



Force Review Board

**CHIEF'S
REPORT**
(P78F)

MARCH 4, 2021

TIME: 1004 TO 1147
HOURS

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

FRB CHAIR (P78)	DCOP [REDACTED] (Management Services and Support Bureau) – via teleconference
VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	DCOP [REDACTED] (Special Operations Bureau) – via teleconference
	DCOP [REDACTED] (Investigative Bureau) – via teleconference
	DCOP [REDACTED] (Field Services Bureau) – via teleconference
NON-VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	Judge Rod Kennedy (Legal) – via teleconference
	Lindsay Van Meter (City 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	Commander [REDACTED] (IAFD) – via teleconference
	A/Commander [REDACTED] (SOD) – via teleconference
	Lieutenant [REDACTED] – (CIT) – via teleconference
	Sergeant [REDACTED] – (CNT) – via teleconference
	Patricia Serna (OPA) – via teleconference
	Detective [REDACTED] (Presenter / IAFD) – via teleconference
OBSERVERS (P78b)	Sergeant [REDACTED] (Presenter / SOD) – via teleconference
	DCOP [REDACTED] (Compliance) – via teleconference
	A/ Chief of Staff [REDACTED] (Chief's Office) – via teleconference
	A/ Deputy Commander [REDACTED] (TDY – IAFD) – via teleconference
	A/ Deputy Commander [REDACTED] (TDY – IAFD) – via teleconference
	Sergeant [REDACTED] (Observing for IAFD) – via teleconference
	Sergeant [REDACTED] (IAFD) – via teleconference
	Detective [REDACTED] (IAFD) – via teleconference
	Officer [REDACTED] (TDY – IAFD) – via teleconference
	Officer [REDACTED] (TDY – IAFD) – via teleconference
	Christine Bodo (DOJ Policy and Training) – via teleconference
	Patrick Kent (USDOJ) – via teleconference
	Elizabeth Martinez (USDOJ) – via teleconference
Yvonne Demmeritte (USDOJ) – via teleconference	

PREVIOUS MINUTES February 25, 2021

UNFINISHED
BUSINESS

- None

REFERRAL RESPONSE(S)

CASE NUMBER	MEETING DATE	REFERRAL	REFERRAL PARTY	ACTION TAKEN	STATUS
-------------	--------------	----------	----------------	--------------	--------

20-0016293	10/16/2021	DCOP [REDACTED] will complete an Internal Affairs Request (IAR) for the Internal Affairs Professional Standards Division (IAPS) to assess the facts of the case to determine whether the search was legal. IAPS Commander [REDACTED] will provide the Force Review Board with an update at the conclusion of the investigation.	Commander [REDACTED]	Pending	Update due to board on March 11, 2021
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]	Sergeant [REDACTED] completed an extension request for March 31, 2021.	Update due March 31, 2021.

CASE #: 20-0043667		DATE OF INCIDENT: MAY 31, 2020	LOCATION: [REDACTED]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1022 HOURS
TYPE: LEVEL 3 / OIS (P78)				
CASE PRESENTER	DETECTIVE [REDACTED]			
DID THE LEAD DETECTIVE PRESENT THE CASE? (P78b)	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE			
WHY DID THE LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT PRESENT THE CASE?	<input type="checkbox"/> LEAD INVESTIGATOR NO LONGER IN UNIT <input type="checkbox"/> LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT AVAILABLE TO PRESENT <input type="checkbox"/> LEAD INVESTIGATOR WAS CASE PRESENTER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR PRESENT AS SME <input type="checkbox"/> NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION			
INJURIES SUSTAINED	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO			
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> 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	FIELD SERVICES DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT			

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".)		INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT				
		TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT				
		FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT				
DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION? (P78a)		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO				
DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO				
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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
	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: WAS THE TACTICAL ACTIVATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S SPECIALIZED RESPONSE PROTOCOLS?				
MAJORITY VOTE		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION				
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION				
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, VOTE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATION WAS THOROUGH AND COMPLETE? (P78a)				

