



# Force Review Board

**CHIEF'S  
REPORT**  
(P78F)

APRIL 15, 2021

TIME: 1007 TO 1200  
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 Luke Languit (Investigative Bureau designee) – via teleconference  
Commander James Collins (Foothills Area Command) – via teleconference  
A/Commander [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  
Patricia Serna (OPA) – via teleconference  
Lieutenant [REDACTED] (Presenter / SOD) – via teleconference  
Detective [REDACTED] (Presenter / IAFD) – via teleconference  
Sergeant [REDACTED] (IAFD) – via teleconference  
Sergeant [REDACTED] (IAFD) – via teleconference  
Sergeant [REDACTED] (Observing for IAFD) – via teleconference

**OBSERVERS**  
(P78b)

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  
Patrick Kent (USDOJ) – via teleconference  
Sarah Lopez (USDOJ) – via teleconference  
Yvonne Demmeritte (USDOJ) – via teleconference

**PREVIOUS MINUTES** April 8, 2021

**UNFINISHED  
BUSINESS**

- None

**REFERRAL RESPONSE(S)**

CASE NUMBER	MEETING DATE	REFERRAL	REFERRAL PARTY	ACTION TAKEN	STATUS
19-0044654	5/7/2020	The Training Academy will develop a module on Miranda training, which will be provided via PowerDMS.	Lieutenant [REDACTED]	Sergeant [REDACTED] provided the following update: The training was turned into the CTU on 4/7/21. CTU is in the process of completing their review.	Update due June 14, 2021

20-0072103	1/26/2021	The Training Academy will create a PowerDMS training discussing the different types of restraining orders and the process for serving them.	Lieutenant [REDACTED]	Sergeant [REDACTED] completed a memo informing the board as of April 13, 2021, the training has been developed and uploaded to PowerDMS for review by all sworn personnel.	Closed
20-0055810	3/25/2021	Commander [REDACTED] will provide an update on the MOU language regarding the collaboration between the Auto Theft Unit and New Mexico State Police.	Commander [REDACTED]	Commander [REDACTED] provided the draft of the MOU with State Police, which will be submitted to City Legal on 4/15/2021. The board will be provided the draft for review and the update will be provided on 4/22/2021.	Update to board on April 22, 2021.

CASE #: 20-0031830		DATE OF INCIDENT: APRIL 16, 2020	LOCATION: [REDACTED]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 2233 HOURS
TYPE: LEVEL 3 (P7B)				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO			
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT  FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE			

		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input 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		<u>FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY:</u> 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		<u>FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY:</u> 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		<u>FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY:</u> 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		<u>FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY:</u> 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				

<p>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?  <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>MAJORITY VOTE</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION</p>
<p>DISCUSSION</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
<p>DISCUSSION TOPICS</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. IS IT IAFD'S OPINION THE USE OF K-9 IS A FORM OF DE-ESCALATION?       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. NO, IT WAS A POOR CHOICE OF WORDING.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. HOW DID OFFICERS CONFIRM THE INDIVIDUAL THEY WERE TRYING TO CONTACT WAS THE SAME SUBJECT WHO HAD THE OUTSTANDING WARRANTS?       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE FROM THE CLERK AT THE CONVENIENCE STORE AND CONFIRMATION WITH THE FEMALE WHO WAS WITH THE INDIVIDUAL.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. CONCERNS EXPRESSED REGARDING OFFICER'S STATEMENT IN REPORT ADVISING THEY BELIEVED THE INDIVIDUAL IS TRYING TO LURE THE OFFICERS.       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. IAFD'S INVESTIGATIVE CHANGES WOULD HAVE COMPLETED A MORE IN DEPTH INTERVIEW, REQUIRING THE OFFICER TO PROVIDE A BETTER EXPLANATION.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. WOULD CHEMICAL MUNITIONS HAVE BEEN REASONABLE TO TRY?       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. THERE WAS A STRUGGLE TO GAIN CONTAINMENT ON THIS CALL DUE TO LACK OF MANPOWER, WHICH CAUSED THE NEED FOR A QUICK RESPONSE.</li> <li>B. IF DONE TODAY, SOD WOULD UTILIZE ADDITIONAL SOD PERSONNEL IN ORDER TO SLOW THE RESPONSE DOWN, DRONE, AND USE OF CHEMICAL MUNITIONS TO EXHAUST ALL OPTIONS IN PROGRESSION.</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. WHY WAS AIR SUPPORT NOT USED TO ILLUMINATE THE AREA?       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. NOT AVAILABLE AT THE TIME.</li> <li>B. NOW SOD HAS THE OPTION TO USE THE DRONE.</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. THE USE OF K-9 WAS DESCRIBED AS A "SAFE AND MOST EFFECTIVE" WAY TO TAKE THE INDIVIDUAL INTO CUSTODY. WHY WAS THIS THE CASE?       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. SOD IS CONSTANTLY WORKING TO IMPROVE THE USE OF FORCE NARRATIVES FOR OFFICERS TO USE FIRST PERSON LANGUAGE IN LIEU OF TRAINING/POLICY JARGON.</li> </ol> </li> <li>7. WHEN THERE IS CONCLUSIONARY AND/OR BOILERPLATE LANGUAGE IN A NARRATIVE, WILL IAFD CLARIFY THE STATEMENTS WITH THE OFFICERS?</li> </ol>

