

2020 Crowd Control Audit Results

Executive Summary

Compliance to Portland Police Bureau (PPB) directives 635.10 Crowd Management/Crowd Control, 905.00 Non-Force After Action Reporting, and 1010.00 Use of Force for events with Rapid Response Team (RRT) and/or Mobile Field Force (MFF) personnel assigned was determined by auditing the associated Incident Action Plans (IAPs), After Action Reports (AARs), General Offense (GO) reports, supplemental reports, and Force Data Collection Reports (FDCRs). The audit utilized a methodology that addressed three areas: reporting requirements, crowd behavior & response requirements, and event organization & communication requirements. Eight protest events were audited. Due to the continuous nature of protest events during the summer and fall of 2020, crowd control activity was divided into operational periods, defined as an approximately 12-hour period from the evening of the first day into the following morning of the next day. A random sample of 20% of the protest operational periods (35 operational periods) was audited for protests related to the murder of George Floyd. 100% of operational periods were audited for all other crowd control events that spanned multiple days.

This was not a process audit and only involved assessing reporting compliance to directives. A process audit should be conducted to determine if there are issues with practices related to reporting.

- Overall, the Bureau had a compliance rate¹ of 96% (211 deficiencies).
- More than three-quarters (84%) of the deficiencies were found in the reporting requirements criteria; zero were found in the crowd behavior and response requirements criteria; less than a quarter (16%) were found in the event organization and communication requirement criteria.
- Nearly half (48%) of all deficiencies were due to the lack of documentation of whether a debrief occurred at the IC/CMIC and RRT/MFF squad levels. 30 event AARs and George Floyd protest operational periods did not include that the CMIC/IC conducted a formal debrief of the event to discuss the overall plan, tactics, staffing and areas of improvement; 71 force/squad AARs did not include that the RRT/MFF squad supervisor conducted a debrief of the event.
- 10% of deficiencies were due to reports not found at the time of the audit: 8 missing Event Master AARs, 4 missing IAPs, 9 missing force/squad AARs, and 1 missing FDCR.
- 8% of the deficiencies were due to the lack of documentation regarding the communication between Demonstration Liaisons and event organizers, and the use of social media or other media outlets by the Public Information Officer (PIO) to communicate with participants during the event.
- 8% of the deficiencies were due to an AAR not being completed within the required timelines.

¹ Compliance rate formula: Total Number of deficiencies ((# of possible deficiencies) x (# of events/operational periods/AARs audited)) – Actual Number of Deficiencies /Total Number of Possible Deficiencies

Recommendations

1. The Master After Action form should be edited to include a crowd control checkbox, which when selected, activates a debrief section prompting the author to document the debrief including the discussion of the overall plan, tactics, staffing and areas of improvement. An additional text box, also activated by the crowd control checkbox, which would be for the purpose of documenting who attended the debrief. Adding both of these items to the AAR would assist PPB in achieving greater compliance with Directive 635.10.13.1.5 and 635.10.13.3.2.
2. Modify Directive 635.10 to include a reporting requirement for the communication between PPB Demonstration Liaisons (or designee) and event/demonstration organizers, as well as, communications with the IC to keep them apprised of the situation. Also modify Directive 635.10 to include a reporting requirement for the communication between the PIO and the crowd/public. This will provide standardization and consistency with other communication requirements, such as the Bureau's sound truck reporting requirements found in Directive 635.10.8.3.3, resulting in greater compliance.
3. Create and maintain a centralized roster of personnel working each event, or operational period. The list should include personnel assignments including PIO and Demonstration Liaisons.
4. Complete project to move the AAR form to new technology platform. During this audit, the Bureau began a project to create a new Master After Action form using technology that would facilitate the electronic generation, routing, timeline management, records management, and auditing capability. This new form would replace the existing form that is managed utilizing an individual's email and should assist PPB with achieving greater compliance to timeline requirements and issues found in the audit with missing reports.

Methodology

Criteria were evaluated using IAPs, AARs, GO reports, supplemental reports, and FDCRs, to determine if each event met reporting requirements found in Directives 635.10, 1010.00 and 905.00. 41 audit criteria were divided into three subject areas, as follows:

1. Reporting Requirements - 26 criteria. The majority of criteria assessed the completeness of reports and whether or not deficiencies were identified during the After Action and/or Command Review processes.
2. Event Organization and Communication – 10 criteria. The majority of criteria assessed the quality and consistency of communication with event participants before, during, and after an event. This communication was delivered either face to face, through social media, or through the deployment of sound trucks.
3. Crowd Behavior and Response – 5 criteria. The majority of criteria assessed the classification of the event (i.e. civil disturbance) by the IC/CMIC and the associated response to such a classification. Assessed response criteria included the authorization for crowd dispersal, use of Riot Control Agents (RCA), specialty impact munitions/aerosol restraints, and detention practices.

1: Reporting Requirements

All 26 criteria were found to be deficient during the audit of at least one event, or operational period². There were 177 reporting deficiencies in total: 66 Event AAR deficiencies and 111 Squad/Force AAR deficiencies. The 56 events/operational periods, and 77 force/squad AARs audited contained at least 1 reporting deficiency, with an average of 1.33 deficiencies per event, operational period, or force/squad AAR.

George Floyd Protest Events Summary

All 26 criteria were found to be deficient during the audit of at least one event, or operational period with 114 reporting deficiencies in total (42 Event AAR and 72 Squad/Force AAR). The 36 event/operational periods and 60 force/squad AARs audited contained at least 1 reporting deficiency, with an average of 1.19 deficiencies per event, operational period, or force/squad AAR.

