INDEPENDENT CITIZEN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

816 Fifth Avenue, Suite 400
Pittsburgh PA 15219
412-765-8023 Telephone – 412-765-8059 Facsimile
cprb@pittsburghpa.gov

`Minutes of the CPRB Meeting Held on February 28, 2023 (Mtg. No. 251)

Online Zoom Webinar # 854 0367 9472
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Neighborhood: Citywide

Video of the meeting: https://cprbpgh.org/443714

Members Present:	Excused Members:
Dr. Mary Jo Guercio, Chair	Ms. Karen McLellan, LEP*
Mr. Raymond Robinson, Vice Chair	Mr. Sheldon Williams, LEP*
Mr. Elwin Green	Absent: None
Ms. Lakeisha Brown	
Dr. Emma Lucas-Darby	Vacancy: None
	*Law Enforcement Professional
Solicitor: Atty. William F. Ward	Excused staff: All present.
Staff Present:	
Ms. Elizabeth C. Pittinger, Exec. Director	
Ms. Stephanie Hampton, Asst. Exec. Director	
Ms. Michelle Gamble, Lead Investigator	
Ms. Sherri Bridgett, Investigator	
Mr. David Ellwood, Investigator	
Ms. Tiffani Hunt, Investigator	

The entire meeting may be viewed here: Independent CPRB Meeting 02/28/2023

Dr. Guercio, Chair, called for corrections or additions to the Board meeting minutes conducted on February 28, 2023. No modifications or additions were offered, and hearing no objection, Dr. Guercio declared the minutes approved as distributed according to Robert's Rules of Order.

Dr. Mary Jo Guercio, Chair, called the online Zoom meeting to order at approximately 6:07 pm. Dr. Guercio acknowledged the presence of a quorum. Mr. Williams and Ms. McLellan were excused.

Opening remarks by the Chair:

Dr. Guercio had no opening remarks.

Executive Director's Report:

Ms. Pittinger, Executive Director of CPRB, reported that intake year to date is 40 complaints or contacts that involved City of Pittsburgh police officers' conduct.

The city of Pittsburgh has a Community Health and Safety Office that has been under development for the last several years. Most recently, it has been identified in some news reports with criticism, such as "they're still trying to get up and ready". However, Ms. Pittinger did have an opportunity to meet with their LEAD *(Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion)* Community Engagement Coordinator. They have some great ideas that they are pursuing with the community, including solicitation of input to development of a response model appropriate to the neighborhoods.

Their goal is to have officers assisted by mental health professionals and people who could with an effort to connect people to the kind of help and support they need immediately rather than having an enforcement action taken against them. It would put the police officers into a caretaking role which would be positive as long as the person gets what they need and the safety of a staff person assisting or riding with officers is also protected.

Mr. Jim Rogers's death (10/14/21) is still an open investigation. District Attorney Zappala indicated to media that he intends to release all the body-worn camera (BWC) video involved in that incident but did not reveal when that will be.

Ms. Pittinger introduced the guest speaker, Mr. Anthony Tassone, co-founder and CEO of Truleo, which has a body-worn camera (BWC) audio analytics program. It is an app that runs BWC video through a system and analyzes the characteristics of verbal communication between an officer and another person throughout an encounter. The program assesses an officer's language as recorded on a bodycam for both professionalism and risk, i.e., whether the officer's language was professional, escalated a situation, or contributed to a use of force. In addition, the app provides feedback to the officer, becoming a tool for professional development and accountability. Castle Shannon Chief of Police, Kenneth M. Truver, piloted the program, and now Castle Shannon is using it, and the Chief is reportedly very satisfied with the product.

Mr. Tassone thanked the Board for having him. Mr. Tassone shared a presentation with the Board. He explained that Truleo is an automated body-camera review and analysis platform, Truleo is based in Chicago and is a data science company. Truleo's technology is widely used in Fortune 500 companies, Wall Street and call centers like Bank of America, "This call is being monitored for quality assurance purposes." The product is not new. Businesses in sales and customer service can analyze employee phone calls to help generate Insight to recruit better people, train better people, and understand their client's pain points. Truleo has applied the technology they have worked on for ten years to policing. They have been in the police industry for about a year and a half and Mr. Tassone himself is from a police, military and law family.