- A. YES. ALL INVOLVED AND WITNESS OFFICERS ARE NOW INTERVIEWED ON EVERY INVESTIGATION.
8. COMMENDED WHEN OFFICER [REDACTED] PSD DID A GUARD AND BARK WHEN IT LOCATED THE INDIVIDUAL, OFFICER [REDACTED] WAS LOUD TO ANNOUNCE THE INDIVIDUAL WAS LOCATED.
9. TIME FROM WHEN K-9 ARRIVED TO WHEN THE BITE OCCURRED?
- A. ON CAD, K-9 ARRIVED AT 2153 HOURS AND CONTACT WITH THE INDIVIDUAL AT 2233 HOURS.
10. IS A CHECKLIST USED TO DETERMINE WHEN A PSD IS USED?
- A. THE SERIES OF PROGRESSION USED BY SOD IS AS FOLLOWS: CONTAIN, VERBAL COMMANDS AND DE-ESCALATION, ELICIT A RESPONSE (NFDD), USE PSD AS A LOCATING TOOL, WHEN LOCATED RECALL AND ATTEMPT TO GAIN A RESPONSE, THEN MOVE TO PSD.
11. WERE THE OFFICERS FAMILIAR WITH THE INDIVIDUALS?
- A. UNKNOWN; HOWEVER, NO REPORTS INDICATE THEY HAD PRIOR CONTACTS.
12. HOW IS SOD MOVING FORWARD IN THEIR RESPONSE, OTHER THAN THE DE-ESCALATION OF TIME, DISTANCE, AND TALKING AN INDIVIDUAL INTO SURRENDERING?
- A. NOW SOD GAINS AS MUCH INTEL AS POSSIBLE ON AN INDIVIDUAL.
- I. THEY USE THEIR NAME WHILE SPEAKING TO THEM, USING VERBAL HOOKS, DIALOGUE, BUILDING RAPPORT TO ELICIT A RESPONSE AND GET THE INDIVIDUAL TO SURRENDER.
13. COMMENDED EFFORTS MADE BY OFFICERS OF EVEN IF THE INDIVIDUAL DOES NOT RESPOND, ATTEMPTS ARE MADE.
14. KNOWING THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL, WHY NOT ARREST HIM LATER?
- A. SOD MAKES DETERMINATION BY COMPARING THE IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY AND POTENTIAL OF DANGER TO COMMUNITY VERSUS THE INTRUSION TO THE INDIVIDUAL.
- I. DUE TO THIS INDIVIDUAL BEING AN ARMED ROBBERY SUSPECT WITH A VIOLENT HISTORY, SOD DETERMINED IT NECESSARY TO RESPOND.
15. ANY INFORMATION TO CONFIRM THE INDIVIDUAL WAS ARMED AT THE TIME OF THE CALL?
- A. NO.
16. IF K-9 LOCATES THE INDIVIDUAL, WOULD K-9 BACK OUT, TREAT IT AS AN OPEN-AIR BARRICADE, AND INITIATE A TACTICAL ACTIVATION?
- A. YES. DUE TO THE LACK OF MANPOWER AND INFORMATION KNOWN ABOUT THE INDIVIDUAL, THIS WOULD FIT THE CRITERIA FOR A FULL TACTICAL ACTIVATION TO PROVIDE THE ABILITY

