



Force Review Board

CHIEF'S REPORT

(P78F)

OCTOBER 28, 2021

TIME: 1005 TO 1136 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) DCOP Michael Smathers (Special Operations Bureau) Interim DCOP Joshua Brown (Field Services Bureau) Commander Arturo Sanchez (Field Services – Northwest)
NON-VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	Judge Rod Kennedy (City Legal) – via teleconference Lieutenant [REDACTED] (FRB Admin Personnel/IAFD) Julie Jaramillo (FRB Admin Personnel/COD)
REPRESENTATIVES	Commander Renae McDermott (Training Academy) – via teleconference A/ Commander Richard Evans (IAFD) – via teleconference Sergeant [REDACTED] SOD/CNT) – via teleconference Sergeant [REDACTED] (CIU) – via teleconference A/ Lieutenant [REDACTED] (Training Academy) – via teleconference Patricia Serna (Policy and Procedure) – via teleconference Detective [REDACTED] (IAFD/Presenter) – via teleconference DCOP Eric Garcia (Police Reform) – via teleconference Interim DCOP Cori Lowe (Compliance Bureau) – via teleconference Chief of Staff Cecily Barker (Chief's Office) A/ Commander Jason Sanchez (COD) – via teleconference Deputy Commander Ben Bourgeois (IAFD) – via teleconference
OBSERVERS (P78b)	Sergeant [REDACTED] (TDY COD) – via teleconference Sergeant [REDACTED] (IAFD) – via teleconference A/ Sergeant [REDACTED] (IAFD) – via teleconference Marvin Barnes (IAFD) – via teleconference Dr. Jessica Henjy (Training Academy) – via teleconference Carlos Pacheco (City Legal) – via teleconference Elizabeth Martinez (USDOJ) – via teleconference Corey Sanders (USDOJ) – via teleconference Darryl Neier (EFIT) – via teleconference
PREVIOUS MINUTES	October 21, 2021
UNFINISHED BUSINESS	• None

CASE # 20-0085317	DATE OF INCIDENT: OCTOBER 21, 2020	LOCATION: [REDACTED]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1319 HOURS
TYPE: LEVEL 3 (P78)			
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"/> FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND INVESTIGATIVE CHAIN UNAVAILABLE <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 type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" 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. WHAT IS THE TRAINING FOR OFFICERS OF WHEN THEY ADVISE AN INDIVIDUAL THEY ARE BEING DETAINED VERSUS ARRESTED? WHY DOES AN OFFICER ADVISE AN INDIVIDUAL THEY ARE BEING DETAINED IF THEY KNOW THE INDIVIDUAL IS UNDER ARREST? A. WHAT AN OFFICER ADVISES AN INDIVIDUAL HAS EVERYTHING TO DO WITH WHERE THEY ARE IN THE INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS.

- I. IF THE OFFICER HAS REASONABLE SUSPICION TO DETAIN AN INDIVIDUAL BUT IS STILL LACKING PROBABLE CAUSE, THEY WILL ADVISE THE INDIVIDUAL THEY ARE DETAINED.
 - II. ONCE AN OFFICER ESTABLISHES PROBABLE CAUSE, THEY WILL ADVISE THE INDIVIDUAL THEY ARE UNDER ARREST.
2. ARE WE ELABORATING ON THIS TOPIC DURING TRAINING OF THE CADETS?
 - A. YES.
3. DID ARCHULETA ADVISE HE WOULD PRESS CHARGES AGAINST THE INDIVIDUAL BEFORE OR AFTER OFFICERS DETAINED THE INDIVIDUAL?
 - A. BEFORE.
 - I. INITIALLY, WHEN ARCHULETA DECLINED, OFFICERS ADVISED HIM WITHOUT A VICTIM, THEY DO NOT HAVE A CRIME.
 - II. ARCHULETA EXPRESSED CONCERN THINKING OFFICERS WERE NOT GOING TO TALK TO THE INDIVIDUAL, SO HE DECIDED TO PRESS CHARGES.
4. WHY DID OFFICERS NOT GO HANDS ON WHEN THE INDIVIDUAL WAS BEING COMPLIANT?
 - A. THE OFFICERS KNEW THE INDIVIDUAL WAS THE SUSPECT OF A VIOLENT FELONY AND POTENTIALLY ARMED WITH A BOX CUTTER. THEY FELT THE RISK OF INJURY TO GO HANDS ON WAS TOO GREAT.
5. WHAT WAS THE APPROXIMATE TIMEFRAME BETWEEN WHEN THE INDIVIDUAL WENT TO HIS KNEES TO WHEN HE BECAME NONCOMPLIANT AND HE TOOK OFF RUNNING?
 - A. APPROXIMATELY 10-SECOND PERIOD WHERE THE INDIVIDUAL BECAME NON-COOPERATIVE FROM WHEN THEY WERE GIVING ORDERS.
6. THE ON-SCENE ACTING SERGEANT WAS ORDERING FORCE. DID SHE FEEL THE OFFICERS WERE NOT TAKING ACTION OR WAS SHE JUST BEING PROACTIVE TO CONTROL THE SITUATION?
 - A. SHE WAS BEING PROACTIVE. THE OFFICER WAS A P2/C AT THE TIME OF THIS INCIDENT.
 - I. THE OFFICER ALSO EXPLAINED THIS DURING HIS USE OF FORCE INTERVIEW.
7. USE OF FORCE #5 (USE OF 40MM) WAS DEEMED OUT OF POLICY; HOWEVER, USE OF FORCE #6 (SHOW OF FORCE WITH THE 40MM) WAS IN POLICY. WHY IS ONE IN AND THE OTHER OUT OF POLICY WHEN THE BEHAVIOR OF THE INDIVIDUAL WAS SIMILAR DURING THOSE MOMENTS?
 - A. THE USE OF 40MM WAS DETERMINED TO BE AN OUT OF POLICY USE OF FORCE BECAUSE IT WAS NOT AN IMMINENT THREAT. THE SHOW OF FORCE WHEN THE INDIVIDUAL WAS RUNNING WAS REASONABLE DUE TO IT BEING THE MINIMUM AMOUNT OF FORCE NECESSARY AND THE

