Force Review Board

CHIEF'S REPORT (P78F)

APRIL 1, 2021

TIME: 1002 TO 1223 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 Commander [redacted] (Investigative Bureau designee) – via teleconference Commander [redacted] (Foothills Area Command) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (Training Academy) – via teleconference
NON-VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	Judge Rod Kennedy (Legal) – via teleconference Edward Harness (CPOA Director) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (FRB Admin Personnel/IAFD) – via teleconference Julie Jaramillo (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD) – via teleconference
REPRESENTATIVES	A/Commander [redacted] (SOD) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (CIT) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (CNT) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (SOD) – via teledonference Patricia Serna (OPA) – via teleconference
OBSERVERS (P78b)	Lieutenant [redacted] (Presenter / SOD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (Presenter / IAFD) – via teleconference DCOP Eric Garcia (Compliance) – via teleconference Superintendent Sylvester Stanley (Police Reform) – via teleconference A/ Deputy Commander [redacted] (TDY – IAFD) – via teleconference A/ Lieutenant [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (Observing for IAFD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] IAFD) – via teleconference Christine Bodo (DOJ Policy and Training) – via teleconference Andrea Jones (SOD – Tactical Support Specialist) – via teleconference Elizabeth Martinez (USDOJ) – via teleconference Corey Sanders (USDOJ) – via teleconference Stephen Ryals (USDOJ) – via teleconference Sarah Lopez (USDOJ) – via teleconference
PREVIOUS MINUTES	March 25, 2021
UNFINISHED BUSINESS	• None

REFERRAL RESPONSE(S)					
CASE NUMBER	**MEETING DATE**	**REFERRAL**	**REFERRAL PARTY**	**ACTION TAKEN**	**STATUS**
20-0010100	10/29/2020	The Training Academy will ensure Sergeant Whitten successfully attends the 2020 Supervisor Training and provide verification of his attendance to the Force Review Board.	Lieutenant [redacted]	Sergeant [redacted] provided a memo advising the referral is complete	Closed
20-0007132	12/10/2020	Commander [redacted] will create a task force to study best practices for communication between dispatch, specialized units, and field services during a critical incident.	Commander [redacted]	Commander [redacted] provided an update on March 24, 2021.	Closed
20-0072103	1/26/2021	The Training Academy will create a PowerDMS training to cover investigative detentions versus arrests, how to differentiate them, and handle them properly.	Lieutenant [redacted]	Sergeant [redacted] provided a memo requesting to close out this referral as it is duplicative to a referral being completed by city legal.	Closed
20-0064745	2/4/2021	IAFD shall research and address in the IAFD Newsletter information regarding an individual having the ability to speak and still risk positional asphyxia.	Sergeant [redacted]	Sgt. [redacted] provided the following response. Referral has been addressed in the IAFD Newsletter Issue 11.	Closed
20-0020662	3/11/2021	SOD Commander [redacted] will 1) Identify and address deployment criteria to increase the initial review and assessment prior to any deployment; 2) consider ways to add announcements	Commander [redacted]	A/Commander [redacted] provided a response to the referral.	Closed

		and surrender demands prior to entry into confined spaces and/or structures; 3) greatly restrict layered response with a PSD; 4) add restrictions to building search requests to ensure SOD chain of command review prior to PSD Deployment; and 5) consider only allowing unmuzzled searches of a commercial structure when the RP is present and is willing to prosecute and there is a clear indication someone is inside who has committed a felony and/or is believed to be armed.			

CASE #: 20-0044218	DATE OF INCIDENT: JUNE 6, 2020	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1036 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 1154 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 1252 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	FIELD SERVICES DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT

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')	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	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? (P78e)
MAJORITY VOTE	☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. DID THIS CALL MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A PSD DEPLOYMENT? A. YES. PROPER SERIES OF PROGRESSION FOR PSD CONTACT. 1. CHEMICAL DEPLOYMENT AND DRONE CONTACT BOTH FAILED, LEADING TO LAST OPTION OF SEARCHING BEHIND A PSD. 2. FOR HIS DIGNITY, DID DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL PROVIDE CLOTHING FOR THE INDIVIDUAL? A. YES HE WAS WRAPPED IN A GARMENT WHILE HE WAS STILL ON THE BALCONY AND PRIOR TO WALKING DOWNSTAIRS. 3. DOES SOD USE A BEHAVIOR HEALTH SPECIALIST? A. DID NOT HAVE ONE DURING THIS TIME. SOD IS IN THE PROCESS OF HIRING A NEW CLINICIAN. 4. WOULD ANYTHING BE DONE DIFFERENTLY IF THIS CALL WERE TO HAPPEN TODAY? A. YES. SOME THINGS WOULD BE ONCE ARRIVING ON SCENE, A COMPLETE CRIMINAL HISTORY OF THE OFFENDER WOULD OCCUR, AND A MORE IN DEPTH INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE ALLEGATIONS OF THE CRIME TO ENSURE IT MEETS THE NEED FOR A TACTICAL RESPONSE. 5. IF IT DOES NOT MEET THE TACTICAL CALL OUT CRITERIA, WHAT HAPPENS REGARDING THE FIELD SERVICES RESPONSE? A. SOD WOULD ASSIST FIELD SERVICES TO TACTICALLY WITHDRAW, COMPLETE A DEBRIEF, AND CLEAR THE SCENE. THE SITUATION CAN

