



Force Review Board

**CHIEF'S
REPORT**
(P78F)

JUNE 10, 2021

TIME: 1002 TO 1226
HOURS

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

FRB CHAIR
(P78)

DCOP JJ Griego (Management Services and Support Bureau)

VOTING MEMBERS
(P78)

DCOP Donny Olvera (Field Services Bureau)
DCOP Arturo Gonzalez (Investigative Bureau)
Commander Tim Espinosa (Southwest Area Command)
A/ Commander [REDACTED] (Training Academy)

**NON-VOTING
MEMBERS**
(P78)

Judge Rod Kennedy (Legal)
Edward Harness (CPOA Director)
Lieutenant [REDACTED] (FRB Admin Personnel/IAFD)
Julie Jaramillo (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD)

REPRESENTATIVES

Commander Cori Lowe (IAFD)- via teleconference
A/ Commander [REDACTED] (SOD)
Lieutenant [REDACTED] (CIT) – via teleconference
Sergeant [REDACTED] (SOD/CNT)
Sergeant [REDACTED] (SOD/K9)
Patricia Serna (OPA)
Lieutenant [REDACTED] (SOD/Presenter)
Sergeant [REDACTED] (IAFD/Presenter)
DCOP Eric Garcia (Compliance Bureau)
Superintendent Sylvester Stanley (Police Reform)
Deputy Commander Ben Bourgeois (IAFD)
A/ Deputy Commander [REDACTED] (IAFD) – via teleconference

OBSERVERS
(P78b)

Sergeant [REDACTED] (IAFD) – via teleconference
Detective [REDACTED] (IAFD) – via teleconference
Officer [REDACTED] (IAFD/FRB)
Christine Bodo (Compliance Bureau) – via teleconference
Elizabeth Martinez (USDOJ) – via teleconference
Corey Sanders (USDOJ) – via teleconference
Stephen Ryals (USDOJ) – via teleconference
Yvonne Demmerritte (USDOJ) – via teleconference
Darreill Bone (EFIT) – via teleconference
Darryl Neier (EFIT) – via teleconference

PREVIOUS MINUTES June 3, 2021

UNFINISHED
BUSINESS

- None

REFERRAL RESPONSE(S)					
CASE NUMBER	MEETING DATE	REFERRAL	REFERRAL PARTY	ACTION TAKEN	STATUS

19-0031543	11/19/2020	Send the case back to IAFD for additional investigation specifically to review the potential vehicle pursuit and conduct additional interviews regarding the use of force, specific to shows of force in this case.	Commander Cori Lowe	Commander Lowe requested a 30-day extension.	Update due July 12, 2021
20-0037586	5/20/2021	The FRB has identified a deficiency/concern related to training. The Training Academy will use this incident as an example in the EPIC curriculum for when officers should intervene another officer's actions.	A/Commander [REDACTED]	Sergeant [REDACTED] completed a department memorandum, which was provided to the FRB on June 9, 2021.	Closed
20-0037586	5/21/2021	he FRB has identified a deficiency/concern related to supervision. Deputy Chief Donovan Olvera will complete a Mandatory Behavior Services Referral Form for Officer [REDACTED]	Deputy Chief Donovan Olvera	Deputy Chief Olvera advised the referral form was completed on May 25, 2021.	Closed