Summary of Findings – 177 deficiencies:

- Debrief – 101 AARs did not include documentation that the CMIC/IC conducted a formal debrief and/or that the RRT/MFF squad supervisor conducted a debrief of the event. Nearly three-quarters of the deficiencies (55 deficiencies) were found in force/squad AARs audited from the George Floyd Protest operational period sample.
- Chain of Command Review Requirements – 20 deficiencies were related to AARs that did not complete all required chain of command review levels.
- Timeliness – 16 deficiencies resulted from an AAR not being completed within the required timelines. The majority of deficiencies, 15 of the 16 total, were found in the audit of George Floyd Protest operational periods.
- Report not found - 22 deficiencies resulted from a missing AAR, IAP, or FDCR.
- Documentation of Injuries – 9 deficiencies resulted from subjects who were injured due to force, but were not included on the associated force/squad AAR and/or photographed and squad members who were injured during the event were not found documented on the associated force/squad AAR.
- Completeness of AAR Use of Force Review – 9 deficiencies resulted from an Event Master AAR not including the review of any uses of force by other agencies' personnel, which crowd control squads were activated, staged, or deployed, but did not use force, and/or a squad member's use of force not being reviewed on the associated squad AAR. This was further complicated by the lack of squad rosters to determine personnel assignments.

² One Event Master AAR was completed for the George Floyd protests and included in the audit. In addition, a random sample of days with George Floyd protest activity and a PPB crowd control response, also known as an operational period, was audited.

2: Event Organization and Communication

Among the evaluated criteria there were 34 deficiencies in total, 19 from operational periods within the George Floyd Protests and 15 from all other events. Overall, 14 of the 35 audited George Floyd Protest operational periods, and 7 of the 13 other operational period AARs, contained at least 1 Event Organization and Communication deficiency.

Summary of Findings – 34 Deficiencies:

There was an average of 0.54 deficiencies per event for George Floyd Protest operational periods, and an average of 1.53 deficiencies for all other events. Direct attempts to contact event organizers and communication with the public via social media and news announcements were often not documented within reports, and deficiencies related to making and recording these communications accounted for 56% of deficiencies in this topic for all events in 2020. While social media posts and news announcements could be searched for on the relevant platforms themselves, the lack of internal record keeping of contact and communication attempts made it difficult to establish whether attempts had been made at all. This was further complicated by the inconsistent recording of assigned Demonstration Liaisons during operational periods.

Other events

- 6 of 13 events had deficiencies regarding the communication between demonstration liaisons and event organizers, and the use of social media or other media outlets by the PIO to communicate with participants during the event, with a total of 12 deficiencies. The most common deficiency was that communication with the public via social media and traditional news announcements could not be found and was not documented.
- 2 of 13 events had deficiencies regarding the announcement and recording of warnings from the Sound Trucks related to Use of Force, with a total of 3 deficiencies. The most common deficiency was the lack of a record, or document of Sound Truck warnings given during the operational period.

George Floyd Protest Operational Period Deficiencies

11 operational periods had deficiencies regarding the communication between demonstration liaisons and event organizers, and the use of social media or other media outlets by the PIO to communicate with participants during the event. The most common deficiency was that communication with the public via social media and traditional news announcements could not be found and was not documented. Attempts to make contact with organizers were made by assigned liaisons in the earlier operational periods of the event, but were determined to be ineffective, impractical or unsafe over subsequent periods.

3 operational periods had deficiencies regarding the announcing and recording of warnings from the Sound Trucks related to Use of Force, with a total of 8 deficiencies. The most common deficiencies found when auditing associated sound truck reports were the requirements to provide a use of force warning and the documentation of those warnings in a report.

3: Crowd Behavior and Response

Summary of Findings – 0 Deficiencies:

Other Events

There were no crowd behavior and response deficiencies found in the 13 audited operational periods related to other crowd control events.

George Floyd Protest Operational Period Deficiencies

There were no crowd behavior and response deficiencies found in the 35 audited operational periods related to the George Floyd Protests.

Complaint Data

In 2020, Internal Affairs and/or IPR opened 126 cases with 282 allegations of misconduct related to crowd control events^{3,4}. Allegation types included: Conduct (74), Control (8), Courtesy (10), Disparate Treatment (6), Force (146), and Procedure (38). 94 allegations were administratively closed while 188 allegations proceeded beyond the initial investigation resulting in 129 closed allegations that were found to be not sustained/unfounded/exonerated/unsubstantiated.

Complaints Related to Crowd Control Events:

2020 Crowd Control Events Number of Complaints		
Event Name	Date	Total Number of Complaints
George Floyd Protests	05/29/2020-11/15/2020	258
S26	9/26/2020	23
New Years Eve	12/31/2020-01/01/2021	1
Total		282

³ Source: PPB Internal Affairs Division, City of Portland IPR.

⁴ Refer to Directives at <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/police/29867> for definitions.