Departments spend a lot of money on body cameras and less than one percent of those videos are ever reviewed by any human unless there's a horrific use of force or a civilian complaint. Most departments have a random review process where they'll select one video per month per officer. That video can be one minute long and could be of the officer driving. There's a review process that might occur called a random review that is not helping to improve police professionalism.

Truleo has learned that hundreds of millions of hours of this body camera data sitting in the cloud, where they can access it. PBP will wear their axon cameras and dock their cameras like they normally do. Truleo has integration into Axon, Motorola, LensLock and other camera providers. They are in the cloud, where their graphics processing units (GPUs) and Artificial Intelligence (AI) machine reside. They communicate back and

forth with the video storage. No human beings participate in the process and courts can not compel Truleo for the data because all data would stay with PBP. Truleo would automatically process a 100% of the data and provide PBP sergeants with insights around which officers are getting high professional remarks so they can celebrate, promote and flag which officers are using insults, threats or profanity. They would provide officers with training materials such as "don't use that language because it's ineffective and the data would show that if an officer is using threats, insults and profanity, they don't get any higher compliance rates than an officer that doesn't use that language. There is no benefit to using such language. It looks terrible to judges, juries or the public and the officer looks angry, out of control and emotional. Police officers need to be in control, think logically and at all times, professional.

Police officers are human beings that have bad days and make mistakes but Truleo can put things in context, so if an officer had a bad call for whatever reason, a supervisor may want to check in on them and say, "Hey, are you good? Do you need a break? You usually don't speak to people like that. Are you burned out? What's going on?" It can also act as an officer wellness tool so a supervisor may intervene and prevent risky behavior before it becomes a culture. The five young officers in Memphis made hundreds of decisions that would have happened before they decided to beat a man to death on camera. That didn't happen just that day. It was a lack of supervision and a culture that deteriorated over time. Truleo is a tool and a platform to automate supervision and maintain super-high levels of professionalism through body camera analysis.

Mr. Tassone explained that natural language processing is a fancy way of saying transcription and analysis again. The technology is used throughout the world by Fortune 500 Companies. Truleo transcribes and identifies which officer is speaking, which is essential. Then, It focuses on the officer's audio, which detects which officer is speaking based on the "Voice ID print." Once it separates out officers, it will automatically detect what events are happening right now with the officer. It looks for non-compliance and tries to figure out how to help the officer get better compliance in the future.

Officers that use Truleo will log into their non-compliance queue to review all the instances for the month of non-compliance. Officers listen to themselves, think about what they heard and take a small survey on their interaction. Truleo believes it is the key to getting reasonable compliance rates by giving fewer commands and more explanation. When officers give more explanation, they have about five times less use of force and escalations occurring. The officer collects points when they control their language, provide an explanation, are polite and give gratitude. When profanity, insults and threats are used, the program will flag it as a risk and the sergeant will have to manually click "yes or no, that's against policy."

The entire meeting may be viewed here: Independent CPRB Meeting 02/28/2023

Mr. Tassone explained that Truleo is like an email inbox. Supervisors can go into their officer's calls and look at stats. A search can be done by typing titles like "use of force." Data will come in as the shifts end and officers dock their BWC. A sergeant can click right to the chapter instead of watching a long one-hour video and go directly to where the use of force occurred. They can click on use of force and be taken to where the use of force occurred, listen to the language and watch the tactics to make sure the officer is following policy and procedure. Supervisors could click on an officer's name and get what's called the baseball card stats for cops. It looks at each officer over time to get a sense of how much professional language they use how much non-compliance they encounter and do they use risky behavior. Officers want to know how to get higher scores so as part of the onboarding, Truleo tells the officers exactly what they need to say. The idea is that the more professional officers are, the better (lower) their non-compliance rates are going to be.