CASE #: 20-0051552		DATE OF INCIDENT: JUNE 29, 2021	LOCATION: [REDACTED]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 0513 HOURS
TYPE: LEVEL 3 (P78)				
CASE PRESENTER	SERGEANT [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
<p>DID EACH VOTING MEMBER OF THE FORCE REVIEW BOARD REVIEW THE MATERIAL PRIOR TO THE MEETING?</p> <p>(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".)</p>	<p>FIELD SERVICES DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT</p> <p>ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT</p> <p>INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT</p> <p>TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT</p> <p>FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT</p>
<p>DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION?</p> <p>(P78a)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
<p>DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS?</p> <p>(P78c)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
DISCUSSION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. THE INDIVIDUAL ALLOWED OFFICERS INTO THE ROOM CORRECT? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. YES. SHE WAS ANGRY BUT SAID, "COME ON IN." 2. THE INDIVIDUAL TOLD OFFICERS SHE WOULD PAY UNTIL 11 AND WOULD STAY UNTIL THEN. ANY REASON OFFICERS HAD TO REMOVE HER PRIOR? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. THERE IS A CITY ORDINANCE THAT ALLOWS HOTELS/MOTELS TO REMOVE DISORDERLY GUESTS. OFFICERS SPOKE TO TWO EMPLOYEES WHO WERE ADAMANT ABOUT HAVING HER REMOVED. 3. IN THESE TYPES OF CASE, JUST BECAUSE WE CAN, DOES NOT ALWAYS MEAN WE HAVE TO. ASSESS WHETHER OR NOT IT IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY THAT WE DO. WHAT IS THE TRAINING FOR OFFICERS ON TAKING ACTION ON THESE TYPES OF CALLS? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. NOTHING SPECIFIC TO THIS SCENARIO WITH THE EXCEPTION OF LOOKING AT THE TOTALITY OF CIRCUMSTANCES. B. IT IS IMPORTANT TO ALSO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE REQUEST FROM THE HOTEL MANAGER WHO SAID THEY WANTED THE SUBJECT REMOVED.

4. HOW MUCH CONVERSATION WITH THE EMPLOYEES WAS THERE? WERE THEY ADAMANT ABOUT HAVING HER REMOVED OR JUST REQUESTED?
 - A. WHEN THE FIRST OFFICER SPOKE TO THE CLERK, THEY REQUESTED. THE SECOND CONVERSATION, THE CLERK WAS ADAMANT.
5. OVERALL GOAL IS FOR OFFICERS TO MOVE FORWARD IN THE LEAST INTRUSIVE MANNER. THEY OFFERED TO MOVE HER TO A SECOND ROOM BUT HER REACTION WAS NOT POSITIVE. THEY TRIED THE LESSER INTRUSIVE WAY AND WHEN THEY REALIZED THIS WAS NOT WORKING AND ALONG WITH HER ELEVATED STATE, MADE IT REASONABLE FOR OFFICERS TO TAKE ACTION.
6. DID OFFICERS REVIEW VIDEO PRIOR TO TALKING WITH HER?
 - A. UNKNOWN.
7. ANY INTOXICATION NOTICED BY THE OFFICERS?
 - A. UNKNOWN.
8. IS SHE IN THE CIU DATABASE?
 - A. NO; HOWEVER, SHE WAS NOT FROM HERE.
9. APPEARS THERE WAS A MENTAL HEALTH CONCERN ON BOARD. WHEN DOES DISENGAGEMENT COME INTO PLACE?
 - A. AGREED. GOOD TRAINING OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE OFFICERS MULTIPLE WAYS TO HANDLE THE CALL. WOULD THE CLERK BE OK IF SHE WERE TO QUIET DOWN, THEY TO ALLOW HER TO STAY UNTIL CHECKOUT. IF SHE DOES NOT, OFFICERS CAN RESPOND BACK OUT.
10. DID THE MANAGER EVER TELL HER TO LEAVE?
 - A. UNKNOWN. WHEN SHE BROKE THE PLEXIGLAS, HE IMMEDIATELY GOT ON THE PHONE AND TOLD HER HE WAS CALLING FOR OFFICERS.
11. REFERENCE DE-ESCALATION, WHAT WAS CIU'S ASSESSMENT?
 - A. SEEMED LIKE A HALF-HEARTED EFFORT. IT IS HARD TO PREDICT WHAT COULD HAVE HAPPENED BUT SEEMS LIKE THERE COULD HAVE BEEN BETTERS WAYS TO DE-ESCALATE.
 - B. REFERRAL NEEDED?
 - I. THIS IS JUST ANOTHER CONSIDERATION BUT HARD TO TRAIN ON EVERY SITUATION.
12. THERE ARE MULTIPLE CONSIDERATIONS TO MAKE ON THIS CALL. (E.G. THE INDIVIDUAL'S BEHAVIOR, THE VIDEOS, CRIMES COMMITTED, ETC.) GOOD TRAINING SITUATION.
13. IT'S A GOOD EXAMPLE OF EMOTIONS BEING HIGH ON THE REPORTING PARTY AND BY PROVIDING THEM TIME TO SETTLE AND DE-ESCALATE THEM AS WELL WOULD ALSO BE BENEFICIAL TO CHANGING THE OUTCOME OF THE CALL.
 - A. AGREED WITH PROVIDING THEM A MULTITUDE OF OPTIONS ON A CALL LIKE THIS.