2020 Crowd Control Events Complaint Type and Findings			
Event Name	Allegation Type	Finding	Total
George Floyd Protests	Conduct	Exonerate	13
		IA AC - Lack of Investigative Merit	2
		IA AC - No Jurisdiction	1
		IA AC - No Misconduct	3
		IA AC - Unidentified Employee	2
		IAD Admin-Refer to Prec Cmdr	1
		IAD Investigation	4
		IPR AC - Judicial Remedy	4
		IPR AC - No Misconduct	7
		IPR AC - Other Remedy	1
		Not Sustained	16
		Not Sustained w/debriefing	1
		Pending RL Finding	3
		Pending RU Finding	2
		Sustained	2
		Unfounded	6
	Control	Exonerate	1
		IAD Investigation	3
		IPR AC - Lack of Investigative Merit	1
		IPR AC - No Misconduct	2
	Courtesy	IPR Ref - Precinct Referral	1
		IPR AC - Lack of Investigative Merit	2
		IPR AC - No Misconduct	2
		IPR AC - Trivial/Lack of Good Faith	1
		IPR AC - Unidentified Employee	1
		IPR Ref - Precinct Referral	1
		Not Sustained	1
		Not Sustained w/debriefing	1
	Disparate Treatment	Refer to Precinct	1
		IA AC - Unidentified Employee	2
		IPR AC - No Misconduct	1
	Force	Unfounded	1
		Exonerate	3
		Exonerate	16
		Exonerate w/debriefing	5
	Procedure	IA AC - Previously Investigated	2
		IAD Investigation	6
		IPR AC - Complainant Unavailable	12
		IPR AC - Lack of Investigative Merit	13
		IPR AC - No Jurisdiction	7
		IPR AC - No Misconduct	6
		IPR AC - Third Party Complainant	2
		IPR AC - Unidentified Employee	1
		Not Sustained	33
		Not Sustained w/debriefing	2
		Pending RL Finding	3
		Pending RU Finding	9
		Sustained	4
		Unfounded	8
		Exonerate	1
		Exonerate w/debriefing	4
		IA AC - No Misconduct	1
		IAD Investigation	4
		IPR AC - Complainant Unavailable	1
		IPR AC - Judicial Remedy	1
		IPR AC - No Misconduct	10
		IPR AC - Unidentified Employee	2
		Pending RU Finding	4
		SI - Substantiated	1
		SI - Unsubstantiated	1
		Sustained	3
		Unfounded	2
S26	Conduct	IA AC - Unidentified Employee	1
		IPR AC - No Misconduct	1
		IPR Investigation	1
		Not Sustained	3
	Disparate Treatment	Unfounded	2
		Exonerate	8
	Force	IPR Investigation	2
		Not Sustained	2
		Not Sustained w/debriefing	1
		IPR AC - No Misconduct	1
	Procedure	IPR AC - Other Remedy	1
		IPR AC - Other Remedy	1
New Years Eve	Force	Not Sustained	1
Total			282

Summary of Findings

Crowd Control Management Audit Results* 2020					
Total Deficiencies	Event Name	Date	Reporting Requirements	Event Organization and Communication	Crowd Behavior and Response
6	Feb. 8th Free Speech Event	2/8/2020	4	2	0
4	Women's March 2020	3/1/2020	3	1	0
133	George Floyd Protests**	5/28-11/15 2020	114	19	0
8	S26 Call to Action	9/26/2020	8	0	0
17	Election 2020	11/3-11/9/2020	14	3	0
3	Street Racer Mission	11/8/2020	3	0	0
27	Red House Event	12/8/2020	21	6	0
13	New Year's	12/31/20-01/01/21	10	3	0
			177	34	0

*Includes events with RRT/MFF personnel assigned

**Random sample of operational periods

Crowd Control Audit Methodology

The Crowd Control Audit is an audit of a Crowd Control event as a whole. For the purpose of this audit, a Crowd Control event is an event in which RRT, or MFF were mobilized. The data collected is used to analyze the overall success of post event review, and report on associated findings that may be of interest to command.

Information often has to be hunted for. Many data points are to provide context (not deficiencies), so if needed, don't hesitate to make approximations. Quantitative data points such as "# of Officers" or "# of Participants" are often an approximation unless the IAP/AAR is present and completed as intended. Similarly, if the information cannot be found, utilize Null and N/A options where appropriate.

Many Null or N/A options are provided to prevent forcing the auditor to choose as less than appropriate answer. In many cases, these options can be chosen for various reasons as there are too many impacting factors to account for. Recommend creating event notes to keep track of notes and extenuating circumstances that can help clarify why a determination was made and help identify information that should or should not be included in the final report.

Not all questions include a potential deficiency, but the answer to these questions may still be worth reporting. For example, there is no policy requirement that a sound truck be assigned to every event (so there is no possible deficiency for this question), however, if it is discovered that only 50% of events had a sound truck assigned, it may be a finding worth reporting for command consideration. Whether or not it should be included will depend on the specific event's characteristics.

Before beginning this audit you will need to compile a list of key case numbers for each event and all associated case numbers of each key case number. These case numbers will be utilized to locate all necessary reports for this audit.

* Answers highlighted in **red** are deficiencies.

Queries:

1. Force queries: FDCR table and FDCR attachment (by date), highlight duplicates.
2. Run each case number through the related cases query.

Survey 1

General Information – Event Level – Primary Sources: Master AAR/IAP, UDAR, ICS 211

If this event spanned multiple days:

- For George Floyd protest events where only 1 event master AAR was completed for the event that spanned multiple days, complete this survey once for the master AAR.