About two dozen departments use Truleo throughout the country. Two are in Pennsylvania, Castle Shannon and Elizabethtown. A study that Truleo conducted on a department in California measured 12 months of historical data before Truleo was used they then processed data after Truleo was used for 12 months. The department saw a 36% decrease in use of force, a 30% decrease in unprofessional language and a 17% increase in explanation. They also saw a 12% decrease in non-compliance due to the officers using different language and giving more explanation and 98.7% of all the interactions were rated as professional, meaning there was no risk involved.

Dr. Darby said she was fascinated with the program and asked how long the program retains the data. Mr. Tassone replied that the machine does not retain any of the data. It communicates with the Axon evidence environment (evidence.com) and processes all of the videos. It then puts the transcripts and all the metadata in a database owned by the department. What Truleo has seen is that departments will tie it to the retention policy and as they delete videos in evidence.com after a certain period, that information will also be deleted from Truleo's database.

Dr. Darby asked if it required time to review each officer's data to determine what Trulia has picked up. Mr. Tassone replied no that Truleo processes 20,000-30,000 hours of video in a single night. Each officer creates about 250 hours a year of data. That is based on six to twelve interactions per shift and working an average of 20-22 days a month. Once the data is received, it is processed in almost real time. Before the sergeant goes home, his shift comes in, they dock their cameras and Truleo processes the data within minutes.

Dr. Darby asked if the data was processed on the spot and Mr. Tassone replied that as soon as the officers dock their cameras, Truleo begins to process the data before they leave the building.

Dr. Darby asked if the sergeant wanted to look at the data, what triggers whether the behavior was acceptable or not and Mr. Tassone replied that they would set up alerts and notifications just like in your email inbox and create their custom notifications.

Dr. Guercio asked if it was the sergeant at the end of their shift or the next sergeant at the start of their shift to review the data. Mr. Tassone replied that Truleo has seen that the sergeants are spread super thin and Truleo exists because departments are about 70% staffed with three years or less of experience. The middle of the department officers are gone or spread thin. There is no longer a big supervisory sergeant layer and that's where Truleo helps as a virtual sergeant or a sergeant's assistance tool.

When the squad comes in, they dock their BWC and Truleo will process their cameras. The sergeant may come in to take a look at the data. They're looking for all the use of force, frisk pursuits and non-compliant incidents so they can review it and not be surprised by anything before they leave. If there is a use of force, the sergeant would want to make sure the paperwork is filed. They'll typically do the risk review on a Friday. How many calls did the officer go on? Where did the officer use threats insults or profanity? The sergeant will verify that it's accurate, verify that it's against policy and then bring the incident up in their next performance review or discussion with the officer or they can send it right to the Command Staff.

Truleo provides suggestions to the patrol officer and the patrol officer knows that something has been flagged which could help get the conversation between the sergeant who remembers also a young officer who might have been a patrol officer six months ago and a lot of times it's hard for them to have the conversation with the patrol officers.

Ms. Hampton, Assistant Executive Director of CPRB, read questions from the audience.

Q: Is there a review mechanism for a situation where a sergeant may be overriding a review of language and such too frequently?

A: A whole bunch of metadata gets generated and sent to command staff, where Truleo compares the false positive rates of all the sergeants. It's very difficult for an officer to game the program even though they could use professional language. Still, their demeanor or attitude is ineffective. Truleo would detect that through the civilian response to prevent a sergeant from covering for officers or even picking on officers. The bias is removed, and everyone is judged by the same algorithms, models and weights.

Q: Is the FOP receptive in Pittsburgh?

A: Yes. Unions have different personalities and different attitudes throughout the country Pittsburgh in particular has been one of the more supportive unions of the product.

Q: Will CPRB have the ability to subpoena the metrics if an officer is in review.