	<p>TO GAIN CONTAINMENT, USE THE ROBOT FOR CHEMICAL MUNITION DEPLOYMENT, DRONE, ETC.</p> <p>17. AAR EXPLAINS FIRST PSD DID A GUARD AND BARK DUE TO THE INDIVIDUAL BEING PASSIVE. WOULD PSD BITE IF THE INDIVIDUAL BECAME ACTIVELY RESISTANT?</p> <p>A. THE K-9 WARNING IS CLEAR REGARDING THE PSD'S ACTIONS, "IF YOU MOVE, IT WILL BITE".</p> <p>18. WHY NOT MOVE UP WHILE PSD IS COMPLETING GUARD AND BARK TO CONTACT INDIVIDUAL?</p> <p>A. WITHOUT BEING ABLE TO CLEAR THE INDIVIDUAL'S HANDS, IF OFFICERS MOVE UP, THIS LIMITS THE OFFICERS' REACTIONARY GAP TO USE LESS LETHAL OPTIONS.</p> <p>19. IS IT NORMAL FOR AN INDIVIDUAL NOT TO REACT TO EFFORTS MADE TO ELICIT A RESPONSE?</p> <p>A. NO, NFDD HAS AN 83% SUCCESS RATE.</p> <p>B. THIS CALL IS CONSIDERED TO BE A STATISTICAL OUTLIER FOR THERE BEING NO RESPONSE.</p> <p>20. HOW WAS IT DETERMINED THE PSD'S MOUTH ON THE INDIVIDUAL'S FOOT WAS NOT A USE OF FORCE?</p> <p>A. WATCHING THE OBRD, THERE WAS NO INDICATION THE PSD BITES THE FOOT.</p> <p>I. MOVING FORWARD, HANDLER WOULD BE INTERVIEWED TO CLARIFY WHAT HE MEANT WHEN HE SAID "CONTACT" WITH THE FOOT.</p>
--	---

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

<p>DISCUSSION TOPICS</p>	<p>1. VERIFICATION THE INDIVIDUAL WAS NOT ON SCENE WHEN OFFICERS ARRIVED.</p> <p>A. CORRECT.</p> <p>2. HAD THE INDIVIDUAL BEEN ON SCENE, WOULD OFFICERS HAVE ARRESTED HIM?</p> <p>A. YES DUE TO THE WARRANTS KNOWN PRIOR TO OFFICERS' ARRIVAL,</p> <p>3. ONCE LOCATED BY AIR SUPPORT AND K-9, WHAT WAS THE FORCE ARRAY?</p> <p>A. PERSONNEL ON SCENE WITH LESS LETHAL (TO INCLUDE A 40MM), AND CHEMICAL MUNITIONS; HOWEVER, THEY WERE DETERMINED NOT TO BE APPROPRIATE FOR THE CALL.</p> <p>4. OUT OF POLICY FOR TOTALITY OF CIRCUMSTANCES DUE TO THERE NOT BEING ANY DE-ESCALATION. NOT APPROPRIATE TO MOVE TO A LEVEL 3 WHEN THERE IS NO IMMEDIATE THREAT.</p>
--------------------------	--

DATE OF INCIDENT: JULY 28, 2020

LOCATION: [REDACTED]

0110 HOURS  
CALL TO TACTICAL: 0236 HOURS  
SWAT ACTIVATION: 0423 HOURS

TYPE: SOD  
(P78)

CASE PRESENTER		LIEUTENANT [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? <small>(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" )</small>		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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT  FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input 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	<u>FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: WAS THE TACTICAL ACTIVATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S SPECIALIZED RESPONSE PROTOCOLS?</u>
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	<u>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?</u>
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	<u>FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, VOTE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATION WAS THOROUGH AND COMPLETE? (P78a)</u>
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	<u>FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE UOF IS CONSISTENT WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY? (P78d)</u>
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	<u>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)</u>
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"> <li>1. WHAT DETERMINES THE TIMELINE OF PROGRESSION? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. SOD DRASTICALLY DISPLACES THE COMMUNITY BY EVACUATING OR HAVING THEM SHELTER IN PLACE.</li> <li>B. HAVE TO CONSIDER THEIR IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY AND THE INDIVIDUAL'S BEHAVIOR.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>



