Force Review Board

CHIEF'S REPORT
(P78F)

JULY 8, 2021

TIME: 1003 TO 1135 HOURS

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

FRB CHAIR (P78)	DCOP JJ Griego (Management Services and Support Bureau)
VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	DCOP Arturo Gonzalez (Investigative Bureau) Interim DCOP Joshua Brown (Field Services Bureau) Commander Johnny Yara (Southeast Area Command) A/Commander [redacted] (Training Academy)
NON-VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	Judge Rod Kennedy (City Legal) Edward Harness (CPOA Director) Lieutenant [redacted] FRB Admin Personnel/IAFD) Julie Jaramillo (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD)
REPRESENTATIVES	Interim Deputy Chief Cori Lowe (IAFD) – via teleconference A/ Commander [redacted] (SOD) Lieutenant [redacted] (CIT) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (SOD-K9) Sergeant [redacted] (SOD) Policy Manager Patricia Serna (Policy and Procedure)
OBSERVERS (P78b)	Sergeant [redacted] (IAFD/Presenter) Sergeant [redacted] (SOD/Presenter) Superintendent Sylvester Stanley (Police Reform) – via teleconference DCOP Eric Garcia (Police Reform) – via teleconference DCOP Donovan Olvera (Field Services Bureau) A/Commander Richard Evans (IAFD) Deputy Commander Ben Bourgeois (IAFD) Detective [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Officer [redacted] (IAFD ILD) – via teleconference Trevor Rigler (City Legal) – via teleconference Christine Bodo (Compliance Bureau) – via teleconference Elizabeth Martinez (USDOJ) – via teleconference Corey Sanders (USDOJ) –via teleconference Patrick Kent (USDOJ) – via teleconference Darriell Bone (EFIT) – via teleconference
PREVIOUS MINUTES	July 1, 2021
UNFINISHED BUSINESS	• None

REFERRAL RESPONSE(S)

CASE NUMBER	MEETING DATE	REFERRAL	REFERRAL PARTY	ACTION TAKEN	STATUS

20-0007881	9/17/2020	The Training Academy will create and conduct refresher training regarding the good faith exception and how it is addressed in NM along with applicable case law and officers articulating their known facts regarding search and seizure.	Lieutenant [redacted]	During the FRB meeting, A/Commander [redacted] requested a two-week extension.	Update due July 26, 2021
20-0037586	5/20/2021	The FRB has identified a deficiency/concern related to training. The Training Academy will complete retraining with Officer [redacted] In addition, Officer [redacted] will not receive another recruit until the retraining and internal affairs investigation is complete.	A/Commander [redacted]	Blue Team Training Request Form will be completed to move forward with completing the retraining.	Update due August 2, 2021
20-0081816	5/27/2021	Commander Lowe will ensure this case is prioritized for completion in order for it to be reviewed by the FRB.	Interim Deputy Chief Cori Lowe	Extension memo for 30 days and case will be put on the "30-day presentation" list when it is complete.	Update due August 9, 2021
21-0000606	6/3/2021	Acting Commander [redacted] will identify techniques and/or tools to prevent an individual from getting handcuffs to the front of their body.	A/Commander [redacted]	A/Lieutenant [redacted] provided a response memorandum, which was provided to the board on 7/7/2021.	Closed
21-0000606	6/3/2021	Acting Lieutenant [redacted] will verify whether the Prisoner Transport Unit has proper knowledge/training on how to properly apply leg shackles.	A/Lieutenant [redacted]	A/Lt. [redacted] provided the following response: Officers informed to not place shackles on prisoners any where other than on ankles, until approval and training by Advanced Training Academy has provided for new procedure of placing shackles above elbows to prevent prisoners from	Closed

				moving their handcuffed arms to the front of their bodies (slipping cuffs).	
21-0000606	6/3/2021	Deputy Chief Donovan Olvera will research the practice of not verifying a warrant through NCIC when a probation officer advises an individual has a valid warrant.	Reassigned to Deputy Chief JJ Griego	Deputy Chief Griego requested a one week extension.	Update due August 19, 2021
20-0026670	6/24/2021	Deputy Chief Donovan Olvera will complete a mandatory BSD referral for Officer Brandon Forsberg.	Deputy Chief Donovan Olvera	Deputy Chief Olvera provided the BSS Form, which was provided to the board on 7/7/2021.	Closed
20-0031289	7/1/2021	The FRB has identified a deficiency/concern related to supervision. Lieutenant [redacted] will ensure CIU completes an incident debrief with the three ECIT officers on the call to address the de-escalation concerns surrounding this call.	Lieutenant [redacted]	Lieutenant [redacted] provide a response memorandum, which was provided to the board on 7/7/2021.	Closed

CASE #: 20-0042176 TYPE: LEVEL 3 (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: MAY 26, 2020	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 0936 HOURS
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 ☒ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR PRESENT AS SME ☐ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND INVESTIGATIVE CHAIN UNAVAILABLE ☐ NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION		