A: Departments wrap this into a training program. Mr. Tassone has yet to see where anyone has been able to subpoena training data, and he has not seen any attempts, so it's very early for him to give an opinion. Departments emphasize the platform's training nature and do that to ensure that it's not exposed to public records requests.

Ms. Malaysia Smith, Community Engagement Coordinator with the Office of Community Health and Safety, asked whether the program could be used in a case where a person needs to be located. Can you search by name? Mr. Tassone replied the data is searchable, the videos are getting transcribed, and it's not a simple syntax parsing or simple keyword search. It's deep learning. Not only will Truleo reference the actual search term but all like terms.

Ms. Pittinger asked if the control of the BWC video is under a policy, is the Truleo data kept separately even if the video may have been purged could the analysis of that video retained somewhere else? Mr. Tassone replied: Yes, Axon sends Truleo an audio stream that they transcribe and analyze, and a transcript gets created. Some Metadata around the insight of how officers get scored is stored on a database, in Amazon.gov Cloud, Microsoft Azure or any gov cloud. The retention of the video and the transcript, so when they delete one, the other one is gone but the department can do whatever they want. Truleo never gets access to the database. They install the AI, called GPU containers, in the gov cloud and turn the cloud over to the department.

The entire meeting may be viewed here: Independent CPRB Meeting 02/28/2023

Ms. Pittinger asked Mr. Tassone if the Departments using the program are building that into an early warning system in-house. Mr. Tassone replied yes and said it was exciting because analytics is the future of policing. The federal government just created grant money for body camera analytics for the first time in 2023.

The Chief of Police, Neil H. Gang, Pinole Police Department uses Truleo to help with officer Wellness, depression and mental issues. ([Chief Gang in Pinole County, CA](#)) The Chief is looking for relationships between spikes and baseline. Where an officer performs at a certain rate over time and then suddenly their behavior has changed. It's an opportunity for the supervisor to check-in with the officer and ask how they are and if they are going through something.

Having analytics is good leadership and good policing. It's good to know what's going on with the officers. Truleo isn't being used as a punitive tool to catch officers using swear words. It is a tool that can celebrate officers doing a good job and a small percentage that are not doing a good job and can't get good compliance. They don't get good compliance because their professionalism and language are poor. Truleo is all about trying to identify who are the cops that are having problems getting compliance and letting sergeants and human beings focus on trying to fix that issue.

Ms. Pittinger expressed her high regard for the product, the way it works, and the feedback it gives to the individual officers. In her experience, what she has observed is a mix of officers wanting and reaching a professional level and others with no high level of expectation, so they aren't even reaching for it. Ms. Pittinger thinks that giving that feedback directly to the officer for their own personal professional development is huge. The things that work in in Corporate America, do have a place where we're trying to develop a profession and this is a tool that can help develop and put that element into the training and elevate the expectation.

Ms. Pittinger applauded Mr. Tassone and his colleagues for bringing Truleo out and for paying attention to this part of community life that usually only gets negative attention and thanked him for coming.

Mr. Tassone said Truleo is doing what everyone else already does in the Fortune 500. In any call center, anybody working in sales or support their calls are being analyzed by their employer to help the employee improve. Truleo is just simply taking the same technologies and applying them to policing.

Ms. Pittinger asked Mr. Tassone if he had an opportunity to discuss this product with the PBP, the Administration and or electeds in the City and if so, what kind of a response did you receive?

Mr. Tassone replied yes, he had a few interactions with Commander Ragland from PBP. The Commander has been an ally and is doing his best to champion the product and get it into the City. Mr. Tassone's understanding is there has been a lot of change in the PBP, and he could not recall having any formal presentations with any elected officials or the Mayor, and it is important that it happens. A lot of chiefs want their local Mayor to push this over the line. With analytics, it is tough for a chief to be in the position to say, "Well, I'm going to go do this," when no one is forcing them to do it. They need the elected officials to come and support the product. Both the Chiefs and the Mayors need to be partners in acquiring and implementing a product like Truleo.

