Force Review Board- Chief's Report

CHIEF'S REPORT
(P78F)

SEPTEMBER 10, 2020 **TIME: 1100 TO 1245 HOURS**

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

FRB CHAIR (P78)	Deputy Chief of Staff [redacted]
VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	DCOP [redacted] via teleconference DCOP [redacted] – via teleconference Commander [redacted] – via teleconference Commander [redacted] – via teleconference
NON-VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	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] (IAFD) – via teleconference Commander [redacted] (SOD)- via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (CIT) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (CNT) – via teleconference Officer [redacted] (SOD) – via teleconference Patricia Serna (OPA) – via teleconference
OBSERVERS (P78b)	Sergeant [redacted] (Presenter/SOD) Detective [redacted] (Presenter/IAFD) – via teleconference DCOP [redacted] (Compliance) Commander [redacted] (AOD) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (SOD) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (SOD) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (TDY IAFD) – via teleconference Esteban Aguilar (City Legal) – via teleconference Tina Archuleta (SOD) –via teleconference Elizabeth Martinez (USDOJ) – via teleconference Stephen Ryals (USDOJ) – via teleconference Patrick Kent (USDOJ) – via teleconference Corey Sanders (USDOJ) – via teleconference Yvonnie Demmerritte (USDOJ) – via teleconference
PREVIOUS MINUTES	August 3, 2020 - approved
UNFINISHED BUSINESS	• None

CASE #: 19-0094657	DATE OF INCIDENT: OCTOBER 14, 2019	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 0203 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 0320 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 0425 HOURS
TYPE: SOD (P78)			

CASE PRESENTER	**SERGEANT [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 ☒ NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION
INJURIES SUSTAINED	☒ YES ☐ NO
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	☒ YES ☐ NO
DID THE BOARD REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF RECEIVING THE CASE INFORMATION? (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

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

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): (P78e)	☐ POLICY DEFICIENCY ☐ POLICY VIOLATION (IAR) ☒ TRAINING ☐ SUPERVISION ☐ EQUIPMENT ☐ TACTICS ☐ SUCCESS (IAR)
REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A CONCERN RELATED TO TRAINING, SPECIFIC TO THE NEED FOR A CRITICAL ANALYSIS TO BE CONDUCTED AFTER TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS TO DETERMINE IF ANYTHING CAN BE IMPROVED UPON IN THE PROCESS REGARDING TACTICS, EQUIPMENT, TRAINING, POLICY, AND SUPERVISION. THE SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION WILL CONDUCT A CRITICAL ANALYSIS AFTER TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS TO DETERMINE IF ANYTHING CAN BE IMPROVED UPON IN THE PROCESS REGARDING TACTICS, EQUIPMENT, TRAINING, POLICY, AND SUPERVISION.

EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	COMMANDER [redacted]
DEADLINE: (P78e)	October 1, 2020

CASE #: 19-0094605/19-0094657 TYPE: LEVEL 3 (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: OCTOBER 14, 2020	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 0202 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 ☐ NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION
INJURIES SUSTAINED	☒ YES ☐ NO
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	☒ YES ☐ NO
DID THE BOARD REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF RECEIVING THE CASE INFORMATION? (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

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

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

Next FRB Meeting: September 17, 2020

~~Approved:~~ [redacted] Interim Chief of Police

Received

Force Review Board- Chief's Report

CHIEF'S REPORT	JULY 23, 2020	TIME: 1007 TO 1143 HOURS	APD HEADQUARTERS - CHIEF'S CONFERENCE ROOM (VIA TELECONFERENCE)

FRB CHAIR	Chief of Staff John Ross
VOTING MEMBERS	DCOP [redacted] via teleconference DCOP [redacted] – via teleconference DCOP [redacted] ia teleconference Commander [redacted] – via teleconference Commander [redacted] via teleconference
NON-VOTING MEMBERS	Robyn Rose (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 Sergeant [redacted] (SOD) – via teleconference Patricia Serna (OPA) – via teleconference
OBSERVERS	Detective [redacted] esenter/IAFD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (Presenter/IAFD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (Presenter/IAFD) – via teleconference DCOP [redacted] (Compliance) Commander [redacted] (AOD) – via teleconference Deputy Commander [redacted] (IAFD) Sergeant [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Corey Sanders (USDOJ) – via teleconference Elizabeth Martinez (USDOJ) – via teleconference
PREVIOUS MINUTES	July 9, 2020 - approved
UNFINISHED BUSINESS	• 20-0006029 (10% - Level 2) • 16-0048656 (SUoF – OIS) • 20-0008743 (10% – Level 2)

CASE #: 16-0048656 TYPE: SUOF-OIS	DATE OF INCIDENT: MAY 28, 2016	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIME: 2142 HOURS
CASE PRESENTER	DETECTIVE [redacted]		
INJURIES SUSTAINED	YES		
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	YES		
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

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 CONCERNS RELATED TO TRAINING AND TACTICS, SPECIFIC TO WHETHER CURRENT AND UPCOMING TRAINING INCLUDES AND ADEQUATELY ADDRESSES TACTICAL RETREATING AND CONTAINMENT. THE TRAINING ACADEMY WILL REVIEW CURRENT AND UPCOMING TRAINING TO ENSURE IT INCLUDES AND ADEQUATELY ADDRESSES TACTICAL RETREATING AND CONTAINMENT
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S)	*COMMANDER* [redacted]
DEADLINE	AUGUST 20, 2020

CASE #: 20-0006029	DATE OF INCIDENT: JANUARY 20, 2020	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIME: 0019 HOURS
TYPE: 10% - LEVEL 2			

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	<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	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 #: 20-0008743 TYPE: 10% - LEVEL 2	DATE OF INCIDENT: JANUARY 28, 2020 LOCATION [redacted]	TIME: 1121 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? ☐ 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

Next FRB Meeting: July 30, 2020

Approved: _____
Michael J. Geier, Chief of Police