Audit Question	Source/Notes
1. Start Date	No input needed – will auto fill

2. Did this event span multiple days? a. Yes b. No	
3. Case Number	Form: 2 digit year followed by the case number. Use the key case number. Source: IAP/UDAR (Chief's Office RRT). Note: if auditing the master AAR for an event that spanned multiple days and had only 1 master AAR, leave blank for master AAR survey. Otherwise complete for each event master AAR.
4. Event Name	Source: Master AAR/IAP. Complete this for each event Master AAR. Note: if auditing the master AAR for an event that spanned multiple days and had only 1 master AAR, complete once. Otherwise complete for each event master AAR.
5. Date of Event – start date & time - end date & time	Source: Master AAR, or operational period for an event that spanned multiple days. Note: if no Master AAR was found, use the IAP as the source. Dates should be precise. Time of day may be approximate. If the event spanned multiple days, this is the 1 st operational period date and last operational period date – times are approximate.
6. # of PPB Officers Assigned	Source: Master AAR/UDAR/count personnel on Final 211's. Note: some MFF 211's are problematic. For protests that span multiple days, this data point should be gathered ahead of time and will probably need to be divided among auditors/analysts by operational period. Complete this question for Master AAR survey only.
7. # of Participants	Source: Master AAR. If no Master AAR found, utilize open data sources/media for estimates. For protests that span multiple days, this data point should be gathered ahead of time and will probably need to be divided among auditors/analysts by operational period. Complete this question for Master AAR survey only.

Reporting Requirements – Event Level – Primary Source: Master AAR

Remember: for George Floyd protest events, complete this section once, then leave blank/null for operational period surveys.

8. Was an event Master AAR completed? a. Yes b. No – one should have been completed, but it was not – this is the deficiency c. Unclear/null (unclear – cannot be determined/ null – not required for the event)	Directive 905.1.1.4: Supervisors shall be required to complete an After Action Report for the following events: 1.1.4. Any incident or event for which an Incident Action Plan was written. IC or Operations section chief/designee usually writes this.
---	--

9. Event Master AAR Author (DPSST)	"From" field at top of AAR
10. Review Date	Found at top of AAR
11. Date Master AAR Author forwarded AAR to next level of review	Date listed in the "I forwarded this after action to" section.
12. Did the Master After Action Report go through ALL of the required levels of review? a. Yes b. No – this is the deficiency Unclear/null (unclear – cannot be determined/ null – not required for the event)	Directive 905.1.4.5: After Action Reports following SERT, CNT, or RRT deployments that are managed by a Critical Incident Commander or a Crowd Management Incident Commander will be reviewed and approved by the appropriate Assistant Chief
13. If not, at what level of review was there a deficiency? a. Author b. Level 2 c. RUM d. CHO e. Null	
14. Was the event Master AAR completed within the required timelines? a. Yes b. No – this is the deficiency c. Unclear/null (unclear – cannot be determined/ null – not required for the event)	Directive 905.2 Sgt/Author: 7 days (non-force AARs) RUM/Critical Incident Commander (CIC)/Crowd Management Incident Commander (CMIC): 21 days CHO: 28 days
15. Did the Master AAR indicate which RRT squads were activated, staged, or deployed, but did not use force, or engage the crowd? a. Yes b. No – this is the deficiency c. Unclear/null (unclear – cannot be determined/ null – not required for the event)	Directive 905.1.1.4: Supervisors shall be required to complete an After Action Report for the following events: 1.1.4. Any incident or event for which an Incident Action Plan was written. Note: For the 2020 George Floyd event, we evaluate this at the event master AAR level due to no AARs written for RRT activation/deployment, but no force used for each operational period. For the George Floyd 2020 protest event only, this replaces the squad AAR requirement when force was not used.
16. Did the Master AAR include the review of any uses of force by other agencies' personnel as part of the overall incident after action report? a. Yes b. No – this is the deficiency c. Unclear/null (unclear – cannot be determined/	Directive 635.13.1.2 Review any uses of force by other agencies' personnel as part of the overall incident after action report. Note: For the 2020 George Floyd event, we evaluate this at the event master AAR level. Other agency involvement will also be evaluated at the operational level using a different question.

<p>null – not required for the event)</p>	
<p>17. Did the IC hold a formal debrief?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No – this is the deficiency</p> <p>c. Unclear/null (unclear – cannot be determined/ null – not required for the event)</p>	<p>Directive 635.13.1.5</p> <p>Hold a formal debrief of the event to discuss the overall plan, tactics, staffing and areas of improvement. The debrief should include key supervisory member participants in the event.</p> <p>Note: For the 2020 George Floyd event, we evaluate this at the event master AAR level. This information will also be collected at the operational level using a different question.</p>

Survey 2

- Complete the following survey for each event. When an event spanned multiple days, complete for each operational period using only reports from that operational period.

General Information – Operational Period - Level

1. Start Date	No input needed – will auto fill
2. Date of Event – start date & time - end date & time	Source: AAR, or operational period for an event that spanned multiple days. Note: if no AAR was found, use the IAP as the source. Dates should be precise. Time of day may be approximate.
3. Case Number	Form: 2 digit year followed by the case number. Use the key case number. Source: AAR, IAP, UDAR (Chief's Office RRT)).
4. Event Name	Source: Master AAR/IAP.
5. IC/CMIC DPSST	Source: Master AAR/IAP/UDAR
6. Planning Section Chief's DPSST	Source: Master AAR/IAP