MAJORITY VOTE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE UOF IS CONSISTENT WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY? (P78d)
MAJORITY VOTE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DISCUSSION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WHEN OFFICER #1 SHOT, HE HIT A VEHICLE. HOW WAS THIS ADDRESSED WITH SKILL SET AND DRAMATIC MISS. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. OFFICER #1 WAS ORIGINALLY SET UP ON APARTMENT #2169. B. HE HAD TO REPOSITION AND CHANGE POINT OF AIM FROM HIS INITIAL SET UP WHEN THE INDIVIDUAL EXITED FROM APARTMENT #2170 AND HE DID NOT ACCOUNT FOR THE MECHANICAL OFFSET BETWEEN THE OPTIC AND BARREL. C. THERE IS ONGOING TRAINING AND RECENTLY ADDITIONAL EQUIPMENT ORDERED TO ASSIST WITH FUTURE TRAINING. D. OFFICERS ENGH AND KING ARE SCHEDULED TO ATTEND PRECISION RIFLE TRAINING 2. COULD ANYTHING HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY TO PREVENT SOD FROM GASSING WRONG APARTMENT? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. SUPERVISOR COMPLETED A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THIS INCIDENT. B. SUPERVISOR ALSO SPOKE TO PAST SOD PERSONNEL FOR THEM TO ANALYZE THE INCIDENT. C. DETERMINATION MADE THAT DUE TO DYNAMIC SITUATION AND IMMEDIACY TO STOP THE INDIVIDUAL'S ACTIONS, SOD MOVED FORWARD WITH THE MOST ACCURATE INFORMATION THEY HAD AVAILABLE AT THE TIME. 3. WHY WERE THERE SO MANY VOLLEYS OF GAS DEPLOYED WITHOUT PROVIDING GUIDANCE OR PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS (PA'S) TO PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL TO SUBMIT TO ARREST? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. THERE WAS AN UNKNOWN SITE OF FIRE WHEN THE INDIVIDUAL BEGAN FIRING HIS HIGH-POWERED RIFLE. THIS ALLOWED FOR THE USE

OF AN EMERGENCY CHEMICAL DEPLOYMENT, IN ORDER TO STOP THE INDIVIDUAL'S ACTIONS IMMEDIATELY.

- B. STANDARD DEPLOYMENT IS TWO VOLLEYS PER OPENING.
4. WHAT INFORMATION DID OFFICER [REDACTED] HAVE TO BELIEVE THE WINDOW OF APARTMENT #2169 BELONGED TO APARTMENT #2170?
- A. BASED ON THE AVAILABLE INFORMATION, HE BELIEVED IT WAS AN EXTENSION OF APARTMENT #2170.
 - B. AFTER HE FIRED THE CHEMICAL MUNITION, HE WAS ADVISED THE WINDOW IN FACT BELONGED TO APARTMENT #2169.
 - C. THIS WAS AN OPERATIONAL MISTAKE; HOWEVER, HE DID NOT HAVE THE FLOOR PLAN AND DUE TO THE EMERGENCY SITUATION OF BEING FIRED UPON, HE OPERATED WITH THE BEST INFORMATION HE HAD AT THE TIME OF DEPLOYMENT.
5. OFFICER CAN HE HEAR ADVISING HIS "ZERO" IS OFF. WAS THIS REFERENCE HIS RIFLE?
- A. NO. THIS WAS REFERENCE THE DEPLOYMENT OF A FERRET ROUND FROM THE PAST, WHICH IS DIFFERENT FROM THE FERRETS SOD IS CURRENTLY USING.
6. CONCERNS THE INCIDENT WAS RUSHED. CHARACTERIZED AS AN ACTIVE SHOOTER; HOWEVER, HE WAS SHOOTING AT A WALL.
- A. SOD REPRESENTATIVE DOES NOT BELIEVE THE REACTION WAS RUSHED.
 - B. UNABLE TO DETERMINE AT THE TIME THE INDIVIDUAL'S PLANNED ACTIONS.
 - I. HE HAD ALREADY SHOT AT VEHICLES AND IN THE AIR.
 - II. HE COULD HAVE EASILY SHOT THROUGH THE APARTMENT WALLS, AT PASSERBY'S, AND OFFICERS.
 - C. IT WAS NOT IMMEDIATELY KNOWN WHERE THE INDIVIDUAL WAS SHOOTING.
7. CAN A RIFLE SHOOT THROUGH AN ARMORED VEHICLE?
- A. YES IT CAN AND IN THE EVENT IT DOES PIERCE THE ARMOR, IT WILL RICOCHET INSIDE CAUSING RISK OF SERIOUS INJURY/DEATH TO OFFICERS INSIDE.
 - B. WHEN IT DOESN'T PIERCE THE ARMOR, IT WILL RICOCHET OFF THE VEHICLE, CAUSING RISK TO CITIZENS AND OFFICERS OUTSIDE THE VEHICLE.
8. COULD INTRODUCING CHEMICALS INTO THE ENVIRONMENT TO GET THE INDIVIDUAL TO STOP SHOOTING CAUSE HIM TO EXIT THE APARTMENT WITH THE RIFLE, IN TURN INDUCING AN OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING?
- A. IMMEDIACY WAS PRESENT, REQUIRING EMERGENCY CHEMICAL DEPLOYMENT.