14. DOES SEEM LIKE THEY ESCALATED HER. DO YOU THINK IT WOULD HAVE CHANGED THE OUTCOME OF THE CALL?
- A. NO.
15. THEY COULD HAVE DONE A BETTER JOB COMMUNICATING; HOWEVER, TIER 4 ADDRESSED THESE CONCERNS.
16. YES BUT THE TRAINING OCCURRED IN AN OPEN SPACE. THE OFFICERS WERE HAVING ISSUES IN THE CONFINED SPACE. ANY CONSIDERATIONS FOR TRAINING UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES?
- A. WE DO NOT PRACTICE HANDCUFFING OR DEFENSIVE TACTICS ENOUGH AS IS; HOWEVER, THE TEAM TRAINING TACTICS, THERE IS A REFRESHER TRAINING TO FOLLOW THIS UP.
- I. IT IS A GOOD CONSIDERATION TO TRAIN UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES AS WELL.
17. REEDUCATE THE BOARD ON THE TRAINING/TECHNIQUES FOR HANDCUFFING LARGER INDIVIDUALS AND/OR AMPUTEES?
- A. TRAINING USING MULTIPLE SET OF HANDCUFFS AND EVALUATING THE PROPER AMOUNT TO USE. ALSO TRANSPORTING LARGER SUBJS BY USING AN AMBULANCE, ETC.
- B. RECENT REFERRAL WILL ALSO ADDRESS THIS CONCERN BY LOOKING INTO EQUIPMENT TO PREVENT SUBJS MOVING HANDCUFFS TO FRONT BY HANDCUFFING TO A NYLON BELT. THIS WOULD HELP THIS CONCERN AS WELL.
18. REGARDING WHEN OFFICER [REDACTED] GOT SPIT ON. WAS HER REACTION A DISTRACTION TECHNIQUE OR JUST A REACTION?
- A. A REACTION CAN STILL BE A TECHNIQUE. WE ARE TRAINED TO REACT WITH CERTAIN TECHNIQUES. TRAINED IN EMPTY HAND STRIKES AND DISTRACTION TECHNIQUES AND SINCE WE ARE TRAINED IN THEM, A REACTION CAN BE USING A TRAINED TECHNIQUE.
19. CHARGES WERE DROPPED. IS THERE A WAY TO DO A DEEPER DIVE TO FIND OUT WHY THESE CHARGES ARE DROPPED? IT WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO SEE WHY THIS IS OCCURRING TO IMPROVE PROSECUTION ON THE OFFENDERS WE ARE USING FORCE.
- A. AGREED THIS WOULD BE GOOD.
20. IT COULD HAVE BEEN DUE TO HER NOT LIVING HERE.
- A. CORRECT BUT IT IS OCCURRING ON MANY OF THESE INVESTIGATIONS. YES, CASELOAD IS HIGH BUT STILL GOOD INFORMATION TO HAVE.
- B. POSSIBLE ACCOUNT WITH ODYSSEY CASE MANAGER IN ORDER TO GET THIS INFORMATION.
- C. THERE COULD ALSO BE THE CONCERN OF DISMISSING THE CASE TO PREVENT THE CASE FROM BEING DISMISSED DUE TO TIMELINES.
21. WHAT IS THE POLICY OF INTERVIEWING CHILDREN WHERE THE CHILD BELONGS TO THE PERSON WE USE FORCE ON?

