Force Review Board

CHIEF'S REPORT
(P78F)

JULY 22, 2021

TIME: 1002 TO 1139 HOURS

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

FRB CHAIR (P78i)	Commander Elizabeth Armijo (Aviation Division)
VOTING MEMBERS (P78i)	DCOP Michael Smathers (Special Operations Bureau) A/DCOP Luke Languit (Investigative Bureau) Interim DCOP Joshua Brown (Field Services Bureau) Commander Johnny Yara (Southeast Area Command) A/Commander [redacted] (Training Academy)
NON-VOTING MEMBERS (P78i)	Trevor Rigler (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 Policy Manager Patricia Serna (Policy and Procedure) Katharine Jacobs (IAFD/Presenter of Quarterly Update) Detective [redacted] (IAFD/Presenter) Sergeant [redacted] (SOD/Presenter)
OBSERVERS (P78b)	A/Commander Richard Evans (IAFD) Deputy Commander Ben Bourgeois (IAFD) A/ Deputy Commander [redacted] (IAFD) Officer [redacted] IAFD ILD) Bill Hurlock (EFIT) – via teleconference
PREVIOUS MINUTES	July 15, 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	Interim Deputy Chief Cori Lowe	A/Commander Rich Evans provided the investigative addendum, which was provided to the board on 7/21/2021. A/Commander Evans advised with the approval from the board, the case will be inserted back into the FRB	Closed

		of force, specific to shows of force in this case.		presentation pool to be presented to the FRB.	
20-0051552	6/10/2021	Policy and procedure manager Patricia Serna will review policy to determine the current practice of interviewing children in administrative investigations.	Policy and Procedure Manager Patricia Serna	Policy and Procedure Manager Patricia Serna complete a memorandum in response to the referral. A synopsis of the memo was provided to the FRB during the meeting on 7/22/2021.	Closed
20-0026670	6/24/2021	Lieutenant [redacted] will evaluate the timeline on what it will take to audit the IAPRo database to back check each officer for the EIS query during the timeframe from when the EIS changes were made ensuring the EIS is triggered.	Lieutenant [redacted]	Lt [redacted] provided a memorandum responding to the referral, which was provided to the board on 7/21/2021.	Closed

USE OF FORCE 2ND QUARTER REPORT	
PRESENTER	KATHARINE JACOBS
DISCUSSION	☒ YES ☐ NO
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. WHY IS THE PTC REPRESENTED SEPARATE RATHER THAN IN THE VA? A. PTC IS BROKEN OUT SEPARATELY BECAUSE OF HOW MANY DIFFERENT AREA COMMANDS ARE REPRESENTED. 2. NOT SURPRISED OF THE UPTICK AT THE MALL BECAUSE OF THE MAYOR AND CHIEF'S INITIATIVE THIS IS NOT A SURPRISE. 3. WHY HAVE THERE NOT BEEN ANY POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE HIGH PERCENTAGE OF CASES INVOLVING INDIVIDUALS ENTERING AND/OR EXITING A PATROL CAR? EVEN IF IT DOES NOT GET INCORPORATED, IT SHOULD AT LEAST BE ASSESSED. A. POLICY WILL LOOK INTO IT. 4. IS THIS DATA FOR THE DISCIPLINE REGARDING OBRD VIOLATIONS RESULTING FROM BOTH THE MONTHLY INSPECTIONS AND FORCE INVESTIGATIONS? A. UNSURE WILL CHECK WHAT SEQUEL CODE WAS RAN BUT BELIEVES IT WAS ONLY GENERATED FROM FII'S. 5. TYPE OF ALLEGATION IS APPLICABLE DUE TO THE DIFFERENCE IN THE SERIOUSNESS BETWEEN AN OFFICER WHO DID NOT DOWNLOAD THEIR OBRDS BY END OF SHIFT VS. DID NOT RECORD

	AN INCIDENT. THIS MIGHT EXPLAIN THE REVERSE VARIATION OF DISCIPLINE. A. HAD NOT CONSIDERED THESE FACTORS. WILL ANALYZE THESE ADDITIONAL POINTS OF DATA AND INCLUDE IN THE NEXT QUARTERLY UPDATE. 6. ALSO WOULD BE GOOD TO SEE HOW MANY ARE COMING FROM THE MONTHLY INSPECTIONS VS. FORCE INVESTIGATION.

DID THE CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS OR MAKE A STATEMENT TO THE PRESENTER? ☒ YES ☐ NO	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. WAS THE DATA REGARDING THE HIGH PERCENTAGE OF CASES INVOLVING INDIVIDUALS ENTERING AND/OR EXITING A PATROL CAR USED TO REWRITE POLICY 2-52? A. NO.