Ms. Pittinger asked how the local law departments, not just the city of Pittsburgh, but generally speaking, city municipal solicitors, the lawyers on behalf of the municipal corporations, responded to the product. Mr. Tassone replied that the City managers and the like do like the tool. Truleo does not run into any hurdles with any of the law departments.

Dr. Guercio asked how recently Mr. Tassone had talked with PBP, and he responded he has had informal contacts with Commander Ragland and Zoom visits last summer. He hasn't had much interaction with the PBP

administration and his understanding is that there's been some leadership changes and he is waiting for the City to get a chief. Dr. Guercio thanked Mr. Tassone for presenting to the board and that the Board appreciated his time.

Case Review:

Dr. Guercio moved to the Case Review Agenda (copy attached). Each group of recommendations was voted upon as recorded on the attached Case Review Actions.

Mr. Green asked for clarification for case 099-22. Who directed them to go to customer service? Ms. Hunt, the investigator, responded they were directed by loss prevention, and he is a witness but can't recall which witness number he is.

Re: #175-22: Ms. Brown asked for clarification on 175-22. is this the same case presented a few months ago with the gentleman who saw the police officer in the bike lane? Ms. Hunt responded yes. Ms. Brown asked if there was an extended investigation. Ms. Hunt responded that it is suspended because it's ready to move forward with a possible vote for a public hearing vote. Ms. Pittinger added that the case would return to the Board next month with a recommendation for a public hearing, but the charge sheets need to be prepared.

Mr. Green asked for clarification of the incident time for 175-22 being 2815 (hrs) would it be 1815 (hrs). Ms. Hunt responded yes it was 1815 (hrs).

Mr. Green asked for clarification of the BWC policy. Specifically, the distinction between not turning the camera on in the first place and turning it off when it is already on. Ms. Hunt responded the policy says because he was interacting with the public, the officer should have turned on his BWC on to begin with. Dr. Guercio asked if the officer turned the BWC off or he never turned it on. Ms. Hunt responded yes he never turned it on.

Ms. Brown and Dr. Guercio asked was he off duty and doing something socially and not in uniform? Ms. Hunt responded that the officer was on a secondary detail and parked his personal vehicle in the bike lane.

The entire meeting may be viewed here: Independent CPRB Meeting 02/28/2023

Next Meeting:

Dr. Guercio announced the time and location of the next Board meeting: Tuesday, March 28, 2023, at 6:00 pm via Zoom. The meeting link will be posted on the cprbpgh.org website and Facebook page.

Unfinished Business:

None

New Business:

None

Public Comment:

Mr. and Mrs. Ozark greeted the Board.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was offered by Mr. Green, seconded by Ms. Brown, and approved unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Stephanie M. Dorman
Assistant Executive Director