		<p>A. MIRANDA ON JUVENILES IF UNDER ARREST? YES, THERE IS A POLICY.</p> <p>B. BEING THE INDIVIDUAL'S CHILD WAS NOT UNDER ARREST AND DID NOT MEET POLICY. THERE IS A LOT OF TRAINING AVAILABLE TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT A CHILD CAN BE A INTERVIEWED AS A WITNESS.</p> <p>22. THERE IS POLICY NOT TO USE A CHILD AS AN INTERPRETER FOR A DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SITUATION. THIS MIGHT NOT BE THE BEST TO INTERVIEW THEM. IS THERE CONFLICT WITH THE TWO POLICIES?</p> <p>A. WOULD NOT BE A CONFLICT IF THERE IS NOT A POLICY.</p> <p>23. NO NEED TO PROHIBIT, BUT MAYBE POLICY TO MAKE CONSIDERATIONS TO THIS CONCERN.</p> <p>24. ARE THERE GUIDELINES FOR INTERVIEWING PROCESS IN THE IAPS SOP THAT IAFD CAN MIRROR?</p> <p>A. NOTHING IN THIS SPECIFIC SOP.</p> <p>B. REFERRAL TO P&P IF WHAT WE ARE DOING NOW FOR INTERVIEWING CHILDREN IN ADMIN 27S IS THE BEST PRACTICE. DUE DATE: 30 DAYS</p> <p>25. IS THIS IS BEING TAUGHT AT THE DETECTIVE ACADEMY?</p> <p>A. UNKNOWN.</p> <p>26. ON THE USE OF FORCE DETECTIVE NARRATIVE BY IAFD, QUESTIONS 5, 6, AND 12 WERE CUT AND PASTED FROM A RESPONSE. IS THIS STILL A CURRENT PRACTICE?</p> <p>A. NO. THE PROCESS HAS EVOLVED AND NOW REQUIRES AN ANALYSIS FROM THE DETECTIVE.</p>				
<p>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>		<p>DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER FOR:</p>				
(P78e)	POLICY	TACTICS	EQUIPMENT	TRAINING	SUPERVISION	SUCCESSES
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input 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 type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
<p>WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?</p>		<p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>				
<p>PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ENTERING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS REQUEST (IAR)</p>		<p>N/A</p>				
<p>SOP TITLE OF VIOLATION</p>		<p>N/A</p>				
<p>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>		<p><u>FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY:</u> WAS THE TACTICAL ACTIVATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S SPECIALIZED RESPONSE PROTOCOLS?</p>				
<p>MAJORITY VOTE</p>		<p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION</p>				
<p>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>		<p><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?</p>				

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

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OFFICERS DO NEED TO BE EMPOWERED TO BE ABLE TO GO BACK TO THE MANAGER TO DETERMINE WHETHER DISENGAGEMENT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. IMPORTANT TO ALSO CONSIDER THE PROPERTY DAMAGE ELEMENT. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. AGREED BUT DISENGAGEMENT COULD STILL BE A POSSIBLE OPTION. 2. IF THE INVESTIGATIVE SERGEANT INCORRECTLY DETERMINED THE USE OF FORCE TO BE A LEVEL 2, HOW WAS THIS HANDLED? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. IT WAS AN ACTING SERGEANT COMPLETING THE ON SCENE FORCE INVESTIGATION. HE UNDERSTOOD A TAKEDOWN AND STRIKE OCCURRED; HOWEVER, DID NOT CONSIDER THE FACT THE INDIVIDUAL WAS HANDCUFFED AT THE TIME. IT WAS AN OVERSIGHT, WHICH WAS CAUGHT BY IAFD WHEN THEY RESPONDED. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. WAS THE OFFICER NOTIFIED OF THE MISTAKE? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UNKNOWN BUT IT WAS COVERED IN TIER 4. 3. IN POLICY.

DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE FOR THE REFERRAL? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> IAR	REFERRAL INFORMATION
TYPE OF REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> POLICY <input type="checkbox"/> POLICY VIOLATION (IAR) <input type="checkbox"/> TRAINING <input type="checkbox"/> SUPERVISION <input type="checkbox"/> EQUIPMENT <input type="checkbox"/> TACTICS <input type="checkbox"/> SUCCESS (IAR)
REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	THE FRB HAS IDENTIFIED A DEFICIENCY/CONCERN RELATED TO POLICY. POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANAGER PATRICIA SERNA WILL REVIEW POLICY TO DETERMINE IF THE CURRENT PRACTICE, OF INTERVIEWING CHILDREN IN ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS, THE DEPARTMENT FOLLOWS IS BEST PRACTICE.
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANAGER, PATRICIA SERNA
DEADLINE: (P78e)	JULY 12 2021