Event Organization and Communication – General

<p>7. Was the event spontaneous?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No</p> <p>c. Unclear</p>	<p>Source: Master AAR/IAP</p> <p>Spontaneous event: Events that the Bureau learns of with less than twenty-four hours before the start of the event are deemed spontaneous. (Directive 635.4.2)</p>
<p>8. If protest was planned, was it a precinct-level protest or a bureau-level protest?</p>	<p>Source: Master AAR/IAP</p> <p>Directive 635.4.1</p> <p>4.1.1.1. Events that are small in crowd size, or for which credible information indicates that there is little concern of civil disturbance, shall</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Precinct-level b. Bureau-level c. Unclear 	<p>generally be managed at the precinct level and staffed by the shift supervisor, who shall serve as the IC.</p> <p>4.1.1.2. Events that are anticipated to have a greater critical impact, require a significant police response, and/or have the potential to become a civil disturbance shall have a CMIC designated by the Assistant Chief of Operations as the IC.</p>
<p>9. Was a CMIC assigned to this event?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes a. No b. Unclear 	<p>Refer to the After Action, could be the author of the after action CMICs are Captains and Commanders.</p> <p>Bureau wide = CMIC, Precinct level = IC</p>
<p>10. Did the bureau attempt to contact organizers prior to the event?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Yes d. No e. Unclear 	<p>If the event has a permit, PPB has contacted them.</p> <p>Source: Find this in the IAP or the Master/Event Level After Action</p> <p>Directive: 635.3.1.1</p> <p>For George Floyd protest event, assess reasonable attempts to contact protest organizers at some point during the overall period.</p>
<p>11. Was a member assigned as the PPB Demonstration Liaison?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. No-deficiency c. Unclear-deficiency 	<p>Source: Refer to IAP or After Action.</p> <p>Directive: 635.3.1.1</p> <p>This will only be deficient when an IAP was written, or the protest was not spontaneous.</p>
<p>12. Was there a PIO assigned to this event?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. No-deficiency c. Unclear-deficiency 	<p>Source: IAP/ICS 211's</p> <p>This will only be deficient when an IAP was written, or the protest was not spontaneous.</p>
<p>13. Did the PIO communicate or attempt to communicate information about the event via social media or other conventional media outlets to keep the public informed throughout the event?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. No – this is the deficiency c. Unclear 	<p>Check/verify PPB social media</p> <p>Check/verify PPB news releases to conventional media</p> <p>Directive: 635.3.1.1</p> <p>3.1.1.3. The Bureau, through the Public Information Officer (PIO) or another designee, shall communicate through the use of social media and other conventional outlets to keep the public, including the crowd, informed throughout the event.</p>
<p>14. Was a sound truck assigned to this event?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. No c. Unclear 	<p>Source: the sound truck operator's report can be found in RMS under one of the associated case numbers. The sound truck operators can be found in the IAP.</p> <p>See also: Sound Truck schedule</p>
<p>15. Did the sound truck attempt to convey the police action to the crowd</p>	<p>Source: sound truck operators report in RMS</p> <p>Directive: 635.5.3.1.1</p>

<p>via announcements and warnings?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No – this is the deficiency</p> <p>c. Null – sound truck not assigned to this event/not feasible</p>	<p>Note: to determine if feasible, refer to reports.</p>
<p>16. Did the sound truck deliver multiple warnings?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No – this is the deficiency</p> <p>c. Null – sound truck not assigned to this event/not tactically feasible</p>	<p>Source: sound truck operators report in RMS</p> <p>Note: Policy requires a minimum of 2 warnings if tactically feasible. The warnings are not exclusive to force, for example a warning of arrest, or citation.</p> <p>Directive: 635.8.3.2</p> <p>8.3.2. When issuing warnings, members should cite specific offenses and violations being committed and caution the crowd that these acts of civil disturbance will not be permitted and can result in arrest or necessitate the use of force. An IC-designated member and/or the member operating the sound truck shall give clear directions in an attempt to reduce or eliminate the necessity for force. Members shall issue a minimum of two warnings to alert the crowd of possible impending arrest or force, unless doing so would present a danger to the member(s) or others.</p> <p>Note: to determine if feasible, refer to reports.</p>
<p>17. Did the sound truck cite specific offenses being violated?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No – this is the deficiency</p> <p>c. Null – sound truck not assigned to this event/not feasible</p>	<p>Source: sound truck operators report in RMS</p> <p>Directive: 635.8.3.2</p> <p>8.3.2. When issuing warnings, members should cite specific offenses and violations being committed and caution the crowd that these acts of civil disturbance will not be permitted and can result in arrest or necessitate the use of force. An IC-designated member and/or the member operating the sound truck shall give clear directions in an attempt to reduce or eliminate the necessity for force. Members shall issue a minimum of two warnings to alert the crowd of possible impending arrest or force, unless doing so would present a danger to the member(s) or others.</p> <p>Note: to determine if feasible, refer to reports.</p>
<p>18. Did the sound truck deliver a warning related to the potential use of force?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No – this is the deficiency</p>	<p>Source: sound truck operators report in RMS</p> <p>Directive: 635.8.3.2</p> <p>8.3.2. When issuing warnings, members should cite specific offenses and violations being committed and caution the crowd that these acts of civil disturbance will not be permitted and can result in arrest or necessitate the use of force. An IC-designated member and/or the member operating the sound truck shall give clear directions in an attempt to</p>

c. Null – sound truck not assigned to this event/not feasible	reduce or eliminate the necessity for force. Members shall issue a minimum of two warnings to alert the crowd of possible impending arrest or force, unless doing so would present a danger to the member(s) or others.
19. Did the sound truck deliver direction to participants for avoidance of force? a. Yes b. No – this is the deficiency c. Null – sound truck not assigned to this event/not feasible	Source: sound truck operators report in RMS. Directive: 635.8.3.2 8.3.2. When issuing warnings, members should cite specific offenses and violations being committed and caution the crowd that these acts of civil disturbance will not be permitted and can result in arrest or necessitate the use of force. An IC-designated member and/or the member operating the sound truck shall give clear directions in an attempt to reduce or eliminate the necessity for force. Members shall issue a minimum of two warnings to alert the crowd of possible impending arrest or force, unless doing so would present a danger to the member(s) or others. Note: to determine if feasible, refer to reports.
20. Was the delivery of these warnings recorded? a. Yes b. No – this is the deficiency c. Null – sound truck not assigned to this event/not feasible	Source: sound truck operators report in RMS Directive: 635.8.3.3 8.3.3. Members shall document the warnings in an appropriate police report, and if feasible, ensure the audio (e.g., date, time, announcing member, messages, etc.) confirmation received by identified staff on other end. Note: to determine if feasible, refer to reports.