OFFICER WAS TRYING TO GET THE INDIVIDUAL TO STOP HIS ACTIONS.

- B. HAD THE OFFICER USED THE 40MM IT WOULD HAVE BEEN DETERMINED TO BE AN OUT OF POLICY USE OF FORCE AS WELL.
 - C. THERE WERE DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN IAFD AND COD TO DETERMINE IF THE FORCE USED WOULD BE OUT OF POLICY THEN THE SHOW OF FORCE WOULD ALSO BE OUT OF POLICY.
8. WERE THE USES OF FORCE #7 AND #8 DETERMINED TO BE OUT OF POLICY BECAUSE THEY WERE TASINGS FROM AN ELEVATED AND ON A FLEEING INDIVIDUAL ONLY?
- A. BOTH USES OF FORCE WERE OUT OF POLICY REGARDLESS BECAUSE THEY WERE FLEEING AND ELEVATED POSITION.
9. THE PRESENTER'S STATEMENT OF THE CONVERSATION BETWEEN IAFD AND COD THAT IF A USE OF FORCE IS OUT OF POLICY, THEN A SHOW OF FORCE WITH THE SAME WEAPON SYSTEM WOULD ALSO BE OUT OF POLICY IS CONCERNING.
- A. ULTIMATELY, IT WAS DETERMINED THIS WOULD NOT BE APPROPRIATE TO SAY, WHICH IS WHY THE SHOW OF FORCE WAS FOUND POLICY.
10. A SHOW OF FORCE IS SEEN AS THE SAME AS A LEVEL 1 USE OF FORCE. THIS SHOULD BE REEVALUATED BECAUSE THE INTENT BEHIND A SHOW OF FORCE IS TO CHANGE THE MIND FRAME OF AN INDIVIDUAL TO PREVENT THE NEED TO USE FORCE.
11. IS THERE A WAY TO WRITE THIS INTO POLICY TO COVER THE DIFFERENT CONCERNS?
- A. THIS WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO COMPLETE.
12. HAD THE OFFICERS TACKLED THE INDIVIDUAL INSTEAD, WOULD IT HAVE BEEN AN IN POLICY USE OF FORCE?
- A. IT WOULD BE EVALUATED WITH THE USE OF FORCE POLICY, NOT THE ECW POLICY.
13. THE UNREPORTED USE OF FORCE (SHOW OF FORCE) WAS DETERMINED TO BE IN POLICY. HOW WAS IT RECTIFIED THAT SHE MISSED THE SHOW OF FORCE?
- A. DURING THE USE OF FORCE INTERVIEW, THE IAFD DETECTIVE ASKED THE OFFICER IF SHE REALIZED SHE MISSED THE SHOWS OF FORCE.
 - I. THE OFFICER ADVISED DID NOT REALIZE SHE HAD SHOWN FORCE.
14. SHE DID NOT KNOW SHE USED FORCE BUT HAD SHE USED FORCE, IT WOULD BE IN POLICY?
- A. CORRECT.
15. THERE WERE TWO INSTANCES WHERE SHE DID NOT RECOGNIZE SHE USED FORCE?
- A. CORRECT. WHEN DISCOVERED, SHE DID NOT RECEIVE ANY CORRECTIVE ACTION; HOWEVER, THEY DID NOT DO ANY FOLLOW UP DUE TO HER NO LONGER BEING WITH THE DEPARTMENT.