ALWAYS BE REASSESSED IF THE INDIVIDUAL BECOMES A DANGER TO THE PUBLIC.

6. DOES SOD CONSULT WITH SID WHEN AN INCIDENT DOES NOT MEET THE TACTICAL ACTIVATION CRITERIA BUT DISENGAGEMENT IS ALSO NOT A GOOD IDEA?
    A. YES. IF THEY SOD IS NOT GOING TO RESPOND, AN EVALUATION TAKES PLACE PRIOR TO DISENGAGEMENT.
7. ASSESSMENT TO USE SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS WHEN AN INDIVIDUAL IS USING THEM DURING AN ACTIVATION?
    A. YES. IN THE EVENT IT IS AN OPEN SOURCE, OFFICERS ARE FREE TO COMMUNICATE WITH THEM. IF IT IS A CLOSED SOURCE, OFFICERS HAVE TO GET A WARRANT TO GET INFORMATION FROM SOCIAL MEDIA.
8. COMMENDED PROGRESS FOR CHANGES TO THE PROCESS.
9. INDICATION THERE WAS A "HISTORY" ON THE INDIVIDUAL. DID OFFICERS ON SCENE KNOW THIS AND DID THIS PLAY INTO THE DECISION-MAKING?
    A. YES, IT WAS KNOWN TO OFFICERS AND PLAYED A ROLE IN THEIR DECISION-MAKING; HOWEVER, THE MOST IMPORTANT PART OF THIS IS THE COMMUNICATION WITH THE INDIVIDUAL. WHEN THEY WILL NOT COMMUNICATE, IT BECOMES ORDERS ONLY.
10. WERE OFFICERS AWARE OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S CRIMINAL HISTORY?
    A. YES. IT WAS KNOWN PRIOR TO CONTACT.
11. WHAT IS SOD DOING TO GET A NEW CLINICIAN HIRED?
    A. CURRENTLY USING CNT TO FILL VOID.
    B. WORKING ON JOB DESCRIPTION TO GET POSTED.
12. WAS THE AMOUNT OF GAS ADMINISTERED IN LINE WITH THE GAS DEPLOYMENT PLAN?
    A. YES. FULL SATURATION IS NECESSARY AND HIERARCHY OF TYPE OF DEPLOYMENT IS BASED ON WHERE OFFICERS CAN DEPLOY FROM (E.G. DEPLOYMENT WITH DISTANCE VS. CLOSE UP)
13. TIME DISPARITY ON AAR.
    A. DISPARITY BETWEEN POWERPOINT AND AAR COULD BE CLERICAL MISTAKE.
    B. RELY ON NOTES TAKEN BY TACTICAL COMMANDER AS TO WHEN SIGNIFICANT EVENTS OCCUR DURING A TACTICAL ACTIVATION.
    C. THERE CAN BE A TIME VARIANCE BETWEEN THE COMMANDER'S NOTES AND DISPATCH ADDING IT TO THE CAD.
14. WHY DID SOD HAVE SHOT GUNS?
    A. THOSE ARE THE BREECHING OFFICERS TO ADDRESS THE NEED FOR A MECHANICAL BREECH WHEN CLEARING.
    B. NOT FOR USE ON A PERSON.
15. WAS THERE AN APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF EFFORT FROM THE FIELD TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE INDIVIDUAL?

	A. YES. PA'S AND FACE-TO-FACE CONTACT OCCURRED. B. DURING THE CONTACT, THE INDIVIDUAL BEGAN THROWING DANGEROUS ITEMS SO OFFICERS WERE FORCED TO RETREAT FOR SAFETY. 15. DOES SOD TRACK OCCURRENCES WHERE THEY ARE REQUESTED BUT DO NOT RESPOND? A. YES AND AN ASSESSMENT OF THE REASON IS COMPLETED AND FILED INTERNALLY WITH SOD. B. THE ASSESSMENT IS ALSO AND PROVIDED TO THE EFFECTED COMMANDER.