Attachments (1): 02/28/2023 Case Review Actions

CPRB CASE REVIEW AGENDA 02/28/2023

CPRB CASE NO. INVESTIGATOR	ALLEGATION(S)	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
				PUBLIC HEARING ()
				FULL INVESTIGATION (3)
028-23 Ellwood	16-1.3.7 Conduct Toward the Public 16-1.3.13: Neglect of Duty 40-19 Reports	The Cx alleges that SO#1 and SO#2 were rude and discourteous to her and W#1 when dealing with an incident involving W#2.	Authorized Full Investigation 4-0	Preliminary Inquiry (PI) Supports the cause to investigate if SOs violated PBP Policy and Procedures
010-23 Hunt	11-3 Unbiased Policing 16-1 (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 16-1(3.7) Conduct Towards the Public 16-1(3.13.1) Neglect of Duty 40-9 Reports	The Cx alleges that he was in a motor vehicle accident and the SO refused to provide him with an accident report.	Authorized Full Investigation 4-0	Preliminary Inquiry (PI) Supports the cause to investigate if SOs violated PBP Policy and Procedures
004-23 Ellwood	16-1.3.7 Conduct Toward the Public	The Cx alleges that the SO came to her home while she was working and arrested her for disorderly conduct he was rude and discourteous.	Authorized Full Investigation 4-0	Preliminary Inquiry (PI) Supports the cause to investigate if SOs violated PBP Policy and Procedures
				30-DAY EXTENSION OF FULL INVESTIGATION (5)
187-22 Elwood	16-1.3.13: Neglect of Duty 40-19 Reports	The Cx alleges that the SO neglected his duty when he failed to take a police report after the Cx called 911 for a traffic accident.	Authorized 30-day investigation 4-0	More time is needed to determine if SOs violated PBP Policy and Procedures.
181-22 Bridgett	16-1 (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 16-1 (3.7) Conduct Toward The Public 16-1 (3.13) Neglect of Duty	The Cx alleges that he was the victim of a hit and run accident and the SOs refused to take a report or file charges against the person who hit his vehicle.	Authorized 30-day investigation 4-0	More time is needed to determine if SOs violated PBP Policy and Procedures.
175-22 Hunt	16-1 (3.6.1 & 3.6.3) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 16-1 (3.7.2) Conduct Toward The Public 16-1 (3.19.1) Truthfulness 29-01-01(14.10,14.11) Secondary Details 69-03 (8.0) Body Worn Camera	The Cx states that he encountered the SO while riding his bike through downtown Pittsburgh and noticed an illegally parked vehicle in the bike lane.	Authorized 30-day investigation 4-0	More time is needed to determine if SOs violated PBP Policy and Procedures.

CPRB CASE NO. INVESTIGATOR	ALLEGATION(S)	SUMMARY	RECOMMENDATION	RATIONALE
102-22 Ellwood	12-06 Use Of Force 16-1.3.06: Conduct Unbecoming 16-1.3.07: Conduct Toward The Public 16-1.3.13: Neglect Of Duty	Cx alleges that the SOs used excessive force in arresting her and that it was illegal to arrest her because she was trying to protect her wounded son from the police during his arrest.	Authorized 30-day investigation 4-0	More time is needed to determine if SOs violated PBP Policy and Procedures.
099-22 Hunt	11.3 (3.) Un-biased Policing 12-6 Use of Force 16-1 (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 16-1 (3.7) Conduct Toward The Public	Cx#1 and Cx#2 alleged that SOs were inappropriate and used excessive force toward them when they (SOs) responded to a shoplifting call.	Authorized 30-day investigation 4-0	More time is needed to determine if SOs violated PBP Policy and Procedures.
				UNFOUNDED (0)
				UNSUSTAINABLE (1)
160-21 ED Ellwood	11-3 (3.1, 3.2, 4.1.2) Unbiased Policing 12-6 (3.0, 4.0, 5.0) Use of Force 12-8 (3.0, 4.0) Matrix of Control 12-13 Taser 16-1 (3.06) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 16-1 (3.07) Conduct Towards the Public	Executive Director has opened an inquiry into an alleged incident on August 17, 2021, at UPMC Presbyterian Hospital.	Authorized Dismiss as unfounded 4-0	Nothing gathered in the evidence point to the SO violating Policy and Procedures.
				OTHER (0)
				SUSPENSION (1)
197-22 Ellwood	16-1.3.06 Conduct Unbecoming 16-01.3.07 Conduct Toward the Public 16-1.3.13 Neglect of Duty	The Cx alleges that the SO is harassing him based on calls made to 911 by W#1 for abuse.	Authorized suspension until March 2023.	More time is needed to determine if SOs violated PBP Policy and Procedures.