INJURIES SUSTAINED	☒ YES ☐ NO
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	☐ YES ☒ 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 ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT PRESENT INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT
DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION? (P78a)	☐ YES ☒ NO
DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)	☐ YES ☒ NO
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. WHAT IS THE CURRENT CRITERIA FOR BEING DISPATCHED TO THE WESTSIDE SHELTER FOR CRIMINAL TRESPASS ONLY? A. BELIEVES WE ARE NO LONGER RESPONDING TO THESE CALLS. IT IS UP TO THE SHELTER STAFF AND/OR SECURITY TO REMOVE PEOPLE 2. WAS THE OFFICER DISPATCHED BY HIMSELF OR DID HE "CODE FOUR" HIS BACKUP OFFICER? A. UNKNOWN BUT IT TOOK 20+ MINUTES FOR HIS BACKUP TO GET THERE. 3. TWO OFFICERS SHOULD ALWAYS BE DISPATCHED THERE DUE TO THE DISTANCE AND THE NATURE OF THE CLIENTELE. 4. DOES THE SHELTER HAVE ANY SURVEILLANCE VIDEOS? A. SERGEANT [redacted] NQUIRED AND WAS ADVISED THEY ARE NOT WORKING. 5. WHEN HANDCUFFED AND REMOVING THE INDIVIDUAL, HE WAS COMPLAINING OF SHOULDER PAIN. THE OFFICER TOLD HIM IF HE WERE TO COOPERATE, THEY WOULD LET GO OF HIS SHOULDER. WAS THIS ADDRESSED REGARDING WHETHER THIS WAS A COERCIVE STATEMENT?

	A. NO, THEY DID NOT ASK. NOW WITH NEW INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS, THIS WOULD BE ASKED. 6. WHEN THE PRESENTER STATED THE OFFICERS WERE "CINCHING HIS LEGS TOGETHER," DID THEY MEAN THE OFFICERS WERE CINCHING THE INDIVIDUAL'S FEET CLOSER TO HIS BACK? A. YES. 7. IAR OPENED FOR FAILURE TO RENDER AID? A. 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:

(P78e)	POLICY	TACTICS	EQUIPMENT	TRAINING	SUPERVISION	SUCCESSES
	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO	☐ YES ☒ NO

WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?	☐ YES ☒ 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? ☐ 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

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☒ YES ☐ NO	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. IN POLICY.

CASE #: 21-0027103 TYPE: SOD (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: APRIL 9, 2021	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1224 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 1421 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 1653 HOURS
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 ☐ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR PRESENT AS SME ☐ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATIVE CHAIN UNAVAILABLE ☒ NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION		
INJURIES SUSTAINED	☐ YES ☒ NO		
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	☐ YES ☒ 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 ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT PRESENT INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE		

	☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT
DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION? (P78a)	☐ YES ☒ NO
DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)	☐ YES ☒ NO
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. ANY CONVERSATION WITH THE DA'S OFFICE FOR THE DISPUTE BETWEEN THE WARRANT NOT BEING APPROVED THE NIGHT OF THE ACTIVATION BUT WERE APPROVED THE NEXT DAY? A. A NEW WARRANT WAS DRAFTED THE NEXT DAY AND THE JUDGE DID SIGN OFF ON THE BREAKING AND ENTERING CHARGES; HOWEVER, UNKNOWN WHETHER IT WAS ADDRESSED WITH THE DA'S OFFICE. B. ANY FOLLOW-UP WOULD HAVE BEEN DONE BY THE INVESTIGATIVE UNIT.
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

WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?	☐ YES ☒ 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? ☐ 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

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☒ YES ☐ NO	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. DOES THERE NEED TO BE POLICY TO DICTATE WHAT SOD WILL DO IF THE CHARGES ARE NOT THERE AND ONLY HAVE EXIGENCY? A. NOT A POLICY. THE IMPORTANCE LIES WITH VETTING THE CASES ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS, WHICH HAPPENS NOW AND NEEDS TO CONTINUE. B. TACTICAL CONTINUOUSLY ASSESSES THE CALL AS IT PROGRESSES TO ENSURE IT MEETS CRITERIA FOR THE ACTIVATION.

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 ☐ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND LEAD INVESTIGATOR PRESENT AS SME ☐ FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND INVESTIGATIVE CHAIN UNAVAILABLE ☒ NOT AN IAFD PRESENTATION
INJURIES SUSTAINED	☐ YES ☒ NO
DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	☒ YES ☐ 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 ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT PRESENT INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT PRESENT
DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION? (P78a)	☐ YES ☒ NO
DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)	☐ YES ☒ NO
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. WHEN WE LIST DAMAGE, IS CHEMICAL MUNITIONS CONSIDERED DAMAGE? A. NOT UNLESS A WINDOW IS BROKEN BECAUSE THEY ARE DECONTAMINANTS. B. SOD PROVIDES THE PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION ON HOW TO PROPERLY DECONTAMINATE THE PROPERTY.

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
WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?			☐ YES ☒ 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? ☐ 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			

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☒ YES ☐ NO	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. NONE.

Next FRB Meeting: July 15, 2021

Signed: _____

Harold Medina, Chief of Police