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☒ YES ☐ NO	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. NONE.

CASE #: 20-0050806 TYPE: SOD (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: JUNE 26, 2020	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 0904 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 0940 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 1020 HOURS
CASE PRESENTER	LIEUTENANT [redacted]		
DID THE LEAD DETECTIVE PRESENT THE CASE? (P78c)	☐ 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? (P79a)	☐ 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	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. WHAT IS STEALTH PROBE CONTACT? A. IN THIS CASE, THE VICTIM WAS PARAPLEGIC BUT THE ACTION WAS NEEDED TO ENSURE HER SAFE REMOVAL AS THEY BELIEVED SHE WAS BEING COERCED IN GIVING HER ANSWERS TO OFFICERS. 2. COMMENDED OFFICERS' ACTIONS. 3. WHY WERE ONLY SOME OF THE INDIVIDUALS WHO EXITED THE RESIDENCE INTERVIEWED? A. UNKNOWN; HOWEVER, THE NEW PROCESS WILL MITIGATE THIS FROM OCCURRING. I. WITH THE NEW PROCESS, CNT RESPONDS EARLIER THAN THE REST OF THE TEAM IN ORDER TO COMPLETE INTELLIGENCE GATHERING. 4. WHERE DOES STEALTH PROBE TRAINING COME FROM? A. IT IS PART OF A COVERT RESPONSE TRAINING PACKAGE GIVEN DURING COVERT ENTRY TRAINING. 5. IS STEALTH PROBE TRAINING AN APD DEVELOPED PRACTICE? A. NO, IT IS TAUGHT IN BASIC SWAT SCHOOL AND BEST PRACTICES ACROSS THE COUNTRY. 6. HOW DID OFFICERS CIRCUMVENT A SEARCH WARRANT TO REMOVE THE VICTIM FROM THE RESIDENCE? A. THE EXTRACTION OF THE FEMALE FELL UNDER THE COMMUNITY CARETAKER WARRANTLESS ENTRY CLAUSE. 7. DOES HAVING SOMEONE WHO IS NOT AMBULATORY CHANGE SOD'S RESPONSE, SPECIFICALLY CHEMICAL MUNITIONS? A. YES, IT WILL ALTER THE PROGRESSION OF SOD'S RESPONSE. SOD WILL POTENTIALLY USE A ROBOT, THROWBOT, DRONE, ETC. TO MAKE ENTRY.

	8. WHY NOT USE THESE AVAILABLE OPTIONS ON OTHER TACTICAL DEPLOYMENTS OVER CHEMICAL MUNITIONS? A. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS LIMIT THE USE OF THE OTHER OPTIONS. 9 WHY WAS THE THROW PHONE SUCCESSFUL DURING THIS INCIDENT? CAN OFFICERS USE THE SAME TACTICS TO MAKE THE DEVICE MORE SUCCESSFUL IN FUTURE EVENTS? A. DURING THIS CALL, THE DOOR TO THE RESIDENCE WAS OPENED. OFFICERS TOOK THIS OPPORTUNITY TO THROW THE PHONE INSIDE BEFORE IT CLOSED. THIS IS NOT A COMMONLY AVAILABLE OPTION. 10. ARE OFFICERS BEING TRAINED ON USING SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS TO COMMUNICATE WITH INDIVIDUALS? A. YES, SERGEANT [redacted] TEACHES A SOCIAL MEDIA COMMUNICATION CLASS TO TRAIN OFFICERS TO COMMUNICATE WITH THESE PLATFORMS. B. SOD LOOKS INTO THIS COMMUNICATION OPTION ON EVERY DEPLOYMENT. 11 HOW HAS SOD IMPROVED COMMUNICATION EFFORTS MOVING FORWARD? A. CNT OFFICER OR TEAM RESPONDS BEFORE THE REST OF THE TEAM TO GET THE MOST UP TO DATE INFORMATION FROM THOSE ON SCENE FOR INTELLIGENCE GATHERING. 12. ON AAR UNDER THE "DAMAGE" SECTION, IT IDENTIFIES THE ROOK DAMAGED A GARAGE DOOR IN ORDER TO ENTER CHEMICAL MUNITIONS. THIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED IN THE BODY OF THE AAR. A. CLERICAL ERROR ON AAR. THIS WAS INADVERTENTLY LEFT ON THE AAR TEMPLATE FROM A PREVIOUS ACTIVATION. B. CORRECTIONS TO THE PROCESS MADE TO ENSURE THIS WILL NOT HAPPEN IN THE FUTURE. 13. IS THE AAR COMPLETED BEFORE OR AFTER A USE OF FORCE INVESTIGATION IS COMPLETE? A. BEFORE. IN THE EVENT CONCERNS ARE IDENTIFIED (E.G. INFORMATION GATHERED, APPROPRIATE IAR, NOTIFICATION TO IAFD, ETC.) AND AMENDED AAR WOULD BE COMPLETED.

