Force Review Board

CHIEF'S REPORT
(P78F)

AUGUST 12, 2021

TIME: 1003 TO 1236 HOURS

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

FRB CHAIR (P78)	DCOP JJ Griego (Management Services and Support Bureau)
VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	DCOP Michael Smathers (Special Operations Bureau) – first presentation only DCOP Arturo Gonzalez (Investigative Bureau) Interim DCOP Joshua Brown (Field Services Bureau) Commander James Collins (Foothills Area Command) A/Commander [redacted] (Training Academy)
NON-VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	Judge Rod Kennedy (City Legal) Lieutenant [redacted] (FRB Admin Personnel/IAFD) Julie Jaramillo (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD)
REPRESENTATIVES	Lieutenant [redacted] (CIU) – via teleconference A/ Lieutenant [redacted] (SOD) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (SOD) Sergeant [redacted] (CIU) – via teleconference Policy Manager Patricia Serna (Policy and Procedure) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (IAFD/Presenter) Sergeant [redacted] (SOD/Presenter) Superintendent Sylvester Stanley (Police Reform) Chief of Staff Cecily Barker (Chief's Office) – via teleconference Interim DCOP Cori Lowe (Compliance Bureau) – via teleconference Commander Renae McDermott (Training Academy) A/Commander Richard Evans (IAFD) – via teleconference
OBSERVERS (P78b)	A/ Commander [redacted] (COD) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (TDY SOD) – via teleconference Sergeant [redacted] (IAFD) Sergeant [redacted] (Training Academy) – via teleconference Officer [redacted] (IAFD/FRB) Dr. Jessica Henjy (Training Academy) – via teleconference Carlos Pacheco (City Legal) – via teleconference Elizabeth Martinez (USDOJ) – via teleconference Corey Sanders (USDOJ) –via teleconference Patrick Kent (USDOJ) – via teleconference Yvonnie Demmerritte (USDOJ) – via teleconference Sarah Lopez (USDOJ) – via teleconference Laura Kunard (IMT) – via teleconference Darryl Neier (EFIT) – via teleconference
PREVIOUS MINUTES	August 5, 2021
UNFINISHED BUSINESS	• None

CASE # 20-0044826 TYPE: LEVEL 3 (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: JUNE 4, 2020	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1355 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 ☒ 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. WAS IT EVER DETERMINED WHETHER THE INDIVIDUAL WAS ARMED WHEN HE WENT BACK INTO THE HOUSE OR IF HE ARMED HIMSELF AFTER HE ENTERED?		

A. UNKNOWN, NO PAT DOWN WAS DONE.

2. A/COMMANDER EVANS EXPLAINED IAFD ONLY LOOKED AT THE FORCE ON THIS CASE ONLY AND NOT THE TOTALITY OF THE INCIDENT AS A WHOLE. USING TODAY'S STANDARDS, IT WOULD BE OUT OF POLICY.
3. PERFECT EXAMPLE AS WHY WE NEED A DIFFERENT STANDARDS OF RESPONDING TO THESE TYPES OF CALLS (EG. MENTAL HEALTH, INEBRIATED PEOPLE, DRUG ABUSE ETC.)
4. WOULD THIS TYPE OF CALL FALL UNDER AN MCT RESPONSE?
    A. IN DETERMINING WHETHER THEY WILL RESPOND, MCT LOOKS AT WHETHER THE SUBJECT NEEDS TO BE HANDCUFFED AND WHETHER THE TRANSPORT IS VOLUNTARY VERSUS NON VOLUNTARY.
    B. THIS CALL WOULD NOT HAVE LIKELY FIT THE REQUIREMENTS INITIALLY.
    C. THIS BEING SAID, HAD THEY RESPONDED, LT. [redacted] BELIEVES THE INDIVIDUAL WOULD HAVE GONE VOLUNTARILY WITH THEIR ASSISTANCE.
5. PROHIBITION IN POLICY OF IF THE OFFICER CAUSED THE FORCE DUE TO THEIR ACTIONS, DOES THIS NOT HELP DETERMINE WHETHER IT WAS REASONABLE?
    A. NOT NECESSARILY. THE OFFICER WANTED TO RENDER AID, WHICH IS WHY HE MADE THE DECISION TO ALLOW THE MOTHER TO OPEN THE DOOR.
    B. ONCE THE DOOR WAS OPEN, HE FOUND HIMSELF IN A SITUATION WHERE HE WAS PRESENTED WITH AN IMMEDIATE THREAT OF THE INDIVIDUAL ARMED WITH A KNIFE.
    C. THERE IS NO KNOWN TRAINING THAT WHEN AN INDIVIDUAL IS APPROACHING AN OFFICER WITH A KNIFE WITHIN 3-5 FEET, IT SHOULD BE ANYTHING OTHER THAN DEADLY FORCE.
6. DO YOU THINK IT WAS THE WRONG DECISION TO HAVE MOM OPEN DOOR?
    A. 20/20 HINDSIGHT? YES OF COURSE.
7. OPTIC VIEW OF ONLY LOOKING AT FORCE WOULD BE LIKE AN OFFICER JUMPING IN FRONT OF A CAR, IT WOULD BE REASONABLE.
    A. REGARDING OFFICER INDUCED JEOPARDY, WE HAVE A SPECIFIC SOP WHICH PREVENTS THIS ACT. WE DO NOT HAVE AN SOP TO COVER THIS ACTION.
8. TRUTHFULNESS OF THE OFFICER?
    A. IAFD NOW GOES DOWN THE "RABBIT HOLE" TO UNPACK AN OFFICER'S STATEMENT.
    B. DIFFICULT TO KNOW IF IT WAS UNTRUTHFUL OR NOT REMEMBERING.
        I. THE QUESTIONS WERE NOT ASKED SO IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO KNOW.
        II. ONE EXAMPLE, THE OFFICER SAID MOM INTERFERED THE WHOLE TIME, WHICH CLEARLY DID NOT OCCUR UPON

