Force Review Board-Chief's Report



CHIEF'S REPORT

MARCH 26, 2020

TIME: 1008 TO 1045 HOURS

APD HEADQUARTERS - CHIEF'S CONFERENCE ROOM

| FRB CHAIR | Chief of Staff John Ross |
|------------------------|--|
| VOTING MEMBERS | DCOP DCOP Commander |
| NON-VOTING MEMBERS | Lindsay Van Meter (City Legal)- via teleconference Edward Harness (CPOA)- via teleconference Lieutenant (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD) Julie Jaramillo (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD)- via teleconference |
| REPRESENTATIVES | Sergean (IAFD) |
| OBSERVERS | Detective (Presenter/IAFD) Detective (Presenter/IAFD) DCOP (Compliance)- via teleconference Commander (AOD)- via teleconference Elizabeth Martinez (DOJ)- via teleconference |
| PREVIOUS MINUTES | March 12, 2020 approved |
| UNFINISHED BUSINESS | 19-0051831 (SUoF) 18-0122233 (SUoF/OIS) |

| CASE #: 19-0051 | | DATE OF INCID JUNE 6, 2019 | ENT: LOCATIOI | V:TIN | ME: 0230 HOURS | |
|--|------------|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|--|
| CASE PRESENT | | DETECTIVE | | | | |
| 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? DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONDESSED NOT IDENTIFIED BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONDESSED NOT IDENT | | | | | | |
| POLICY | TACTICS | EQUIPMENT | TRAINING | SUPERVISION | SUCCESSES | |
| ☐ YES ⊠ NO | ☐ YES ⊠ NO | ☐ YES ☒ NO | ☐ YES 図 NO | ☐ YES 図 NO | ☐ YES Ø 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 図 NO |
| | |

| DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR | HAVE THE OP | PORTUNITY TO | O ASK QUESTION | IS OR MAKE A |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? | | | | |
| Ø YES □ NO | | | | |

| CASE #: 18-0122233 | DATE OF INCIDENT: DECEMBER 23, 2018 | LOCATION: 308 PENNSYLVANIA ST | TIME: 1855 F | IOURS |
|--|--|---|--------------|------------|
| TYPE: SERIOUS-OIS | BEOEMBER 20, 2010 | NE NE | | |
| CASE PRESENTER | DETECTIVE | CLEAN COLUMN TO THE COLUMN TO | | 146 146 |
| INJURIES SUSTAINED | YES | | | |
| DAMAGE TO PROPERTY | YES | 50.27 | | |
| 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 Ø NO | ☐ YES ⊠ NO | □ YES 🖾 NO | □ YES ⊠ NO | ☐ YES Ø NO | □ YES ⊠ NO | |
| DID ANY MEMBI ATTENDANCE F □ YES ⊠ NO | | ACTIVATION IN | | NLY: WAS THE TA VITH THE DEPART OCOLS? | | |
| 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 VOT | E | ⊠ YES □ NO | □ NOT AN IAFD I | NVESTIGATION | | |
| 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 MEMB ATTENDANCE F | | 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 VOT | MAJORITY VOTE ☑ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION | | | | | |
| DISCUSSION | | Ø YES □ NO | | | | |
| DID THE CPOA E | | | OPPORTUNITY TO | ASK QUESTIONS | OR MAKE A | |

Approved:

Michael J. Geier, Chief of Police

Next FRB meeting: April 2, 2020