Reporting Requirements - General

21. IAP present? a. Yes b. No – this is the deficiency c. Null	Written IAPs are not required for spontaneous events. Note: IAPs are not required when PPB is assisting another agency (mutual aid). There will often be an AAR for these events, but no IAP because it is not PPB's event. IAP location: EOC folder Spontaneous event: Events that the Bureau learns of with less than twenty-four hours before the start of the event are deemed spontaneous. (Directive 635.4.2)
22. Did the IC/CMIC hold a formal debrief? a. Yes b. No – this is the deficiency	ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY FOR GEORGE FLOYD PROTEST EVENTS THAT SPAN MULTIPLE DAYS WITHOUT AN EVENT MASTER AAR FOR EACH DAY/OPERATIONAL PERIOD – SEE QUESTION #17 IN MASTER AAR SURVEY Source: AARs (Master or squad AARs), ICS 214 activity log

<p>23. Other agencies (non-PPB) involved?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No</p>	Source: IAP/Master AAR
24. Other agency name(s)	List all separated by commas.
<p>25. Did a member of any other involved agency use force?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No</p> <p>c. Unclear – this is the deficiency</p> <p>d. Null</p>	<p>ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY FOR GEORGE FLOYD PROTEST EVENTS THAT SPAN MULTIPLE DAYS WITHOUT AN EVENT MASTER AAR FOR EACH DAY/OPERATIONAL PERIOD – SEE QUESTION #16 IN MASTER AAR SURVEY</p> <p>For events that did not span multiple days, or had an event master AAR for each day, this audit point is evaluated in the event Master AAR survey.</p> <p>Note: For the 2020 George Floyd event, we also evaluate this at the event master AAR level, as well as, for each operational period. The source for each operational period is all reports in RMS/AARs, but for other events the Master AAR is required to have this information.</p> <p>Null = no other agencies involved in crowd control effort, or answered using the event Master AAR only.</p> <p>Unclear = other agencies participated in crowd control event, but whether they used force, or not cannot be determined.</p> <p>Source: reports in RMS/AARs</p> <p>Directive 635.13.1.2 Review any uses of force by other agencies' personnel as part of the overall incident after action report.</p>

Crowd Behavior and Response

<p>26. Was crowd behavior described as civil disturbance (threatening the public safety)?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No</p> <p>c. Unclear</p>	<p>Source: Master AAR, Squad AARs, RMS reports</p> <p>Look for unlawful assembly language – look in sound truck records, or AARs. "This is an unlawful assembly". If we see record of the entire crowd being pushed/moved, then civil disturbance. Otherwise, categorized as civil disobedience.</p> <p>Directive 635.00:</p> <p>Civil Disobedience: A non-violent form of protest or resistance to obeying certain laws, demands or commands of a government.</p> <p>Civil Disturbance: An unlawful assembly that constitutes a clear and present danger of riot, disorder, interference with traffic upon the public streets or when another immediate threat to public safety, peace or order appears.</p>
--	---

27. Did the IC authorize/order the crowd dispersal?	Source: AARs, sound truck operator's report in RMS.
a. Yes b. No c. Unclear	
28. Did the IC/CMIC authorize RCAs (Riot Control Agents) or special impact munitions?	Source: Master AAR, Squad AARs, ICS 214's
a. Yes b. No c. Unclear	Examples of RCAs: CS, smoke, tear gas, OC vapor, smoke grenade (hand tossed) Examples of Special Impact Munitions: RBDD's, sting ball Directive 635.6.2: 6.2. The CMIC shall (in addition to the IC responsibilities): 6.2.1. Activate RRT, when deemed necessary; and 6.2.2. Authorize the deployment of riot control agents and/or special impact munitions, when objectively reasonable, to address civil disturbance and crowd dispersal. See also: Directive 1010.6.4.6 Riot Control Agents, or Area Impact Munitions
29. If specialty impact munitions or aerosol restraints were used, were they deployed indiscriminately into a crowd?	Source: Master AAR, Squad AARs, RMS reports, crowd control FDCR data
a. Yes – this is the deficiency b. No c. Unclear d. Null – neither specialty impact munitions, nor aerosol restraints were used	Note: Deployment would not be considered indiscriminate if/when the officer described and articulated the purpose of the device. Note: use the crowd control FDCR data to determine which force types were used. Directive 635.10 Prohibited Crowd Control Tactics 10.2. Members shall not deploy specialty impact munitions or aerosol restraints indiscriminately into a crowd.
30. If Prohibited Crowd Control Tactics were used, did the officer indicate that the use of the tactic was justified/authorized?	Source: AARs and RMS reports
a. Yes b. No c. Unclear-this is the deficiency d. Null – prohibited crowd control tactics were not used	Directive 635.10: 10. Prohibited Crowd Control Tactics. 10.1. Members shall not take the following actions to disperse a crowd: 10.1.1. Use fire hoses; 10.1.2. Deploy Canine Units; and 10.1.3. Use a conducted electrical weapon (CEW). 10.2. Members shall not deploy specialty impact munitions or aerosol restraints indiscriminately into a crowd. 10.3. The Bureau shall not use mounted patrol units (MPUs) against passively resistant demonstrators who are sitting or lying down. 10.4. Motor vehicles shall not be intentionally brought into contact with protestors (i.e., to push or strike).

