Force Review Board- Chief's Report



CHIEF'S REPORT

MAY 21, 2020

TIME: 1006 TO 1125

HOURS

APD HEADQUARTERS - CHIEF'S CONFERENCE ROOM

FRB CHAIR	Chief of Staff John Ross - via teleconference		
VOTING MEMBERS	DCOP - via teleconference DCOP - via teleconference DCOP - via teleconference Commander - via teleconference - via teleconference - via teleconference		
NON-VOTING MEMBERS	Commander - via teleconference Robyn Rose (City Legal) - via teleconference Edward Harness (CPOA) - via teleconference Lieutenan (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD) Julie Jaramillo (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD)		
REPRESENTATIVES	Commande Licutenant (CIT) - via teleconference Patricia Serna (OPA) - via teleconference		
OBSERVERS	Detective (Presenter/IAFD) - via teleconference Detective (Presenter/IAFD) - via teleconference DCOP (Compliance) Commander (AOD) - via teleconference Lieutenant (AOD) - via teleconference Sergeant (IAFD) - via teleconference Corey Sanders (USDOJ) - via teleconference Elizabeth Martinez (USDOJ) - via teleconference Stephen Ryals (USDOJ) - via teleconference		
PREVIOUS MINUTES	May 14, 2020 - approved		
UNFINISHED BUSINESS	• None		

CASE #: 18-0105978	DATE OF INCIDENT: LOCATION: TIME:1430 HOURS NOVEMBER 11, 2018
TYPE: SERIOUS/OIS	NOVEWBER 11, 2016
CASE PRESENTER	DETECTIVE
INJURIES SUSTAINED	YES
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	YES
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:

				-c = 5		
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				
	XECUTIVE DIRECTION THE PRESENTER		OPPORTUNITY TO	ASK QUESTIONS	OR MAKE A	
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE FOR THE REFERRAL?		REFERRAL INF	ORMATION			

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 BEST PRACTICES ON LONG DISTANCE OPEN AREA ENCOUNTERS ON ARMED SUBJECTS. THE TRAINING ACADEMY WILL RESEARCH BEST PRACTICES ON LONG DISTANCE OPEN AREA ENCOUNTERS ON ARMED SUBJECTS. THE BUREAU OR DIVISION EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR COMPLETING THE REFERRAL IS COMMANDER THE DUE DATE IS JULY 23RD, 2020.			
EMPLOYEE RESP RESPONDING TO		COMMANDER		.	
DEADLINE		July 23, 2020			
CASE #: 20-0004 TYPE: LEVEL 3	795	DATE OF INCIDE JANUARY 15, 20)20	15 57 TH ST	E: 1443 HOURS
CASE PRESENT	ER	DETECTIVE	## P		
INJURIES SUSTA	INJURIES SUSTAINED		YES		
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY		NO			
DID THE BOARD REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF RECEIVING THE CASE INFORMATION?		YES	78 43 43 43	<u>.</u>	
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 Ø NO	□ YES ⊠ NO	☐ YES 図 NO	☐ YES ⊠ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? □ YES ☒ NO		ACTIVATION IN		NLY: WAS THE TA VITH THE DEPART OCOLS?	

 \Box YES $\;\Box$ NO $\;\boxtimes$ NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION

MAJORITY VOTE

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 WHO 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 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 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 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 QUES	TIONS OR MAKE A
STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER?		
⊠ YES □ NO		

Next FRB meeting: May 28, 2020

Approved: Michael J. Geler, Chief of Police