED BY IAFD? A. UNKNOWN OF IAFDS FOLLOW-UP, WOULD HAVE TO CONFER WITH IAFD.

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☐ YES ☒ NO (DIRECTOR HARNESS WAS NOT PRESENT)	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. N/A

Next FRB Meeting: May 6, 2021

Signed: _____

Harold Medina, Chief of Police