- B. THE INDIVIDUAL'S ACTIONS WILL DETERMINE OFFICER'S RESPONSE.
 - C. THE IMMEDIACY OF THE THREAT MADE IT NECESSARY TO GET THE INDIVIDUAL TO CHANGE HIS THOUGHT PROCESS IN ORDER TO STOP HIS ACTIONS.
 - D. THE FAMILY NEXT DOOR EXPRESSED CONCERN FOR THEIR SAFETY DUE TO THE SHOTS BEING FIRED. THE FAMILY ADVISED THEY LAID ON THE GROUND FEARING THEY WOULD BE SHOT.
9. HOW MANY ATTEMPTS TO CONTACT THE INDIVIDUAL WERE MADE.
- A. UPON THE INDIVIDUAL CALLING 911 WHEN THE DRONE WAS DEPLOYED INSIDE THE APARTMENT, THEY WERE ABLE TO IMMEDIATELY GET CNT ON THE PHONE WITH HIM AND STOPPED CHEMICAL DEPLOYMENT. HE WENT ON AND OFF LINE; HOWEVER, WHEN HE WENT BACK ON LINE, THEY WERE ABLE TO GET HIM TO EXIT THE APARTMENT WITH HIS HANDS FREE.
10. WAS AN IAR GENERATED WHEN OFFICER ██████ SAID HE DID NOT USE FORCE AND IAFD IDENTIFIED IT AS A LEVEL 1?
- A. NO. PAST PRACTICE DID NOT HAVE IAFD GENERATE IARS, IT WAS ADDRESSED THROUGH THE INVESTIGATION.
 - B. THIS PRACTICE HAS BEEN CHANGED MOVING FORWARD.
 - C. NEW PRACTICE OF INTERVIEWING EVERYONE INVOLVED/WITNESS TO USE OF FORCE WILL ALSO MITIGATE THIS FROM OCCURRING MOVING FORWARD.
 - I. DIRECT ORDER FOR INTERVIEWS GIVEN ON MARCH 2, 2021.
11. WHAT DETERMINATION MADE TO CONCLUDE THIS WAS A LEVEL 1 AND NOT A LEVEL 3?
- A. DEFINITION OF LEVEL 1 – TRANSITORY PAIN, NOT ACTUAL INJURY OR COMPLAINT OF INJURY, OF WHICH HE NEVER HAD COMPLAINTS OF INJURY.
12. DOES SOD TRAIN LOW-LEVEL CONTROL TACTICS?
- A. YES, THROUGH QUARTERLY TRAINING OF DEFENSIVE TACTICS.
13. CONCERN OF PRACTICE THAT AS LONG AS AN OFFICER DESCRIBES WHAT THEY DID BUT SAYS THEY DID NOT USE FORCE, IT IS ACCEPTABLE.
- A. COMPLETING INTERVIEWS WILL HELP CURTAIL THIS FROM HAPPENING BECAUSE THEY WILL IMMEDIATELY ACCOUNT FOR THESE CONCERNS.
 - B. EVEN WITH OFFICERS NOT BELIEVING THEY USED FORCE, THE DETERMINATION IS ULTIMATELY MADE BY THE SUPERVISOR/INVESTIGATOR.
 - I. OFFICERS MIGHT NEED GUIDANCE ON ODD CIRCUMSTANCES; HOWEVER, IN GENERAL, THEY NEED TO RECOGNIZE WHEN THEY ARE USING FORCE.

	<p>14. WAS THE INDIVIDUAL ASKED WHY HE EXITED WITH THE RIFLE? A. NO. I. HIGHLIGHTS WHY WE NEED INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED.</p> <p>15. COMMANDS SHOULD NOT BE LISTED AS DE-ESCALATION. A. THEY WERE NOT IDENTIFIED AS DE-ESCALATION IN THE INVESTIGATION. IT IS ONLY ON THE SAME SLIDE ON THE TEMPLATE OF THE POWERPOINT. THIS CAN BE CHANGED TO ELIMINATE CONFUSION.</p>
	<p>16. IN IAFD REPORT, INDIVIDUAL WAS ASKED ABOUT INJURIES. ASSUMING THIS WAS COMPLETED BY THE DETECTIVE, DID AN ON SCENE SUPERVISOR DO THIS, AS REQUIRED BY POLICY? A. INDIVIDUAL WAS EVALUATED ON SCENE BY RESCUE AND OBSERVED BY THE ON SCENE SUPERVISOR. HE WAS NOT MIRANDIZED AND ASKED DUE TO IT BEING AN OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING AND LEVEL 2 INVESTIGATION.</p>

