Force Review Board

CHIEF'S REPORT (P76F)

AUGUST 26, 2021

TIME: 1119 TO 1304 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)
NON-VOTING MEMBERS (P78)	Judge Rod Kennedy (City Legal) Edward Harness (CPOA Director) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (FRB Admin Personnel/IAFD) Julie Jaramillo (FRB Admin Personnel/AOD)
REPRESENTATIVES	Commander Terysa Bowie (SOD) Lieutenant [redacted] (SOD) – via teleconference Lieutenant [redacted] (CIT) – via teleconference Policy Manager Patricia Serna (Policy and Procedure) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (IAFD/Presenter) Sergeant [redacted] (SOD/Presenter) Superintendent Sylvester Stanley (Police Reform) – via teleconference DCOP Eric Garcia (Police Reform) – via teleconference Chief of Staff Cecily Barker (Chief's Office) – via teleconference Interim DCOP Cori Lowe (COD) – via teleconference Commander Zakary Cottrell (IAPS) – via teleconference
OBSERVERS (P78b)	Sergeant [redacted] (IAFD) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (IAPS) – via teleconference Detective [redacted] (IAPS) – via teleconference Christine Bodo (Compliance Bureau) – via teleconference Carlos Pacheco (City Legal0 – via teleconference Corey Sanders (USDOJ) –via teleconference Patrick Kent (USDOJ) – via teleconference Sarah Lopez (USDOJ) – via teleconference Darryl Neier (EFIT) – via teleconference
PREVIOUS MINUTES	August 12, 2021
UNFINISHED BUSINESS	• None

REFERRAL RESPONSE(S)

CASE NUMBER	MEETING DATE	REFERRAL	REFERRAL PARTY	ACTION TAKEN	STATUS
19-0044654	5/7/2020	The Training Academy will develop a module	A/Commander [redacted]	A/ Lt [redacted] provided an extension memorandum	Referral to be reassigend to Commander

		on Miranda training, which will be provided via PowerDMS.		responding to the referral.	McDermott. Update from Commander McDermott on a definitive status of completion for each portion of the training due September 6, 2021.
20-0035593	1/21/2021	The Training Academy will develop a training, which need to include de-escalation techniques, planning, threat assessment, and tactics, to address situations, which require officers to remove individuals from vehicles safely and within policy.	A/Commander [redacted]	A/ Lt [redacted] provided a response memorandum addressing the referral where he advised the following information: The training video has been filmed and is being prepared for upload to PowerDMS. There are no further training needs related to this referral.	Board wants notification of when the video is uploaded to PowerDMS. Update due September 6, 2021.
20-0047550	4/8/2021	The Training Academy will ensure a department representative will be involved in the instruction portion of the warrant-writing section of the detective academy.	A/Commander [redacted]	Lieutenant [redacted] provided a memorandum responding to the referral.	Closed.
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]	A/ Lt [redacted] provided a memorandum and completed training form responding to the referral	Closed.
20-0037586	5/20/2021	Deputy Chief Smathers will complete an	Commander Zakary Cottrell	Commander Cottrell advised the IA	Update due September 27, 2021.

		Internal Affairs Request (IAR) for the Internal Affairs Professional Standards Division (IAPS) to assess the potential policy violations from SOP 2-52-5-C: Officers shall not use force against a restrained or handcuffed individual unless the force is necessary: 1. To prevent imminent bodily harm to the officer or another person or persons; 2. To overcome active resistance; or 3. To move an individual who is passively resisting; and SOP 2-52-4-B, C, and D: B. Reasonable Force: 1. Force is reasonable when it is the minimum amount of force necessary to effect an arrest or protect an officer or other individual under the circumstances. C. Necessary Force: 1. Force is necessary when no reasonable alternative to the use of force exists. When force is necessary, officers shall use the minimum amount of force required that is reasonable. D. Proportional Force: 1. Force is proportional when it includes consideration of the totality of the circumstances surrounding the situation, including the presence of		investigative due date is September 23, 2021.	

		articulable imminent danger to the officer or others. 2. The use of proportional force by an officer does not require the use of the same type or amount of force as that used by the individual. IAPS Commander Cottrell will provide the policies investigated, findings of the investigations, and response of the findings. Responsible party: Commander Cottrell.			
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	Sergeant [redacted] provided an extension memorandum responding to the referral.	Email Sergeant [redacted] to identify the due date of the misconduct investigation in order to determine a referral update due date (to be 30 days after due date of misconduct investigation).
20-0036730	7/29/2021	Internal Affairs Force Division will amend the ruling of the use of force number four to be out of policy through all recorded votes.	A/Commander Richard Evans	Lieutenant [redacted] emailed Internal Affairs Unit Coordinator Samantha Stefoin informing her to amend the force findings to reflect the recorded votes of the FRB.	Closed.
20-0036730	7/29/2021	Internal Affairs Force Division will present cases under current standards and any discrepancies or issues will be addressed prior to presentation.	A/Commander Richard Evans	Pending	Update due August 30, 2021.