		<p>16. WHAT TYPE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION WOULD OCCUR IF AN OFFICER FAILED TO IDENTIFY FORCE THEY USED NOW?</p> <p>A. IF IAFD IDENTIFIES THIS NOW, A TARGET LETTER AND CORRECTIVE ACTION HAPPEN THROUGH THE INVESTIGATION.</p> <p>B. WHEN IT GETS TO COMPLIANCE FOR FRB PREPARATION AND IS DISCOVERED, SOME TYPE OF DOCUMENTATION WILL OCCUR AND LIKELY FOLLOW UP WITH IAFD WILL OCCUR.</p> <p>17. PRESENTER STATED THE SHOW OF FORCE WAS USED TO DEESCALATE, THEN THEY SAID IT WAS USED TO GAIN COMPLIANCE. ARE WE USING A SHOW OF FORCE TO DEESCALATE?</p> <p>A. NO, MISSPOKE.</p> <p>18. DID OFFICER #1 IDENTIFY WHETHER HE RECOGNIZED HE WAS INDEPENDENTLY JUSTIFIED TO USE FORCE OR WAS HE ONLY DOING IT BECAUSE HE WAS COMMANDED?</p> <p>A. THE OFFICER IDENTIFIED IT AS INDEPENDENTLY JUSTIFIED ACTIONS, APART FROM THE ORDER FROM THE ACTING SERGEANT.</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>				
(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>				
<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 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? <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 type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO (NOT PRESENT)	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. NOT PRESENT.

CASE # 21-0055772	DATE OF INCIDENT: JULY 17, 2021	LOCATION: [REDACTED]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1406 HOURS
TYPE: LEVEL 2 (P78)			
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"/> FRB DETECTIVE PRESENTER AND INVESTIGATIVE CHAIN UNAVAILABLE <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? (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input 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 type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input 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. LOOKING AT A COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS WITH THIS ONLY BEING A SHOPLIFTING, THIS DOES NOT MAKE SENSE; HOWEVER, DUE TO THE ACTIONS OF THE INDIVIDUAL, IT WAS NECESSARY. HAD HE COOPERATED, WOULD THE INDIVIDUAL RECEIVED A CITATION AND BE ON HIS WAY? A. CORRECT. 2. REFERRAL FOR REVIEW OF POLICIES 2.56.5.C.1 AND 2.57.3.C.1.G REGARDING COMPLETION OF USE OF FORCE NARRATIVES TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT OFFICER FATIGUE AND THE ABILITY FOR A SUPERVISOR TO GRANT AN EXTENSION WHERE NECESSARY. DUE IN 60 DAYS. A. IAFD IS WORKING WITH DEPUTY CHIEF BROWN ON LEVEL 1 USE OF FORCE NARRATIVES, NOT SPECIFICALLY TO EXTENSIONS. 3. PROCESS TO DEAL WITH THE CASA LIMITATIONS REGARDING EXTENSIONS ON USE OF FORCE NARRATIVES. 				
<p>DID ANY MEMBER IN ATTENDANCE FAIL TO VOTE? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO (P78e).</p>		<p>DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, IDENTIFY CONCERNS, DEFICIENCIES, OR SUCCESSES NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE CASE PRESENTER FOR:</p>				
	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 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 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: 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 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: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, VOTE THAT THE IAFD INVESTIGATION WAS THOROUGH AND COMPLETE? (P78a)</u>
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: DID THE FRB, BY A MAJORITY VOTE, DETERMINE THAT THE UOF IS CONSISTENT WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY? (P78d)</u>
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: 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 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 type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO (NOT PRESENT)	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. NOT PRESENT

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)	POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANAGER PATRICIA SERNA WILL REVIEW POLICIES 2.56.5.C.1 AND 2.57.3.C.1.G REGARDING COMPLETION OF USE OF FORCE NARRATIVES TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT OFFICER FATIGUE AND THE ABILITY FOR A SUPERVISOR TO GRANT AN EXTENSION WHERE NECESSARY.
EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESPONDING TO REFERRAL(S): (P78e)	POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANAGER PATRICIA SERNA
DEADLINE: (P78e)	JANUARY 3, 2022

Next FRB Meeting: November 4, 2021

Signed: _____
Harold Medina, Chief of Police