CASE #: 20-0096558	DATE OF INCIDENT: DECEMBER 1-2, 2020	LOCATION: [REDACTED]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1845 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 2104 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 0014 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		

<p>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")</p>		<p>FIELD SERVICES DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT</p> <p>ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT</p> <p>INVESTIGATIVE DEPUTY CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT</p> <p>TRAINING ACADEMY REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT</p> <p>FIELD SERVICES COMMANDER REPRESENTATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT PRESENT</p>				
<p>DID THE FRB REVIEW THE CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE COMPLETION OF THE INVESTIGATION? (P78a)</p>		<p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>				
<p>DID THE BOARD GENERATE A REFERRAL REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION TO IMPROVE THE FORCE INVESTIGATION FINDINGS? (P78c)</p>		<p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</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"> 1. COULD HEAR SOD PERSONNEL COUGHING FROM THE NFDD. WHEN DOES IT BECOME A REQUIREMENT FOR THEM TO WEAR GAS MASKS? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. UPON ENTRY. B. SOD PURCHASED EQUIPMENT FOR BETTER COMMUNICATION WHILE USING THE GAS MASKS. 2. WERE DRONES UTILIZED DURING THIS CALL? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. NO THIS INCIDENT OCCURRED DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DRONES. 3. WERE THERE CONCERNS WITH DRIVING THE ROOK SO CLOSE NOW KNOWING THE INDIVIDUAL'S ACCESSIBILITY TO WEAPONS INSIDE THE RESIDENCE? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. CONSIDERATIONS MADE AND THE ROOK CAN WITHSTAND A 50-CALIBER BULLET. 				
<p>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>		<p>DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER FOR:</p>				
(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
<p>WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?</p>		<p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>				

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 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:</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 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:</u> 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	<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 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:</u> 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

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

CASE #: 20-0099001		DATE OF INCIDENT: DECEMBER 11, 2020	LOCATION: [REDACTED]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 2026 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 2257 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 0023 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 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 type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" 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			
DISCUSSION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO			
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. THE INDIVIDUAL HAD A BLOODY ARM. REASON WHY?			

		<p>A. THE INDIVIDUAL WAS HIGHLY INTOXICATED. HE PUNCHED THE WINDOWS, ETC. SO IT WAS DETERMINED TO WALK UP TO HIM TO MAKE CONTACT, IN LIEU OF USING LESS LETHAL MUNITIONS.</p> <p>2. INVESTIGATION IDENTIFIED THE INDIVIDUAL WAS BARRICADED. HOW WAS THIS CONFIRMED?</p> <p>A. SPATIAL SEPARATION TO PREVENT CONTACT WITH OFFICERS AND AN OVERT ACTION FROM PREVENTING OFFICERS FROM MAKING CONTACT.</p> <p>I. THE INDIVIDUAL WAS PLACING FURNITURE IN FRONT OF THE DOOR.</p> <p>B. SOD USED A ROBOT IN ATTEMPT TO OPEN THE DOOR AND WAS UNABLE TO DO SO DUE TO THE ITEMS PLACED IN FRONT.</p> <p>3. ACCOLADES FOR SERGEANT [REDACTED] RESPONSE WITH CONSIDERING THE TOTALITY AND HOW TO APPROPRIATELY RESPOND.</p> <p>A. SERGEANT [REDACTED] HAS BEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN IMPLEMENTING THE CHANGES AT SOD.</p>				
<p>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>		<p>DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER FOR:</p>				
P78a	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
<p>WAS A POLICY VIOLATION IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD?</p>		<p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>				
<p>PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR ENTERING THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS REQUEST (IAR)</p>		<p>N/A</p>				
<p>SOP TITLE OF VIOLATION</p>		<p>N/A</p>				
<p>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>		<p><u>FOR TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS ONLY:</u> WAS THE TACTICAL ACTIVATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S SPECIALIZED RESPONSE PROTOCOLS?</p>				
<p>MAJORITY VOTE</p>		<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION</p>				
<p>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>		<p><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?</p>				
<p>MAJORITY VOTE</p>		<p><input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> NOT A TACTICAL ACTIVATION</p>				

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

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: June 17, 2021

Signed: 
Harold Medina, Chief of Police