CASE #: 21-0001037 TYPE: LEVEL 3 (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: JANUARY 4, 2021	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 2040 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. CONFIRMING WHILE OFFICERS WERE WAITING FOR MEDICAL TO ARRIVE TO EVALUATE THE INDIVIDUAL, THERE WAS A 27-MINUTE TIMEFRAME WHERE OFFICERS ATTEMPTED DE-ESCALATION. A. CORRECT. 2. LIEUTENANT [redacted] NOTICED THE INDIVIDUAL MADE SEVERAL COMMENTS REGARDING BEING SEXUALLY MOLESTED A WEEK PRIOR. DID OFFICERS FOLLOW THIS UP? A. SERGEANT [redacted] ASKED THE INDIVIDUAL IF IT WAS REPORTED, TO WHICH THE FEMALE ADVISED SHE DOES NOT TRUST OFFICERS OR THE FBI. 3. ANY FOLLOW UP REGARDING HER BEING SUICIDAL. WAS SHE EVALUATED FOR HER SUICIDAL THOUGHTS. A. HOSPITAL EVALUATION WAS A MEDICAL CLEARANCE AFTER WHICH SHE BOOKED. AT MDC IF THERE WERE ALLEGATIONS OF SUICIDE, IT IS MANDATORY THEY BE CLEARED BY MEDICAL AT MDC. 4. OFFICERS DID COMPLETE A MENTAL HEALTH FORM WAS THIS FOLLOWED UP BY CIT? A. CIT IS NOT SHOWING HER ON THEIR CASELOAD OR A REFERRAL.
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. APPRECIATED SGT [redacted] CONVERSATIONS WITH THE INDIVIDUAL. SHE DID AN EXCELLENT JOB. A. THANK YOU. 2. IN POLICY.

CASE #: 21-0029927	DATE OF INCIDENT: APRIL 19, 2021	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1614 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 1755 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 2046 HOURS
TYPE: SOD (P78)			

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. NOTHING.			
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. HOW WERE THE OFFICERS ABLE TO TRACK THE INDIVIDUAL'S CELL PHONE TO THE APT? A. UNKNOWN THAT WAS COMPLETED BY THE FIELD OFFICERS PRIOR TO SOD'S RESPONSE.

CASE #: 21-0032465 TYPE: SOD (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: MARCH 28, 202	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1226 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 1306 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 1827 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. WAS THE CONCERN REGARDING MCT NOT RESPONDING TO THE SCENE ADDRESSED? A. IT IS A STANDARD PART OF THE VETTING PROCESS TO ENSURE THE FIELD HAS ATTEMPTED TO HAVE MCT RESPOND TO THE SCENE TO ASSIST PRIOR TO SOD RESPONDING. 2. DOES A CALL WITH CRIMINAL CHARGES AND THE SUBJECT IS NOT COMPLIANT FIT THE RESPONSE CRITERIA FOR MCT? A. NO, LIEUTENANT [redacted] WOULD NOT RECOMMEND USING MCT FOR THIS PROCESS. 3. THERE WAS A 4-HOUR DELAY BETWEEN THE FIELD RESPONSE AND TACTICAL COMING OUT, WOULD IT BE BENEFICIAL TO HAVE CIU RESPOND TO ATTEMPT THIS RESOURCE PRIOR TO SOD RESPONDING? A. TO TIE UP CIU DETECTIVES AND/OR MCT ON A TACTICAL ACTIVATIONS WITH SOMEONE WHO IS REFUSING TO COMMUNICATE WHEN THEY COULD BE OUT ASSISTING ON OTHER CALLS IS NOT A GOOD USE OF RESOURCES AND WOULD NOT MAKE A DIFFERENCE ON THE CALL. 4. HOW CAN WE ENSURE THIS WOULD NOT MAKE A DIFFERENCE WHEN THEY HAVE MORE EXPERIENCE AND OTHER TOOLS TO ENCOURAGE AN INDIVIDUAL TO COMMUNICATE WITH THEM? A. ACCORDING TO THE CADS, MCT4 DID RESPOND. 5. IS THE VETTING BETWEEN BY SOD FOR BOTH ECIT AND MCT OR JUST MCT? A. IT IS EITHER. 6. SOD ACTIVATIONS DO NOT OCCUR EVERY DAY. TO ADDRESS THIS TYPE OF DELAY, HOW CAN THIS NOT BE A BENEFIT TO AT LEAST TRY? A. IN THIS CASE, ECIT WAS TRYING TO CONTACT THE INDIVIDUAL WITHOUT SUCCESS. CIU WOULD NOT HAVE HAD FURTHER SUCCESS. 7. CIU HAS MORE EXPERIENCE THAN ECIT AND IT SEEMS LIKE THIS NEEDS TO BE AT LEAST A CONSIDERATION. A. SOD DOES CNT WHO RESPONDS WITH THEM TO HAVE THE ENHANCED ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE

			8. WHERE ARE WE WITH GETTING THE CLINICIAN FOR SOD? A. SHE HAS BEEN HIRED AND IS GOING THROUGH THE CITY ENTRANCE AND TRAINING PROCESS. EXPECTS TO BE READY BY 8/16/21.			
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 29, 2021

Signed: _____
Harold Medina, Chief ~~of Police~~