	<p>C. SOD HELPS FACILITATE CNT'S CONTACT WITH THE INDIVIDUAL.</p> <p>I. IF CONTACT IS GOING AND PROGRESSING, THEY WILL ALLOW CNT TO CONTINUE.</p> <p>II. IF CONTACT IS NOT PROGRESSING, SOD WILL BEGIN THEIR PROCESS.</p> <p>2. WHY DID SOD TAKE OUT THE FRONT FENCE?</p> <p>A. IF THERE IS AN OBSTRUCTION BETWEEN A COMMON EXIT FOR AN INDIVIDUAL TO SOD, THEY WILL REMOVE FOR THE EASIEST TRANSFER OF CUSTODY TO SOD.</p> <p>3. DOES SOD COLLECT EVIDENCE?</p> <p>A. NO, THIS IS COMPLETED BY THE DETECTIVES.</p> <p>B. SOD WILL GET THE INDIVIDUAL AND RENDER THE SCENE SAFE.</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>
---

DISCUSSION TOPICS	1 NONE
-------------------	--------

CASE #: 20-0103973	DATE OF INCIDENT: DECEMBER 29, 2020	LOCATION: [REDACTED]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1540 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 1840 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 1910 HOURS
TYPE: SOD (P78)	LIEUTENANT [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 type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" 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")		<b>INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT				
		<b>TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT				
		<b>FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT				
<b>DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION?</b> (P78a)		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO				
<b>DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS?</b> (P78c)		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO				
<b>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		<b>DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER FOR:</b>				
(P78e)	<b>POLICY</b>	<b>TACTICS</b>	<b>EQUIPMENT</b>	<b>TRAINING</b>	<b>SUPERVISION</b>	<b>SUCCESSES</b>
	<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
<b>WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO				
<b>PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ENTERING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS REQUEST (IAR)</b>		N/A				
<b>SOP TITLE OF VIOLATION</b>		N/A				
<b>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		<b>FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY: WAS THE TACTICAL ACTIVATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S SPECIALIZED RESPONSE PROTOCOLS?</b>				
<b>MAJORITY VOTE</b>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION				
<b>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		<b>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?</b>				
<b>MAJORITY VOTE</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION				
<b>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		<b>FOR IAFD INVESTIGATIONS ONLY: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, VOTE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATION WAS THOROUGH AND COMPLETE?</b> (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? (P76d)
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"> <li>1. AFTER THE INDIVIDUAL WAS TAKEN INTO CUSTODY, WHY WAS A SAFETY SWEEP CONDUCTED? WAS THERE A WARRANT IN PLACE? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. IT WAS UNKNOWN IF ANYONE ELSE WAS STILL IN THE ROOM DUE TO THE INFORMATION PROVIDED.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. COMMENDED ISU CONTACTING SOD FOR ASSISTANCE.</li> <li>3. COMMENDED SERGEANT [REDACTED] COMMUNICATION WITH THE INDIVIDUAL.</li> <li>4. NOTICEABLE DIFFERENCE IN SOD'S RESPONSE.</li> <li>5. DOES SOD GET A COPY OF THE FIELD'S AAR PRIOR TO SOD'S AAR BEING COMPLETED? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. NO, DUE TO LIMITED TIMEFRAME TO COMPLETE SOD AAR.</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. WHAT CHANGES WOULD BE MADE ON RESPONSE? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. THIS CALL WAS AN ANOMALY WITH IT BEING MOBILE AND THE HOSTAGE SITUATION. CONSIDERING CIRCUMSTANCES, RESPONSE WAS GOOD.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>ONE CHANGE, CONTACTING CIT/CNT PRIOR TO FULL TACTICAL ACTIVATION IN ORDER TO PRODUCE A QUICKER RESPONSE.</p>
DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. NONE.

Next FRB Meeting: April 22, 2021

Signed:   
Harold Medina, Chief of Police