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☒ YES ☐ NO	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. NONE

CASE #: 20-0017623 TYPE: LEVEL 3 (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: FEBRUARY 24, 2020	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1627 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:

(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? (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 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? (P78d)
MAJORITY VOTE	☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. WAS TACTICAL CALLED ON THIS DUE TO IT BEING A BARRICADED INDIVIDUAL? A. THE CALL WAS TO THE K-9 SERGEANT, [redacted] WHO WAS ON DUTY AND CAME TO THE CALL, WITH SERGEANT [redacted] B. PA'S GIVEN WORKED IMMEDIATELY; THEREFORE, A TACTICAL ACTIVATION WAS NOT NECESSARY.

	2. THE DETECTIVE ACTING AS LETHAL COVERAGE WANTED TO CREATE DISTANCE AND COULD NOT BACK UP DUE TO A VEHICLE BEHIND HIM. HAD HE USED HIS HANDS TO CREATE DISTANCE, WOULD THIS HAVE BEEN DETERMINED TO BE THE APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF FORCE? A. IAFD INVESTIGATING DETECTIVE AGREED AND STRUGGLED WITH THEIR DECISION. DETERMINED COMMUNICATION ISSUES BY DETECTIVE #1 CAUSED THE ISSUES OF THE INDIVIDUAL GETTING TOO CLOSE TO THE LETHAL COVERAGE. 3. WHAT ELSE WAS THE LETHAL COVERAGE OFFICER TO DO? A. TELL THE INDIVIDUAL TO STOP AND PROVIDE HIM DIRECTION OF WHAT THE DETECTIVE WANTED HIM TO DO. 4. THIS WAS A PREVENTABLE USE OF FORCE BY NOT ALLOWING THE INDIVIDUAL TO GET SO CLOSE AND PROVIDING CLEAR DIRECTION. A. CORRECT AND WAS IDENTIFIED AS AN ADDITIONAL CONCERN ON THE ORIGINAL INVESTIGATION. I. IAFD LIEUTENANT CONTACTED THE EFFECTED UNIT AND COMPLETED A MEMO OF THE CONCERNS ADDRESSED. 1. SERGEANT [redacted] ADVISED HE WILL PROVIDE A COPY OF THE MEMO TO THE FRB VIA EMAIL. 5. OTHER POSSIBLE ISSUE WAS TDY DETECTIVE NOT HAVING OPPORTUNITY TO TRAIN WITH THIS UNIT TO ENSURE CLEAR COMMUNICATION. 6. VERIFICATION RESISTED HANDCUFFING IS A LEVEL ONE. 7. WAS A SERGEANT ASSIGNED TO THIS UNIT AT THE TIME OF THE INCIDENT? IF SO, WERE THEY PRESENT ON THE CALL? A. SERGEANT ASSIGNED TO UNIT WAS NOT ON CALL; HOWEVER, TWO K-9 SERGEANTS WERE PRESENT. 8. EXPRESSED CONCERNS REGARDING WHAT DETECTIVE #1 REPORTED VERSUS WHAT OCCURRED WERE NOT THE SAME; HOWEVER, THESE CONCERNS WERE ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED BY IAFD.

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☑ YES ☐ NO	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. EXPRESSED CONCERNS OF SUPERVISION AND TRAINING. 2. ASKED IF DETECTIVE ON LETHAL COVERAGE IS STILL WITH THE UNIT. A. NO HE IS NOT.

	3. EXTENT OF IAR? A. UNKNOWN 4. QUESTION VERACITY OF DETECTIVE'S STATEMENT REGARDING BEING FEARFUL DUE TO INDIVIDUAL'S HISTORY. 5. CONCURS WITH IAFD'S FINDINGS.

Next FRB Meeting: April 8, 2021

Signed: _____

Harold Medina, Chief of Police