************* Continuing Suspensions Follow *************

CPRB CASE NO. INVESTIGATOR	ALLEGATION(S)	REASON FOR CONTINUED INVESTIGATION	POSSIBLE CLOSING DATE
171-22 Hunt	11-3 Unbiased Policing 16-1 (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 16-1 (3.7) Conduct Toward The Public 16-1 (3.19.1) Truthfulness 12-6 Use of Force	More time is needed to review BWC.	TBD
170-22 Ellwood	11.3 Unbiased Policing 12.3 Oath of Office 16.3.01 Obedience to orders and laws 16-1.3.06 Conduct Unbecoming 16-1.3.13 Neglect of Duty	The investigator is trying to determine what disciplinary action the SO received.	TBD
143-22 Ellwood	016-1.3.06 Conduct Unbecoming 016-1.3.07 Conduct Toward the Public	More time is needed to gather officer statements.	TBD
123-22 Ellwood	016-1.3.06 Conduct Unbecoming 40-04 Motor Vehicle Stops 41-04.01 Towing Procedures, Reasons for Towing 44-02 Arrests, Summary Citations, Non-traffic 44-03 Arrests, Electronic Citations, Traffic and Non-traffic 54-01 Traffic Citations	More time is needed to gather officer statements.	TBD
100-22 Bridgett	16-1 (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 16-1 (3.7) Conduct Toward the Public	Verifying if there is body cam footage available.	TBD

CPRB CASE NO. INVESTIGATOR	ALLEGATION(S)	REASON FOR CONTINUED INVESTIGATION	POSSIBLE CLOSING DATE
063-22 Bridgett	16-1 (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 40-4 Traffic Stops	The investigator is trying to determine what disciplinary action the SO received.	TBD (Updated 10/25/22)
035-22 Hunt	16-1 (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming A Member 16-1 (3.7) Conduct Toward The Public 16-1 (3.9) Truthfulness 44-1 Arrests 45-2 (5.1) Warrantless Searches & Seizures	More time is needed to obtain BWC footage, SO statements, Affidavit of Probable Cause, receipts for vehicle repairs, and identify witnesses.	TBD
020-22 Hunt	16-1 (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming a Member or Employee 16-1 (3.7) Conduct Toward the Public 16-1 (3.13) Neglect of Duty 16-1 (3.19.1) Truthfulness 53-01, Court Appearances	The Cx, the victim of a home invasion, alleges that SO#1 was rude and discourteous towards her when she questioned why W#1 did not appear in court that day.	TBD
001-22 ED Bridgett	16-1 (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 20-01 (6.4.1, 6.4.5, 6.4.6) No Harassment	Waiting on a response from the Public Safety Director.	TBD
177-21 Hunt	16-1 (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 16-1 (3.13) Neglect of Duty 45-2 Warrantless Searches & Seizures 54-01 Traffic Citation	More time is needed to obtain BWC footage, SO statements, affidavits of probable cause, receipts for vehicle repairs, and identify the witnesses.	TBD
138-21 Ellwood	12-06.3.2 Use of Force 16-01.3.06 Conduct Unbecoming 16-01.3.07 Conduct Toward the Public	More time is needed to determine if the SO violated PBP Policy and Procedures.	TBD
252-20 Ellwood	16-01 (3.7.1) Conduct Toward the 40-04 Public Motor Vehicle Stops	Waiting for SO statements.	TBD
112-20 Bridgett	11-3 Unbiased Policing 16-1, (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 16-1, (3.07) Conduct Toward the Public	Waiting for the Daily Activity Log/ Running Sheet from the PBP	TBD
190-19 Bridgett	16-1, (3.6) Conduct Unbecoming a Member 16-1, (3.7) Conduct Toward the Public	The investigator is trying to determine what disciplinary action the SO received.	TBD

	40-12 Police-Response-to-Domestic-Violence-Incidents		
CPRB CASE NO. INVESTIGATOR	**ALLEGATION(S)**	**REASON FOR CONTINUED INVESTIGATION**	**POSSIBLE CLOSING DATE**
87-18-ED Gamble	12-6 Use of Force 12-7 Discharge of firearms 16-1 (3.6) Conduct unbecoming a member 16-1, (3.19) Truthfulness 62-1 Records/Reports/Files	Waiting for witnesses. to cooperate.	TBD