REVIEWING THE OBRD. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO DETERMINE WHETHER THIS WAS HIS PERCEPTION OR IF HE WAS BEING UNTRUTHFUL WITHOUT A FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW.

III. NOW REGARDING THE INDIVIDUAL BLEEDING OUT, IT DOES SEEM LIKE HE WAS TRYING TO RENDER AID. IT WAS ONLY AFTER THE MOTHER ADVISED HE WAS STABBING HIMSELF IN THE NECK THE OFFICER TOLD HER TO OPEN THE DOOR.

9. WAS THE OFFICER AFFORDED THE ABILITY TO WATCH HIS OBRD PRIOR TO HIS INTERVIEW?
    A. HE SHOULD HAVE BEEN.
10. THEN HOW WOULD HE NOT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS PERCEPTION?
11. SPECIFIC POLICY PROHIBITION OF JUMPING IN FRONT OF CAR 2-52-5 DOES COVER THIS CONCERN BUT SEEMS IT WAS ANALYZED DIFFERENTLY.
    A. HE WAS SUSTAINED ON 2-55
12. NO ONE SAYS HE SHOULD HAVE GOTTEN STABBED; HOWEVER, 2-52-5, WAS GROSSLY VIOLATED. WHY DOES THE OTHER POLICY TRUMP THE VIOLATION OF THIS ONE OVER AND OVER?
    A. BECAUSE IN THE MOMENT THE 34 DID NOT HAVE ANY OTHER OPTIONS. IF IT DOES NOT COVER THESE THINGS
    B. IF WE ARE SAYING IT WAS 34 INDUCED BUT IT IS NECESSARY, THEY MADE THE DETERMINATION ON THIS BECAUSE AT THE TIME OF THE SHOOTING, THERE ARE NO OTHER OPTIONS, IAFD HAD TO MAKE THE DETERMINATION BASED ON THE PRONGS
13. HOW ARE YOU LOOKING AT IT NOW? THAT VERY SECOND, YES. BUT EVERYTHING THAT LED UP CAUSES THE ACTIONS TAKEN, HOW IS THAT NOT USED TO DETERMINE?
14. REGARDING GRAHAM AND CHARGING AN OFFICER, YES THEY ARE COVERED. BUT THE POLICY IS MORE RESTRICTIVE AND IT SHOULD NOT HAVE HAPPENED. THESE CONSIDERATIONS HAVE TO PLAY INTO THE ROLE OF MAKING THE DETERMINATION.
15. WHEN INVESTIGATING LEVEL 1 USE OF FORCE, THERE ARE A LOT OF CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE PRELIMINARY THINGS DONE PRIOR TO USING FORCE, WHICH OUR POLICIES DO TO ENCOURAGE US TO NOT USE FORCE.
16. THE JEOPARDY BEGAN AT THE BEGINNING OF ARRIVAL. THE OFFICER'S CONDUCT HELP DETERMINE THE STEPS LEADING UP TO THE FORCE USED. THERE ARE SEARCH AND SEIZURE LAWS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THEIR PRESENCE WAS LAWFUL.
    A. YES COMMANDER OF IAFD SAID IT WOULD BE OUT OF POLICY SO THAT IS THE OPINION OF THE PRESENTER.

17. DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MISTAKES AND MISCONDUCT. THEY ARE STILL HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE POLICY. THE MISTAKES MADE CAUSED THIS SHOOTING. THE FACT THE OFFICER DID NOT RECOGNIZE THE MISTAKES IS TERRIBLY CONCERNING.
18. THE REASONABLE OFFICER ON THIS CALL WAS THE ROOKIE OFFICER WHO SAID THINGS WERE NOT RIGHT ON THE CALL.
19. WERE THE ACTIONS OF THE OFFICERS CONGRUENT WITH ECIT TRAINING?
    A. NO, THE ACTIONS WERE IN CONFLICT OF BOTH CADET TRAINING, CIT TRAINING, AND ECIT TRAINING.
    B. THE FAMILY MEMBER EVEN SAID THEY DID NOT WANT TO CALL OFFICERS BECAUSE OF THIS EXACT OUTCOME.
    C. THE INDIVIDUAL SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN ALLOWED TO GO BACK INSIDE.
20. IT WAS MENTIONED IN PRESENTATION THERE WAS MANDATORY TRAINING; HOWEVER, GIVEN THE NATURE OF THE CALL AND ONGOING LITIGATION, THE ACADEMY STAFF AND CIT WERE NOT PERMITTED TO COMPLETE THE TRAINING. THE TRAINING FOR OFFICER RUIZ NEEDS TO BE COMPLETED IMMEDIATELY.
21. REFERRAL: THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A DEFICIENCY/CONCERN RELATED TO POLICY. POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANAGER PATRICIA SERNA WILL CREATE A SPECIAL ORDER TO AMEND POLICY THAT INCLUDES SPECIALTY PAY. THIS AMENDMENT WILL INCLUDE REMOVAL FROM THE UNIT OR PROGRAM BASED ON PERFORMANCE, FAILURE TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS, AND/OR NEGLIGENCE IDENTIFIED TO BE DETERMINED BY THE AFFECTED CHAIN OF COMMAND AND/OR PROGRAM LEAD. DEADLINE: 30 DAYS
22. WILL HE BE TDY'D TO THE ACADEMY?
    A. LIKELY; HOWEVER, HE IS CURRENTLY ON SERGEANT OJT, SO HE IS ALREADY ASSIGNED TO THE ACADEMY.
23. CAN HE SIT IN THE CURRENT CADET TRAINING COURSES?
    A. NO THE ACADEMY WILL BE SITTING DOWN INDIVIDUALLY WITH OFFICER [redacted]
    B. THERE WILL BE A FULL CURRICULUM TO DEAL WITH THE TRAINING NEEDS.
24. WORKING IN CONCERT WITH ANOTHER OFFICER IS ALSO A TRAINING CONCERN THAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN HIS TRAINING.
    A. AGREED AND IF HE FAILS TO ADEQUATELY PERFORM DURING THIS TRAINING, IT WILL BE ADDRESSED ACCORDINGLY.
25. HE IS ON OJT; HOWEVER, HE WILL NEED TO REPORT TO THE ACADEMY IMMEDIATELY.
26. REGARDING ECIT TRAINING AND EVALUATION, IS THERE TALK OF REMOVING OFFICER RUIZ FROM THE ECIT PROGRAM?