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

DISCUSSION TOPICS	<p>1. WAS SHOTSPOTTER AVAILABLE? A. NOT AVAILABLE IN THE AREA OF THIS INCIDENT.</p> <p>2. AGREES WITH FRB DETERMINATION THE FORCE WAS IN POLICY.</p>
-------------------	---

<p>CASE #: 20-0043652</p> <p>TYPE: SOD (P78)</p>	<p>DATE OF INCIDENT: MAY 31, 2020</p>	<p>LOCATION: [REDACTED]</p>	<p>TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1023 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 1040 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 1100 HOURS</p>
--	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

CASE PRESENTER	SERGEANT [REDACTED]
----------------	---------------------

DID THE LEAD DETECTIVE PRESENT THE CASE? (P78b)	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
--	---

WHY DID THE LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT PRESENT THE CASE?	<input type="checkbox"/> LEAD INVESTIGATOR NO LONGER IN UNIT <input type="checkbox"/> LEAD INVESTIGATOR NOT AVAILABLE TO PRESENT <input type="checkbox"/> LEAD INVESTIGATOR WAS CASE PRESENTER <input type="checkbox"/> FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR PRESENT AS SME <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION
---	---

INJURIES SUSTAINED	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
--------------------	---



DAMAGE TO PROPERTY		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT				
		ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT				
		INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT				
		TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT				
		FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT				
DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION? (P78a)		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO				
DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO				
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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
	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: WAS THE TACTICAL ACTIVATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S SPECIALIZED RESPONSE PROTOCOLS?				
MAJORITY VOTE		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION				
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, VOTE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATION WAS THOROUGH AND COMPLETE? (P78a)
MAJORITY VOTE	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE UOF IS CONSISTENT WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY? (P78d)
MAJORITY VOTE	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION
DISCUSSION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WAS THE CONCERN REGARDING THE DRONE'S BATTERY DYING ADDRESSED? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. THE DRONE PROGRAM WAS NEW WHEN THIS CALL OCCURRED. B. NEED FOR A LARGER DRONE WITH BETTER OPTIONS WAS IDENTIFIED AND THE PROCESS IS UNDERWAY TO OBTAIN A BETTER DRONE. C. THE PLAN IS TO BE ABLE TO IMMEDIATELY DEPLOY ANOTHER DRONE, WHEN THE FIRST HAS TO GO DOWN FOR A DYING BATTERY. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION (FAA) GUIDELINES DO NOT ALLOW FOR TWO DRONES IN THE AIR AT THE SAME TIME, CAUSING A GAP IN INFORMATION GATHERING BY THE DRONE. 2. WHAT ARE THE FIREARM QUALIFICATIONS FOR SOD'S HIGH GROUND POSITION? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. QUARTERLY QUALIFICATIONS, WHICH INCLUDE SHOOTING FROM 100 AND 300 YARDS. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. IF THEY FAIL THE PRECISION PORTION OF THE QUALIFICATIONS, THE OFFICER IS REMOVED AS HIGH GROUND. B. WEEKLY FIREARMS TRAINING, WHICH INCLUDES MOVING TARGETS AND ACCURACY DRILLS.

	<p>3. OBRD CONCERNS</p> <p>A. STUDY WAS COMPLETED FOR ADDITIONAL CAMERA AND/OR MOUNTING OPTIONS; HOWEVER, NO VIABLE OPTION WAS IDENTIFIED.</p> <p>4. WOULD RIFLE MOUNTED OBRDS BE AN OPTION?</p> <p>A. NO NOT FOR HIGH GROUND AS IT COULD JEOPARDIZE THE ACCURACY OF THE RIFLE.</p> <p>5. HOW ARE PRECISION RIFLE OPERATOR'S (PRO'S) SELECTED?</p> <p>A. THE SELECTION IS MADE BY SOD'S CHAIN OF COMMAND AND THE OFFICER'S PERFORMANCE QUALITY.</p> <p>B. ONCE SELECTED, THE OFFICER GOES THROUGH PRECISION RIFLE TRAINING.</p>
--	---

<p>DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>	
<p>DISCUSSION TOPICS</p>	<p>1 IF APARTMENT #2169 WAS OCCUPIED WHEN CHEMICAL MUNITIONS WERE DEPLOYED, SHOULD THIS NOT HAVE BEEN INVESTIGATED AS A USE OF FORCE?</p> <p>A. YES AND IT WAS EVALUATED AND INVESTIGATED AS A USE OF FORCE.</p>

Next FRB Meeting: March 11, 2021

Signed: 
 Interim Chief of Police