CASE #: 21-0047521	DATE OF INCIDENT: JUNE 19, 2021	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1336 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 1446 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 1804 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. SEEMS EGREGIOUS THE K9 OFFICER WOULD TAKE INDEPENDENT ACTIONS BASED ON TRAINING RECEIVED. A. YES ALL TRAINING ON THIS TOPIC IS STRESSED DUE TO THE POTENTIAL OF INJURY AND A DEBRIEF OCCURRED WITH THIS OFFICER TO ENSURE THEY UNDERSTOOD THE SERIOUSNESS OF THEIR ACTIONS. 2. DOES SOD BELIEVE THIS CONCERN WAS PROPERLY REMEDIATED? A. YES MISTAKES ARE MADE BUT THE CONSEQUENCE STOOD OUT TO HIM. 3. HOW DID SOD CONFUSE A FIRE ALARM CHIRP AS A COUGH AND HOW DID THEY VERIFY IT WAS IN FACT A CHIRP AND NOT A COUGH? A. SOD PERSONNEL IDENTIFIED THE NOISE WAS CONSISTENTLY OCCURRING SO THEY STARTED TIMING IT AND REALIZED THE NOISE WAS TIMED APART AND WERE LATER ABLE TO CONFIRM. 4. NOT USING A WEAPON LIGHT AS A PRIMARY SOURCE OF LIGHT CORRECT? A. WHILE DOING A BUILDING SEARCH, YES. B. DANGEROUS NOT TO HAVE A FREE HAND TO THE PRIMARY WEAPON SO MUST USE WEAPON-MOUNTED LIGHTS WHILE SEARCHING. 5. UNDERSTOOD, BUT PERSONNEL ARE NOT USING IT ON ROUTINE CONTACTS (E.G. VEHICLE CONTACT). A. NO NOT USED IN THIS MANNER.
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	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.

CASE #: 21-0048246	DATE OF INCIDENT: JUNE 22-23, 2021	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 2141 HOURS CALL TO TACTICAL: 2305 HOURS SWAT ACTIVATION: 0406 HOURS
TYPE: SOD (P78)			
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	
DISCUSSION TOPICS	1. NONE.

CASE # 21-0015637 TYPE: LEVEL 3 (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: FEBRUARY 27, 2021	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1539 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. IT IS NOTED ON THE PRESENTATION THERE WERE NO CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS A. MISTAKE ON SLIDE AND IDENTIFIED AS VIOLATED UNDER SOP 1-1. 2. THIS INVESTIGATION WAS REFRESHING. INCONSISTENT STATEMENTS BY THE OFFICER WERE PROPERLY CHALLENGED BY THE IAPS DETECTIVE. CHAIR COMMENDED THE IAPS DETECTIVE OF THE INVESTIGATION COMPLETED. 3. DID OFFICER #2 HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING THE INCIDENT WAS OUT OF POLICY?

	A. WHEN HE WAS ASKED HE ADVISED HE DID NOT FEEL THREATENED BY THE INDIVIDUAL. B. WHETHER IT WAS OUT OF POLICY, HE ASSUMED THE OTHER OFFICER HAD BEEN HIT AND/OR FELT THREATENED, WHICH IS WHY HE ASSISTED. 4. KNOWING OFFICER #1 WAS ECIT AND WAS "SUCKED INTO CONTEMPT OF COP," IS THERE A BLOCK OF TRAINING OR A SCENARIO DURING TRAINING TO ADDRESS THIS CONCERN? A. YES BOTH CIT AND ECIT HAVE TRAINING FOR RECOGNIZING WHEN TO BACK OFF, PASS THE CONTACT TO ANOTHER OFFICER, AND/OR HAVE ANOTHER OFFICER STEP IN AND TAKE OVER.
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. IAPS ADDRESSED CONCERNS WELL. 2. CONCURS WITH THE INVESTIGATOR'S FINDINGS FOR BOTH OFFICERS.

CASE # 21-0017967 TYPE: LEVEL 3 (P78)	DATE OF INCIDENT: FEBRUARY 27, 2021	LOCATION: [redacted]	TIMES: DISPATCH / ON SITE: 1539 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. WHAT WAS DCOP BROWN'S INVOLVEMENT IN THIS CASE? A. PURSUIT REVIEW ONLY.

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	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. DETECTIVE WHO COMPLETED THE INVESTIGATION WAS ASKING LEADING QUESTIONS. (PG. 27 – "DID THE OFFICER USE DEADLY FORCE TO PROTECT THEMSELVES OR ANOTHER?" THIS IS A LEADING QUESTION.) NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED IF THIS DETECTIVE IS TO REMAIN IN THE UNIT. 2. CONCURS WITH THE FINDINGS.

Next FRB Meeting: September 2, 2021

Signed: _____
Harold Medina, Chief of Police