	A. ECIT COMES WITH INCENTIVE PAY SO WILL HAVE TO DEAL WITH THE REGULATIONS; HOWEVER, HIS CERTIFICATION ENDS AT THE END OF 2021 AND HE WILL NOT BE INVITED BACK TO THE RE-TRAINING. 27. THIS BRINGS UP THE NEED FOR A REFERRAL THAT IF SOMEONE IS THAT NEGLIGENT WITH THEIR SPECIALIZED TRAINING, THE DEPARTMENT HAS THE ABILITY TO REMOVE THE PERSON FROM THE SPECIALIZED UNIT/COLLARTERAL DUTY. 28. REFERRAL: THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A DEFICIENCY/CONCERN RELATED TO POLICY. POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANAGER PATRICIA SERNA WILL CREATE A SPECIAL ORDER TO AMEND POLICY THAT INCLUDES SPECIALTY PAY. THIS AMENDMENT WILL INCLUDE REMOVAL FROM THE UNIT OR PROGRAM BASED ON PERFORMANCE, FAILURE TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS, AND/OR NEGLIGENCE IDENTIFIED, WHICH WILL BE DETERMINED BY THE AFFECTED CHAIN OF COMMAND AND/OR PROGRAM LEAD. DUE DATE: 9/13/2021. 29. SPECIALIZED FOR SEVERAL UNITS SO IT SHOULD BE A GLOBAL POLICY TO COVER ANY SPECIALIZED UNIT OR COLLATERAL DUTY TO REMOVE AT ANY TIME. 30. IS THE ACADEMY LOOKING AT THE MISSED TRAINING REFERRAL? A. IT WAS NOT MISSED. ACADEMY PERSONNEL WERE TOLD NOT TO PROCEED WITH TRAINING FROM PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION DUE TO ONGOING LITIGATION. B. SUBMITTED A TICKET TO PULL EMAILS TO ACCESS THE ORDER TO STOP THE TRAINING.
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	<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? (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 (NOT PRESENT)	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. N/A

DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE FOR THE REFERRAL? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ IAR	REFERRAL INFORMATION
TYPE OF REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	☐ POLICY ☐ POLICY VIOLATION (IAR) ☒ TRAINING ☐ SUPERVISION ☐ EQUIPMENT ☐ TACTICS ☐ SUCCESS (IAR)
REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A DEFICIENCY/CONCERN RELATED TO TRAINING A/ COMMANDER [redacted] WILL COMPLETE A

	TRAINING REFERRAL FOR OFFICER [redacted] REGARDING THE FOLLOWING TOPICS: ACTIVE LISTENING, DE-ESCALATION, DISENGAGEMENT, DEVISING AN APPROACH PLAN, DETERMINING LAWFUL OBJECTIVES, PROPER HANDCUFFING AND PAT DOWN TECHNIQUES (WITH SDP), RESPONSE TO BARRICADED INDIVIDUALS, INVESTIGATION, SCENE MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL, MENTAL HEALTH TRANSPORT, AND FIREARM SAFETY RULES
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	A/ COMMANDER [redacted]
DEADLINE: (P78e)	SEPTEMBER 13, 2021

DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE FOR THE REFERRAL? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ IAR	**REFERRAL INFORMATION**
TYPE OF REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	☒ POLICY ☐ POLICY VIOLATION (IAR) ☐ TRAINING ☐ SUPERVISION ☐ EQUIPMENT ☐ TACTICS ☐ SUCCESS (IAR)
REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A DEFICIENCY/CONCERN RELATED TO POLICY. POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANAGER PATRICIA SERNA WILL CREATE A SPECIAL ORDER TO AMEND POLICY THAT INCLUDES SPECIALTY PAY. THIS AMENDMENT WILL INCLUDE REMOVAL FROM THE UNIT OR PROGRAM BASED ON PERFORMANCE, FAILURE TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS, AND/OR NEGLIGENCE IDENTIFIED WHICH WILL BE DETERMINED BY THE AFFECTED CHAIN OF COMMAND AND/OR PROGRAM LEAD
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANAGER PATRICIA SERNA
DEADLINE: (P78e)	SEPTEMBER 13, 2021

(P78)	SWAT ACTIVATION: PREDETERMINED WARRANT
CASE PRESENTER	SERGEANT
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. WHAT WAS THE BASIS FOR THE SEARCH WARRANT? A. IT WAS A SEARCH WARRANT ONLY. I. THE INDIVIDUAL WHO WAS PLACED INTO HANDCUFFS WAS DUE TO THE PRIOR

			KNOWLEDGE OF HIM BEING ARMED FROM THE PREVIOUS INCIDENT. II. THE OTHER INDIVIDUALS WHO EXITED WERE DETAINED BRIEFLY TO RENDER IT SAFE. THEY WERE NOT PLACED IN HANDCUFFS AND WERE PERMITTED TO LEAVE AFTER DETECTIVES ON SCENE MADE CONTACT.			
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			<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			<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			☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ 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			☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT AN IAFD INVESTIGATION			
DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? ☐ YES ☒ 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			☐ 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 (NOT PRESENT)	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. N/A

CASE #: 21-0041827 TYPE: SOD (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: MAY 31, 2021	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1004 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 1116 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 1313 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. NONE
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 (NOT PRESENT)	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. N/A

Next FRB Meeting: August 19, 2021

Signed: _____
Harold Medina, Chief of Police