<p>31. Was the Detective Division activated for arrests by the IC (mass arrest teams)?</p> <p>a. Yes b. No c. Unclear</p>	<p>Source: IAP, AARs</p> <p>Notes: Mass arrest team = Field arrest and Formal arrest teams in Detectives Division. If we see either field arrest team or formal arrest team, then we know that the Detective Division was activated for arrests by the IC.</p>
<p>32. If so, were arrests made?</p> <p>a. Yes b. No c. Unclear – this is the deficiency d. Null – Detective Division was not activated for arrests by the IC</p>	<p>Source: reports in RMS</p> <p>Look for AB reports related to the case numbers associated with the event (or operational period).</p> <p>Answer based on whether arrests are made, or not. Does not have to be by the Detective Division.</p>
<p>33. Were there mass arrests conducted of large groups of individuals at once?</p> <p>a. Yes b. No c. Unclear – this is the deficiency d. Null – No arrests</p>	<p>Source: reports in RMS (including AB reports), AARs</p> <p>Directive 635.6.4: 6.4. The Detective Division Commander or Supervisor shall: 6.4.1. Coordinate with the IC to determine the scale of the mass arrest team response; 6.4.2. Assign detectives to assist with mass arrests; 6.4.3. Manage the processing of all arrests pursuant to the Detective Division SOP; and 6.4.4. Ensure that all required documentation for arrests is collected.</p>
<p>34. Was a group of people detained?</p> <p>a. Yes b. No c. Unclear</p>	<p>Source: RMS reports and AARs</p> <p>Notes: Look for corralling, kettling, box-in; look in DIMS for photos of ID's</p>
<p>35. If so, did members describe a legal justification for that detention?</p> <p>a. Yes b. No – this is the deficiency c. Unclear d. Null – a group was not detained</p>	<p>Source: AARs, RMS reports</p> <p>Notes: Legal justification examples: Probable Cause, Criminal Investigation, etc.</p>

Survey 3

Reporting Requirements – Squad/Force Reporting

Complete for each involved PPB squad. When an event spanned multiple days, complete for each involved PPB squad, for each operational period.

1. Start Date	No input needed – will auto fill
2. Date of Event – start date & time - end date & time	Source: AAR Note: if no AAR was found, use the IAP as the source. Dates should be precise. Time of day may be approximate.
3. Event Name	Source: Master AAR/IAP. Complete this for each event/operational period.
4. Case Number	Form: 2 digit year followed by the case number. Use the key case number. Source: AAR, IAP, UDAR (Chief's Office RRT).
5. Squad a. RRT-Alpha b. RRT-Bravo c. RRT-Charlie d. RRT-Delta e. RRT-Echo f. MFF-Central g. MFF-East h. MFF-North i. MFF-Training j. MFF-Traffic k. FAT – Detective l. Sound Truck m. Other-list in following question	Source: Squad AAR, if no AAR found use reports in RMS Notes: if multiple squads are covered on the same AAR, select Other and list under next question.
6. Other PPB squad	List all separated by commas.
7. Squad Sgt. DPSST	Typically, the author of the AAR. Source: Squad AAR, if no AAR found, use reports in RMS (including FDCRs – sergeants are listed at the bottom). If FDCRs list multiple sergeants for the same squad and no squad AAR, use the "Other" field below and enter all sergeant DPSSTs.
8. Other Sgt. DPSST	See note above. Leave blank if not needed.
9. Review Date	Found at top of AAR, if no AAR leave blank. This is the date the author (Sgt.) started their review.
10. Date Author (Sgt.) forwarded AAR to next level of review	Date listed in the "I forwarded this after action to".... section. If no AAR, leave blank.
11. Date AAR completed all levels of review	Source: squad AAR. This is the date AAR was forwarded to Inspector. If no AAR, leave blank.

<p>12. Did the AAR go through ALL of the required levels of review?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No – this is the deficiency</p> <p>Unclear/null (unclear – cannot be determined/ null – not required for the event)</p>	<p>Source: squad AAR</p> <p>Directive 905.1.4.5: After Action Reports following SERT, CNT, or RRT deployments that are managed by a Critical Incident Commander or a Crowd Management Incident Commander will be reviewed and approved by the appropriate Assistant Chief</p> <p>Directive 1010.00 for MFF/Other squads – review level is based on Category of force.</p>
<p>13. If not, at what level of review was there a deficiency?</p> <p>a. Author</p> <p>b. Level 2</p> <p>c. RUM</p> <p>d. CHO</p> <p>e. Null</p>	
<p>14. Did the supervisor of the squad hold a formal debrief?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No – this is the deficiency</p>	<p>Source: squad AAR, supervisor report in RMS</p> <p>Directive: 635.10.13.3.2</p> <p>13.3.2. At the end of the event, the lead supervisor of each squad shall conduct a debriefing of the incident with their personnel and complete an appropriate police report in accordance with Directive 900.00, General Reporting Guidelines, and 1010.00, Use of Force, documenting the actions of their squad during the incident.</p>
<p>15. Did a member of the squad use force?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No</p>	<p>Source: RMS reports, AARs</p>
<p>16. Number of FDCRs missing for this squad:</p>	<p>Source: RMS reports, AARs</p> <p>Directive: 1010.11.1.4</p> <p>11.1.4. All members involved in a Category II through IV use of force shall submit use of force reports in a timely manner, which include a candid and detailed account of the event, to facilitate a thorough review of the incident in question by supervisory members. Involved members shall submit use of force reports prior to the conclusion of the shift, unless incapacitated. Involved members shall report all uses of force whether or not the subject is struck or affected by any weapon.</p> <p>If number > 0, this is the deficiency</p>
<p>17. Every squad member FDCR addressed by a squad AAR?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No – this is the deficiency</p> <p>c. Null – no force used</p>	<p>Source: squad AAR and FDCRs</p>
<p>18. Number of AARs not completed for this squad:</p>	<p>Source: RMS reports (including FDCRs), completed squad AARs</p> <p>If number > 0, this is the deficiency</p>

	<p>To determine if an AAR was required see: Directive 905.00 Non-force After Action Reporting, 635.00, or 1010.00 Use of Force (if force was used).</p> <p>635.13.3.2. At the end of the event, the lead supervisor of each squad shall conduct a debriefing of the incident with their personnel and complete an appropriate police report in accordance with Directive 900.00, General Reporting Guidelines, and 1010.00, Use of Force, documenting the actions of their squad during the incident.</p> <p>Directive: 635.10.13.3.4</p> <p>13.3.4. The assistant supervisor, or a designated alternate supervisor, of each squad shall write an after action of any force used by the squad in accordance with Directive 1010.00, Use of Force, during the incident. This after action shall be routed to the IC</p> <p>Note: For George Floyd only, squad AARs are not required when force was NOT used.</p>
<p>19. Were all subjects who were injured due to force used by a squad member documented on the squad AAR?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No – this is the deficiency</p> <p>c. Null – no force used</p>	<p>Source: FDCRs and completed squad AARs</p> <p>Notes: If 1 or more subjects were injured and at least 1 was not documented on the AAR, this would be deficient.</p> <p>When force was used: Directive 1010.13.4.5</p> <p>13.4.5. Injuries: a description and photographs of the presence or absence of injuries to the subject or Bureau member involved in the use of force and if any medical treatment was administered, and by whom.</p> <p>When force was used: Directive 1010.13.4.6</p> <p>13.4.6. Subject statement: supervisors shall make an attempt to obtain a statement from the subject detailing the event and any injuries.</p>
<p>20. Were all subjects who were injured due to force used by squad member and the subsequent injuries photographed?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No – this is the deficiency</p> <p>c. Null – no force/no subject injuries</p>	<p>Source: DIMS</p> <p>If there were subject injuries – regardless of whether they were included on the AAR, or not.</p> <p>Notes: these may be the FAT photos taken when the person was taken into custody. Some injuries, such as complaint of pain, cannot be photographed, so just a photo of the subject is sufficient.</p> <p>When force was used: Directive 1010.13.4.5</p> <p>13.4.5. Injuries: a description and photographs of the presence or absence of injuries to the subject or Bureau member involved in the use of force and if any medical treatment was administered, and by whom.</p>
<p>21. Were any squad members injured?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No</p>	<p>Source: FDCRs, AAR</p> <p>Note only injuries documented on FDCRs, or AARs.</p>
<p>22. If injured, were the squad members injuries included on the AAR?</p> <p>a. Yes</p>	<p>Source: squad AAR</p> <p>When force was used: Directive 1010.13.4.5</p>

<p>b. No – this is the deficiency</p> <p>c. Null – no injuries</p>	<p>13.4.5. Injuries: a description and photographs of the presence or absence of injuries to the subject or Bureau member involved in the use of force and if any medical treatment was administered, and by whom.</p> <p>Note: Directive 905.1.1.1 does not require an AAR if the member injury did not result in hospital admission, or death: Member injury resulting in hospital admission or death. For all other member injuries, supervisors shall be required to enter critiques and recommendations in the appropriate section of the injury log entry.</p>
<p>23. Are all officer's actions consistent with PPB Policy/DOJ Agreement? – Author</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No</p> <p>c. Unclear – Missing AAR</p> <p>d. Null – no force used</p>	<p>Source: squad AAR</p> <p>Unclear = required level of command did not review, or missing AAR</p>
<p>24. Are all officer's actions consistent with training? – Author</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No</p> <p>c. Unclear – Missing AAR</p> <p>d. Null – no force used</p>	<p>Source: squad AAR</p> <p>Unclear = required level of command did not review, or missing AAR</p>
<p>25. Force used was objectively reasonable? – Author</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No</p> <p>c. Unclear – Missing AAR</p> <p>d. Null – no force used</p>	<p>Source: squad AAR</p> <p>Unclear = required level of command did not review, or missing AAR.</p>
<p>26. Does command agree with the sergeant's findings?</p> <p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No</p> <p>c. Unclear – Missing AAR/missing level of review</p> <p>d. Null – no force used</p> <p>e. N/A – level of review not required</p>	<p>Source: squad AAR</p> <p>Answer for each level of review</p> <p>Unclear = required level of command did not review, or missing AAR</p>
<p>27. I reviewed this after action under the preponderance of the evidence standard</p>	<p>Source: squad AAR</p> <p>Answer for each level of review</p> <p>Unclear = required level of command did not review, or missing AAR</p>

<p>and concur with the sergeant's findings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes b. No c. Unclear – Missing AAR/missing level of review d. Null – no force used e. N/A – level of review not required 	
---	--